AN ANNOTATED AND CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WORKS WRITTEN IN ENGLISH SINCE 1900 ON THE PRE- AND POST-REVOLUTIONARY RUSSIAN THEATRE

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
JAY ELLIOT RAPHAEL
1971

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

AN ANNOTATED AND CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WORKS WRITTEN IN ENGLISH SINCE 1900 ON THE PRE- AND POST-REVOLUTIONARY RUSSIAN THEATRE

presented by

Jay Elliot Raphael

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Theatre

E. C. Mayorga

Major professor

Date July 23, 1971

O-7639

ABSTRACT

AN ANNOTATED AND CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WORKS WRITTEN IN ENGLISH SINCE 1900 ON THE PRE- AND POST-REVOLUTIONARY RUSSIAN THEATRE

By

Jay Elliot Raphael

This bibliographical study attempts to deal with the problem of the English speaking student interested in studying the Russian-Soviet theatre. It has been constructed in order to provide both the general reader and the specializing scholar with a current tool which will facilitate an awareness of the quantity and quality of research and recording done in this century on the history and development of the Russian-Soviet theatre.

The classification of source materials falls under four categories: Books; Articles and Periodicals; Reports; and Unpublished Materials. Other bibliographies consulted by the researcher will be found in the appendix. Bulletins, dissertations, and exchange materials are contained under the appropriate headings. The major content areas (determined by number of listings, and the importance and stress in the total body of literature) are labeled as

separate subdivisions of the total bibliography. These areas are Acting and Actors; Stanislavsky; Children's Theatre; Design and Technology; Directing and Directors; National Republic and Minority Theatres; Pre- and Post-Revolutionary Russian Theatre History; The Moscow Art Theatre; Surveys and Eyewitness Accounts of Soviet Theatrical Productions; Theory and Criticism; and Training the Professional Theatre Worker. A listing for a given source appears under all the applicable headings, although it is annotated only under the heading of its primary content. In order to overcome any confusion over subjective judgments as to the classification of an entry and to facilitate the use of this bibliography by individuals of varying degrees of knowledge, a complete subject index accompanies the body of entries. The index contains an alphabetical arrangement of individual personalities, theatres, plays, concepts, and movements. Next to each item is a list of the numbers which correspond to the related entries. A second and separate index lists alphabetically all of the authors whose works are annotated, with a similar number guide indicating the individual works. In order to quickly locate an entry and to identify it according to its major subject heading, each of the aforementioned indices is preceded by a number guide which associates a given run of numerals with the category within which it is housed.

More than just reporting, the more than three hundred annotations are intended to compare, to judge, and to direct the reader; in short, to anticipate the reader's needs and to accommodate them. The textual descriptions seek to provide the reader with an overview--an idea of the scope of the source, the orientation, the background of the author (where it applies),--and an evaluation of the author's use of the materials. The criticism may pertain to conflicts in theory, major divergences from historical fact, the orientation of the author, or, on the other hand, provide support for the entry's form and content.

This bibliography has been created and constructed so as to encourage further research, indicate the need for continued translation, and promote study of the Russian theatre as a source for the modern tradition.

AN ANNOTATED AND CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WORKS WRITTEN IN ENGLISH SINCE 1900 ON THE PRE- AND POST-REVOLUTIONARY RUSSIAN THEATRE

By

Jay Elliot Raphael

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Theatre

1971

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to my major professor, Dr. E. C. Reynolds, and to the other members of my committee--Dr. David C. Ralph. Mr. Frank C. Rutledge, and Dr. John A. Waite--for their advice and assistance in the completion of this dissertation. I also wish to acknowledge the influence of Dr. Sidney L. Berger, whose interest in world theatre provided the original impetus for this study. Finally, I am indebted to my wife Bonnie, whose patience, encouragement, and critical assistance made her the "fifth member" of my committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

When chroniclers write of the modern theatre, they allude to Ibsen and after. The after extends to now, to the 1970's, to a world theatre as active as that of any other decade in the twentieth century (excluding perhaps the Broadway and West End variety of production).

When the modern Russian theatre is spoken of, our sharpest images and memories stop in the middle 1930's. From 1898 to 1938, the date of the liquidation of the Meyerhold theatre, Russian theatre practitioners had anticipated and frequently realized theories and production concepts for virtually every major movement of the modern stage up to and including the present. Actually, by 1917, Stanislavsky, Tairov, Meyerhold, and Vakhtangov had already established their individual methods and ideologies. In addition to establishing the model of twentieth century realistic production, Russian theatre people had employed "some methods as determinedly non-realistic as has [sic] ever been used."[1] This highly varied group of

[1]Oscar G. Brockett, History of the Theatre (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1968), p. 582.

experimenters worked with and developed forms of theatrical convention in such depth and in such a manner as to be a representative microcosm of the twentieth century's pursuit of realism and its ultimate reactions against it. Therefore, it may be said that in many ways the characteristic modern Russian theatre is not the Soviet theatre but the monarchial theatre of Nicholas II, a theatre beginning with Stanislavsky and Danchenko and with the ballets of Diaghilev in 1899. This was indeed the freest, most productive period in the history of the Russian-Soviet theatre. It is true that this dynamic theatre experience extends into the 1920's under the Soviets, but, by the mid-1930's, the routinized, dramatically shoddy theatre that prevailed until the mid-1950's was firmly established.

John Gassner wrote that the modern theatre:

> . . . has swung from extreme to extreme. . . . There has been no resting point for playwrights and devotees of the stage ever since realism reached its apogee half a century ago. At best it may be said that the multiplication of formal experiments since 1890 has resulted in an uneasy coexistence of poorly developed and haphazardly reconciled alternatives.[2]

However, it has also been said by Gassner (as well as by many others), that a productive merger has always been possible. Such a merger demands neither compromise nor a destructive relationship. Both can be successful when provided with the freedom to complement one another. The

---

[2]John Gassner, Form and Idea in Modern Theatre (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1956), p. viii.

producers and directors in Russia were innovators in realism, in theatricalism, and in just such a productive merger.

Although Stanislavsky is now best recalled (especially in America) for his development of an efficient method of acting, he and Nemirovitch-Danchenko, in the creation and operation of the Moscow Art Theatre, also produced the definitive model of realistic stage interpretation and raised realism to its highest standard of production. Accurate detail, milieu, and historical fact were all painstakingly observed and refined. Although Russia had produced realistic dramatists before 1898, the eighteenth century conventions of production practiced by such a theatre as the Maly were unsuited to such as Ostrovsky and Pisemsky and ultimately to Chekhov and Gorky.

In America, Stanislavsky's influence has been detrimental to the ultimate value of his own body of ideas and subsequently to the development of this country's theatre. Stanislavsky is most often associated with his acting "system" rather than his production efforts. The misinterpretation of the former and its superficial adaptation (against his recommendations) have caused a proliferation of opposed and impractical interpretations. This tie with the Russian theatre, although strong, has been narrow in orientation; we are only now becoming aware of the many other innovators in Stanislavsky's time who

dealt with issues primary to the concerns of contemporary workers in the American theatre.

Just as Stanislavsky came to be recognized as the foremost practitioner of realism, so Vsevolod Meyerhold epitomized the search for antirealistic form (even more characteristic of this century). The essence of Meyerholdia (constructivism, the social mask, plastic movement, biomechanics, chronometrage, the circus) was the unceasing experimentation with the very nature of form in art. We can find examples of his techniques in the work of many of the directors whose productions have chronologically followed Meyerhold's earliest pre-Revolutionary experiments (The Fairground Booth, The Death of Tintagiles, Spring's Awakening, The Life of Man, etc.). While direct and acknowledged influence is difficult to establish, similarities in purpose, philosophy, and actual staging techniques in the efforts of many individuals throughout the world point to the significance of the Russian régisseur. In a review of Peter Brook's 1970 gymnastic staging of A Midsummer Night's Dream, Charles Marowitz points out not only Meyerhold's generally durable influence on Brook but that the specific production is Meyerhold's "circus theatre returned with a vengeance."[3] The staging

---

[3]Charles Marowitz, "Brook: From 'Marat/Sade to Midsummer Night's Dream,'" New York Times, September 13, 1970, sec. 2, p. D7.

methods in Meyerhold's productions of The Inspector General and Mystery-Bouffe bear strong resemblance to the approach of Piscator and Brecht. Norris Houghton has written that "what Brecht and Piscator . . . gained from close study of Meierhold has never been properly appreciated."[4] Still another example of a parallel relates to the idea of biomechanics which repeats throughout Artaud's The Theatre And Its Double, and is currently in operation under other labels in the laboratory of Jerzy Grotowski. Pictorialism, area spotting, the grotesque, the gestus, kinesics--these are all examples of what has been called the avant-garde in the twentieth century. The appearance of these theatrical conventions in the early 1900's in Meyerhold's productions points to the importance of the Russian theatre and the value of a study of Meyerhold as a valid source for the modern tradition.

Russian theatre sired not only a leader in realistic staging and a most thorough and inventive investigator of nonrealistic form, but also a man who laid the groundwork for the productive merger discussed earlier as well. Yevgeny Vakhtangov, a student of Stanislavsky's (and a director whose short career ended with his death in 1922), managed to demonstrate, in such productions as The Dybbuk and Turandot, the direction for a synthesis of

---

[4]Norris Houghton, "Mowcow Theatre 1935 and 1970: This Is Where I Came In," Educational Theatre Journal, XXIII (May, 1971), 121.

the approaches of Stanislavsky and Meyerhold, of realism and nonrealism. His method of mediation was known as "fantastic realism." His productions photographed life but also filtered it to stress the crucial ideas; the emphasis was achieved in a shared communication between actor and audience, in a kind of dialogue established by neither Stanislavsky nor Meyerhold. "Fantastic realism, not a paradoxical name for just another paradoxical style but--a practical workable procedure for achieving a synthesis of realistic content with boldly theatrical forms of expression . . . "[5]

Still another kind of synthesis emerged from the Moscow Art Theatre. Nemirovitctch-Danchenko's Musical Studio, in coupling the best of Stanislavsky's methods of actor training with the highest musical principles of lyric theatre, accomplished the most for the "romantic ideal" since Wagner instituted the "synthetic theatre."

Thus, in the work of the few men mentioned, which does not exhaust the list by any means, the student of theatre can find the primary characteristics of modern theatre, and perhaps even some of the roots.

The significance of the Russian theatre lies in the aforementioned microcosm of the total modern theatre. It is possible, however, to identify other individuals

---

[5]William Kuhlke, "Vakhtangov and the American Theatre of the 1960's," in Total Theatre, ed. by E. T. Kirby (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1969), p. 161.

whose influence in a number of areas also continues to reach out all over the world. In design, the leaders were to come from ballet, which saw modernist stylization as early as 1899 in the pieces of Diaghilev. The sets and costumes designed by such as Bakst, Benois, and Golovin effected the use of fantasy in a myriad of European renderings. Alexandra Exster, in the design and construction of formalized costumes and a cubist setting for Tairov's Salomé at the Kamerny Theatre (1917), provided a model for practicing German expressionists.[6] As for the use of the physical stage, in addition to Meyerhold's constructivism and Tairov's experiments with levels, Nicolai Okhlopkov is credited with the operation of the first professional theatre in the round. His pioneer efforts in central staging utilized such innovations as "transferring the action from the boards to a podium built in the middle of the house and surrounded by other platforms, steps, bridges, and balconies which served as a stage for various episodes of the show."[7] This is very much the vogue in what is now called environmental staging. In short, whether the topic is sensory theatre, decentralization, realism, form versus content, creative dramatics, children's theatre, actor

---

[6]Kenneth Macgowan and William Melnitz, The Living Stage (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955), p. 467.

[7]Marc Slonim, Russian Theatre: From the Empire to the Soviets (New York: Collier Books of the World Publishing Company, 1961), p. 303.

training (Grotowski has said that although his own answers are different he is still raising Stanislavsky's questions),[8] or "politics and performance," a study of the Russian theatre of the early 1900's provides much of the essential information in these areas.

