

1993

The Western States Theatre Review, Volume 1, 1993

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cedar.wwu.edu/wstr>

 Part of the [Other Theatre and Performance Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

(1993) "The Western States Theatre Review, Volume 1, 1993," *The Western States Theatre Review*: Vol. 1 , Article 1.
Available at: <https://cedar.wwu.edu/wstr/vol1/iss1/1>

This Complete Volume is brought to you for free and open access by the Peer-reviewed Journals at Western CEDAR. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Western States Theatre Review by an authorized editor of Western CEDAR. For more information, please contact westerncedar@wwu.edu.

Northwest
THEATRE
REVIEW

Volume 1

1993

- 1 "OTHERWISE I MUST HAVE ENCUMBERED THE STAGE WITH DEAD BODIES": NAHUM TATE'S *KING LEAR* — LAURILYN J. HARRIS
- 13 RESOURCES FOR THE STUDY AND REPLICATION OF ALASKAN NATIVE COSTUME — MARCIELLA BROWN, SEPTEMBER LAAKSO, ANNE MCBETH AND TARA MACINNIS; EDITED BY TARA MACINNIS
- 19 CO-EXISTENCE AND WAR BETWEEN THE TEMPLE AND GRAND OPERA HOUSES DURING LEWISTON, IDAHO'S THEATRE BOOM — KRISTINE M. YATES
- 24 A PARADIGM FOR SECURING ARTS AGENCY FUNDING THAT SUPPORTS THE ACTOR-TEACHER PRELUDE TO THEATRE PERFORMANCE FOR YOUNG AUDIENCES — CHARLES R. HANNUM

NORTHWEST THEATRE REVIEW

Editor

George Caldwell
School of Music and Theatre Arts
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington 99164-2432 (509) 335-7447

Coordinating Editors

Dawn Reynolds
Pullman, Washington

Doug Kerr
Pierce College, Tacoma, Washington

Lyle Schwarz
Eastern Oregon State College, La Grande, Oregon

Editorial Policy

The *Northwest Theatre Review* is a regional journal intended to publish works by or about Northwest theatre scholars and practitioners. Our goal is to provide a means by which to share the discoveries and accomplishments of our vast, highly productive region as exemplified by the diverse topics contained in this first issue. Future issues will include a research article on the training of apprentice actors in Shakespeare's company, an historical account of the Northwest Drama Conference and a description of an early scenic studio in Boise, Idaho. All contributions are of vital importance to our region and may encompass topics as wide ranging as playwriting, community college issues, theatre for youth and international theatre. Please submit projects, articles, reports or short playscripts to the editor. Materials should consist of a hard copy (double spaced with the title, your name and professional title and institutional affiliation, if applicable) and, if possible, a 3 1/2" diskette with the identification of the language/format and document title.

On behalf of the membership and the executive board of the Northwest Drama Conference, it is my great pleasure to hail and to celebrate this inaugural issue of the Northwest Theatre Review. I believe that the publication of this journal marks a major step in the development of our organization, and I invite active participation from all who share our interest in, enthusiasm for, and dedication to the theatre in the Northwest. Sincere thanks to all the contributors and especially to George Caldwell, our editor, for helping to make this dream into a reality.

Michael Hood, President NWDC, Inc.

NORTHWEST DRAMA CONFERENCE
(Founded 1948)

Membership in the Northwest Drama Conference, which includes a subscription to the *Northwest Theatre Review*, is open to non-students for \$35 per year and \$20 per year for students. Individual copies of the *Northwest Theatre Review* without conference membership are \$6.00 each.

Please send change of address, payment of dues or other requests to:

Millie Stenehjelm, Treasurer
P.O. Box 1647
Yakima Valley State College
Yakima, WA 98902

Officers of the Conference

Michael Hood, President
University of Alaska, Anchorage
Mark Kuntz, Vice President
Eastern Oregon State College
Millie Stenehjelm, Treasurer
Yakima Valley State College
Bruce Brockman, Secretary
University of Idaho

NWDC Participating Institutions

Bellevue Community College	Shoreline Community College
Boise State University	Skagit Valley Community College
Centralia Community College	Southern Oregon State College
Central Washington University	Treasure Valley College
Clark College	University of Alaska, Anchorage
Columbia Basin College	University of Alaska, Fairbanks
Eastern Montana College	University of Idaho
Eastern Oregon State College	University of Montana
Everett Community	University of Northern Colorado
Highline Community College	University of Oregon
Lane Community College	University of Portland
Lewis-Clark State College	University of Puget Sound
Linfield College	University of Wyoming
* Oregon State University	Walla Walla Community College
Pacific Univeristy	Washington State University
Pierce College	Western Oregon State College
Portland State University	Western Washington University
Rocky Mountain College	Yakima Valley Community College
Sheldon Jackson College	

Northwest Theatre Review invites advertisements. All material submitted should be camera-ready. Rates and standard proportions are as follows:

Full page (4.5" wide x 7.25" high) — \$75 per issue
Half page (4.5" wide x 3.5" high) — \$50 per issue

Submit material and inquiries to George Caldwell, School of Music and Theatre Arts, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington 99164-2432.

“Otherwise I must have encumbered the Stage with dead Bodies”: Nahum Tate’s *King Lear*

LAURILYN J. HARRIS

According to the Lord Chamberlain’s records,¹ on December 12, 1660, eleven plays were exclusively set aside as the special property of the Duke’s Company. The plays included Shakespeare’s *Tempest*, *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night*, *King Lear*, and *Romeo and Juliet*, all of which William Davenant, the company’s manager, proposed “to reform and make fitt”² for the sophisticated Restoration audiences. However, though he busily set about operatizing *Macbeth* and altering *The Tempest* into something truly “rich and strange,” Davenant seems to have paid little attention to a play now considered one of Shakespeare’s most profound tragedies—*King Lear*. The play was apparently produced very infrequently; records of only a few performances can be found prior to 1681,³ and *Lear* was not even listed among the “Principal, which we call’d Stock-Plays” of the company.⁴ Indeed, John Downes in his *Roscius Anglicanus* (1708) says that *King Lear* was only occasionally played “as Mr. Shakespeare wrote it,”⁵ and therefore “we may not unfairly infer that Shakespeare’s great tragedy . . . failed either to please the critics or to attract the town.”⁶

The play might have languished indefinitely save for the industry, talent, and unbridled self-confidence of Nahum Tate, a future Poet Laureate with an already-solid literary reputation, who decided that the drama merely needed a few minor modifications in order to captivate the public. The result—*The History of King Lear*, “Reviv’d with Alterations. By N. Tate,”⁷—was unleashed on Restoration audiences in the spring of 1681⁸ at the Dorset Garden Theatre. The cast was the finest the city could provide, with the great Thomas Betterton as Lear, William Smith as Edgar, Thomas Gillo as Gloster, Joseph Williams as Edmund, the distinguished tragedienne Lady Slingsby (Mary Lee) as Regan, Mrs. Shadwell as Gonerill,

LAURILYN J. HARRIS, Ph.D., is Associate Professor of School of Music and Theatre Arts, Washington State University.

and Elizabeth Barry, renowned for pathetic roles, as Cordelia.⁹ The audience received both Tate's redaction and the performers with the greatest enthusiasm (Smith, Shadwell, and Lady Slingsby were particularly applauded),¹⁰ the only untoward incident occurring when Mrs. Barry, who was famous for her amorous exploits, proclaimed as Tate's Cordelia that she was "Bold" in her "Virgin Innocence," at which the audience gave way to unseemly laughter.¹¹ However, Tate's adaptation easily survived this indecorous outburst and speedily "became one of the most popular plays on the English stage,"¹² holding its own for 157 years and delighting approximately five generations of theatre-goers, who supported it long after almost all other Shakespearean redactions had been rejected. For example, during the period 1700-1728, *Lear*, as revised by Tate, was performed 87 times,¹³ and was one of the five most frequently performed tragedies at Drury Lane from 1747-1776.¹⁴ Every important actor of the late seventeenth, eighteenth, and early nineteenth centuries, including Betterton, George Powell, Robert Wilkes, Barton Booth, Anthony Boheme, James Quin, David Garrick, Spranger Barry, and John Kemble, played the title role in a *Lear* that was essentially Tate's.

And what exactly did the label "Alterations. By N. Tate" imply? What modifications so enchanted audiences, actors, and managers alike that the play not only held the stage until 1838 but also outlived its later competitors?¹⁵ Tate's "Alterations" in general fall into three major categories: plot, characterization, and language. In the first place, Tate apparently found Shakespeare's plot line confusing and incoherent, "a Heap of Jewels, unstrung and unpolisht."¹⁶ Therefore, urged on by his friend, Thomas Boteler, Esq. (who achieved dubious immortality thereby), he hit upon a unique method of tying together the *Lear*-Gloucester plot strands:

'Twas my good Fortune to light on one Expedient to rectifie what was wanting in the Regularity and Probability of the Tale, which was to run through the whole, A Love betwixt Edgar and Cordelia, that never chang'd word with each other in the Original. This renders Cordelia's Indifference and her Father's Passion in the first Scene probable. It likewise gives Countenance to Edgar's Disguise, making that a generous Design that was before a poor shift to save his Life. The Distress of the Story is evidently heightened by it; and it particularly gave Occasion of a New Scene or Two.¹⁷

In order to incorporate this minor plot revision, Tate soon found it necessary to make a few other accommodations. For example, if Cordelia and Edgar are to be in love, the King of France must be omitted. If tragic decorum is to remain intact, the Fool likewise must disappear. However, Tate does give Cordelia a bland confidante, Arante, who is useful both for running errands¹⁸ and for chaperoning the love scenes. Other roles are diminished (Albany) or enlarged (Edmund, Regan) as Tate deems appropriate for his version of the "Tale." The ending too seemed to need some slight alteration, for if the love story was to occupy the audience's attention, Tate believed it appropriate that the plot "conclude in a Success to the innocent distrest Persons."¹⁹ He appears particularly pleased with his final scene, in which Lear is restored to his throne, reconciled to Cordelia, and resigns his kingship in her favor in order to retire with

Kent and Gloster "to some cool Cell" and meditate "in calm Reflections on our Fortunes past" (V, 6, 150).²⁰ This conclusion not only fulfilled the demands of poetic justice, but left most of the major characters upright instead of prone. "Otherwise," said Tate, "I must have incumbred the Stage with dead Bodies."²¹ Plot and character changes also necessitated substantial alterations in tone, sentiments, phrasing, and language, and Tate, to the applause of the theatrical world, didn't hesitate "to omit, conflate, and rearrange Shakespeare's scenes while rewriting (and reassigning) a good deal of his blank verse."²² Carried away by his own ingenuity, Tate smugly concludes in his Epilogue:

If you like nothing you have seen to Day
The Play your Judgment damns, not you the Play.²³

The modern reaction to Tate's *Lear* is usually stunned disbelief and/or hysterical laughter, quickly followed by expressions of outrage that anyone, Poet Laureate or not, should dare ravish a masterpiece in such a cavalier fashion. The words most used by twentieth-century critics to describe Tate's efforts are "mutilate"²⁴ and "mangle,"²⁵ and the result of those efforts has been variously categorized as "heinous,"²⁶ a "distortion,"²⁷ and "this execrable piece of dementation."²⁸ By 1850, the word "Tatefication" had been coined "to refer to the debasement of great literary works."²⁹ However, as Summers points out, "a drama which lives in the theatre for one hundred and fifty years cannot be ignorantly dismissed with a shrug and a sneer."³⁰ The play was not only, as Tate claims in his dedicatory letter, "well receiv'd by my Audience,"³¹ but also, as subsequent theatre managers discovered, good box office for well over a century whereas Shakespeare's version was not. Therefore, Tate's *Lear* is more than just a curious artifact or an object lesson in the mutilation of a masterpiece. It deserves serious examination, if only to illuminate the tastes and attitudes of the audiences and critics who both shaped it and faithfully supported it, for "nowhere better can we find expressed the likes and the dislikes of the time."³² Such an investigation into seventeenth and eighteenth century standards of art, and into the reputations of both Tate and Shakespeare, provides ample explanation for the adaptation's astounding success and its stubborn refusal to disappear.