In the last twenty years, armed world conflict, and the questioning of social values and political morality, to say nothing of the spectre of atomic death, have caused the theatre literature to be filled with references to examples of theatre of the Movement, theatre and commitment, guerilla theatre, people's theatre, and to be concerned with the social function of the theatre art. While social and political commitment has always been represented in world drama, the function of the total Soviet theatre, having been determined by the political conception of the national social interest, provides another and special area of significance. There can be no doubt that Soviet Russia has taken more seriously than any other nation in this century the proposition that the progress of society and the use of its theatre can have an inextricable relationship. Beginning with the early days of Lunacharsky's Commissariat for Education, the drama and the stage have been subjected to political pressures, but the institution itself has been respected as a powerful social lever. In the days

---

[8]Jerzy Grotowski, "Towards the Poor Theatre," Tulane Drama Review, XI (Spring, 1967), 60.

following the Bolshevik seizure of power in 1917, the development of art was considered the forging of a powerful weapon. Although this governmental support stimulated fantastic growth and public concern (in the 1930's Moscow alone witnessed the operation of over forty professional theatres)[9] and ultimately involved as both viewers and practitioners a large percentage of the population, the effect of Soviet reconstruction on the literature that became the Soviet drama promoted an outdistancing of the printed word by stage technique and thus weakened the great advances made before 1917. In the opinion of this researcher, the paucity of even passable dramatic literature (excluding the censored and stifled works of such as Bulgakov and Mayakovsky) acted as a very effective stimulant to the already imaginative minds of the Soviet directors and their students.

The Soviet Union has never accepted the "formalistic" doctrine of art for art's sake, but has preferred to consider art as valuable only in direct relationship to its utility in other social endeavors. The Soviet drama begins with a respect, not for the individual's experiences, but only for the collective power of society. Science, letters, world affairs, even the chronicling of Russian and Soviet history have depended upon the Marxian

---

[9]Norris Houghton, Moscow Rehearsals: An Account of Methods of Production in the Soviet Theatre (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1936), p. 17.

deus. From such plays as Fear, The Optimistic Tragedy, The Armoured Train, and Roar China down to It Happened In Irkutsk (a favorite of the 1960's), the Soviet system has employed the drama first to make previous changes palpable and then to encourage acceptance of further change. However, it has consequently changed the spirit of the Russian theatre; indeed, under Stalin it emasculated it. Under the banner of "Socialist Realism" life is viewed in books and plays through the Party eyes, ideologically, and at best as a didactic parable. Plays of collectivization, two-dimensional treatments of complex human problems, and positive heroes stressing social duty made for predictable and boring fare. "The complex manifestation of the divine spark of creativity in man is thus reduced to the slogan: 'realism in form; socialism in content.'"[10] Treatment of world and Russian classics has been similar. Mikhail Morozov's Shakespeare on the Soviet Stage makes clear throughout that productions of Shakespeare have been concerned with relating the Renaissance to the Revolution, Shakespeare to the collective, Macbeth to the war effort, and Hamlet to imperialism.[11] Playbills of Russian classics produced in the first decade of the Soviet era contain

---

[10]Robert Magidoff, A Guide To Russian Literature (New York: New York University Press, 1964), p. 49.

[11]Mikhail Morozov, Shakespeare on the Soviet Stage, trans. by David Magarshack (London: Soviet News, 1947).

parenthetical interpretations which indicate the use of these plays and the emphasis in staging. Tsar Fedor Ivanovitch, the Moscow Art Theatre's first production in 1898, was reinterpreted as "an attack on Kingcraft," and The Lower Depths was presented as "a picture of lodging house life under the Tsars, but objected to by the Bolshevists on account of its christian doctrine of love and forgiveness."[12]

Today's critics of the textual theatre and proponents of a theatre without words will be interested in the struggles of the most antirealistic directors under the aforementioned conditions. Antirealists who have concentrated on movement, sensory stimulation, and visceral and sub-conscious response have also tended to regard the word as just another element rather than as the most important one. While it is true that Meyerhold freely adapted, altered, and ground up the original script, one of his strongest artistic affiliations was with the gifted poet and playwright, Vladimir Mayakovsky. Norris Houghton, returning to the Soviet theatre some twenty-five years after the publication of Moscow Rehearsals (1936), relates in his book, Return Engagement, the idea that the Soviet theatre has failed to make any progress in the intervening quarter of a century because of the effect of a lack of

---

[12]Huntly Carter, "The New Age of the Moscow Art Theatre," Fortnightly Review, DCCXXXIII (January, 1928), 62.

freedom of expression. "Of all the artists of the Soviet theatre, its dramatists make the least distinguished contribution."[13]

Despite the national malaise that has prevented the substantial development of dramatic literature, the effects of the accomplishments in directing, actor training, theatrical conception, and design by pre-Soviet twentieth century innovators on succeeding Soviet developments, plus the Soviet support for and national dedication to the value of the theatre arts, combine to uphold John Gassner in his belief that "the Soviet Republics provided the 20th century with the greatest example of a communal theatre since medieval times when the culture of Western Europe was federated by the Universal church."[14]

Given the significance of the modern Russian theatre and its exciting variety of events and accomplishments, the student of world theatre will find a close study of this nation's artistic development both interesting and rewarding. This bibliographical study attempts to deal with the problem of the English speaking student interested in studying the Russian-Soviet theatre. It has been constructed in order to provide both the general student and

---

[13]Norris Houghton, Return Engagement: A Postscript to "Moscow Rehearsals" (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1962), p. 52.

[14]John Gassner, Masters Of The Drama (3rd rev. ed.; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1951), p. 541.

the specialized scholar with a current tool which will facilitate an awareness of the quantity and quality of research and recording done in this century on the history and development of the Russian-Soviet theatre. To date, there has not been as comprehensive a bibliography. Many of the well-known general texts and histories contain selected bibliographies (some annotated; see Simonson's The Stage Is Set),[15] and, in 1938, H. W. L. Dana provided an excellent Handbook On Soviet Drama, which also contained a general guide to texts and periodicals on the theatre.[16] Whereas there are content descriptions or statements about the plays, films, and ballets listed, the specific articles and books are not annotated. Dana's coverage was broad in that it also included an expository account of different theatres in the Soviet Union and even of productions in the various fields of drama. A comprehensive book, prepared as a preliminary project for a larger book on the Soviet drama, it was for years a valuable first source for initiating research on many aspects of the Russian-Soviet theatre.

Rosamond Gilder, in A Theatre Library, published in 1932, listed and annotated seven sample texts, as well

---

[15]Lee Simonson, The Stage Is Set (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1932), p. 540.

[16]Henry Wadsworth Longfellow Dana, Handbook On Soviet Drama (New York: American Russian Institute, 1938).

as four general works containing good individual chapters, and mentioned two general journals.[17] In 1949, in an attempt to supplement and update Gilder, Stallings and Meyers put out a Guide To Theatre Reading, which listed an additional seven sources published after 1932.[18] In 1947, Ettlinger and Gladstone presented Russian Literature, Theatre and Art: A Bibliography of Works in English Published 1900-1945.[19] This offers some fifty sources on drama, theatre, and film. Blanch Baker's Theatre And Allied Arts (until the completion of the present paper) offered the largest collection of annotated text entries, covering a number of areas, all efficiently presented.[20] In Paul Horecky's Basic Russian Publications, the student will find a list of twenty-three texts and periodicals compiled by Bertha Malnick dealing with historical development and the genesis of trends of theory for specific

---

[17]Rosamond Gilder, A Theatre Library: A Bibliography Of One Hundred Books Relating To The Theatre (New York: Theatre Arts, Inc. for the National Theatre Conference, 1932), p. 34.

[18]Roy Stallings and Paul Meyers, A Guide To Theatre Reading (Portland: The Anthoensen Press for the National Theatre Conference, 1949).

[19]Amrie Ettlinger and Joan M. Gladstone, Russian Literature, Theatre and Art: A Bibliography of Works in English, Published 1900-1945 (London: Hutchinson & Co., Ltd., 1947).

[20]Blanch M. Baker, Theatre And Allied Arts (New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1952), pp. 145-49.

periods in the Russian-Soviet theatre.[21] Horecky's companion to Basic Russian Publications, Russia and the Soviet Union, published in 1965, also has a section on the Russian theatre, variously subdivided into General Reference Works and Bibliography, Surveys and History of the Theatre, The Soviet Period, Eyewitness Accounts, and Special Aspects of the Theatre.[22] The section, containing twenty-one sources in English, was prepared by François de Liencourt.

In the area of dissertations, until 1969, Dossick's Doctoral Research on Russia and The Soviet Union was an adequate one-stop check point, at least for work predating 1960.[23] The volume also provides a supplement of bibliographical items and aids to research for each section. As of 1969, however, we have Frederic Litto's American Dissertations on the Drama and the Theatre: A Bibliography, which, owing to its date and thoroughness, has become the more valuable source,[24,25] In relation to the works

---

[21]Paul H. Horecky, Basic Russian Publications (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 244-47.

[22]Paul H. Horecky, Russia and the Soviet Union (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 394-99.

[23]Jesse J. Dossick, Doctoral Research on Russia and The Soviet Union (New York: New York University Press, 1960), pp. 43-47.

[24]Frederic M. Litto, American Dissertations on the Drama and the Theatre: A Bibliography (Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1969).

[25]It is exciting to note that in 1970 alone, three new dissertations in progress on aspects of the

described, the bibliography which follows is presented as the most current and inclusive annotated and critical bibliography of works in English. In addition to compiling a list of texts not previously presented all together, this project is unique because of its inclusion of dissertations and periodical literature and because of its critical nature. This is the only bibliographical work of the ones mentioned that is solely dedicated to the Russian theatre. In addition to being the most comprehensive study of available materials, it goes beyond listing to be a comparative study and to provide a partial history of the Russian and Soviet theatre in the twentieth century.

More than just reporting, the annotations are intended to compare, to judge, and to direct the reader; in short to anticipate the reader's needs and to accommodate them. The textual descriptions aim to provide the reader with an overview--an idea of the scope of the source, the orientation, the background of the author (where it applies)--and an evaluation of the application of materials. The criticism may pertain to conflicts in theory, major divergences from historical fact, the orientation of the author, or, on the other hand, provide support for the

---

Russian-Soviet theatre were listed in the Educational Theatre Journal (Albert E. Johnson, "Doctoral Projects in Progress in Theatre Arts, 1970," Educational Theatre Journal, XXII (May, 1970), 204.) This is a number proportionately higher than the total number accepted to date.

entry's form and content. In most cases, the description and the presentation of the material is sufficient. However, where the book or article has been judged to have succumbed to its own bias, or where the author's intentions and actual accomplishments are not equal, such considerations are duly noted. This research too has developed a critical bias, and this is considered justified by the project. After reading and analyzing the included materials, judgments were made on the basis of how useful or reliable a given text would be to the bibliographer were he to undertake a study in any of the various subject areas of Russian-Soviet theatre.

The critical approach involves the medium itself and the efficiency of expression. Questions of style may be a reader's choice, but where an overabundance of "slavic melancholy" (a seemingly national literary tendency) or Soviet chauvinism is prominent, these will be noted in the commentary. A contemporary study of the Soviet theatre would be hampered by the fact that the cultural climate of the Soviet Union is so subject to unexpected shifts that the material on the arts rapidly becomes dated. Investigations of the early Soviet theatre are likewise made difficult by the nature of the reporters, in that they were frequently people who regarded the Soviet system, the Revolution, and Communism as palliatives for the world's ills and thus had their vision narrowed by political inclinations. On the other hand, it is a tribute to

the scope and depth of the early Russian theatres that the foreign visitors to Moscow and other major cities who came shortly after the Revolution (and some during the heat of the Red-White conflict)[26] were awed by what for the serious theatre student and worker was indeed the promise of a glorious adventure. Thus, the criticism also takes into consideration discrimination between what the bibliographer considers sincere and deserved ovations and the cheers of foreigners discontent with systems or conditions in their native countries.

The most serious limitation of the value of the criticism is that the author does not read Russian. Some of the texts, both primary and secondary sources, have been translated from Russian into English, but the bibliographer's evaluation does not extend to the translator's efficiency. The user of this paper is cautioned that comments on and criticisms of materials may in places be unjust. Where it is possible to ascribe the "error" or fault to the translation, such a factor is noted. The only valid assumption the reader should permit himself to make is that those translations which have seen frequent reissuing and which are cited in general work's bibliographies have already been scrutinized. Also, where a manuscript is published in English translation in Russia,

---

[26]Oliver M. Sayler, The Russian Theatre Under The Revolution (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1920).

correct treatment of the language has been assumed. In some instances the author undertook communication with contemporary theatre scholars who spoke Russian and were at the time engaged in relevant studies, in order to ascertain their opinions of specific materials. Where appropriate, the consensus of informed opinion is included in the annotation.

In addition to an awareness of a technical need and a respect for an area of academic and professional interest, this study was initiated by an immediate curiosity and the realization that the need for theatre scholars to be contributors to a living theatre and not simply to libraries (making obvious a commitment to many pursuits) would frequently necessitate an investigation into an area in which the researcher does not have a language proficiency. As was stated earlier in this chapter, the purpose of this study is to provide both the general student and the specializing scholar with a current tool which will facilitate their awareness of the quantity and quality of research completed during this century on the Russian-Soviet theatre. It is sufficiently comprehensive to provide the reader not only with an immediate overview of the types of material available, but also with those which can help initiate a study in any aspect of the Russian-Soviet theatre with the exception of dramatic literature. It is the opinion of this author that much research time is wasted in the countless

duplications of individuals who, without access to the experience of others, must repeat the initial investigations necessary to obtain materials to synthesize and evaluate. A personal acquaintance with the literature is a necessity, but the task of simply becoming familiar with what is available, while a skill, is hardly a demonstration of expertise. The nonspecializing student who is providing himself with an overview in the study of theatre history, or attempting to gain a background for a related study, or is engaged in an initial inquiry based on personal curiosity is offered a document which, on the most pragmatic level, saves time and gives direction. He is also given an idea of the materials extant but not necessarily available at the site where the research is initiated. In the case of the scholar, the completeness of annotation, the analysis of each entry's emphasis, and the nature of the critical commentary combine to provide both an indication of needed areas for continued work and the basis for an understanding of the diversity of movements, ideas, and developments in relation to the outgrowth of printed materials. Finally, the bibliography is intended as a teaching aid. In the preparation of individuals capable of depending upon themselves for continued and applied learning, the bibliography, especially with its critical provision used as an adjunct to the first stages of research, would seem to be a most appropriate

resource in providing the student with a methodology for advanced study.

The following chapter serves as a guide to the use of the bibliography. A pattern of organization is presented as well as an analysis of the subject headings and a suggested use for the indices. Chapter III contains the bibliography itself and all the subdivisions. The final chapter indicates areas for further research and directs the reader to source materials in the process of being developed.

CHAPTER II

A GUIDE TO THE USE OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and articles on the Russian theatre do not fall neatly and singularly into clearly delineated categories. Much of the material overlaps and includes many aspects of development and types of records. Technically, all of the entries could be simply categorized under Russian and Soviet Theatre History. However, an effort has been made to anticipate the types of studies that might be done by various interest groups, and to analyze the total body of literature for emphasis and evident areas of repeated investigation. The location of a particular annotation as an evaluation of such emphasis is the judgment of the bibliographer. To justify the decisions by including an appendix of chapter headings for each text would have been insufficient without an interpretation of the more "poetic" titles. In order to overcome any confusion over subjective judgments and to facilitate the use of this bibliography by individuals of varying degrees of knowledge, a complete subject index accompanies the body of entries. This index contains an

alphabetical arrangement of individual personalities, theatres, plays, concepts, and movements. Next to each item is a list of the numbers which correspond to the related entries. A second and separate index lists alphabetically all of the authors whose works are annotated, and a similar number guide indicating the individual works. In order to quickly locate an entry and to identify it according to its major subject heading, each of the aforementioned indices is preceded by a number guide which associates a given run of numerals with the category within which it is housed.

The classification of source materials falls under four categories: Books; Articles and Periodicals; Reports; and Unpublished Materials. Other bibliographies consulted by the researcher will be found in the appendix, but bulletins, dissertations, and exchange materials are contained under the above headings. The major content areas (determined by number of listings, and the importance and stress in the total body of literature) are labeled as separate subdivisions of the total bibliography. These areas are: Acting and Actors; Stanislavsky; Children's Theatre; Design and Technology; Directing and Directors; National Republic and Minority Theatres; Pre- and Post-Revolutionary Russian Theatre History; The Moscow Art Theatre; Surveys and Eyewitness Accounts of Soviet Theatrical Productions; Theory and Criticism; and Training The Professional Theatre Worker.

With two exceptions, the above areas are presented alphabetically. The section entitled Stanislavsky, owing to the historical bias of our country, is most closely associated with Actors and Acting and is therefore located accordingly. Although the latter could absorb the former, the sheer volume of material on Stanislavsky and the international significance of his work and writings justifies special emphasis. It should be noted that exhaustive coverage of all the materials in English on Stanislavsky could constitute a separate bibliography. The nature, however, of many of the potential entries (particularly from the periodical literature) is such that they would be of little value in providing new information or even correct interpretation of the "system" and of Stanislavsky's written statements. For these reasons the section on Stanislavsky contains a listing and annotation of only the primary sources and research guides. The sampling of periodical literature indicates the types of material that further study will uncover.

The other section that does not comply with the overall alphabetical organization is entitled The Moscow Art Theatre. This section is an outgrowth of the Pre- and Post-Revolutionary Russian Theatre History section. The history of realism in the twentieth century is strongly tied to this theatre. Beginning production in 1898, it has since established itself as an internationally seminal

influence in the areas of style, individual artistry, the concept of the repertory company, and production methods. Foreign observers in the first two decades of this century used the titles Russian Theatre and The Moscow Art Theatre synonymously. In addition to the space devoted in general history texts to the Moscow Art Theatre and its Studios, there is a large body of material based solely on "the home of the Seagull." Therefore, I have attempted to call attention to its achievements and its place in world theatre history by creating a separate division.

Chronologically, the materials annotated were written between the years 1900 and 1969. As some works are translations, they may have been published in English as late as 1969 but written as early as 1914. For example, the excellent translations and texts on Meyerhold by Edward Braun and on Tairov by William Kuhlke, both published in 1969, deal with individuals and movements of the early 1900's.[1,2] If a work written in English during the last seventy years pertains to an earlier time and is still included, it is due to the fact that the bibliographer has judged it relevant to a study of the twentieth century

---

[1]Vsevolod Meyerhold, Meyerhold On Theatre, trans. and ed. with a critical commentary by Edward Braun (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1969).

[2]Alexander Tairov, Notes of a Director, trans. and with an introduction by William Kuhlke (Miami: University of Miami Press, 1969).

Russian theatre. This may be because of comparisons or observations inherent in the works, or because the materials are potentially illuminating.

Before discussing the characteristics of the various subject headings, it should be noted that a listing for a given source appears under all the applicable headings, although it is annotated only under the title of its primary content. As indicated earlier, failures of personal judgment are rectified by the subject index.

Acting and Actors.--This heading needs little description. Most of the entries are about or by leading personalities, including commemorative statements and discussions of past performances. If the reader is interested in photographs of the actors and the characters they portrayed, it is suggested that he consult the heavily illustrated general history texts and those texts listed under Design and Technology because of their graphic illustrations. Most of the theory written about acting has been associated with Stanislavsky. Tairov, Vakhtangov, and Meyerhold have also been instrumental in Russian theatre history in the development of actors and acting training. Their notes and materials will be found under Directing and Directors however, owing to the predominant themes of their writings and to the nature of their primary achievements in theatre.

Stanislavsky.--Despite the English-speaking theatre world's tie to Stanislavsky, as indicated in the annotations, there is still much to be desired in the volumes that have frequently been considered definitive statements. In addition to the translated works, there are pieces indicative of Stanislavsky's international fame and influence, of the controversies that have surrounded the "system," and of the attempted clarifications. Once again, the reader is urged to consult the indices of the general Russian theatre history texts and the volumes on the Moscow Art Theatre for additional factual data and interesting anecdotal accounts of his work and reactions.

Children's Theatre.--These entries describe the industrious and ingenious achievements of a branch which brought great attention to the Soviet theatre in its earliest years. Despite the small number of entries, reference to Gene Sosin's dissertation will make clear the scope and effect of children's theatre on art education and sovietization.[3]

Design and Technology.--This category encompasses scenic and costume design, makeup, and theatre architecture. The most important sources of information are the great number of illustrations in all of the general

---

[3]Gene Sosin, "Children's Theatre and Drama in the Soviet Union" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1958).

history texts, and in the Soviet-produced special editions. With reference to the photograph albums and design books, an effort has been made in the annotations to list the productions represented as well as the respective designers. Heavy illustration is a characteristic of most of the studies that have been done on the Russian theatre. Fülöp-Miller and Gregor's The Russian Theatre, for example, contains four hundred illustrations.[4] The reader is advised to use materials in the Pre- and Post-Revolutionary Russian Theatre History and Theory and Criticism sections for explanations of constructivism, Mir Isskustva, socialist realism, etc., so as to obtain assistance in interpreting the styles and trends depicted in the design section.

Directing and Directors.--The Russian directors, both before and after the Revolution, have been the ideological art teachers of their companies, and, when not restricted, the most significant sources of innovation and direction. Consequently, much of what they have written and of what has been written about them encompasses theory, critical comparisons of ideas and productions, and the evaluation of historical movements and theatrical conventions. However, because most of this was developed in preparation for or in analysis of their

---

[4]René Fülöp-Miller and Joseph Gregor, The Russian Theatre, trans. by P. England (London: Lippincott, 1930).

actual productions, and is characteristic of the rehearsals, actor coaching, physical staging, and approach to dramatic literature, it is all presented under the heading of Directing and Directors. Evreinov, who did direct, was primarily a theoretician, a playwright, and a prolific author. His writings are not annotated under this subject heading.

National Republic and Minority Theatres.--Georgians, Armenians, Jews, Gypsies, Uzbeks, Byelorussians, Ukranians, Turks, and Mongolians are only a few of the many peoples living all over the great expanse of Russia. Ostensibly to aid in the development of national minority cultures and to provide for social integration and mutual respect, but also to help explain industrialization and insure widespread sovietization, the development of national theatres in well over one hundred languages was given economic, professional, and official support throughout the early years of the Soviet era. The books and articles in this category describe the goals, organization and management, and styles of presentation of the more well-known and established of these companies.

Pre- and Post-Revolutionary Russian Theatre History.--Containing annotations of over forty volumes, this is the largest single category in the bibliography. Almost all of the texts include information on all of the other categories and therefore, the annotations should be consulted as an adjunct to other separate areas of specific

interest. The forceful impact, novelty, and exciting variety of events in the twentieth century Russian theatre has provoked partisanship and considerable philosophizing on the part of reporters and historians. Indeed, it has occasionally been difficult to decide whether to classify a particular entry as history or as theory and criticism. The nature of the political and social system that evolved out of the events of the Revolution is an additional and undeniable factor in how this theatre history has been gathered and presented. In some ways this has proven beneficial, as the life and nature of the Soviet theatre is inherent in the social system. On the other hand, Russian historians have been faced with constant ideological shifts which have forced reinterpretation or overt fantasizing about past events. Matters of questionable judgment and reversals of favor in relation to well-known individuals are often finessed or passed over entirely in many Soviet accounts.

The Moscow Art Theatre.--The structure of and justification for this section has been dealt with earlier in this chapter. Individual entries pertain to the evolution of the distinct style of the Theatre; the production record; changes in the repertory; individual personalities; and the purpose, organization, and achievements of the Moscow Art Theatre Studios and schools. The interesting relationship between the Moscow Art Theatre

and the Soviet government over the years is also the subject of many native and foreign articles dealing with the Theatre's history. Additional information can be found in the section on Stanislavsky and, where indicated by the annotation, in many of the general history entries.

Surveys and Eyewitness Accounts of Soviet Theatrical Productions.--These entries are also historical records. Their scope and form, however, cause them to differ from the type of item listed in the Pre- and Post-Revolutionary Russian Theatre History section. Reviews of individual seasons; reports on activities and plans; exchanges of data; investigations of one theatre or one group of related theatres during a specific season; and interviews comprise the bulk of articles which are here grouped together. They provide updating for the subject areas first described by the early major historical works, an ongoing key to trends and shifts in direction, and a source of artistic evaluation.

Theory and Criticism.--As indicated, the history section contains within it a great many discussions of movements and critical controversies. This grouping highlights those books and articles which isolate movements and ideas. Usually narrower in approach, and smaller in text, these writings pertain to such theories as socialist realism, the instinct of transformation, theatre of

the single will, historical drama, constructivism, and similar topics. They can provide a method for analyzing treatments of similar topics in the major historical treatises and the surveys.

Training The Professional Theatre Worker.--There are only seven entries in this category, but they pertain to sources containing considerable information on state institutes, and technicums in Russia responsible for training every kind of professional theatre worker. The treatment of artists and the planning for the productivity and development of creative individuals is one of the outstanding positive attainments of the Russian system.

It is obvious, I am sure, that this bibliography treats dramatic literature only incidentally. This is not to indicate a disparaging view of Soviet drama but rather an honest analysis of the most significant achievements in theatre. The developments in staging, production style, design, performer-audience relationship, and actor training, are those areas which have made the pre-Revolutionary Russian theatre and the Soviet theatre (where the latter has not destroyed previous accomplishments) very important to the directions of world theatre in the twentieth century.