Though Nahum Tate is usually dismissed by modern critics as a mediocre poetic bungler whose reach far exceeded his grasp,³³ he was known to his contemporaries as "a man of learning, courteous and candid,"³⁴ and a versatile and prolific writer. Educated at Trinity College, he was active in London literary circles by 1676, and had his first book of poems ("in the lugubrious vein")³⁵ published in 1677. He was eventually Poet Laureate of England for 23 years (1692-1715), and author of more than 100 published works, including a metrical translation of the Psalms, the libretto for Purcell's *Dido and Aeneas*, several collaborations with John Dryden (for example, *The Second Part of Absalom and Achitophel*), a number of political and eulogistic poems, and a mock-heroic "Poem Upon Tea"

(1700) which is sometimes considered his masterpiece.³⁶ Other notable literary contributions are a free rendering of Fracastoro's verse history of syphilis (1686), and a poem entitled "A Present for the Ladies: Being an Historical Vindication of the Female Sex" (1692), both of which went through several editions.

Tate's dramatic efforts met with varied success. His *Cuckold's-Haven* (adapted from *Eastward Ho!* in 1685) was unsuccessful, but his farce *A Duke and no Duke* (adapted from Astou Cokain's *Trappolin Suppos'd a Prince* in 1684) "proved extremely to the taste of the town"³⁷ and held the stage until the end of the eighteenth century. *Brutus of Alba* (1678) and *The Loyal General* (1679) did not set the theatrical world on fire, and his adaptations of *Richard II* (suppressed by the Lord Chamberlain in 1680)³⁸ and *Coriolanus* (entitled by Tate *The Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth*, 1682) sank without a trace, but *Lear* was a great success, and Tate's literary reputation seems to have suffered little damage from his less durable theatrical creations.

In studying any adaptation, it is necessary to determine the redactor's vision of the work being revised. Hazelton Spencer describes Tate's revisions as "purely capricious"³⁹ and "without rhyme or reason,"⁴⁰ but a close study of Tate's *Lear* reveals that Tate, unlike some of his contemporaries, did not alter Shakespeare out of a burning desire for novelty or "a thoughtless and senseless passion for any kind of alteration."⁴¹ Nor do his changes seem to arise solely from an intuitive divination of what would best please the public. Indeed, as the prefaces to his plays make abundantly clear, Tate "evidently thought a good deal of and about Shakespeare,"⁴² and based his redactions on definite critical principles. He seems to have been genuinely dissatisfied with the original *Lear*, and his drastic revisions follow a coherent plan. In general, Tate attempted both to force the play to conform to Restoration standards of dramatic art and to put the play within the scope and comprehension of his audience. In order to accomplish both objectives, he tried to make the play "reasonable,"⁴³ to unify and simplify what he saw as a hopelessly episodic and confusing plot, to motivate actions he saw as bizarre, to remove all the improbabilities he considered dramatic defects—in short, to rationalize an irrational play.⁴⁴ He more than succeeded. He made the actions more probable and "the dilemmas more obviously moral,"⁴⁵ pruned away in the name of clarity, cut down the play's immense scope to a manageable size, sentimentalized, trivialized, and conventionalized the characters and their emotions, and, as Lamb stated, thus "put his hook in the nostrils of this Leviathan" in order "to draw the mighty beast about more easily."⁴⁶

In dealing with the plot, Tate simply found that "the action did not conform to Restoration standards of dramatic unity, and the mixed style failed the test of genre."⁴⁷ Unity of action was one of the major neoclassical precepts, and, as Dryden pointed out in his essay "On the Grounds of Criticism in Tragedy" (1679), a tragedy should be "an imitation of one

entire, great, and probable action."⁴⁸ Given this dictum, it was natural that Tate, busy "Newmodelling"⁴⁹ the *Lear* story, should look for some sort of link to connect the *Lear*-*Gloucester* actions, ignoring "the poignancy of the coincidence of *Lear*'s and *Gloucester*'s misfortunes which is the essence of Shakespeare's tragedy."⁵⁰ Given the popularity of "heroic" love stories in dramas such as Dryden's *Conquest of Granada*, it was obvious what the link should be, and the love affair between Cordelia and Edgar "is the *raison d'être*"⁵¹ of most of the alterations that follow. Cordelia answers her father coldly, not out of disgust at the hypocrisy of her sisters, but out of a desire to escape from a forced marriage to Burgundy, her "loath'd" suitor. The love interest likewise provides Edgar with a sufficiently noble motive for his Mad Tom disguise—not sordid self-preservation, but a desire to protect Cordelia as she wanders about the heath in search of her father. The love affair also gives Tate a number of opportunities for interpolated scenes, such as Cordelia's rejection of Edgar to "test" his love, Edgar's rescue of Cordelia from Edmund's ruffians on the heath and their mutual declaration of love which follows, and the final salvation of Cordelia and *Lear* by Edgar and Albany in the last act ("Death! Hell! Ye Vultures hold your impious Hands," V, 6, 34). Tate simply "seized on the romance characteristics of Shakespeare's play and restored it to what must have seemed to him its intended genre,"⁵² and the love affair becomes the center of the play.

The greatest sacrifice to the new focus was Tate's revised ending, of which he was inordinately proud. Even modern critics find *King Lear* "unspeakably sad,"⁵³ and Tate had no intention of distressing an audience who plainly had no interest in a tragedy about chaos and disintegration. Tate's motives in changing the final scene and thus the tone of the whole play are complex, and his statement about not incumbering the stage with dead bodies is certainly the least of them. The audience had obviously not objected to Dryden's "corpse-paved ending"⁵⁴ for *Troilus and Cressida* two years before, and Tate himself drenched the stage with gore in his adaptation of *Coriolanus*, in which not only the hero (as in the original) but almost everyone is dispatched, including *Coriolanus*' little son, who is "Maugled, Gash't, Rack't, Distorted."⁵⁵ But, while the Restoration audience liked scenes of mayhem and murder, they were also firm believers in the principle of poetic justice, which insured the safety of "innocent distressed Persons" such as Cordelia and Edgar. The age of Tate "held that under the appearances of things lay an order of justice which it was the job of literature to imitate, not to hide,"⁵⁶ and the purpose of tragedy was to illuminate this divine order and to demonstrate the workings of "a Divine Power which distributed even-handed justice."⁵⁷ Shakespeare's play explicitly demonstrates that the destruction of evil may involve the destruction of much good, and Restoration audiences would have none of it. Said the critic Gildon in 1710, "The King and Cordelia ought by no means to have dy'd, and therefore Mr. Tate has very justly alter'd that particular, which must disgust the reader and audience to have vertue

and piety meet so unjust a reward."⁵⁸ Rymer had condemned Shakespeare for sacrificing innocent characters in defiance of "poetick justice,"⁵⁹ and Dryden concluded that "the Punishment of Vice and Reward of Virtue are the most adequate Ends of Tragedy, because most conducive to good Examples of Life."⁶⁰ Tate, scion of a family of protestant ministers and renowned for his determination to "reform the Stage,"⁶¹ needed no encouragement, and announced in his Prologue that "morals were alwaies proper for the Stage."⁶² Hence, "those who are more sinned against than sinning, including Lear, Cordelia, and Gloucester,"⁶³ are permitted to live. Shakespeare's bleak, elemental tragedy is reduced to a melodrama, and diminished beyond recognition.

However, as a writer of melodrama, Tate proved remarkably effective. He clearly had an affinity for the genre. In his quest to make the implicit explicit, he "firms up the appearances of plausibility throughout,"⁶⁴ and finds an expedient for every difficulty. Cordelia's silence, Lear's destructive acts, the success of Edmund's plots—all are neatly and persuasively explained. In addition, Tate exploited theatricality by turning potentialities to actualities, giving audiences scenes they clearly wished to see: a seduction scene for Regan and Edmund ("A Grotto. Edmund and Regan amorously Seated."), an interlude with the blinded Gloucester during the final battle, and a pathetic prison scene with Lear and Cordelia ("Lear asleep, with his Head on Cordelia's Lap"). To these, "Tate adds passages of distressed love, heroic rescue, joyful reunion with happy prospects, and adulterous lust."⁶⁵ To the typical audience of the late seventeenth century, in love with "happy endings, villain plays, and pathetic tragedies,"⁶⁶ Tate's *Lear* fulfilled all the dramatic expectations that Shakespeare's uncompromising tragedy seemed to violate.

In order to make room for his new scenes, Tate cut a number of passages in the original and considerably modified Shakespeare's language. This too was considered not only acceptable, but necessary by Restoration critical standards. Among the basic assumptions of the adapters was the firm conviction that language had greatly improved since the Elizabethan age. They believed "that there was only one standard of excellence"⁶⁷ by which to judge literary style, and that standard was theirs. To them, "other manners of writing were merely imperfect efforts to reach an ideal to which the age of the adapters was closer."⁶⁸ The critics of the Restoration regarded Elizabethan style as markedly inferior to their own, and "agreed unanimously" that Shakespeare, "whatever else he could do, could not write decent English."⁶⁹ According to Dryden:

The tongue is in general so greatly refin'd since Shakespear's time, that many of his Words, and more of his Phrases, are unintelligible. And of those which we understand, some are ungrammatical, others coarse and his whole Stile is so pester'd with Figurative Expressions, that it is as affected as it is obscure.⁷⁰

In an attempt to rectify these errors and weaknesses, the Restoration dramatists clarified, simplified, and regularized, polishing the speeches until very little of the original figurative diction was left. In Tate's *Lear*,

some verbal changes were obviously made for the sake of elegance: "I cannot heave my heart into my mouth" is replaced by "I can't Dissemble;" "Rumble thy bellyful" becomes "Rumble thy fill." At other times, in attempting to make the suggestive explicit, Tate eliminates much of the power of Shakespeare's most moving speeches. For example, Lear's storm speech,

Blow, winds, and crack your cheeks! rage! blow!
You cataracts and hurricanoes, spout
Till you have drench'd the steeple, drown'd the cocks!
You sulphurous and thought-executing fires,
Vaunt-couriers to oak-cleaving thunderbolts,
Singe my white head! And thou, all-shaking thunder,
Smite flat the thick rotundity o' the world,
Crack nature's mould, all germins spill at once
That make ingrateful man! (III, 2)71

becomes in Tate's version,

Blow Winds and burst your Cheeks, rage louder yet,
Fantastick Lightning singe, singe my white Head;
Spout Cataracts, and Hurricanos fall
Till you have drown'd the Towns and Palaces
Of proud ingrateful! Man (III, 1, 1-5)

What is particularly alarming is that Tate, in his dedicatory epistle, professes to admire Shakespeare's language in the mad scenes:

The Images and Language are so odd and surprizing, and yet so agreeable and proper, that whilst we grant that none but Shakespear could have form'd such Conceptions, yet we are satisfied that they were only Things in the World that ought to be said on those Occasions.⁷²

Apparently, the "only Things in the World" were in desperate need of revision. In all, Tate cut 827 of Shakespeare's lines, and revised others according to "the curious mixture of extravagance and bathos that composes Tate's style."⁷³

When Tate began to compose new speeches for the play, he self-consciously imitated what he thought was Shakespeare's style, apologizing in his Preface for the lack of "Quaintness" (by which he meant the refinements so dear to his age) "even in the newest Parts of this Play." He confessed "'twas Design in me, partly to comply with my Author's Style . . . and partly to give it some Resemblance of the Time and Persons here Represented."⁷⁴ In other words, Tate could not distinguish between bad poetry and poetry which did not conform to his own standards of elegance.⁷⁵ The results are almost a caricature of Shakespearean verse, as in Cordelia's speech to Edgar on the heath:

By the dear Vital Stream that baths my Heart,
These hallow'd Rags of Thine, and naked Vertue,
These abject Tassels, these fantastick Shreds,
(Ridiculous ev'n to the meanest Clown)
To me are dearer than the richest Pomp
of Purple Monarchs. (III, 4, 96-101).

The creators of *Beyond the Fringe* must have studied Tate's *Lear*.