CHAPTER III

AN ANNOTATED AND CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acting and Actors

Books

1. Boleslavski, Richard, and Woodward, Helen. Lances Down. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1932. pp. 296.
   See entry number 261 for complete annotation.

2. Capon, Eric. Actors and Audiences In the Soviet Union. Leicester: Russia Today Society, 1943. pp. 19. Illus.
   See entry number 188 for complete annotation.

3. Cherkasov, Nikolai. Notes Of A Soviet Actor. Translated by G. Ivanov-Mumjiev and S. Rosenberg. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1965. pp. 228. Illus.
   These are the notes of a reknowned Russian screen actor. Beginning as a super in the opera in St. Petersburg, he went on to perform in pantomimes, ballets, reviews, Living Newspapers, on the legitimate stage, and of course, in a great number of films. Written for the general Soviet reader, the text is both autobiographical and critical, containing the author's observations and opinions on the actor's relationship to the playwright, the director, the specific role, the make-up artist, the cameraman, and the public.
   In the chapters on technique, Cherkasov compares the acceptable acting styles in each of the media in which he performed, particularly the stage and the screen. Aside from the expression of a general obeisance to Stanislavsky and the relating of his battle

(Cherkasov's) to overcome a penchant for playing "the grotesque" in order to obtain realistic roles, the insights into acting theory are few.

Throughout, the spirit and the letter of the text is dedicated to socialism, and the material in the following quotation recurs with frequency: "The Soviet actor expects new plays and scripts covering a wide variety of subjects. What the Soviet actor wants to do is to depict the new worker, born of the Soviet age, to portray the Soviet scientist as a man who brings science and production together, to play collective farmers, those wonderful Soviet men and women who are struggling against all that is new, progressive and communist, to present a Party functionary as a man who is closely connected with the masses and whose political and organizational work is bringing communism nearer."

Without mentioning any names, Cherkasov condemns all the formalists responsible for his early training and direction after the Revolution. He chides himself for being duped and led astray. "For us the younger generation, to follow fashion seemed natural. Most of us did not understand the real meaning of this blind following of fads, and yet it was under its guise that attempts were being made to degrade art."

Among his many roles, Cherkasov appeared as Don Quixote in the Leningrad State Dramatic Theatre's 1941 staging; as Varlaam in Boris Gudunov, as Professor Polezhayev in the film Baltic Deputy; as Alexander Nevsky in Eisenstein's film of the same name; in the title role of Ivan the Terrible; as Maxim Gorky in the film Lenin in 1918; and as the remarkable Russian poet in They Knew Mayakovsky. A whole section of the text, the last, is given over to "Playing Mayakovsky."

The text is heavily illustrated with half-tone photographs of Cherkasov in his many roles. The startling difference in appearance achieved by the actor from role to role is justification for the praise often accorded Russian performers for their care and ingenuity in creating facial images for their characters.

4. Markov, Pavel. The First Studio: Sullerzhitsky-Vakhtangov-Tchekov. Translated by Mark Schmidt. New York: Group Theatre, Inc., 1934. pp. 80. (Typewritten.)

See entry number 265 for complete annotation.

5. Varneke, Boris V. History of the Russian Theater: Seventh Through The Nineteenth Century. Translated by Boris Brasol. New York: Macmillan, 1951. pp. 459.
See entry number 225 for complete annotation.

Articles and Periodicals

6. Abbott, Hazel. "The Soviet Theatre--Acting and Staging." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIII (October, 1937), 433-39.
Miss Abbott's report of her observations on a twelve-day visit to Moscow are more interesting than the conclusions she draws. In commenting on the audience as the prime determinant of the Soviet repertory she writes, "It revels in the functional and rational aspects of a collectivist society. The audience attitude accounts for the removal of a play on the life of Molière." I believe the play in question to be Bulgakov's, which was removed by the Soviet government because in its study of Molière it too closely paralleled methods of government censorship then being applied to Bulgakov himself as well as others.
The author also infers that Meyerhold's and Okhlopkov's experiments in staging resulted from the specific needs and demands of the Soviet audience. While it is true that both men were highly involved in determining the best audience-actor relationship, a much broader knowledge and pursuit of world theatrical convention seems more likely to have been the actual base of their work.
Specifically, the author witnessed and comments on rehearsals at the Moscow Art Theatre; a production of Pogodin's Aristocrats at the Vakhtangov Theatre; Meyerhold's presentation of Woe To Wit (seen by the author as "A memorable performance of eccentricities which one might dane [sic] to style 'realism with a fault'"; and classes at Tairov's Kamerny Theatre.

7. Andronikov, Iraki. "Solomon Mikhoels: Actor, Director, Critic." Soviet Review, I (October, 1960), 36-41.
Solomon Mikhoels, decorated numerous times by the Soviet government, was an actor, director, and producer with the Moscow State

Jewish Theatre. He was best known for his portrayals of King Lear and Tevye. The article is actually a review of a book which is a compilation of his speeches and writings published in Russia after his death. As the title of the book is never mentioned in the body of the article, I am assuming that it may be the same as the title of the review.

In discussing the philosophy inherent in Mikhoels' writing and acting, Andronikov writes, "He rejects the actor who can be played upon like an instrument. He demands that the performing actor should always be seconded by the actor-ideologist, not only able to portray life on the stage but to continue life through his art, penetrating into the inner world of his heroes."

There is also a selection of Mikhoels' commentaries on Stanislavsky and on poetry and acting.

8. Ashby, Clifford. "Alla Nazimova And The Advent of New Acting In America." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLV (April, 1959), 182-88.

Most of this article deals with Nazimova's performances in America. Approximately the first four pages provide background on her training in Europe; her life in Russia; her brief period of employment in the Moscow Art Theatre; and her relationship to the founding of the St. Petersburg Players under Paul Orlenev (the producer who brought Nazimova to America).

9. Ben-Ari, Raiken. "Four Directors and the Actor." Theatre Workshop, I (January-March, 1937), 65-74.

See entry number 123 for complete annotation.

10. Carter, Huntly. "A New Principle in Play-production: The Classics in the Russian Theatre of To-day." Creative Art, VII (1930), 62-69. Illus.

See entry number 75 for complete annotation.

11. Fernald, John. "Russian Theatre Now." Drama, XXXII (Spring, 1954), 14-21.

In a brief salute to Russian acting, which he believed to be the best he had ever observed, Fernald comments at length on Danchenko's revival of The Three Sisters,

which was put into the Moscow Art Theatre repertory in 1938. He comments on the mastery of technique, acting style, and on the use of ensemble playing.

12. Khmelyov, N. P. "My Karenin." Theatre Workshop, I (September-October, 1937), 12-13.
The noted actor describes his role in the Moscow Art Theatre's production of Tolstoy's Anna Karenina. He comments on his approach to the play and the role, on the creation of a physical type, and on the use of gesture. Unfortunately, this is all noted in only two pages.

13. Lozowick, Louis. "The Theatre Is For The Actor: An Iconoclast's Methods in Moscow." Theatre Guild Magazine, October, 1929, pp. 34-35.
Iconoclast is a good term for Tairov's position in the early post-revolutionary theatre. This very brief article outlines the principles of the Kamerny Theatre as practiced in the staging of Hansenclever's Antigone. It is accompanied by photographs of the production.

14. Lukeman, Gerald. "The State of the Soviet Stage: How An Actor Fares." Theatre Arts, XLV (April, 1961), 61, 78.
When Ivan Grikura, an Armenian actor, visited American actors at the Circle-In-The-Square Theatre in New York, they put a number of questions to him concerning conditions for the actor in the Soviet Union. The interview contains information on training, salaries, working conditions, and benefits.
A side note but an interesting one is Grikura's comment that he liked the staging at The Circle-In-The-Square and was sorry there was no arena work in Russia. This is strange, considering the pioneering work in this area done by Okhlopkov as far back as the 1920's.

15. Malnick, Bertha. "A. A. Shakhovskoy." The Slavonic and East European Review, XXXII (December, 1953), 29-51.
See entry number 247 for complete annotation.

16. Malnick, Bertha. "The Actor Shchepkin and His Friends." The Slavonic and East European Review, XXXX (1962), 373-83.
This article, of incidental general interest, attempts to reveal something of

Shchepkin's temperament in relation to his stature as an actor. "Shchepkin had the rare gift of holding people together: in the theatre where he would hold thousands in the hollow of his hand, in life where he could bind people to him even when they disagreed with him." The author reveals aspects of Shchepkin's friendship and experiences with such men as Gogol, Belinsky, Herzen, and Schevchenko.

17. Malnick, Bertha. "The Actors Shchepkin and Sosnitsky." The Slavonic and East European Review, XXXVIII (1960), 289-313.

Sosnitsky and Shchepkin were the most versatile actors of the first half of the 19th century. Sosnitsky was primarily famous for his ability to handle French drawing room comedy. Although the two were frequently compared in the same way as Mochalov and Karatygin, Malnick succeeds in illustrating that Shchepkin was undoubtedly the most famous and perhaps the greatest of all Russian actors. The author sketches both actors biographically, and in relating their individual skills and styles discusses their rivalry as Gogol's Major in The Government Inspector. The stress in the article is clearly on the material concerning Shchepkin. Malnick traces his growth and development from the effect of his first observations of Prince Meschersky through his work with Molière, Gogol, Griboyedov, Turgenev, and Ostrovsky, to his creation of a realistic system of acting.

18. Malnick, Bertha. "Mochalov and Karatygin." The Slavonic and East European Review, XXXVI (June, 1958), 265-93.

Mochalov and Karatygin represent two of Europe's finest actors of the nineteenth century, and represent in their differences of style and approach a contrast "as old as the history of acting."

The author's highly detailed description and comparison of their styles and most famous roles is embodied in a comparison of the theatres of Moscow and St. Petersburg. Pavel Mochalov was considered Russia's greatest romantic actor. He was a product of Moscow, a non-formalist city, Russian in emotion and "classless in audience." Vasily Karatygin, on the other hand, whose technique embodied a "disciplined and brilliant outward form" was

a product of St. Petersburg. At the time, St. Petersburg was a bastion of elegance and artifice, the home of classical stage art and of a well-established, high ranking class audience.

The author traces the developments, style, training, temperament, careers, and critical reception of the two men. Of particular interest is the thorough documentation of the actors' rivalry in the works of Schiller and Shakespeare. Malnick provides a particularly full critical commentary on Mochalov's Hamlet. In contrasting the intuitive and inborn talent of Mochalov with the craftsman-like precision and training of Karatygin, she develops the shape and changes in theatrical and dramatic form in St. Petersburg and Moscow. The reader gets an insight into the effects of the European drama of the period on the developments and taste of the native Russian theatre.

19. Markov, Pavel. "The Actor and the Revolution." Theatre Arts Monthly, XX (September, 1936), 683-93.

Pavel Markov, once literary director of the Moscow Art Theatre, reappears in the literature like a bad dream. Regardless of the topic, his drippingly propagandistic approach is irksomely and stubbornly the most outstanding characteristic of his work. In this article he pushes aside all pre-Revolutionary acting as at best technically proficient and spotlights the theatrical messiah as a new distinctively Soviet acting style made possible by the Revolution. He refers to the change in the inner experience of the actor and the development of social character which was accompanied by a change in form. In dusting off the pre-Revolutionary theatre, he banishes all of Tairov's experiments as disasters and labels Vakhtangov's Turandot as a very minor work. While he hails Meyerhold's biomechanical system as the symbol of Soviet style, he ultimately and paradoxically lauds Stanislavsky's approach as the most complete and most durable.

20. Martin, John. "How Meyerhold Trains His Actors." Theatre Guild Magazine, November, 1930, pp. 26-30. Illus.

This is an attempt to explain biomechanics in theory, by illustrating the physical training methods, and by contrasting

the system with the teachings of Stanislavsky. As is illustrated by Meyerhold's own writings, Martin is correct in his belief that the actor was the key element in constructivist productions. Often, Meyerhold was mistakenly criticized for using the actor as a piece of machinery or as simply a scenic element. Nonetheless, Martin's description of the style as "heavily accented realism" seems an odd choice of words. The most interesting aspect of this piece is the description of the actual exercises used in training.

21. Mauny de, Erik. "Current Trends in the Soviet Theatre." Survey, LVII (October, 1965), 73-80.
See entry number 328 for complete annotation.