The altered language and plot have a profound and devastating effect on characterization. Since so many of Lear's speeches have been cut or altered, he appears not as "a great oak struck by lightning"⁷⁶ or a "towering ruin,"⁷⁷ but as a feeble, fussy old man. Lear is diagnosed by Gloucester, Cordelia, and even himself as "Chol'rick" at the very beginning of the play. He is merely a decrepid and petulant senior citizen, afflicted by "the Infirmary of his Age" (I, i, 53). Since he is aware of the cause of Cordelia's reticence ("Thy Fondness for the Rebel Son of Gloster," I, i, 120), he becomes the stock figure of an obstructive parent, and his fatal hamartia "is reduced in stature to a very common sort of misunderstanding and is not entirely his fault. Accordingly, his punishment and suffering are reduced . . ."⁷⁸ As for Cordelia, her motivation in Tate's version may be more "probable" according to Restoration standards, but by deliberately misleading her father and subsequently rejecting Edgar in order to determine if "his Love be fixt," she is reduced from a heroine of blazing integrity to "a scheming minx,"⁷⁹ who deceives both father and lover, and thus is as hypocritical as her sisters. After Act I, she becomes "the typically dutiful and 'virtuous' daughter,"⁸⁰ wandering about the heath breathing pious platitudes, "almost a Lydia Languish . . . in the over-refinement of her feeling."⁸¹ Of course, Restoration playwrights were writing "for repertory companies of players, whose abilities and specialties strongly affected the writer's product,"⁸² and therefore Tate, in creating a role for Elizabeth Barry, no doubt took into account her ability "to ope the sacred fount of sympathetic tears."⁸³

In his effort to simplify and standardize the characters and clearly define their relationships, Tate also made the villains more explicitly wicked. If Edgar is the heroic lover, Edmund is the Machiavellian villain, lustful, treacherous, and revengeful:

Perhaps the commonest theme of Restoration villain tragedy is the rise of a scoundrel to power by means of lies, treachery, seduction, and murder. Eventually, of course, the villain gets his comeuppance, but not until he has worked his bloody will beyond the limits of credibility.⁸⁴

Tate's Edmund is not introspective, examining his own motives as in Shakespeare's play ("why brand they us/With base? with baseness? bastardy? base, base?" I, 2). Instead, he is a melodramatic cross between Snidely Whiplash and Richard III, planning every conceivable villainy including the rape of Cordelia on the heath, "Where like the vig'rous Jove I will enjoy/ This Semele in a Storm" (III, 2, 122-123). The two evil sisters are bestial lust incarnate, sending Edmund torrid love letters upon first acquaintance (Regan: "A charming Youth and worth my further Thought," II, 2, 43), and making love to him in secret grottos while fervently wishing their husbands dead. They even ghoulishly quarrel over Edmund's body, revealing in the process that they have poisoned each other. In Shakespeare's tragedy we only "catch glimpses" of the dark passions of Gonerill and Regan.⁸⁵ In Tate's play, these episodes are "unpleasantly amplified"⁸⁶ for an audience which liked unambiguous portrayals of lust and ambition.

Thus conventionalized, the characters waltz mechanically through a standard melodramatic plot, clearly polarized as good or bad. All characters who cannot be conveniently placed into either category are diminished (Albany becomes a standard wronged husband), or omitted (the Fool). The Fool not only violated neoclassical genre restrictions, but "his remarks are frequently obscure and indirect in a play Tate was making more obvious and direct."⁸⁷ Besides, his speeches took up time that Tate apparently thought could be better employed in developing the love interest.

And was there no critical outcry at this desecration of what Odell terms "the precious shrine"⁸⁸ of Shakespeare's tragedy for the entire 157 years of its existence on stage? For the most part, there was little or none. Addison might snarl in *The Spectator* that *Lear* "lost half its Beauty" because of the happy ending and was "an admirable tragedy . . . as Shakespeare wrote it"⁸⁹ but he was drowned out by a chorus of influential commentators who favored the redaction. The author of *The Play-House* (1685) placed *King Lear* "in the highest rank of contemporary appreciation,"⁹⁰ but admitted that he referred to the altered version. In the eighteenth century, Tate's version was defended by no less a critic than Samuel Johnson, who was so harrowed by the tragic catastrophe in the original that he "could hardly ever bring himself to read the scenes again. . ."⁹¹ His friend Arthur Murphy noted in 1754 that "the Circumstances of Lear's Restoration, and the virtuous Edgar's Alliance with the amiable Cordelia, must always call forth those gushing Tears which are sweilded and ennobled by a virtuous Joy."⁹² When George Coleman rashly produced a version in 1768 with the love story omitted and the catastrophe apparently restored, the reviewers waxed indignant:

We think his [Coleman's] having restored the original distressed catastrophe is a circumstance not greatly in favour of humanity or delicacy of feeling, since it is now rather too shocking to be borne; and that rejecting the Episode of the loves of Edgar and Cordelia, so happily conceived by Tate, has beyond all doubt greatly weakened the Piece.⁹³

David Garrick toyed with the idea of reinstating Lear's Fool, but abandoned the idea, and even the daring Coleman would not admit the Fool lest the play "sink into burlesque."⁹⁴ Not until 1838 did William Charles Macready cautiously allow the Fool (played by an actress, Priscilla Horton, so as to cause the least possible offense) back into the play, thus essentially restoring Shakespeare's text.⁹⁵ But for 157 years, the audiences clung to Tate's script, and their attitude is best summed up by Thomas Cooke in 1731:

Here is loyalty to a prince, duty to a parent, perseverance in a chaste love, and almost every exalted virtue of the soul, recommended in the liveliest colours, and the opposite vices are placed in the strongest light in which horror and detestation can place them.⁹⁶

Who could ask for more?

For the modern reader, the major question to be asked is "what to make of a diminished thing?"⁹⁷ Tate, in shielding his audience from Shakespeare's apocalyptic vision, does, as his biographer and champion

Christopher Spencer suggests, give us "a coherent combination of theatrical scenes,"⁹⁸ but that is all he gives us. His *Lear* is "a play rather than an experience, bringing several groups of characters through a series of complications to a resolution consisting of punishment for the wicked and reward for the good and the regenerate."⁹⁹ In place of Shakespeare's allegory of a world in dissolution, we have a conventional romantic melodrama. However, "in a sad, shriveled way" Tate's *Lear* is "effective theatre,"¹⁰⁰ and perhaps no play so aptly defines critical and popular taste during the period it held the stage "with Alterations. By N. Tate."

Notes

1. William Van Lennep, ed., *The London Stage, 1660-1800*, vol. 1: *Part I: 1660-1700* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1965), p. 22.
2. George C. D. Odell, *Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving*, 2 vols. (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1966) 1: 24.
3. Van Lennep, pp. 75, 234.
4. Hazelton Spencer, *Shakespeare Improved* (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1927) p. 74.
5. Cited by Maynard Mack, *King Lear in Our Time* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965), p. 9.
6. Montague Summers, *Shakespeare Adaptations* (London: Benjamin Blom, 1922) p. ixxiv.
7. Title page of the printed edition of Nahum Tate's *King Lear* (1681), reprinted in *Five Restoration Adaptations of Shakespeare*, ed. by Christopher Spencer (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1965), p. 201.
8. The date of the first performance is not known. Since the play was entered in the *Term Catalogues* in May 1681, Van Lennep puts the date of the first production "not later than March 1681" (p. 294).
9. Van Lennep, p. 294.
10. Summers notes that "strangely enough," Betterton's *Lear* and Mrs. Barry's *Cordelia* did not receive "particular mention." *Shakespeare Adaptations*, p. xcvi.
11. John H. Wilson, *A Preface to Restoration Drama* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965), p. 28.
12. Christopher Spencer, *Nahum Tate* (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1972), p. 15.
13. George Winchester Stone, Jr., "The Making of the Repertory," in *The London Theatre World, 1660-1800*, ed. by Robert D. Hume (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1980), p. 197.
14. C. Spencer, *Introduction to Five Restoration Adaptations*, p. 4.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 6. Garrick and Coleman also made redactions of *King Lear* which disappeared from the stage long before Tate's version was finally laid to rest.
16. Nahum Tate, Dedicatory Epistle to *King Lear*, in *Five Restoration Adaptations*, p. 203.
17. *Ibid.*
18. Odell, 1:54.
19. Tate, Dedicatory Epistle, p. 203.
20. All quotations from Tate's *The History of King Lear* are taken from the version printed in Spencer's *Five Restoration Adaptations*, and will be cited by act, scene, and line number in the text of the paper.
21. Tate, Dedicatory Epistle, pp. 203-204.
22. Mack, p. 10.
23. Tate, Epilogue to *King Lear*, in *Five Restoration Adaptations* p. 274.
24. For example, see Odell, 1:41.
25. H. Spencer, p. 246.
26. Odell, 1:233.
27. George Sampson, *The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), p. 238.
28. H. N. Hudson, as cited by C. Spencer in *Five Restoration Adaptations*, p. 8.
29. C. Spencer, *Nahum Tate*, p. 14. The word was coined by Hudson.
30. Summers, *Shakespeare Adaptations*, p. cvii.
31. Tate, Dedicatory Epistle, p. 204.
32. Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Restoration Drama, 1660-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1923), p. 161.
33. *The Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 55, calls Tate a "poetaster" (p. 379) and a number of other uncomplimentary names.
34. Theophilus Cibber, *The Lives of the Poets* (London, 1753), vol. 3, p. 258, as cited by C. Spencer, *Nahum Tate*, p. 16.
35. C. Spencer, *Nahum Tate*, p. 23.
36. *Ibid.*, p. ii. See also *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 55, p. 380.
37. Montague Summers, *The Playhouse of Pepys* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935), p. 245.
38. Tate's adaptation of *Richard II* was suppressed after the second performance. The deposition of a king was not considered a particularly tactful subject in the Restoration. He tried to revive the play under the title *The Sicilian Usurper*, but it was promptly banned.
39. H. Spencer, p. 251.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 271.
41. Nicoll, *Dryden as an Adapter*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1922), p. 10.
42. Nicoll, *History of Restoration Drama*, p. 162.
43. Mack, p. 41.
44. *Ibid.*
45. Peter L. Sharkey, "Performing Nahum Tate's *King Lear*: Coming Hither by Going Hence," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 54 (December 1968): 400.
46. Charles Lamb, "On the Tragedies of Shakespeare" (1808), cited by Mack, p. 16.
47. Sharkey, 400.
48. Cited by Wilson, p. 53.
49. Tate, Dedicatory Epistle, p. 203.
50. Sharkey, 402.
51. Christopher Spencer, "A Word for Tate's *King Lear*," *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 3 (1963): 243.
52. Mack, p. 10.
53. Alfred Harbage, Introduction to *King Lear*, in *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. Alfred Harbage (New York: The Viking Press, 1969), p. 1063.
54. H. Spencer, p. 273.
55. Nahum Tate, *Ingratitude of a Common-Wealth*, quoted in H. Spencer, p. 270.
56. Mack, p. 25.
57. Wilson, p. 54.
58. Gildon, *Remarks on the Plays of Shakespeare* (1710), cited by George Winchester Stone, Jr., "Garrick's Production of *King Lear*: A Study in the Temper of the Eighteenth-Century Mind," *Studies in Philology*, 45 (January 1948): 90.
59. Kenneth McClellan, *Whatever Happened to Shakespeare?* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1978), p. 23.
60. *Ibid.*
61. *The Post Angel*, April 1701, p. 299, cited by C. Spencer, *Nahum Tate*, p. 33. In 1713, Tate joined with another author, one "M. Smith" to put out a periodical, *The Monitor*, "Intended for the Promoting of Religion and Virtue."
62. Tate, Prologue to *King Lear*, in *Five Restoration Adaptations*, p. 205.
63. C. Spencer, *Five Restoration Adaptations*, p. 11.
64. Mack, p. 11.
65. C. Spencer, "A Word for Tate's *King Lear*," 250.
66. Wilson, p. 86.
67. C. Spencer, *Five Restoration Adaptations*, p. 12.
68. *Ibid.*
69. Nicoll, *Dryden as an Adapter*, p. 9.
70. Dryden, *Preface to Troilus and Cressida*, cited by McClellan, p. 23.

71. William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of King Lear* (London: The Folio Society, 1956), p. 66.
 72. Tate, Dedicatory Epistle, p. 203.
 73. H. Spencer, p. 246.
 74. Tate, Dedicatory Epistle, p. 204.
 75. C. Spencer, *Five Restoration Adaptations*, p. 13.
 76. Richard Buckle, review of John Gielgud's 1955 production of *Lear* in *The Observer*, 31 July 1955. Cited by Mack, p. 26.
 77. Mack, p. 27.
 78. C. Spencer, "A Word for Tate's *King Lear*," 245.
 79. McClellan, p. 44.
 80. C. Spencer, *Five Restoration Adaptations*, p. 12.
 81. H. Spencer, p. 252.
 82. Wilson, p. 7.
 83. H. Spencer, p. 91.
 84. Wilson, p. 60.
 85. H. Spencer, p. 251.
 86. Odell, 1:54.
 87. C. Spencer, "A Word for Tate's *King Lear*," 246.
 88. Odell, 1:51.
 89. Addison, *The Spectator*, No. 40, 16 April 1711, cited by C. Spencer, *Nahum Tate*, p. 69. See also Stone, "Garrick's Production of *King Lear*," 90.
 90. Emmett L. Avery and Arthur H. Scouten, *The London Stage, 1660-1700: A Critical Introduction* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1968), p. clxxiv.
 91. Cited by Summers, *Shakespeare Adaptations*, p. ciii.
 92. Arthur Murphy, *Gray's Inn Journal* (1754), cited by C. Spencer, *Nahum Tate*, p. 69.
 93. *The Theatrical Review* (1772), cited by Mack, p. 15.
 94. Cited by Mack, p. 16.
 95. Garrick and other actor-managers had gradually restored some of Shakespeare's lines. The tragic ending was restored at Drury Lane in 1823, and Macready's 1838 Covent Garden production contained not only the Fool but almost the whole of Shakespeare's text.
 96. Thomas Cooke, *Considerations on the Stage* (London, 1781), cited by Stone, "Garrick's Production of *King Lear*," 90.
 97. Mack, p. 40.
 98. C. Spencer, *Five Restoration Adaptations*, p. 24.
 99. C. Spencer, "A Word for Tate's *King Lear*," 250.
 100. Mack, pp. 12-13.

Resources for the Study and Replication of Alaska Native Costume

MARCIELLA BROWN, SEPTEMBER LAAKSO,
 ANNE MCBETH, AND TARA MAGINNIS
 EDITED BY TARA MAGINNIS

In the Fall of 1988, the *Costume Society of America*, Region V Newsletter observed that there were no Alaska Native costume books easily available to tourists and inquired if anyone knew of any publications on this subject.

This paper is not, by any means, an attempt to list all the available study sources for Alaska Native costume in the state, but rather is intended as an educational guide for the thousands of people who travel to Alaska each year. It would be advisable for a person with costume interests, before going to the state, to familiarize him/herself with the literature on the subject of Native dress and to plan one's trip around stops at some of the appropriate museums, stores, festivals, and theatre events. The single best all-around book for preliminary study of Alaskan costumes is Smithsonian's new *Crossroads of Continents* by Fitzhugh and Cromwell, and the best book for practical sewing techniques is Wilder's *Secrets of Eskimo Skin Sewing*, both of which are available in low-cost paperbacks. Citations with an asterisk (*) are available in bookstores.

General Books Covering More than One Alaskan Language Group Bibliography by Tara Maginnis

- **Alaska Geographic*, Vol. 6, No. 3: *Alaska's Native People*. Anchorage, 1979. Layman's book providing a brief overview of Alaska Native groups. Chiefly valuable for its color photos of contemporary Alaskans.
- *Blumenstein, Rita Pitka. *Earth Dyes*. Fairbanks: Institute of Alaska Native Arts, 1984. Technical manual on dyeing using native Alaskan plants.
- Collins, Henry; De Laquna, Frederica; Carpenter, Edmond and Stone, Peter. *The Far North: 2000 Years of American Eskimo and Indian Art*. Washington: National Gallery of Art, 1973. Exceptional book with many clear black and white photos of little-seen examples of Alaskan art.

TARA MAGINNIS, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor of Theatre Arts, University of Alaska Fairbanks. MARCIELLA BROWN, SEPTEMBER LAAKSO, and ANNE MCBETH developed the bibliographical material while students at the University of Alaska Fairbanks.

- *Fair, Susan W. *Alaska Geographic, Vol. 12, No. 3: Alaska Native Arts and Crafts*. Anchorage, 1985. A layman's book introducing the beginner to the history and present practice of traditional Alaskan arts and crafts such as mask making, ivory carving, etc. Provides lots of color pictures of museum examples, and museum-quality modern work.
- *Fitzhugh, William W., and Cromwell, Aron. *Crossroads of Continents: Cultures of Siberia and Alaska*. Washington: Smithsonian, 1988. Companion book (not exhibit catalog) to the recent Crossroads of Continents costume exhibit. Contains color pictures of all the garments in the exhibit, detailed description of the culture of the Siberian and Alaskan regions and an entire chapter on the spiritual/religious basis of many Native traditions of clothing construction.
- Steinbright, Jan. Ed. *Alaskameet '86: An Exhibit of Contemporary Alaska Native Masks*. Fairbanks: Institute of Alaska Native Arts, 1986. Slender, magazine style exhibit catalog. Shows several truly interesting modern interpretations of traditional mask forms.
- *Wilder, Edna. *Secrets of Eskimo Skin Sewing*. Anchorage: Alaska Northwest, 1976. Clear, simple instructions for stretching, cutting and sewing furs into a variety of useful garments. Contains patterns, black and white sewing diagrams, and color photos of completed objects. This book is used at the University of Alaska Fairbanks as the textbook for its skin sewing class.

The Tlingits

The Tlingit (pronounced Kling-kit) Indians are Northwest coastal Indians, related to the Haida people of Canada. Tlingits live in the rainy, unfrozen Southeastern part of Alaska, where the land is extremely abundant in natural resources such as fish, beaver, seal and trees. Compared to other Native Alaskan groups in pre-contact times, the Tlingit were historically very "rich," living far above basic subsistence level and consequently developed a complex material culture.

Tlingit art and clothing were primarily indicative of their elaborate social hierarchy and clan groups. Tlingit clothing includes the *Chilcat Blanket*, a fringed robe that was woven into complex heraldic patterns and worn by high nobles and chiefs; the *Button Blanket*, an appliqued robe made of black and red Hudson Bay Company blankets and decorated with hundreds of mother of pearl buttons; *Tunics* made in the styles of the above two robes; and, *Potlach Hats* usually carved of wood in the animal design of the wearer's clan.

Tlingit clothing is now used only for ceremonial occasions, much the way tailcoats are used in Western culture, and consequently, has remained largely fixed in style since the 19th Century. Today, Tlingit design forms can be seen plastered all over T-shirts, and their jewelry is worn throughout the state.

Tlingit Indian Clothing

Marcella Brown

- Billman, Esther Lisle. *Tlingit Clothing and Ornament*. Sitka: Sheldon Jackson Museum, 1975.
- Black, Lydia. *The Bentwood Hats of Alaska: Symbols of Power and Identity*. Juneau: Alaska State Museum, 1988.
- Carlson, Roy L. *Indian Art Traditions of the Northwest Coast*. Burnaby: Archeology Press, 1982.
- Emmons, George T. "The Chilcat Blanket." *Memoirs of the American Museum of Natural History* 3.4 (1907): 229-277.

- Gunther, Erna. *Art in the Life of the Northwest Coast Indians*. Portland: Portland Art Museum, 1966.
- *Hall, Betty. *Totemic Design Forms*. Juneau: Betty's Rainbow Press, 1984. Black and white spiral bound how-to book for making designs with traditional forms.
- Hall, Edwin S. Jr. *Northwest Coast Indians Graphics*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1981.
- Hanson, Charles E. "The Point Blanket." *Museum of the Fur Trade Quarterly* 12.1 (1976): 5-10.
- *Jensen, Doreen and Sargent, Polly. *Robes of Power*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1986. Brief history of button blankets, with numerous color examples of modern blankets from British Columbia.
- Matthews, Downs. "Reproducing Alaska's Aboriginal Art." *The Humble Way* First Quarter (1972): 2-7.
- Razumovskaia, R.S. "Plenteny Izdeliia Severo-Zapdnykh Ikdeitzeu." (Woven Objects of the Northwest Coast Indians). *Sbornik Muzeia Antropologii I Etnografii* 24: 93-123.
- *Samuel, Cheryl. *The Chilcat Dancing Blanket*. Seattle: Pacific Search Press, 1982. Incredibly detailed, scholarly work on the history and construction of Chilcat blankets with many pictures. Contains sufficient weaving diagrams to reproduce a blanket should you have the necessary skill and two years time to do it.
- Stewart, Hilary. *Indian Artifacts of the Northwest Coast*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1975.
- Wherry, Joseph W. *The Totem Pole Indians*. New York: Wilfred Funk, 1964.
- Woodcock, George. *People of the Coast*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977.

The Athabaskans

Athabaskan Indians (sometimes spelled Athapaskan) were part of a semi-nomadic language group, living predominantly in forested central Alaska and the Yukon but with branches as far south as Arizona. Athabaskan culture endured a violent upheaval with the introduction of Western traders in the 19th Century, changing from a subsistence culture to a fur trapping culture. The Athabaskan culture was subsequently connected to the rise and fall of fur sales in the Western world.

Their clothing in the immediate post-contact period reflected this change by the adoption of Western garment features: Italian and Czech *trade beads* replaced porcupine *quillwork*; men discarded their traditional leather pullover tunics for leather *Chief's Jackets* cut on the lines of British military officers' tunics; women changed from wearing leather tunic and trouser sets to wearing calf length leather dresses; and, Athabaskans of both sexes adopted the post-contact version of the Eskimo *parka*, which also had adopted Western features like front closings and pockets.

The most famous Athabaskan textile art is *Athabaska Beadwork*, which uses seed beads couched to moosehide in geometric and floral patterns. This is the primary surviving piece of Athabaskan traditional dress commonly seen today and worn as jewelry, glove decoration, and embellishment on moccasins by both Athabaskans and Anglos. Chief's jackets are also worn at events such as the Tanana Chief's Conference and the Native Arts Festival. Traditional tunics and dresses are still worn by Native dance groups.

Athabaskan Indian (Central Alaska and Yukon) Clothing and Beadwork Bibliography by Anne McBeth

- Cadzon, Donald A. "Old Loucheux Clothing." *Indian Notes* 2 (1925): 292-95.
- Dene Nation. *Denedeh—A Dene Celebration*. Northwest Territories: Yellowknife Denedeh, 1984.
- Duncan, Kate Corbin. *Bead Embroidery of the Northern Athabaskans: Style, Design, Evolution, and Transfer*. Dissertation, University of Washington, 1982.
- *Duncan, Kate. *Northern Athapaskan Art: A Beadwork Tradition*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1988. Readable yet scholarly hardcover book on the history and technique of Athabaskan beadwork. Contains many color and black and white pictures of historical examples of beadwork.
- *Duncan, Kate. *Some Warmer Tones: Alaska Athabaskan Bead Embroidery*. Fairbanks: University of Alaska, 1984. Smaller paperbound book similar to above with sewing diagrams and examples of historical and contemporary beadwork reproduced in color.
- Duncan, Kate C. "The Metis and Production of Embroidery in the Subarctic." *The Museum of the Fur Trade Quarterly* 17.3 (1981): 1-8.
- Duncan, Kate C. "Yukon River Athabaskan Costume in the 1860's: Contributions of the Ethnographic Illustrations of William Dall." *Faces, Voices and Dreams*. Sitka: Sheldon Jackson Museum, 1987.
- *Duncan, Kate Corbin, with Carney, Eunice. *A Special Gift—The Kutchin Beadwork Tradition*. Seattle: University of Washington, 1988. Similar to *Northern Athapaskan Art*.
- Fairbanks Native Association. *Athabaskan Beading*. Fairbanks: 1978.
- Hatt, Gumund. *Moccasins and Their Relations to Arctic Footwear*. New York: American Anthropological Association, vol. 3, 1916.
- *Institute of Alaska Native Arts. *From Skins, Trees, Quills, and Beads: The Work of Nine Athabaskans*. Fairbanks: Institute of Alaska Native Arts, 1985. Biographical sketches of modern Native craftspeople, including a beadworker. Illustrated.
- Jenkins, Michael R. "Glass Trade Beads in Alaska." *Alaska Journal* 2.3 (1972): 31-119.
- Leechman, Douglas. *Vanta Kutchin*. Ottawa: National Museum of Canada, 1951.
- McKenna, Robert A. *The Upper Tanana Indians*. New Haven: Yale University, 1959.
- Murray, Alexander Hunter. *Journal of the Yukon*. Ottawa: Government Printing Bureau, 1910.
- National Museum of Man. *The Athabaskans: Strangers of the North*. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1974.
- *Nelson, Richard K. *The Athabaskans: People of the Boreal Forest*. Fairbanks: University of Alaska Museum, 1988. Readable history of the life, crafts and traditions of the Athabaskan people in Alaska, shown with numerous historical photos and artifacts.
- Orchard, William C. *Beads and Beadwork of the American Indian*. New York: Museum of the American Indian, 1929.
- *Orchard, William C. *The Technique of Porcupine Quill Decoration Among the North American Indians*. New York: Museum of the American Indian, 1916. Reprint of the classic scholarly study of quillwork, complete with excruciatingly detailed drawings and instructions on quillwork technique.
- Osgood, Cornelius. *Yale University Publications in Anthropology* #22: Inqalik Material Culture. New Haven: Yale University, 1971.
- Osgood, Cornelius. *Yale University Publications in Anthropology* #74: *The Han Indians*. New Haven: Yale University, 1971.
- Schmitter, Ferdinand. "Upper Yukon Native Customs and Folklore." *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections* 56.4 (1910): 1-30.
- Shternberg, Lev Ia. "Ornament iz Olen'ego Volosa I Igl Dikobraza." (Reindeer Hair and Porcupine Quill Ornamentation). *Sovetskaiia Etnografiia* 3-4 (1931): 103-121.
- Simeone, William, Jr. "The Alaska Athapaskan Chiefs Coat." *American Indian Art Magazine* 8.2 (1983): 64-69.
- Thompson, Judy. "Preliminary Study of Traditional Kutchin Clothing in Museums." *Mercury Series, National Museum of Canada* 1 (1972).
- Toghotthele Corporation. *Nenana Denayee*. Nenana: Toghotthele Corp., 1983.