22. Metten, Charles. "Mikhail Shchepkin: Artist and Lawgiver of the Russian Stage." Educational Theatre Journal, XIV (March, 1962), 44-49.
"Shchepkin . . . exerted considerable influence on the Russian theatre of the nineteenth century through his personal influence and as an actor and teacher. Perhaps most important to the twentieth century, however, is his influence on Stanislavsky."
This article provides a biographical sketch of the great serf actor and deals with those of his writings which indicate an early concentration on a style of acting based on realism. Metten deals with the actor's directions for preparing a role; use of body and voice; discipline; and the need for ensemble playing. Those tenets which precede and obviously influenced Stanislavsky's practices are stressed. The article makes generous use of quotations taken from Shchepkin's own writings and from the works of others such as Stanislavsky who wrote about Shchepkin's achievements.

23. Niyazova, Elvira. "Anniversary of the Death of Maria Savina." World Theatre, XIV (November-December, 1965), 612-13. Illus.
On the fiftieth anniversary of her death, the celebrated actress and interpreter of Gogol, Tolstoy, Turgeniev, and Ostrovsky is remembered and eulogized.

24. Sayler, Oliver M. "The Deeper Roots Of The Russian Theatre." The Bookman, L (December, 1919), 108-14.
See entry number 250 for complete annotation.

25. Sayler, Oliver M. "Tudor Twelfth Night in Russia." The Drama, X (October, 1919), 3-7.
See entry number 340 for complete annotation.

26. Sudakov, I. "The Actor's Creative Work." Theatre Workshop, I (January-March, 1937), 7-42.
Sudakov, along with Kedrov and Podgorny, managed the Moscow Art Theatre for Stanislavsky and Danchenko. He also directed productions for the Theatre For Young Workers (TRAM), and taught in the Department of Directing at the Moscow Theatrical University. This article is a partial transcript from a "rough translation made for the Group Theatre" of the lectures he gave at the university. The material itself deals with "inner technique" (playing an action, concentration, attention, sense memory, character analysis) and "outer technique" (muscular freedom, relaxation, rhythm, speech, voice, oral interpretation). The material gives a good idea of the orientation and methods of training practiced under Stanislavsky and by such as Sullerzhitsky and Vakhtangov in the Moscow Art Theatre Studios.

27. Sviatskaia, S. "Vera Komissarjevskaia." World Theatre, XIV (March-April, 1965), 179-85. Illus.
In commemoration of the artist's one hundredth anniversary, the author has written a portrait of Komissarjevskaya's struggles with the antiquated methods of the Alexandrinsky Theatre and the symbolist-motivated techniques of Meyerhold. The great actress unsuccessfully sought a union of her brother's philosophy and the nonrealistic staging of Meyerhold. With respect to the latter, her own desires as a performer clashed with his "dematerialization" of the actor.

28. Tarasova, A. K. "Anna Karenina." Theatre Workshop, I (September-October, 1937), 10-11.
Tarasova played Anna in the Moscow Art Theatre's production of Tolstoy's Anna Karenina (as produced by Sakhnovsky and directed by

Volkov). Here she talks of her admiration for the play and its suitability to the Soviet repertory. As to her work on the role, she writes, "I set myself the task not only to act but to live this role."

29. Turner, W. L. "Vakhtangov: The Director as Teacher." Educational Theatre Journal, XV (December, 1963), 318-26.
See entry number 154 for complete annotation.

30. Vishnevsky, A.; Korchaguina, D.; Alexandrovskaya, E.; Monakhov, N.; Pashennaya, V.; Pevstov, I.; Radlov, S.; Satz, N.; Sushkevich, B.; Tairov, A.; and Uzhivy, N. "Actors and Producers Speak of Their Work." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 6 (1934), 60-69.
The most interesting and informative statements are provided by Natalia Satz and Alexander Tairov. Miss Satz expresses her preference for a children's theatre based on a synthetic approach "in which the spoken word may pass into pantomime, in which the rhythm of dramatic action is associated with the rhythm of music. . . ." Tairov talks of the expanse of his theatre's repertory and of how his actors are trained to act in many styles. He discusses the 1933-34 repertory and his conceptions for the Optimistic Tragedy, Fortune Heights, Bogatyri, and Egyptian Nights.

Stanislavsky

Books

31. Balukhaty, S. D., ed. The Seagull Produced By Stanislavsky. Translated by David Magershack. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1952. pp. 292. Illus.
Essentially, this book is a reproduction of Stanislavsky's promptbook for the first production of The Seagull in 1898. It is arranged page-by-page with a translation of the play by David Magarshack. The production notes are fantastically detailed including blocking diagrams; notes on costumes, props and setpieces; and an orchestration of every beat. Virtually every gesture, choice of scenic effect, and change in vocal intensity and duration (to the number of seconds) are duly noted. Obviously,

this production script is not so much a record of the event as it is a meticulously prepared prerehearsal plan. Indeed, from an actor's point of view the plans seems oppressive and inhibiting to any spontaneous rehearsal response. It must be remembered, however, that this production was mounted long before the famous Moscow Art Theatre ensemble was solidified and that it is representative of Stanislavsky's earliest work.

The promptbook itself is preceded by a number of chapters prepared by Balukhaty on Chekhov; the unsuccessful first production of The Seagull at the Alexandrinsky Theatre in St. Petersburg; background on the establishment of the Moscow Art Theatre; the Theatre's plans for The Seagull; and popular and critical response to the production. The text is illustrated with delightful photographs from the first production and the now-famous scene of Chekhov reading the script to the company.

32. Cole, Toby, ed. Acting: A Handbook of the Stanislavski Method. New York: Lear Publishers, Inc., 1947. pp. 223. Illus.

The collection of eleven pieces, when published, provided an adjunct to and even an explanation of the material contained in An Actor Prepares. However, as the listing below indicates, some of the sources pertain more to film and directing than to acting. The first four selections are all attributed to or written by Stanislavsky. They are entitled "The Actor's Responsibility," "Directing and Acting," "From the Production Plan of Othello," and "To His Players at the First Rehearsal of The Bluebird." All of these have appeared separately in the periodical literature. The remaining sections include, "The Work of the Actor," by I. Rapaport, "The Creative Process," by I. Sudakov, "Stanislavski Method of Acting," by M. A. Chekhov, "Preparing for the Role," from the diary of Eugene Vakhtangov, "Case History of a Role," by V. I. Pudovkin, and "Principles of Directing," by B. E. Zakhava. The reader will find the Sudakov and Zakhava articles annotated elsewhere in this paper. The Rapoport article appeared in the first edition of Theatre Workshop in October of 1936 and is one of the best explanations and descriptions of the "system" that I have ever read. Rapoport's notes, based on the work of the First Studio, cover

concentration, organic attention, creative fantasy, the justification for gesture and movement, sense memory, inner intent, subtext, and the use of obstacles to objectives.

The organization of the book requires reader editorializing in order to follow one idea through the text, but Cole has nevertheless provided a one-stop repository of some of the better material created in response to Stanislavsky's investigations.

33. Edwards, Christine. The Stanislavsky Heritage: Its Contribution to the Russian and American Theatre. New York: New York University Press, 1964. pp. 345. Illus.

"Just as the saturation point seems to have been reached in the argument pro and con the Stanislavsky system, up comes Christine Edwards (in private life Emmie E. Hyams) with this fine volume providing some new and useful clarity in two main areas of the discussion. First she brings carefully documented and much needed truth to the history of the ideas embodied in Stanislavsky's work from their inception in pre-Revolutionary Russia right up to the present-day American theatre. Second, the popular misconception that the system is an acting style is laid to rest for all time." This is a quotation from Robert Lewis' foreword, and it sums up quite correctly much of the value of the text. It is clearly the most complete and careful work of its time. Miss Edwards approaches Stanislavsky with an almost religious fervor but also with a good understanding for scholarship. The scope of the undertaking is considerable. The author has provided an introduction to the development of the Russian theatre as a whole; a portrait of the life and work of Stanislavsky (including a great deal of material on the Moscow Art Theatre and all of its Studios); four chapters on acting theories and practices in America prior to Stanislavsky's influence; and three chapters on the subsequent reactions to the introduction of his methods. In relation to his writings, Edwards has provided commentary on the American editions and the materials written by Americans that were developed as a result. An unannotated bibliography of over two hundred entries is of special interest to the Stanislavsky researcher. Many of the entries do not deal with Stanislavsky specifically and can be found in this paper. The

reader's attention is directed to her sections on Periodicals, Newspapers, and Unpublished Materials. In addition to the listings themselves, the more important pieces are discussed in the body of the text.

34. Gorchakov, Nikolai M. Stanislavsky Directs. Translated by Miriam Goldina. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1954. pp. 402.

Nikolai Gorchakov was a member of the Third Studio of the Moscow Art Theatre and studied under Stanislavsky. Later he was to become an accomplished director of the parent company. This book contains the stenographic reports of the rehearsals which Stanislavsky conducted with this group from 1924 to 1936. The specific rehearsals cover the plays Woe From Wisdom, The Battle of Life, Molière, The Sisters Gerard, Merchants of Glory, and a vaudeville production of Lev Gurytch Sinitchkin. Though Gorchakov's commentary stresses Stanislavsky's general fidelity to and understanding of the playwright, most of these pieces are not sufficiently well-known in production to evaluate his conceptions. Despite a non-systematic approach, as a whole, this text provides a better explanation and demonstration of many aspects of the "system" than do Stanislavsky's own three volumes. Excellent illustrations within the rehearsal context touch upon the inner monologue, scenic rhythm, emotional recall, and the use of improvisations and études. Gorchakov also creates a very strong personal portrait of a tireless and constantly imaginative man. The missing element in the cookbook use of the Stanislavsky "system," which often has the effect of confusing and defeating the actor, is the combination of personal distillation, flexibility, intuitiveness, and teaching talent that the great régisseur obviously possessed. Along with Stanislavsky's greatness, however, one gets a feeling for an all-or-nothing despotism. Much of the literature, in general, indicates that pupils and protegés were often unquestioningly subservient to the requests and principles of all the great Russian directors.

35. Magarshack, David. Stanislavsky: A Life. New York: Chanticleer Press, 1951. pp. 414. Illus.

Stanislavsky lived for some fifteen years after he wrote My Life in Art. Magarshack's biography of Stanislavsky utilizes the writings, experiments, and events of this last period in addition to other biographical studies. Some of his best material is developed out of Stanislavsky's working relationships with such men as Kronegk (the manager of the Meiningen Company), Chekhov, Meyerhold (who, despite their polar ideologies, never failed to pay great homage to his former director), Sullerzhitsky (one of the foremost teachers of the "system" in the Studios), Gorky, and, of course, Nemirovitch-Danchenko. A notable value of the text, both by example and in the author's commentary, is the emphasis on illustrating that Stanislavsky's "system" was developmental and that it changed--as Stanislavsky changed, experimented, refined, and rejected--throughout his life.

36. Melik-Zakhurov, S.; Bogatyrev, S.; and Solntsev, N. Konstantin Stanislavsky, 1863-1963. Translated by Vic Schneierson. New York: DBS Publications, 1967. pp. 246. Illus.

This volume was compiled and translated by Progress Publishers of Moscow as a commemorative volume issued in 1963. Some of the material has appeared before in English, but much of it has been taken from a seemingly bottomless archive maintained by the Soviet government. The compilation of articles, interviews, letters, and notes is separated into two categories: "Man and Actor," and "Stanislavsky and the World Theatre." In the first section, notable contemporaries of Stanislavsky, including some still directing in the Russian theatre, pay tribute to his work and teachings. These include Nemirovitch-Danchenko, Vakhtangov, Tairov, Kedrov, and Okhlopkov, among others. "Stanislavsky and the World Theatre," contains reactions and testaments of influence by actors, playwrights, teachers and critics, in addition to some of Stanislavsky's personal correspondences. Maeterlinck, Isadora Duncan, Chekhov, Gielgud, and Lee Strasberg are representative of those contributing to this section.

37. Moore, Sonia. The Stanislavsky System. New York: Viking Press, 1965. pp. 112.

In 1962, Sonia Moore wrote a book entitled The Stanislavsky Method (Viking Press, 1962, pp. 78) which represented a personal distillation of the "system" but little in the way of new insights. This volume, a revised and enlarged edition of The Stanislavsky Method, is important for its treatment of "The Method of Physical Actions." Moore explains the progression from external action to inner feeling and offers scientific evidence and physiological confirmation of Stanislavsky's ideas and exercises which were designed in the last years of his life. Additional new material covers directing and Vakhtangov. Eugene Vakhtangov was considered one of the finest teachers of the "system" in the Moscow Art Theatre Studios, and his personal revisions, achieved before 1922, are very indicative of the directions Stanislavsky was to pursue in later years.