- Turner, Geoffrey. "Hair Embroidery in Siberia and North America." *Pitt Rivers Museum, University of Oxford, Occasional Papers on Technology* 7 (1976).
- Van Stone, James W. *Athapaskan Clothing and Related Objects in the Collections of the Field Museum of Natural History*. Field Museum of Natural History #4, 1981.

The Yupik, Inupiat and Aleut

The Alaskan Eskimo people live predominantly along the extremely cold coastal areas of the main body of Alaska and are part of a large ethnic group that stretches across Greenland, Northern Canada, Alaska and Siberia. Alaskan and Siberian Eskimos speak various dialects of the Yupik or Inupiat languages and so are called Yupik (Southwest and Central coastal) or Inupiat (Northern coastal) to distinguish them from the Inuit speakers of Canada and Greenland. Aleuts are the inhabitants of the Aleutian chain of islands in Southwestern Alaska who live in a warmer, wet climate with no trees and no land animals.

In pre-contact times, Aleuts believed that sea-mammals (particularly otters who were thought to be transformed humans) were attracted to human finery, so hunters wore elegant and elaborate clothing with talismans and decorations while out in their boats. Aleut parkas were often made of the skins of seabirds like puffins and cormorants, and light waterproof parkas were made of sewn strips of *gutskin* (walrus or seal intestine).

Yupiks in pre-contact times also made waterproof parkas of gutskin (on the coast) and *fishskin* (inland), as well as some *birdskin* parkas. However, it is with fur that Yupik seamstresses even today seem to do their most interesting work. In pre-contact times animal skin garments were thought to impart to the wearers the characteristics of the original animals, and garments were often constructed using skin parts comparable to human parts of the body: legs for arms and legs, backs for backs, etc., and many parkas had u-shaped "tail" flaps. Contrasting colors of skins were used in a kind of patchwork style to make decorative effects along joint marks which were thought to be the location of souls.

This tradition has continued with modern *parkas* but is now often done with black and white pieces of clipped cowhide imported to the North for the purpose. Yupik clothing has also adopted a number of Western features during the 20th Century. Parkas have changed from a pullover design to one with a front zippered closing; women's parkas have dropped the front and back u-shaped flap in favor of a short ruffled skirt attached to the bottom, and fur lined parkas now are covered with a cloth shell. The outer shell most frequently consists of a bright flowered print or cotton velvet. A cloth version of the old pullover parka with a two handed pocket, the *kuspuk* (also spelled *Quaspeg*), has become the accepted dress for traditional dancing.

The *cloth parka* is the most commonly worn piece of traditional Alaskan dress, worn not only by many Yupiks but by other Alaska Natives and Anglos. The parka is both a practical method for staying warm and an

expression of local pride in its unique amalgamation of Native and Western design.

Inuit (Eskimo) and Aleut Clothing

Bibliography by September Laasko

- Black, Lydia T. *Aleut Art*. Anchorage: Aleutian/Pribiloff Island Association, 1982.
- Burch, Ernest S. Jr. and Forman, Werner. *The Eskimos*. Tulsa: University of Oklahoma, 1988.
- Collins, Henry B. "Composite Masks: Chinese and Eskimo." *Anthropologica* 13.1-2 (1971): 271-278.
- Fienup-Riordan, Ann. "The Mask: The Eye of the Dance." *Arctic Anthropology* 24.12 (1987): 40-55.
- *Fitzhugh, William W. and Kaplan, Susan A. *Inua: Spirit World of the Bering Sea Eskimos*. Washington: Smithsonian, 1982. Detailed and fascinating book on the spiritual basis for Yupik culture and design. Illustrated in black and white with many historic photos and museum artifacts.
- Harrington, Richard. *The Inuit: Life As It Was*. Edmonton: Hurtig, 1981.
- Hatt, Gudmund. "Arctic Skin Clothing in Eurasia and America: An Ethnographic Study." *Arctic Anthropology* 5.2 (1969): 1-132. [Translated from J.H. Schultz, Forlagsgoghandel Graebes Bogtrykkeri, 1914.]
- *Hickman, Pat. *Inner Skins and Outer Skins: Gut and Fishskin*. San Francisco: San Francisco Craft and Folk Art Museum, 1987.
- Issenman, Betty and Rankin, Catherine. *Ivalu: Traditions of Inuit Clothing*. Montreal: McCord Museum of Canadian History, 1988.
- Jones, Suzi. *Eskimo Dolls*. Juneau: Alaska State Council on the Arts, 1982.
- Joppien, Rudiger and Smith, Bernard. *The Art of Captain Cook's Voyages, Vol. III*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Kaeppler, Adrienne Lois. "Artificial Curiosities": *Being an Exposition of Native Manufactures Collected on the Three Pacific Voyages of Captain James Cook*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum, 1978.
- Larsen, Dinah W. *Eskimo Dolls in the Collection of the University of Alaska Museum*. Fairbanks: University of Alaska Museum, 1973.
- Myers, Mary Belle. *Things Made by Inuit*. Quebec: Federation Des Cooperatives du Nouveau-Quebec, 1980.
- Ray, Dorothy. *Aleut and Eskimo Art: Tradition and Innovation in South Alaska*. London: C. Hurst, 1981.
- Ray, Dorothy Jean and Blaker, Alfred A. *Eskimo Masks: Art and Ceremony*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1967.
- Ritchie, Carson, I.A. *Art of Eskimo*. South Brunswick: Barnes, 1979.
- Van Stone, J.W. "Protective Hide Body Armor of the Historic Chukchi and Siberian Eskimos." *Etudes/Inuit/Studies* 7 (1983): 3-24.
- Winnipeg Art Gallery. *The Inuit Amautik: I Like My Hood to be Full*. Winnipeg: Winnipeg Art Gallery, 1980.

Co-existence and War Between the Temple and Grand Opera Houses during Lewiston, Idaho's Theatre Boom

KRISTINE M. YATES

Lewiston, Idaho's first legitimate theatre began as a humble wooden structure. This two-story building was not originally constructed for the purpose of entertaining the city's citizens but rather as a common mercantile. Two local entrepreneurs, Robert Grostein and Abraham Binnard, partners and owners of the Grostein-Binnard Mercantile decided to remodel the second story of their store into a fully operational theatre in 1881. Naming their establishment the Grand Theatre Opera House, Grostein and Binnard held a monopoly in the town for over two decades.

The first theatrical production performed at the opening of the Grand Opera House was the liturgical operetta *Queen Esther*, presented by the Amateur Dramatic Club in 1881. As transportation into the Pacific Northwest became easier for traveling companies, Lewiston became a vital link on the local circuit. During the next twenty years the Grand audiences became privy to both professional as well as local amateur productions including Frank Cleave's Drama Troupe, Makanlas's New Minstrel Show, Big New England Comedy and Spokane Opera Company, interspaced with *Bull in a China Shop*, *Handy Andy*, *Gypsy's Warning* and *The Streets of New York*.

By the end of the century ticket prices at the Grand for traveling productions were approximately 25 cents for children, 50 cent for adults, and 75 cents for "the best seats in the house." However, after nearly twenty years the Grand Opera House was beginning to show need of repairs. The wooden structure had served the theatre community, but its state of deterioration was evident. Before Christmas an announcement was made that a new opera house would be opening in Grostein and Binnard's latest "brick" store building located on 2nd Street. They remodeled

KRISTINE M. YATES is a member of the United States Army. This article is based on her Masters of Arts thesis at the School of Music and Theatre Arts, Washington State University.

the second floor, 50 x 100 feet, with a 18 x 30 foot stage at the west end and a seating capacity of 400! (*Lewiston Teller*, Dec. 23, 1898)

The new Grand Opera House closed out the century with incredible performances like the one-night engagement of the Metropolitan Opera Company's *La Mascot* (*Lewiston Tribune*, March 9, 1899) and the popular Lindsay Dramatic Company's *Merchant of Venice*, *Ingomar* and *The Noble Outcast*.

Lewiston's early theatrical beginnings were impressive, but the next thirty years would see a true age of excitement in the theatrical history of Lewiston. The Grand had secured itself as an important part of the Pacific Northwest theatrical scene, but free enterprise would soon bring competition for Lewiston's forefathers of theatre, Robert Grostein and Abraham Binnard.

Around the turn of the century the Lewiston Masons contracted Madgwick and Peterson, Co. to build a \$62,752, three-story brick building to serve as a combination opera house and Masonic Temple at 855 Main. The structure was completed in 1904. The rear portion of the building housed the elegant stage and 750-seat auditorium with curtains, backdrops and 400 electric lights. (*Tribune*, June 28, 1964)

Before the opening, however, the Masons feared they had overestimated Lewiston's pocketbooks. The community was not ready to turn over \$2.50 for orchestra seats, \$3.00 for the first three rows of the balcony and \$1.00 for the remaining balcony seats. (*Tribune*, June 28, 1964) Late in the evening of June 28, 1904, the management made an important decision, and the next morning the Lewiston Tribune announced a 50% reduction in ticket prices. (*Tribune*, June 29, 1904)

On June 29th, with an 8:30 curtain, the Temple opened its first production, a musical variety "minstrel," staged by local talent. The show, complete with song, dance, and jokes lasted 2 1/4 hours. "So successful was the opening night that the performance was repeated again the second night with all new jokes." (Warnock, 1989)

The next morning the *Lewiston Tribune* play review proclaimed opening night a smashing success and that "every act was new and the jokes were catchy. Each number brought a storm of applause which called the actors to the footlights for an encore." (*Tribune*, June 30, 1904) The Temple Opera House was off to an incredible start and the community support was astronomical.

The new elegant Temple Theatre, however, did not cause the immediate demise for the Grand Opera House as might have been expected; Lewiston was big enough for two theatres. Healthy competition arose creating a positive impact on the quality, comfort, and cost of live theatre in Lewiston.

Gearing up for the Temple opening, Grostein and Binnard began engaging the best road shows possible, and as frequently as possible. Their effort to create a solid and faithful audience was successful, and it

reaffirmed the Grand's reputation for bringing in the best productions available. The last few months were crucial in their attempt to secure a following; their efforts paid off according to the rave reviews. *Carmen*, *Ten Nights in a Barroom* and *An Eye on Hubby* were three of their best choices.

Though an excellent reputation had been successfully maintained, the Grand, after the opening of the modern and elegant Temple in 1904, did not look so grand. The same year, Issac Binnard, Abraham's son, inherited the brick Grostein and Binnard Opera House and began remodeling the Grand yet again. With the renovation complete and young Issac's new blood bringing renewed energy and determination to keep his father's theatre going, the price wars began.

After first slashing the \$3.00 tickets to \$1.50 for the grand opening of the Temple, management was forced to cut prices again just three months later in order to compete with Binnards. Prices were dropped to "25, 50, 75 cents and \$1.00" for *Sherlock Holmes*, *The Sign of Four* (*Tribune*, Sept. 18, 1904), and by 1905 Temple tickets were available for *A Broken Heart* at just 25, 35, and 50 cents.

Binnard's Grand was getting mileage out of the price war realizing that this was his one advantage and strength. In advertising for *Dora Thorne*, *Charley's Aunt*, and *The Man of the People*, Binnard stated: "The bargain prices of 10c, 20c, and 30c still prevail." (*Tribune*, Nov. 2, 1905)

Issac Binnard learned from his father at an early age the art and rewards of securing a strong female following. He continued his father's precedent of cutting ticket prices for the ladies; this not only made an evening at his theatre more financially attractive to young men looking for entertainment when courting, but it also got the attention of married ladies who made the social arrangements for their families. Ladies were admitted to any seat in the house for 10 cents on the opening night of *Missouri* (*Tribune*, June 1, 1906), and for *My Jim*. (*Tribune*, June 5, 1906) For *The Deserter*, ladies were admitted free opening night. (*Tribune*, June 4, 1906) The Temple followed suit with price reductions and incentives, but Binnard continued to offer less expensive seats and, as in the announcement for *The Indiana Girl*, admission cost is not even included. The advertisement simply stated, "Popular Prices Prevail!" (*Tribune*, Oct. 5, 1908)

Unfortunately, the Grand was not able to compete with the fine facilities and larger stage space that the Temple provided. The Temple's strength existed not in promotion but rather in the ability to house spectacular effects and huge casts. "134 people and 20 horses completed the company for *The Round Up*." (*Tribune*, Nov. 23, 1912) The audiences were awed when Pearl Barte rode a hot air balloon over their heads and were amazed as they watched a live volcano erupt in *Broken Idol*. *Uncle Tom's Cabin* boasted "more men, women, and children, more horses, more ponies, more donkeys, largest pack of Siberian blood hounds, concert and symphony orchestra." (*Tribune*, Aug. 18, 1912)

The two opera houses apparently made no attempt to schedule engagements around each other. One weekend they scheduled the same attraction; it was a newly released movie, *Wrecked City*. A Temple Theatre advertisement announced, "2 night, coming Saturday, June 2 . . . Destruction of San Francisco." (*Tribune*, May 31, 1906) Binnard, however, had beaten them by a few days: "The moving pictures showing destruction of San Francisco at the Binnard Theatre last night . . . gave genuine pleasure to the large crowd present." (*Tribune*, June 1, 1906) Admission prices were the same, but with the Grand ticket the evening's stage show was included.

Competition between the theatres became fierce and, at times, even underhanded. From the summer of 1906 and beyond the managements of the Grand and Temple tried to out-manuever one another, with the Temple as the most frequent instigator of a successful series of machinations. On a number of occasions, A. W. Kroutingier, the Temple manager, virtually stole Binnard's stock companies while engaged at the Grand. Frustrated, Binnard finally sued one of the troupes, the Benson-Laine Company, for Breach of Contract. Although Binnard won the suit, the members split up and left town. The Grand management apparently never received a penny of their award. Finally, fed up with the unreliable companies, Binnard got a great idea: he leased his theatre, thereby removing himself from any further responsibility or expense.

Issac Binnard then began focusing his attentions and investments on the motion picture industry. Movies, he foresaw, were where the entertainment industry was eventually headed. "Binnard's estimate was correct. By the time the 20's arrived, it was obvious that stage presentations would soon wither away." (*Tribune*, June 28, 1964) In 1922, ironically, Binnard became the manager of the Temple Theatre. The same year, his announcement exemplified the infrequency with which live theatre was presented on any Lewiston stage: "*Bringing Up Father* will be the attraction at the Temple Theatre next week. This will be the first road show appearing here in more than a year." (*Tribune*, Dec. 29, 1922)

It is important to note that Lewiston did not abandon theatre; it abandoned her. Actors headed for the silver screen rather than the stage, and traveling productions were just not available. In its final days, the Temple, for example, booked political rallies, conventions and occasionally a recital or a school drama. The last two attractions of note were the famous evangelist, Ammie Semple McPherson, and Walt Disney's first feature length cartoon, *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs*. "From there, it was one step to the ignominious spectacle of wooden bleachers on the stage and professional wrestlers sweating and grunting in a canvas ring." (*Tribune*, June 28, 1964)

Little is factually known of the Grand's decay following Binnard's departure. Clearly, the new management failed to book any notable theatrical entertainment, and eventually, the facility was demolished.

In the late 40's the Masonic Lodge remodeled the Temple building, keeping the upper stories for meeting rooms and leasing the rest, first as East End Trading Co. and later to Bonanza 88, and today, Huggins New and Used Furniture. From Main Street you can see the fly loft rising from the building. From inside the furniture store, far in the back store room the box office window is visible, and upstairs in the Masonic Hall a number of the beautiful theatre seats still exist. The box seats, too, are visible, though the doors providing for their access have been permanently nailed shut.

References

Lewiston Tribune, The. March 1899-June 1964.

Lewiston Teller, The. December 1898-August 1992.

Warnock, K. (Feb. 1989). *Downtown*, a bi-monthly newsletter. Port City Action Corporation.

A Paradigm for Securing Arts Agency Funding that Supports the Actor-Teacher Prelude to Theatre Performance for Young Audiences

CHARLES R. HANNUM

Artists who perform for young audiences understand Dorothy Parker's description of a young girl who discovered "Glory In The Daytime":

Always she had been in a state of devout excitement over the luminous, free, passionate elect who serve the theater. And always she had done her wistful worshipping, along with the multitudes, at the great public altars. It is true that once, when she was a particularly little girl, love had impelled her to write Miss Maude Adams a letter beginning "Dearest Peter," and she had received from Miss Adams a miniature thimble inscribed "A kiss from Peter Pan." (That was a day!)¹

Ironically, Parker's early twentieth century girl was also one of the "elect"—privileged to attend the theatre frequently, profoundly engaged by the experience and therefore more likely to develop an aesthetic appreciation that cannot be matched by many late twentieth century children who are indifferent to theatre, attend it infrequently and revel in electronic media.

Theatres that offer performances for young audiences (Kindergarten through high school) address these problems with printed educational materials that can help teachers prepare students for the performance they will attend. However, the benefit of printed materials declines when the individual classroom teacher exhibits the following: a modest knowledge of theatre theory and practice; a limited understanding of elements in the specific production; teaching time which is constrained by the focus on "basic skills"; and, an insufficient daily planning period.

Thus, printed materials may not only fail to produce the intended result, but they also seem to constitute a significant transfer of control from the producing theatre to the classroom teacher.

CHARLES R. HANNUM, Ph.D., is Associate Professor of Drama and Director of Theatre, Albertson College of Idaho, Caldwell, Idaho.

This study suggests a common sense solution: replace print-only educational materials with lecture/demonstration by an actor-teacher and configure printed materials to support and supplement the actor-teacher. Both students and theatre can benefit from improved communication, and the theatre can retain better control of the entire theatrical experience. It is, however, an expensive proposition that can add \$5,000 to \$50,000 to a theatre's annual budget.

Budgetary considerations make it difficult for theatres to release internal funds for an actor-teacher program, yet their administrators endorse the concept and would implement it in the presence of adequate funding. Therefore, this study focuses on external support by providing a grant application template for theatres that responds to their needs and addresses the general funding requirements imposed by U.S. and Canadian arts councils at the state or provincial level.

Although arts councils commonly fund only 25% to 50% of any given project (corporations and foundations may fund the entire cost), they remain an invaluable source of stable support. Arts councils tend to encourage more lucrative private sector grants when foundation and corporate executives are prone to view arts council funding as a seal of approval for a project or organization. An arts council application typically must be thorough, based on clearly defined criteria, and as such becomes an excellent cornerstone upon which to build applications for corporate or foundation support.

State arts councils are an appropriate first step toward funding the actor-teacher, but the current crisis in arts funding suggests that grant writing skills must improve simply to preserve the present level of state government funding. Ed Dickey, Director of the National Endowment for the Arts state arts agency program, confirmed a \$30 million loss in arts support at the state level for Fiscal Year (FY)1990, the first decline since 1979.² Most state legislatures cut arts funding for FY91 with even deeper cuts for FY92.³ These depredations will not be redressed by corporations or foundations. Ruth Mayleas, Program Director of the Ford Foundation's Educational and Cultural Division, acknowledged:

* The arts are facing very hard times right now. There's no way the private sector can or will make up what's been lost in public monies.⁴

Indeed, corporate and foundation support in FY91 increased at a rate that was less than inflation and therefore registered a decline in buying power.

The Theatre Communication Group's 1990 survey of 185 nonprofit professional theatres across the United States discovered that they experienced a decline in youth theatre productions and performances was coupled with fewer educational outreach programs, perhaps in response to diminished fiscal resources; overall expenses grew faster than income; and, state government funding was essentially flat and so declined when adjusted for inflation.⁵ The survey also cautioned that the recession has

encouraged corporations to seek "more bang for the buck" by abandoning small to medium sized theatres and allocating a smaller number of more robust grants to larger theatres that offer increased visibility.⁶

The arid fiscal climate could lead theatres to focus their grant writing on projects other than the actor-teacher, yet such a project would enhance outreach by using theatre's intrinsic strength (the living presence of the actor) to make specific learning concrete. In fact, most government arts agencies offer funding programs specifically dedicated to the kind of learning experience that an actor-teacher project would provide.

The Research Questions

This study concentrates on the following six primary questions:

1. How likely are college and professional theatres to use the actor-teacher concept?
2. What fiscal and demographic information surrounds their decision?
3. Will government arts agencies—especially state and provincial arts councils—fund the actor-teacher?
4. What kind of grant should a theatre pursue?
5. What application evaluation criteria will most arts councils employ?
6. How will the successful applicant address those criteria?

The Research Methodology

The methodology and data analysis of this study were designed to support development of a grant application template that will be useful to theatres that pursue arts agency funding for the actor-teacher.

A questionnaire was sent to 115 college and 319 professional theatres. They were selected from lists appearing in the Theatre Communications Group *Theatre Directory 1990-91* (1990), *Professional Theatre For Young Audiences, III* (AATE, 1988) and *A Directory of Children's Theatres in the United States* (CTAA, 1979). Professional theatres were identified as: Equity companies playing to both general audiences and young audiences; Equity companies playing primarily to young audiences; or non-Equity companies playing primarily to young audiences.

A different questionnaire was sent to 62 state, provincial and territorial arts councils in the United States and Canada, to the National Endowment for the Arts and to seven foundations. The latter two failed to respond in ways that were meaningful within the context of this study; therefore, data drawn from their responses were excluded from analysis.

Both questionnaires employed Likert-style scales for non-demographic or statistical questions that offered a range of responses, usually five, and reversed the order of responses frequently to minimize the incidence of response-set development.

Theatres and agencies received an initial letter that announced survey goals and indicated that a questionnaire would arrive shortly. Most organizations received the survey questionnaire about two weeks later and were encouraged to respond within three weeks.

Several factors may have influenced the level and nature of the return of the response: staffing (larger organizations, usually better staffed, were more able to respond); motivation (theatres oriented in whole or in part toward youth performance may have been more likely to respond); selection (theatres that did not appear in the publications cited above were not contacted); rhythms (the questionnaire may have arrived while organizations were executing projects that demanded all their energy); and, follow-up (only a few organizations that did not respond within the three week window were contacted again by letter or telephone).

Results

Data were collected, analyzed and used to create a generic grant application for an actor-teacher project. Valerie Ohlsson, Arts Consultant with the Florida Arts Council, reviewed the template and her responses helped shape the final version that appears at the end of this account.

Theatre respondents were usually artistic directors, education directors, general managers or assistant managers; arts agency respondents were usually grants administrators, division directors or theatre program directors.

Responses arrived between February 15 and May 21, 1991 from 104 theatres (24%) including 67 professional and 37 college theatres, 25 arts councils (40%), and six foundations and the National Endowment for the Arts. Except where noted, the percentage figures below refer to the pool of respondents, only.