38. Munk, Erika, ed. Stanislavski and America. New York: Hill and Wang, 1966. pp. 279.

In the Fall and Winter of 1964, the Tulane Drama Review printed two special issues on Stanislavsky and America (Volumes Number 1 and 2). This book is an anthology of selected essays and interviews taken from those two issues. It also contains additional material, some of which was published in subsequent issues, and one piece not printed elsewhere. Below the reader will find two lists. The first contains all the articles common to the journals and the anthology, and the second contains the material found only in the anthology.

"Director's Diary, 1905" by Konstantin Stanislavski
"The Three Sisters at the MAT" by M. N. Stroyeva
"Director and Actor at Work" by Konstantin Stanislavski
"Stanislavski Changes His Mind" by Leslie Irene Coger
"Are Stanislavski and Brecht Commensurable?" by Eric Bentley
"Stanislavski and Shakespeare" by Michael St.-Denis
"The Notion of 'Action'" by Francis Fergusson
"Stanislavski and Freud" by John J. Sullivan

"Working with Live Material" by Lee Strasberg
"The Reality of Doing" by Vera Soloviova, Stella Adler, and Sanford Meisner
"Stanislavski and America: A Critical Chronology" by Paul Gray
"Look, There's the American Theatre" by Elia Kazan
"Would You Please Talk to Those People?" by Robert Lewis
"The Bottomless Cup" by Geraldine Page
"Lee Strasberg: Burning Ice" by Gordon Rogoff
"Notes on Stanislavski" by Bertolt Brecht

Preface by Erika Munk
Introduction: Exit Thirties, Enter Sixties by Richard Schechner
"Stanislavski Preserved: An MAT Discussion"
"The Method of Physical Actions" by Sonia Moore
"Stanislavski Triumphant" by Theodore Hoffman
"Further Entries for a Chronology" by Robert M. MacGregor

The names Strasberg, Adler, Lewis, Mann, Rogoff, and Bentley are important names in the development of American theatre, and particularly in the practice and documentation of American actor training and theory. This volume is an important distillation of Stanislavsky's appeal in America, and of how he has been used and misused in the adaptation of his methods to the American culture. As one reads these articles and interviews, one gets the feeling that part of the reason for the controversy that has surrounded these years relates to the fact that Stanislavsky changed, eliminated, and refined his ideas and practices faster than people in this country could obtain, understand, and utilize the results of his work.

39. Stanislavski, Constantin. An Actor Prepares. Translated by Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1936. pp. 295.

The "preparation" is the training that provides a methodology for approaching a role. The text is not a treatise on rehearsal or performance per se, but an approach to the business of becoming an actor. The text represents Stanislavsky's early thinking. It is by no means the whole "system" nor the man's final statement. Duerr, in The Length and Depth of Acting, has called it "a mere fragment." In Russia, the comparable volume

contains three times as much material and is entitled The Actor's Work on Himself, or Actor and Self: Personal Work in the Creative Process of Reliving. It was originally published in 1938, very shortly before Stanislavsky died.

In semi-fictive form the reader is offered a series of lessons. Torstov, the acting teacher, is obviously Stanislavsky at the time this material was written; and Kostya, the student, is Stanislavsky as he saw himself in his formative period. What can be learned here are Stanislavsky's keen insights into the problems of deciding what acting is, and into the emotional and physical obstacles to concretely achieving that which the actor plans and imagines as the transformation. It is not a cookbook but a guide to understanding those efficient means by which the actor can isolate, absorb and practice the acting experience. This book represents the Stanislavsky of the "inner technique." The work takes in partial discussions and analyses of playing an action, imagination, sense memory, attention and concentration, role analysis, the road signs in the literature. What must be avoided in using this or any of the Stanislavsky books is a literal adoption. Much of what he wrote was in a private language; not so much the result of data and postulates potentially knowable to everyone as a series of shifting ideas, values, and intended directions.

40. Stanislavski, Constantin. Building A Character. Translated by Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1949. pp. 292.

This is the second part of the material Stanislavsky began for An Actor Prepares. Although the translator did not receive the material until after World War II, it was completed by 1936. Henry Schnitzler contends that the book is not well edited in terms of the chapter order. He believes that some of the chapters were actually intended to be the beginnings of a separate book.

The form is once again the teacher-pupil dramatic school dialogue. In this volume, however, the emphasis is on "embodying the role," on externalizing the character. Stanislavsky deals with "outer technique" including rhythm, voice, speech, body movement, physical communication, and the wearing and use of the costume. The reader will also find interesting

discussions of the relationship between inner and outer technique, and "Perspective in Character Building," which defines the actor-playwright relationship.

41. Stanislavski, Constantin. Creating A Role. Translated by Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1961. pp. 271.

The book is divided into three sections which illustrate the approach to specific roles. These cover the role of Chatski in Griboyedov's Woe From Wit, a description of an approach to Othello, and a discussion of acting problems in Gogol's The Inspector General. The latter two sections take the form of lessons between Torstov and Kostya and the other students. There is also a very useful appendix, "Improvisations on Othello" which contains excellent concrete materials on working exercises. Above all, one gets the feeling that this text is more concerned with Stanislavsky the director, coaching the role than with Stanislavsky the actor, creating a role. This is reinforced by a reading of Stanislavsky Directs (see entry number 34). Indeed, Stanislavsky wrote that "every actor should be his own director." The volume has been considered important for some of the material on the method of physical actions. Nonetheless, the text is neither a synthesis of previous writings nor a statement of final conclusions.

42. Stanislavski, Konstantin. My Life in Art. Translated by J. J. Robbins. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1948. pp. 351.

The publishing history of this text is a complicated one. The following are Edwin Duerr's notes on the various editions and modifications that have ensued since Stanislavsky first prepared the manuscript in America in 1923 during his company's first visit to this country. The notes were prepared for the section on "Important Writings On Acting" which appears in Duerr's text The Length and Depth of Acting (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962, pp. 569-70):

"My Life in Art trans. by J. J. Robbins (1924) (Boston, 1927), 586 pp. Reprinted 1956.

"The revised, better illustrated Russian ed. Moia Zhizń'v Iskusstve (Moscow, 1925), and has been trans. into English as My Life in Art by G. Ivanov-Mumjiev (Moscow, 195?), with a

new, hodge-podge Appendix and (translator's) Notes, 503 pp.

"In essentials, even in most of the language, the book is the same as the American ed. However, an editor (Lyubov Gurevich?) has improved organization of the material. E.g. the original 61 chapters, most of them retitled, are lengthened to 72. Also, the first two sections, called 'Artistic Childhood' and 'Artistic Adolescence,' pp. 13-116, are a new arrangement of the original pp. 3-147: Ch. III becomes Ch. I, Ch. IV follows Ch. V, becoming two chapters with enough left over for later pages, Ch. IX is pushed ahead of Ch. VI, which includes material from Ch. VII, etc. The third section, 'Artistic Youth,' pp. 119-342, while often newly paragraphed, briefly cut, rewritten, and expanded, more closely follows the content of the original, pp. 148-457. The fourth section, 'Artistic Maturity,' pp. 345-446, rearranged, briefly cut, rewritten, and expanded, contains much of the new material. Here Stanislavsky significantly comments on voice and speech, and in a new chapter, 'Departure and Return,' pp. 448-458, reacts to the 'theatrical' theatre in 1925 in Moscow.

"The original My Life in Art, commissioned by Little, Brown and Co., was copyrighted in 1924 at Stanislavsky's request in the United States and all Berne Convention countries so that the rights might be secure for him and his heirs. Stanislavsky then allowed a reorganized, revised Russian translation to be published a year later when the international copyright had been established. The appearance in the United States and Berne Convention countries of the Soviet version translated into English has been ruled a violation of the copyright held in trust for Stanislavsky's heirs."

Perhaps the most useful element of the book is the information of and exciting description of the Moscow Art Theatre's birth and development. Stanislavsky does not explain his art as much as he elaborates on his life as an artist in the Moscow Art Theatre. Within the autobiography and description of the Russian theatre, he writes about actors, plays produced, scenic conceptions, rationale for the repertory, and the general development of events that affected his Theatre's growth and style. Although there is material on his acting theory, it represents his first efforts at

definition and at confining his thinking to paper.

Despite the outline quality of this text and the fact that this "system" was to undergo constant change, it should be noted that for many years it was the only available material in English on Stanislavsky's actual teachings and practices.

43. Stanislavski, Konstantin. Stanislavski's Legacy: A Collection of Comments On A Variety Of Aspects Of An Actor's Art And Life. Translated and edited by Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1958. pp. 182.

Mrs. Hapgood, Stanislavsky's official translator, gathered a collection of rehearsal notes, personal papers, letters, and speeches covering a period from 1898 to 1938, and combined them to form this book. While they aptly illustrate the diversity of Stanislavsky's interests, they sometimes suffer from too random a presentation. Part I, which comprises about half of the text, deals specifically with acting and actors. It includes commentary on the actor-audience relationship, the duties and obligations of an actor, types of actors, the education of actors, specific rehearsal coaching, the style of acting for opera, and the personal feelings and reactions of an artist. Despite this abundance of materials in relation to An Actor Prepares and Building A Character, the reader should not expect to find any new ideas or previously undiscovered insights. Part II of Stanislavski's Legacy is devoted to Chekhov. Stanislavsky relates his relationship to the man, to his plays, and to the Moscow Art Theatre productions. The final two sections are an unorganized series of pieces on a wide variety of subjects. Overall, the book serves to communicate its commemorative purpose which was to mark the twentieth anniversary of his (Stanislavsky's) death, the ninety-fifth anniversary of his birth, and the sixtieth anniversary of the opening of The Moscow Art Theatre, but does not really enlarge the legacy.

44. Stanislavsky, Constantin. Stanislavsky Produces Othello. Translated by Dr. Helen Nowak. London: Geoffrey Bles, 1948. pp. 244. Illus.

In 1929, while in Nice recuperating from an illness, Stanislavsky began plans for the Moscow Art Theatre's production of Othello.

His preparatory notes were not intended for publication and consequently, they are incomplete. Nonetheless, what writings we do have provide an insight into Stanislavsky's acting system and his laboratory rehearsal work. Unlike the promptbook for The Seagull (see entry number 31), this effort is not as detailed nor as well prepared for publication. In the former, text and notes occupy separate pages in the classic side-by-side arrangement, and the notes are accompanied by a large number of labeled blocking diagrams. In Nowak's presentation, everything appears together in alternating paragraphs. The text opens with a note on the stage settings and a breakdown of the distribution of acts and scenes, and then proceeds to the production notes. Actually, production notes is a better classification than promptbook. Frequently, Stanislavsky was moved to an aside on a point of acting technique by the particular moment he was working on. "When acting a part, and moreover a tragic part, one must think of tragedy last of all, and most of all of the simplest physical tasks."

Stanislavsky's interpretation of Othello and of Shakespeare in general, is open to question but given his approach, the instructions to the actors are imaginative and highly functional. Stanislavsky provides character sketches, background biographies leading to particular scenes and moments, explanations of objectives and suggestions of tasks for the actor, scoring for many scenes, written expression of objectives and inner intents, and outlines of the "general rhythm of separate moments." In the detailed descriptions of the mass scenes, Stanislavsky prepares the "supers" and provides clear instruction for the actor with the non-speaking role as to how to build a realistic character capable of relating and reacting to a given moment with consistency and individuality. At times, Stanislavsky's thinking is guided by a knowledge of the specific actor problems of the individual who has in fact been cast in the role, and, at other times, he visualizes how he himself would play the role or the moment.

This book can be very helpful to the young actor who is trying to understand the concept and practical use of choosing and playing physical actions. The mechanics of preparation for freeing the imagination ("the

magic if") and experiencing feeling is carefully and repeatedly delineated in many of the scenes. Physicalizing and concretizing in activities and actions is perhaps clearer in the examples provided by these production notes than in some of Stanislavsky's better known theoretical works (Building A Character, Creating A Role). "Should you feel to-day so disposed and be endowed with inspiration, forget everything about technique and abandon yourself to your feelings. But do not forget that inspiration comes only on a red-letter day. Therefore a more available and trodden path must be chosen which the actor should be able to dominate, and not a path which would dominate the actor as that of feelings and sentiment. The path the actor can master easier than any other and can fix for himself is the line of physical action."

45. Stanislavsky, Konstantin. Stanislavsky on the Art of the Stage. Translated by David Magarshack. New York: Hill and Wang, 1961. pp. 311. Illus.