Of the theatres, 72% were likely or quite likely to use the actor-teacher if adequate funding and staffing were in place. Professional theatres were more than twice as likely as college theatres to use the concept; 70% found the level of need for an actor-teacher to be high or moderate; and, nearly 40% reported that they now use an actor-teacher, although it was unclear how closely their program paralleled what is suggested in this study.

Additional data drawn from theatre respondents include the following results:

1. 31% have an annual budget at or above \$500,000, the most frequently selected budget category.
2. 16% have an annual budget of \$100,000 to \$500,00.
3. 23% have an annual budget of \$50,000 to \$100,000.
4. 18% do 100-200 school performances/year.
5. 44% do 25-100 school performances/year.
6. 35% drew from 75% to 100% of their total annual audience from school performances.
7. 62% receive government grants each year.

8. 76% tour.
9. 81% use printed educational materials.
10. 46% of likely users estimated annual cost of the program at \$5,000-\$20,000 and another 31% estimated \$20,000-\$30,000.

Theatres with an annual budget of at least \$500,000 accounted for approximately half of the theatres likely or quite likely to use the actor-teacher. Thus, fiscally advanced operations appeared to be the venue most likely to provide this outreach. However, theatres with extensive youth theatre touring programs (59%) were even more likely to implement the actor-teacher concept.

Theatres appeared highly likely to use the actor-teacher when school performances accounted for either less than 26% or more than 74% of their overall annual attendance. Those two categories embraced 60 responding theatres.

The constellation of data suggests that a typical user of the actor-teacher would be a professional theatre with the following characteristics: an annual budget of at least \$500,000; 25 to 200 school performances yearly that provide either less than 26% or more than 74% of total annual attendance; an annual attendance of at least 50,000; and, annual government grant funding unrelated to the actor-teacher program.

The most likely users fall into two categories: major regional theatres that play primarily to adult audiences, but derive a substantial portion of total attendance from school performances; and, major regional children's theatres that derive all or most of their annual audience from school performances.

Also responding were 25 arts councils (20 U.S. and 5 Canadian). Significantly, virtually all of the agencies, 94%, indicated that they would fund an actor-teacher project of merit and typically recommended application for an arts-in-education grant. Several additional grant categories were cited, but infrequently: projects with arts-in-the-schools; arts-as-basic; general operating; and, special projects.

"Project concept" was cited most often by the arts councils as the best documentation of artistic merit although "the artists involved" also appear to have significant impact. Agency respondents also argued that superior applications are most likely to persuade evaluators when the projects have long-term potential, can become self-sustaining, will draw funding from diverse sources and demonstrate broad-based community support.

Additional data drawn from agency respondents include:

1. 50% reported their average theatre grant equalled or exceeded the average of all grants.
2. Over 50% confirmed a preference for multiple grants to a single project, as when applications arrive from both the producing theatre and presenting schools.
3. Agencies were frequently able to fund 50%-75% of the projects' requests.

4. In-kind services were generally not applicable.
5. Cost per audience member was only moderately important.
6. 50% identified multi-cultural considerations as important sometimes or often.

Agency Evaluation Criteria

U.S. and Canadian arts councils apparently tend to evaluate actor-teacher grant applications according to criteria in seven categories: artistic criteria, the project itself, teacher-artist interaction, educational criteria, ability to foster cultural literacy, curriculum and management of the applicant organization.

Artistic criteria should establish a high degree of professionalism, as evidenced in samples of the work and verify that artistic personnel are highly qualified. Agencies demand substantiated competence in the actor-teacher, who should be able to engage the children profoundly and have ample opportunity to work as a creator/interpreter of art while observed by the participants (children).

The project, itself, should address an appropriate dramatic genre (classic, modern, contemporary, local author, etc.) through an original concept that does not duplicate experience currently available to the target audience. Granting agencies perceive projects as superior when they provide art that is rarely available or innovative, promote artistic excellence in the state or province and support artists of merit. Applicants should also document the long-term record of artistic excellence accumulated by their organization.

Teacher-artist interaction should be defined clearly, as should the educational and artistic skills of the proposed actor-teacher. It is essential to develop and reveal an effective pre-project planning team composed of artists (including the actor-teacher) and teachers in the field. Councils consider collaboration between artists and teachers to be vital for planning and execution.

Education criteria must assure evaluators that the actor-teacher will communicate theatre concepts effectively in an educational setting. Goals should be clear, realistic and designed to produce long-term impact.

The project should foster cultural literacy by broadening audience experiences, serving audiences now served inadequately, and by reaching the disadvantaged or otherwise serving special populations.

Curriculum criteria begin with evidence that schools want the program. The applicant should also clarify the relationship between the actor-teacher project and sequential arts-in-education programming, describe how the project can be inserted and defend its potential to enhance.

Management criteria must prove that the applicant has a long-standing commitment to arts education, a clear mission and generally competent management personnel. They should also present a positive

portrait of demonstrated support from other sources, competent and diverse board leadership, community involvement and solid community support. The project, itself, should be described completely, including: appropriate and accurate budgeting; marketing, planning and implementation strategies that are wise and prudent; clearly articulated goals and evaluation criteria by which the applicant will measure project outcome; and a history of good management practice by the applicant organization.

Funding Considerations

Strategy for funding a single project should target a variety of sources, including foundations and corporations, but remain anchored to support from state and provincial arts councils. Theatre management specialist Stephen Langley argues convincingly that arts council funding frequently becomes the "good housekeeping seal of approval" for a project and, therefore, a powerful tool to use in the search for foundation or corporate funding.⁷ Langley suggests that foundations and corporations are more likely to award funding to organizations that can present a record of success with arts councils, since the latter have the professional staff needed to adjudicate theatre applications effectively. Corporate and foundation executives may lack that staff and, therefore, view arts council decisions as important signs of merit.

Foundation and corporate support differ from arts council support in that the former is usually courted through greater personal contact. Additionally, more attention is paid to the specific goals of the funding organization, which should match the project goals as closely as possible.

Corporation philanthropy is often designed to polish corporate image, increase sales, provide employee benefits or serve a combination of those and other goals. It can also be given altruistically and from a profound belief in the intrinsic value of art, as RJR/Nabisco Chairman and CEO Louis V. Gerstner, Jr. argued in a speech delivered at the School of American Ballet:

... too often, we forget that artists do important work. They remind us what beauty and grace are all about. . . . Artists enrich our souls and that's a job as important as any I can think of. . . . Right now, corporations like mine are almost overwhelmed by requests from needs-driven charities. We can't say no to problems that are so great. Yet, we dare not ignore the creative arts because without them, we would be truly impoverished. . . .⁸

Perhaps the lesson, in Gerstner's opinion, is to aim high. Top executives in major corporations seldom achieve such height without the kind of creative thinking that can also equip them to appreciate the arts at a level that equals or exceeds that of middle or lower level managers. More importantly, top executives have the power to make "yes" decisions and can do so in situations that might lead less highly placed personnel to hesitate or to deny.

The Paradigm Template

The following paradigm is a sample grant application for actor-teacher funding, addressed to a generic arts council on behalf of a hypothetical professional theatre that is an amalgam of traits discovered in the survey of theatres reported above. It can also serve as a foundation upon which to build an application for support from corporations and foundations.

General Applicant Information

Applicant: The Olde Millhouse Theatre
945 North Street
Milan, MI 48160-1066
County: Washtenaw
Telephone: [313] 439-2788

Legislative Information:

Michigan House District: 16
Michigan Senate District: 07
U S Congressional District: 28

Nonprofit Status:

Federal tax exempt number: 103J567991
Registered as nonprofit organization under Chapter 504, Michigan Statutes
Federal Employer ID #371447633

Authorizing Officials:

Chief officer: C. Grant Bruckner, Chairman of the Board
Fiscal officer: Jason Kent, General Manager
Artistic Director: Elizabeth Ireland
Grant Writer: M. Brooks Brown

Contact:

Ms. M. Brooks Brown
Fiscal Development Officer
The Olde Millhouse Theatre
945 North Street
Milan MI 48160-1066

Five Year Grant History—grants received from the following agencies:

Michigan Arts Council (7)
Washtenaw Co. Arts Commission (5)
The Ann Arbor Foundation (3)
Bassett Stores, Incorporated (2)
The Gates Foundation (1)
Detroit Edison (2)
Greater Milan Educational Group, Inc. (2)

General Proposal Information

Type of Organization: Nonprofit LORT B Professional Theatre

Proposal Categorization:

Discipline category: Theatre

Program category: Arts Education Project Support

Project Title:

Actor-Teacher Lecture/Demonstration for Young Audiences as a Pre-lude to Performance of Carlo Goldoni's *The Servant of Two Masters*

General Project Information:

Start date: October 1, 1991

End date: May 1, 1992

Number of individuals expected to benefit: 40,000

Number of artists involved: 1 (the actor-teacher)

75 lecture/demonstrations

Counties in which the project will actually occur: Washtenaw, York, Allendale, Wayne, Jefferson, Bibb, Calhoun, Muenster

Demographic Considerations

Minority and Special Populations

Applicant organization is neither minority owned nor operated, however...

Proposed program will serve minorities and populations with special needs—special efforts will identify high schools in which students who are black, Hispanic, Asian or Native American are present in substantial numbers. Underserved populations in rural and inner city areas will be identified and provisions will be made to serve students who are hearing or vision-impaired, mentally special or physically challenged. These populations will be encouraged to participate through incentives that include:

- Printed support materials tailored to each specific population;
- Lecture/demonstration tailored to each specific population;
- Grant consultation and advice for schools seeking external support for their contribution to the program;
- Financial concessions such as reduced fees for both performance and lecture/demonstration.

The home performance auditorium and building are accessible to the handicapped throughout, and similar conditions will be encouraged at each tour performance site. Signers will be available on request, home and tour.

Demographic Percentages— theatre and audience (see Demographic Percentages table)

Category	Individuals Benefiting (Total Audience)	Artists Participating (Artists)	Applicant Organization (Staff, Board & Volunteers)	Board of Directors (Board Only)
American Indian	0%	0%	0%	0%
Alaskan Native	0%	0%	0%	0%
Pacific Islander	0%	0%	0%	0%
Asian	9%	0%	3%	0%
Black, not Hispanic	35%	100%	20%	12%
Hispanic	15%	0%	12%	5%
White, not Hispanic	61%	0%	65%	83%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Children	100%	0%	0%	0%
Blind	3%	0%	0%	0%
Visually Impaired	10%	0%	0%	0%
Deaf	7%	0%	0%	0%
Physically Disabled	5%	0%	0%	0%
Mentally Impaired	10%	0%	0%	0%

Demographic Percentages (does not include acting company)

Marketing and Programming for Discrete Demographic Groups

Marketing

The Olde Millhouse Theatre expends 18% of its annual marketing budget on activities that discover and attract minority and special populations to performances at home and on tour. Those activities include expert consultations, direct mail, printing/advertising strategies, telephone research and focus groups.

Programming

The Olde Millhouse Theatre promotes multi-cultural literacy by constructing annual seasons that accent:

- Elements of the human condition shared by all cultures;
- Multi-cultural casting and employment practices;
- Production of specifically ethnic works, especially when those works speak to contemporary issues with compelling resonance;
- Multi-cultural marketing, as addressed above.

Applicant Organization Information

Applicant Demographics

Incorporated as a nonprofit professional theatre on August 7, 1979;
 Governed by a Board of Directors whose chief officer is the Chairman;
 Operated by an Artistic Director and a General Manager;
 Lort B Theatre with Equity resident company of 12, supplemented by guest actors;
 October-May season of five plays and one musical / all straight runs;
 One resident director + guest directors and designers;

Annual budget: \$665,000.00;
 Annual school attendance (home & tour): 40,000;
 Total annual attendance for 300 performances: 185,000.

Mission Statement

The Olde Millhouse Theatre is a nonprofit professional theatre serving Southeastern Michigan and Northwestern Ohio by producing American and foreign plays of established merit, augmented by productions of new plays by American authors who demonstrate clear promise.

Project Overview

Project Summary

Actor-teacher Anastasia Arnold will conduct 75 lecture/demonstrations in high school auditoriums for students who will then attend a performance of *The Servant of Two Masters* (Carlo Goldoni) staged by The Olde Millhouse Theatre. The 50-minute lecture/demonstrations will fit into an academic class period and be supported by printed educational materials tailored to each demographic population and sent to teachers six weeks before Ms. Arnold's visit.