The major portion of this volume is the section entitled "The System and Methods of Creative Art." The translator lists this in the Table of Contents as being written by Stanislavsky. Neither this section nor the following one, "Five Rehearsals of WERTHER," were actually written by the director, though they contain his thinking and ideas. Between 1918 and 1922, Stanislavsky conducted a studio organized for the Bolshoi Opera to give opera singers instruction and advice on acting. These materials are based on a stenographic record of the sessions and were written by K. Antarova, a singer with the Bolshoi company. Two appendices contain articles on "Stage Ethics" and "Melodrama." The latter was once again written not by Stanislavsky but rather by Gorchakov. As an Introduction to these pieces Magarshack has written a lengthy essay which explains and discusses the use of the ten elements of Stanislavsky's psycho-technique and evaluates the effectiveness and influence of the "system."

Children's Theatre

Books

46. Cherniavskii, Lev Nikolaievich, ed. The Moscow Theatre For Children. Moscow: Co-operative Publishing Society of Foreign Workers in the USSR, 1934. pp. 96. Illus.

"The main principle in all the work of our theatre is to 'activize' the audience, not only during the performances but also after them."

"We must educate through the theatre not observers, but fighters and builders."

These quotes are from an introductory article on the history and purpose of the children's theatre written by Natalia Satz. In 1934 she was the director, the playwright, and the guiding force not only behind this theatre but behind much of children's theatre all over Russia. The introduction is to a photograph album of many of the productions, activities, and personnel of the Moscow Theatre For Children. The text of the Introduction and the various captions provide information on the size of the theatre, plays produced, number of performances, scope of the enterprise, size of the company and the staff, the use of audience analysis, choice of content on the basis of age, and the stress on psychological realism. The photographs cover some twenty-four separate productions including touring operations, audience reactions, performers, theorists, and producers. Below is a list of the photographed productions.

The Play of Adalmina
A Thousand And One Nights
Pinocchio
Balda The Worker
Hiawatha
Pioneers (operetta)
Chronomobile
Mister Bubble and Chervyak
Amid The External Icefields
The Negro Boy And The Monkey
Katya Maloletka Travels Around The Big Piatiletka
We Are Strength
The Fight Is On
The Little Communist
The Squealer
Beat The War Drum

Dzuba
Aul Gidzhe
The Rapscallion
Cracking
Electricity
The Brother
The Altai Robinson Crusoes
The Matryoshki

"Our theatre is a 'synthetic theatre,' a theatre which includes within its scope the whole wealth of means of expression, where music, movement, stage settings and make-up all contribute to the solution of the problems of the performance together with the play." These photographs, in depicting the use of mixed media, ballet, pantomime, and the various styles of scenic design, aptly illustrate the total theatre approach.

47. Griffith, Hubert, ed. Playtime in Russia. London: Nethuen and Co., Ltd., 1965. pp. 249. Illus.

See entry number 296 for complete annotation.

48. London, Kurt. The Seven Soviet Arts. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938. pp. 381. Illus.

See entry number 207 for complete annotation.

49. Macleod, Joseph. The New Soviet Theatre. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1943. pp. 242. Illus.

See entry number 209 for complete annotation.

50. Sosin, Gene. "The Children's Theater and Drama in Soviet Education." Through the Glass of Soviet Literature. Edited by Ernest J. Simmons. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953.

There is not a considerable amount of information in English on children's theatre in Russia, although there is a full history dating back to the Revolution, and a full body of dramatic literature to examine. Gene Sosin (see entry number 54) provides an excellent capsule history of the children's theatre movement, and a description of the important plays. "The purpose of this study is to demonstrate how the theatre functions in Communist education by examining the social content and ideological direction of its repertoire." I am reproducing here a section of the summation

of the forty-page article, in order to indicate how the author has delineated the periods of development and change, and how the article is organized: "The twenties saw a period of tolerated experimentation, against the background of a growing demand for plays with a 'Marxist-Leninist' viewpoint. On the eve of the First Five-Year Plan, the future role of the theatre was unmistakenly defined: it was to serve not as a temple of art for art's sake but as a 'weapon of Communist education,' an ally of the school and youth organizations. Before 1929, plays dealing with the class struggle at home and abroad were in the vanguard of the new repertoire. With the Stalinist revolution came the demand for drama capturing the tempo of industrialization and collectivization. For a time fantasy fell victim to the excessive emphasis on the contemporary. While the theory of socialist realism was hammered out in the thirties, the call sounded for more contemporary plays, but the repertoire was broadened to include the fairy tale as a fillip to the child's imagination. For reinforcement of the new regime in the school system, plays began to appear which sought to foster disciplined behavior, respect for teachers, application to schoolwork, affection for classmates. . . . The war years saw the full flowering of these themes in plays glorifying the good fight and the victory. . . . Since 1946, under the vigilance of the Party, the children's theatre has conformed even more closely to the standards set by Soviet pedagogical and literary theory."

In each section, the author describes the most important plays and the reaction of the public and the government. The following is a list of these plays according to the section: "Soviet Life and the Class Struggle Abroad,"--Timoshka's Mine, Black Ravine, Be Ready, Fritz Bauer; "First Five Year Plan"--Four Million Authors, Cracking; "MidThirties Stabilizing Drive,"--Senezha Strel'tsov, The Gymnasium Students, Lado Ketskhoveli, Mik, To Be Continued; "Wartime"--At the Cove, Our Weapon, Timur and His Team, The Girls, Tale of Truth; "Birth of the Soviet Fairy Tale,"--A Tale, Laughter and Tears; "Post War,"--Red Necktie, Matriculation Certificate, Prescious Grain; "Beyond The Russian Borders,"--Snowball, I Want To Go Home.

Articles and Periodicals

51. Lunacharskaya, A. "The Bubnov Central House of Children's Art Schools." Soviet Culture Review, II (1934), 23-28. Illus.

In 1930, A. S. Bubnov, then People's Commissar of Education of the RSFSR, formed the institution named in the title in order to have an agency to oversee the national educational goals and practices of the various arts. The article, written by a Russian, deals with the importance of the operation in relation to the first Five Year Plan, and outlines all of the responsibilities and duties of the agency. The Theatre Department working in relation to the curricula of the primary and middle schools coordinated the work of some one hundred Young Spectators Theatres; provided "scientific pedagogy" in helping the playwrights obtain topics; created feedback from the young; organized professional programs; and arranged amateur theatrical circles. The article captures the didactic purpose of art education in Soviet Russia, and the national concern for the arts as exemplified by the widespread and heavily funded programs.

52. "The Moscow Children's Theatre." Theatre Arts Monthly, XXII (April, 1938), 304-05. Illus.

Unfortunately only a page in length, this is an abstract of the philosophy and achievements of the Moscow Children's Theatre. It is accompanied by two photographs of a production of Tolstoy's The Golden Key.

53. Segedi, Irina. "Theatre For The Young Audience." World Theatre, XVI (January-February, 1967), 55-61. Illus.

"Life must be shown as it is, made loveable; young people are to be given a sense of responsibility and made ready to face a possible evolution." This is a solid, informative article on the organization and functioning of one of the world's most famous and energetic national youth theatre operations. Statistics deal with the number of companies, and the number and type of personnel. Additional information illustrates the evolution of the repertory and the coordination of the program within the general pedagogy. While indicating a variety of methods of production and styles of decor, the author observes that "the actor's style of interpretation keeps along the lines of the Russian realist school. . . ."

54. Sosin, Gene. "Art For Marx's Sake." Theatre Arts, XXXIV (February, 1950), 28-31. Illus.

"We must use the theatre to educate builders and fighters, not spectators." This was the statement of Natalia Satz in 1932, the woman who was the pioneering force in children's theatre in Russia. This article acts as an excellent introduction to the scope of the operation, and to the kind of material one can expect to find in Dr. Sosin's dissertation (see entry number 56). He briefly but precisely traces the history, philosophy, and changing repertory of this formidable theatre for young people.

55. Wolfson, Martin. "A Leningrad Theatre For The Young Spectator." Theatre Arts Monthly, XV (May, 1931), 420-25. Illus.

In this short description, Wolfson communicates the feeling, thoughtfulness, and ambition behind the project. In articles of this size the style is usually anecdotal, but in this case there is considerable information given on the repertory, guiding ideology, goals, types of staging, and the types and uses of post-performance feedback activities for the young audiences.

Unpublished Materials

56. Sosin, Gene. "Children's Theatre and Drama in the Soviet Union, 1917-1953." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1958.

More than ten years after its creation, this is still the only work of its kind in the English language. The author discusses "the social role of an artistic medium" in relation to Soviet ideology, and traces the development of the children's theatre chronologically from 1917-1958 and analytically, as divided into the periods of the middle and late twenties, transition and pre-war, war, and post-war to 1953. He illustrates in detail how the Soviets have employed both theatre and trained theatre-going for the conquest of illiteracy and for the education of the Soviet citizen.

Children's theatre in Russia is a planned, total experience, encompassing even the structuring of the intermissions; its quality is equal to the finest adult productions. Education, the perpetuation of a literary and oral

tradition, and, most significantly, the creation of a political tool are among the accomplishments of this carefully nurtured institution. In addition to the clearly written text, there are appendices containing lists of children's theatres which were in existence at various chronological intervals; origins and examples of types of heroes and villains in children's drama from 1925-1953; and the twenty-five most frequently performed children's plays as of 1939.

A word of caution to those looking for a bibliographical source in this area: of approximately three hundred and forty-four references listed, only about ninety are in the English language. Of these, most are in the areas of law, education, and social and political science.

Design and Technology

Books

57. Bakshy, Alexander. The Path of the Modern Russian Stage. London: Cecil Palmer and Hayward, 1916. pp. 243. Illus.
See entry number 185 for complete annotation.

58. Chalif, Louis H. Russian Festivals and Costumes for Pageant and Dance. New York: Chalif Russian School of Dancing, 1921. pp. 176. Illus.
The text and photographs cover religious and secular holidays; peasant costumes; and games and crafts. I have included this book in the bibliography because the more than one hundred illustrations can be of considerable help to the designer and particularly to the costumer. There are numerous examples of embroidered peasant clothing from various social strata and geographic regions represented in this book. Other items of interest include lace work, linens, dolls, crowns, furniture, earthenware, tools, homes, and churches. The reproductions were taken from numerous museum and private collections.

59. Fuerst, Walter René, and Hume, Samuel J. Twentieth-Century Stage Direction. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1967. pp. 191. Illus. (387 Plates)
This book is included for its graphic contribution to those studying Russian costume

and scenic design. Although it covers all the countries of the world, there are approximately twenty-five illustrations of designs for the Russian theatre and ballet. These include the work of Bakst, Dobujinsky, Benois, Samoff, Sapunoff, Shervashidze, Falk, Vesnine, Ekster, Jacouloff, Nivinsky, Rabinovitch, Altmann, Popova, Eisenstein, and Meyerhold as done for the Moscow Art Theatre, the Proletcult, the Kamerny, and the Meyerhold Theatre. The plates are arranged by chapter so as to illustrate the text which deals with trends and styles of design as well as general scenic classifications (plastic settings, picture stage, painted setting, architectural stage, permanent settings, etc.).

("This edition, first published in 1967, is an unabridged and corrected republication of the work originally published by Alfred A. Knopf, Ltd. in 1929. This edition contains a newly prepared Index, and a detailed List of Plates and full captions under all illustrations replace the separately printed Hand-List of Plates that accompanied the original edition.")

60. Fülöp-Miller, René, and Gregor, Joseph. The Russian Theatre. Translated by P. England. London: Lippincott, 1930. pp. 384. Illus.
See entry number 197 for complete annotation.

61. Holme, Charles G. Art in the U.S.S.R.: Architecture, Sculpture, Painting, Graphic Arts, Theatre, Films, Crafts. New York, London: The Studio Publications, Inc., 1935. pp. 137. Illus.
See entry number 199 for complete annotation.

62. Houghton, Norris. Moscow Rehearsals: An Account of Methods of Production in the Soviet Theatre. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1936. pp. 291. Illus.
See entry number 200 for complete annotation.

63. Ivanov, E. G., ed. Sovetskij Teatr (Soviet Theatre). Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Iskusstvo, 1966. Unpaged. Illus.
See entry number 202 for complete annotation.

64. Komissarzhevskii, Viktor Grigorevich. Moscow Theatres. Translated by Vic Schneierson and W. Perelman. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959. Illus.
See entry number 205 for complete annotation.

65. The Moscow Kamerny Theatre. Moscow: Intourist, 1934. pp. 20. Illus.
See entry number 213 for complete annotation.

66. Rybakov, Yuri. The Soviet Theatre. Moscow: Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1968? pp. 62. Illus.
See entry number 216 for complete annotation.

67. Sovietskii Teatr (Soviet Theatre). Moscow: Izdatelsvo Iskousstvo, 1967. pp. 150. Illus.
See entry number 222 for complete annotation.