Ms. Arnold will introduce students to the live theatre experience, accentuating the unique qualities that set it apart from electronic media, and demonstrate how that art will be made onstage in the performance the children will experience. Her lecture/demonstration will usually occur the week before children see The Olde Millhouse Theatre performance in the home facility or on tour.

Project Objectives

- Promote cultural literacy by building appreciation for the live theatre event;
- Broaden audience experiences through introducing them to the Commedia del' Arte performance style in *The Servant of Two Masters*;
- Address special populations through language and actions that are both meaningful to the students and appropriate to the message;
- Induce a basic understanding of how stage acting, directing and design are practiced in rehearsal and performance;
- Create a sense of pleasant anticipation in the students as they look ahead to the performance they will experience within a week.

Project Methods

- A planning team composed of the actor-teacher and three representative high school teachers will work to create the basic lecture/demonstration.
- Actor-teacher Arnold will use direct aural and written evaluations by teachers who witness her lecture/demonstrations as a tool with which to fine-tune the presentation and keep it on-track.
- Each lecture/demonstration will involve:

- Formal lecture material focused on principles;
- Demonstration of general principles through enactment;
- Demonstration through enactment of specific concepts directly related to the performance of *The Servant of Two Masters*;
- Content influenced by the demographics of each individual audience;
- Student interaction and participation encouraged throughout via questions, improvisation and subtle use of creative drama techniques.
- Lecture/demonstration logistics:
 - Series of fifty-minute sessions in each school for students who will see the performance of *The Servant of Two Masters*;
 - Maximum of 100 students per session and no more than three sessions in one day;
 - At least 60-minutes between sessions;
 - Students will be grouped according to age and/or grade level, and may remain after a session to continue talking with the artist.

Project Rationale

A survey of all high schools in the counties cited above found that teachers who were either quite likely or likely to provide *The Servant of Two Masters* for their students were uniformly in favor of the lecture/demonstration experience and willing to work with the theatre and the actor-teacher to provide it. Principals were also enthusiastic and signaled their willingness to cooperate fully.

This project serves students in schools without a significant drama program and enhances curricula in schools that offer drama classes and/or extra-curricular activities. Therefore, it complements existing curricula and offers an introduction to the theatre that can be a broadening experience for students who would not otherwise be exposed to the art.

This program recognizes the artist (actor-teacher) as a vital part of the curriculum in which the artist becomes an important bridge to learning that is cognitive and affective, philosophical and experiential.

This program has been developed as the logical extension of printed educational materials and is intended to bring them alive by incorporating the element that sets theatre apart and is its strength: the living presence of an actor.

Qualifications of the Actor-Teacher

Anastasia Arnold holds a bachelor's degree in secondary education (theatre and speech certification) from Albion College, Albion MI. She taught speech and theatre at Mt. Clemens High School for three years, then

entered the theatre MFA program at Wayne State University (Detroit) on an acting assistantship with the WSU Hillberry Repertory Theatre. Upon receiving the MFA degree, she returned to teach at Mt. Clemens High School before moving to Ann Arbor (Michigan) with her husband in 1990.

Project Evaluation Procedure

Evaluation will incorporate these instruments:

- Narrative forms filled in and mailed to the theatre by principals;
- Narrative forms filled in and mailed to the theatre by sponsoring teachers;
- Consultations between sponsoring teachers and the actor-teacher following each lecture/demonstration;
- Student evaluations collected by sponsoring teachers after the lecture/demonstration and after viewing *The Servant of Two Masters*;
- Actor-teacher narrative evaluation of each lecture/demonstration;
- Narrative evaluation of selected lecture/demonstrations visited on-site by the theatre Artistic Director.

Use of Grant Funds

To Defray Expenses:

- Actor-teacher salary;
- Actor-teacher travel, lodging and food;
- Teaching aids directly related to lecture/demonstration;
- Promotional materials directly related to the lecture/demonstration.

To Stimulate Additional Funding:

- Initial funding will help create a record of substantial accomplishment that can attract additional actor-teacher funding from government, foundation and corporate sources in subsequent years.
- Discovering additional funding sources will be crucial in developing the actor-teacher program as an annual educational outreach.
- Future funding sources for this program may include:
 - The J.P. Grant Foundation
 - Thompson and Thompson Engineering, Inc.
 - The J.C. Penny Foundation
 - Greater Milan, Inc.
 - The Washtenaw County Arts Council
 - The Michigan Arts Council

(See Expenses and Income tables for the project and organization budgets)

Expenses

Category	Cash Expense	In-Kind Contribution
Personnel: Administrative	\$0.00	\$2,500.00
Personnel: Artistic	\$18,000.00	\$300.00
Personnel: Tech/Production	\$0.00	\$0.00
Outside Artistic Fees/Services	\$0.00	\$0.00
Outside Other Fees/Services	\$700.00	\$0.00
Space Rental	\$0.00	\$750.00
Travel	\$3,500.00	\$0.00
Marketing	\$800.00	\$1,000.00
Other Operating Expenses	\$500.00	\$250.00
Subtotals	\$23,500.00	\$5,000.00
Total Cost of Proposal		\$28,500.00

Project Budget—Anticipated Expenses

Income

Category	Cash Income
Admissions	\$0.00
Contracted Services (lecture/demonstration fees @ \$75.00)	\$7,500.00
Other Revenue	\$0.00
Corporate Support (Wolverine Plastics Corporation)	\$1,500.00
Foundation Support (The Florence Harlan Trust)	\$1,500.00
Other Private Support	\$0.00
Government Support: Federal	\$0.00
Government Support: State/Regional (Excluding this application)	\$0.00
Government Support: Local (Washtenaw County Arts Council)	\$500.00
Applicant Cash	\$2,500.00
Total Cash Income	
	\$13,500.00
Grant Amount Requested	\$10,000.00
Total Income	\$23,500.00
Total In-Kind Contribution	\$5,000.00
Total Project Income	\$28,500.00
Percentage of Total Project Cost Requested from the State	35.09

Project Budget—Anticipated Income

Olde Millhouse Theatre: Annual Expenses

Category	Cash Expenses	In-Kind Contributions
Personnel: Administrative	\$135,000.00	\$30,000.00
Personnel: Artistic	\$175,000.00	\$75,000.00
Personnel: Tech/Production	\$136,000.00	\$0.00
Outside Artistic Fees/Services	\$24,000.00	\$25,000.00
Outside Other Fees/Services	\$30,000.00	\$0.00
Space Rental	\$0.00	\$0.00
Travel	\$18,000.00	\$0.00
Marketing	\$100,000.00	\$0.00
Other Operating Expenses	\$47,000.00	\$15,000.00
Totals	\$665,000.00	\$165,000.00
Total: Cash + In-Kind: \$830,000.00		State Funding = 35.9% of Actor-Teacher Project

Additional Fiscal Information

Fiscal year reflected in the figures above: 1991
 Applicant's fiscal year: September 1-August 31
 FY91 operating income: \$665,000.00
 FY91 operating expenses: \$665,000.00
 Date of last financial audit: October 1, 1990
 Average percent of operating expenses provided by state funding: 1.6%
 Anticipated FY92 operating income: \$670,000.00
 Anticipated FY92 operating expense: \$670,000.00

Project Implementation

This project demonstrates The Olde Millhouse Theatre's ongoing commitment to arts education. The theatre has served arts education for ten years through programs that:

- Offer 25% discounts to student groups;
- Conduct special student tours of the theatre facility;
- Sponsor post-performance conversations between students and actors;
- Make actors, designers and directors available to visit local schools;
- Provide educational materials to school groups planning to attend performances of designated plays;
- Offer internships to high school and college students who demonstrate potential for growth in the art.

Teachers and principals will be offered the lecture/demonstration through direct mail marketing as part of the performance package for groups viewing the production in the home theatre or school facility. The actor-teacher will do a series of lecture/demonstrations at each school for all the students of that school who will see the performance. There will be a fee of \$75.00 for the first and \$25.00 for each succeeding lecture/demonstration on the same day. Schools will also pay a mileage assessment of 21/mile (round trip) for mileage traveled outside a fifty-mile radius of the home theatre. They will pay the mileage and performance fees with a single check presented at the door on the day of the performance attended.

Seven Steps To Success With Grants

First, become familiar with grant writing procedures through workshops, books, articles and professional acquaintances. Study both successful and unsuccessful grant applications, drawing appropriate conclusions and recognizing key phrases or approaches that appear to trigger funding.

Second, become an "expert" in a specific area. Areas might include arts-in-education, tour programming, presenter grants, project assistance grants, corporate funding, foundation funding and multi-cultural grant support. Read extensively in books, journals, magazines and newspapers

to remain *au courant* amidst the shifting currents of philosophy and actual practice.

Third, understand the fads and trends that sometimes drive funding at the local, state and national levels and adjust the application process accordingly. Use that knowledge to pursue non-traditional funding; Department of the Interior funds might support production of a native American author; an architectural firm might underwrite Ibsen's *The Master Builder*; and, a travel agency could be interested in *The Marvelous Adventures of Tyl*.

Fourth, establish support within the organization that will seek grant funding. Arrange sufficient time to develop a basic grant proposal, and later to write the detailed grant application, by convincing superiors that the time required will be well invested. Develop solid connections with interested people inside and outside the organization, and schedule objective critiques of each draft.

Fifth, write and submit grant applications. Incorporate feedback and, when rejection notices arrive, learn from them and forge ahead, bearing in mind the conventional wisdom of experienced salespeople that "no is break even."

Sixth, let success breed success by staying one step ahead of each project underway. Build in the flexibility to react to changing conditions agilely and, if project A stalls, switch to B and return to the first project at a later date. Begin each project (and each work session) with success by addressing challenges that are relatively easy to master.

Seventh, check each grant proposal against the following 25-point list:

1. Relates to the purposes and goals of the applicant agency;
2. Adheres to the content and format guidelines of the applicant agency;
3. Is directed toward the appropriate audience—i.e. those who will review the proposal;
4. Obviously addresses the review criteria of the funding source;
5. Is interesting to read;
6. Uses a clear, concise, coherent writing style that is easy to read;
7. Is organized in a logical manner and, therefore, easy to follow;
8. Calls attention to the most significant points in the proposal;
9. Makes appropriate use of figures, graphs, charts and other visual material;
10. Is proofread so meticulously that it has few (if any) grammatical errors, misspellings or typos;
11. Unless it is brief, has a table of contents that is straight-forward and accurate;
12. Has a clear, concise, informative abstract that can stand alone;
13. Presents clearly stated goals and objectives;
14. Documents the needs to be met or problems to be solved;
15. Is of reasonable dimensions;

16. Demonstrates that the individual(s) and/or organization are qualified to perform the proposed project;
17. Has a budget that corresponds to the narrative;
18. Has a budget sufficient to perform the tasks specified in the narrative;
19. Details concrete evaluation criteria by which the organization will judge the outcome;
20. Substantiates a record of good management practice by the organization's governing body;
21. Offers evidence of community involvement;
22. Clarifies the design and execution methodology of the project;
23. Describes clearly the links (if any) between this and other projects;
24. Records all planned funding sources for the project;
25. Reports the manner in which project results will be disseminated, as appropriate.

Endnotes

1. Dorothy Parker, "Glory In The Daytime," in *A Subtreasury of American Humor*, ed. by E. B. White and Katharine S. White (New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1941, p. 74.
2. Allan Parachini, "Public Funding of the Arts is at Crisis Stage," *The Los Angeles Times/Washington Post*, March 24, 1991, p. 106.
3. "State Arts Funds Take Sharp Drop," *American Theatre*, 7:12 (March, 1991), p. 36.
4. "The Buck Starts Here," *American Theatre*, 7:12 (March, 1991), p. 29.
5. Barbara Janowitz, "Theatre 90 Facts," *American Theatre*, 8:1 (April, 1991), pp. 30-42.
6. Ibid.
7. Stephen Langley, *Theatre Management and Production in America: Commercial, Stock, Resident, College, Community Theatre and Presenting Organizations*, New York: Drama Book Publishers, 1990.
8. Louis V. Gerstner, Jr., Speech Delivered at the School of American Ballet, May 21, 1990, in *BCA News*, 101 (September/October, 1990), p. 2.