68. Stage Design Throughout The World Since 1950. Texts and Illustrations Collected by the National Centers of the International Theatre Institute. Foreword by Paul-Louis Mignon. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1964. pp. 276. Illus.

This weighty, beautiful book contains the work of designers from thirty-three nations and was intended as a sequel to the volume Stage Design Throughout The World Since 1935. The U.S.S.R. was among the nations not represented in the first collection but included in this later publication. The reader is provided with pictorial information on current trends and with the names and styles of more recent designers. Most of the highly illustrated texts in English on the Russian-Soviet theatre were written in the twenties and thirties. The illustrations in this text date from as early as 1929 and extend to 1960. Each design, print, or set photograph is accompanied by a caption of information which identifies the play (in its original language), the author, theatre and town of presentation, and year of production. The twenty-four page section on the U.S.S.R. contains sixty-eight black and white and color photographs covering more than fifty plays. A Who's Who appendix provides biographical information on most of the designers whose works are displayed. The Russian

designers whose work is included are: Akimov, Altmann, Bossulayev, Shiffrin, Dmitriev, Dorrer, Favorski, Gamrekeli, Popov, Ryndin, Jankus, Knoblock, Kourilko, Kovalenko, Krivosheina, Lansere, Navicks, Petritzki, Pimenov, Rabinovich, Saryan, Skulme, Timine, Viliams, Tyshler, Vardaunis, Vassiliev, Viks, Virsaladze, Yunovich, and Zolotariev.

69. The Theatres of Moscow. Moscow: Seventh Printery. Undated. Unpaged.
See entry number 223 for complete annotation.

70. Turpin, F., ed. Alexandra Exter. Paris: Editions des Quatre chemins, 1930. pp. 177. Illus.
Although the text of a preface by Alexander Tairov and all the rest of the volume is in French, the student of Exter's cubist designs for the Kamerny Theatre will be interested in studying this volume. It is composed of fifteen color renderings recreated handsomely by Tatiana Gontche. Below is a listing of the plates as it appears in the text. This volume is a valuable contribution to understanding the kind of productions Tairov developed in the years between 1914 and 1920, though these prints do not represent all of his productions, nor was Exter his only designer.

1. Othello, acte premier
2. Othello, acte seconde
3. Faust, projet
4. Cirque
5. Cirque
6. Operette, projet
7. Operette, projet
8. Don Juan, et la mort, projet
9. Revue bateaux, projet
10. Revue bateaux, projet
11. Pantomime espagnole, projet
12. Maquette de lumiere, projet
13. Don Juan, enter, projet
14. Le Marchand de Venise
15. Ballet, maquette de lumiere

Articles and Periodicals

71. Akimov, Nikolai. "The Designer in the Theatre." Theatre Arts Monthly, XX (September, 1936), 700-17. Illus.

Akimov classified Russian design into two schools: Illusionist and Constructivist. He assigned himself to the first school (using the stage as a "frame enclosing an undefined depth in which the designer presents a designed illusion of space."). This article is a very clear and detailed description of his efforts to prepare and focus an audience's response scenically. In explaining his working methods, he presents his approach to a balanced realism--"expressive realism," which combines an objective observation of nature with the temperament of the artist. A large number of illustrations from the work of various designers accompanies the article. These include Knoblock's designs for The Wedding and Othello; Schctoffer's designs for four plays at the Realistic Theatre and Monsieur de Pourceaugnac; Moses Levin's sets for The Poor Bride and Girl Friends (a film); Peter Williams' approach to La Traviata; Shelpianov's design for After The Ball; Tishler's costumes for Gypsies; Akimov's design for My Crime and his poster for Hamlet; and Rabinovich's work on the ballet The Sleeping Beauty.

72. Botkin, Alex; Botkin, Nada; and Gat, John. "Partial Index to the Russian Journal 'Scenic Techniques and Technology' 1965-68." Theatre Design and Technology, No. 20 (February, 1970), 22-23, 35.

A partial index of the Russian journal is produced in order to familiarize the English-speaking readers with the journal's existence, the nature of the articles, and the subjects of importance to Russian designers and technicians. The first six issues (1963 and 1964) are not indexed nor are the first four issues of 1967. The authors names are not supplied, allegedly because of lack of space, but such an omission is nothing more than poor scholarship. The index should be as complete as it can be made or not attempted. The reader is cautioned that, although the titles are printed in English, the journal itself is printed only in Russian.

73. Bykov, V. "Two Tendencies in the Evolution of Theatre Architecture: Part I." Translated by John Gat and Ned A. Bowman. Theatre Design and Technology, No. 1 (May, 1965), 3-11.

This article, written by a member of the Soviet Architectural Institute, originally appeared in the Soviet architectural periodical Arkhitektury SSR. Bykov theorizes that the

"two tendencies" include a formalistic one (a proposed solution of capitalistic countries to the problem of competition with electronic media) and a simultaneous investigation of a "realistic" modification of the proscenium theatre's space.

The formalistic trend is most heavily criticized for being nothing more than "cinematographicity." Bykov calls this an abstract approach developed without actual consideration for the literature or the conventions of the theatre. Illustrations, photographs, cross-sections, and design plans from the work of Venturelli, Schoffer, and Dobloff are offered as proof of this eccentric trend. Bykov's bias is the conventional proscenium arrangement. Other forms accommodated by the theatre building are legitimate as long as they are secondary. He states that "Soviet architects have solved this problem," and the specific examples offered as evidence are contained in Part II of the article.

74. Bykov, V. "Two Tendencies in the Evolution of Theatre Architecture: Part II." Theatre Design and Technology, No. 2 (October, 1965), 21-26.

In this second section, Bykov illustrates the Soviet preference for conventional proscenium "realistic staging" with a report on eight architectural projects in various stages of development. He compares these with the formalistic efforts outlined in Part I of his article. "At the same time another realistic tendency is developing, expressed with particular clarity in the progressive and creative search by directors and architects of socialistic countries who are striving to develop the best world and national traditions of theatrical art, to enrich it with new technical possibilities and to broaden its means for expressing artistic ways, answering more fully the meaning of man's contemporary life and meeting his aesthetic ideals." The examples, each adapted to the needs and styles of the individual régisseurs (such as Okhlopkov, Akomov, and Tovstonogov) include The Theatre of the Young Spectator (Leningrad, 1963); Project for the V. V. Mayakovskii Theatre; Leningrad Comedy Theatre; A. M. Gorkii Theatre (Leningrad); Project for the Theatre Studio of Pantomime; and the Project for the State Dance Theatre.

75. Carter, Huntly. "A New Principle in Play-production: The Classics in the Russian Theatre of To-day." Creative Art, VII (1930), 62-69. Illus.

The paper's emphasis is divided between an outline of the efforts made since 1917 to free the actor from the "studio picture" scene and a critical appraisal of The Russian Theatre by René Fülöp-Miller and Joseph Gregor, Though the two seem unconnected and could indeed have stood separate treatments, they are linked here by Carter's desire to defend the Soviet theatre's achievements against those whom he feels are unable to be just in their criticism.

The article's title and main consideration is with the unique and relevant, rather than jollying or bastardizing, approach Carter felt the Soviets had given the Russian and world classics. In dealing with design, he stresses the efforts of Tairov and Meyerhold to promote "the principle of power in the actor, of tearing him out of the scenery and setting him before the audience . . . of moulding the scene to serve him." He refers to constructivism as a key to removing the actor from traditional restraints. Here Carter is referring specifically to the experiments in expanding stage space both in design and human grouping as opposed to the flat stage of the realistic approach.

In the analysis of The Russian Theatre, Carter criticizes Fülöp-Miller and Gregor's lack of first-hand experiences. He does point out, however, that the sheer bulk of material and the wealth of illustrations (400) makes the volume important and useful.

76. Carter, Huntly. "Present-Day Decoration In the Moscow Art Theatre." Creative Art, V (1929), 579-83. Illus.

"In short, Stanislavsky still leans rather towards a stage picture definitely composed by a painter, than a scene constructed in terms of architecture or engineering or both." In a brief text which accompanies the five illustrations (three full-page prints), Carter points out the trends in constructivist staging that emerged after the Revolution, and discusses the Moscow Art Theatre's refusal to adopt these changes. The photos are all of Moscow Art Theatre productions: The Decembrists, The Armoured Train, The Marriage of Figaro, and The Day of the Turbins.

77. Clements, Colin Campbell. "The Bat." Theatre Arts Magazine, October, 1921, pp. 275-78. Illus.
See entry number 304 for complete annotation.

78. Dana, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. "Afinogenov." Theatre Arts Monthly, XXVI (March, 1942), 168-76.
Dana marks Afinogenov's death (at the front on November 5, 1941, during an air raid) with this commemorative article on the playwright's life and the production of his plays. Although this bibliography is not primarily concerned with dramatic literature, this article contains three pages of illustrations depicting the sets for Raspberry Jam, Fear, and Distant Point.

79. Efros, Abram. "The Russian Theatre and Its Artists Since the Revolution." Translated by H. L. Gordon. Parnassus, I (February, 1929), 6-9. Illus.
Mr. Efros, then the Vice Director of the Government Museums of Fine Art in Moscow, in most flowery rhetoric (which may be the fault of the translation), dedicates the first section of this report to the proposition that "The Russian concept of the theatre is deeper, fuller, and mightier than the concept the Western theatre gave us during the last thirty years." He goes on to say that, "The theatre as it is thought of in the West is to be written with a small 't' . . . but the Russian theatre is the theatre, the theatre with a capital 'T.'" This is all reminiscent of Huntly Carter's statements in The New Spirit in the Russian Theatre: 1917-1928 (see entry number 189).
The historical content relates the development of post-Revolutionary movements in directing and decoration. Efros emphasizes the swing from the "Mir Isskustva" decorativeness of Diaghilev to constructivism. For all his pride in surprising the West with revolutionary theatrical developments, he condemns the capriciousness of the new schools and, somewhat confusingly, ends his discussion by expressing the belief that old and new theatres are repeating each other's practices and methods. "From Meyerhold to the Little Theatre--like the water in two vessels connected by a pipe--the level is the same." If

the play titles are any indication (Love to Three Oranges, Mascarade, etc.), the translation should be questioned.

80. Flanagan, Hallie. "The Russian Theatre: One Theory As To Its Inspiration." Theatre Guild Magazine, June, 1930, pp. 46-47. Illus.
See entry number 240 for complete annotation.

81. "From The Russian Theatre: A Portfolio." Theatre Arts Monthly, XVII (December, 1933), 941-44. Illus.
In January of 1934, the Museum of Modern Art in New York held an International Exhibit of Theatre Art. The portfolio is a collection of five scenes from the Russian Theatre. These include the productions of Fear, Machinal, The Lucrative Place, and The Armoured Train 14-69.

82. Gilliam, Florence. "The Kamerny Theatre of Moscow." Freeman, VII (May, 1923), 255-58.
"The total impression given by this company is that of the charge of a living force against a whole world of inert tradition; a force which loses none of its energy by being disciplined and sophisticated to a very high degree."
The author reports on the company's appearance in Paris with clear and meticulous descriptions of set design, lighting, and use of form and color for Giroflé-Girofla, Phèdre, Princess Brambille, Adrienne Lecouvreur, and Salomé. She found only Salomé disappointing and, without explanation, made a point of declaring that the design concept, despite what is usually said, was not cubistic. The article also contains some interesting critical commentary on the visual concepts and acting techniques.

83. Glagolin, Boris. "What is Constructivism in the Russian Theatre?" Translated by Dr. William Olen. The Drama, XX (1930), 242.
See entry number 362 for complete annotation.

84. Houghton, Norris. "Nikolai Akimov: Portrait of a Designer." Theatre Arts, XX (May, 1936), 349-53. Illus.
In an expression of admiration, Houghton relates his visit to the Russian designer and

director. Akimov reveals his "designs as schemes for productions" and explains his meticulous and detailed graphic approach to designing a show. He discusses the "famous" Hamlet which he both designed and directed at Vakhtangov Theatre.

85. Kalintsev, V. "A Mechano-Optical Model for the Determination of Seat Row Elevations." Translated by John Gat. Theatre Design and Technology, No. 3 (December, 1965), 14-15.
This translation of an article appearing in Arkhitektura SSR, proscribes a "method for the determination of the elevation of the rows of seats in theatres and other public buildings using a mechano-optical model."

86. Korolev, I. "Contemporary Stage Decoration in U.S.S.R." The Drama, XX (January, 1930), 100-03.
Essentially, Korolev, once President of the Association of Theatrical Artists of Moscow, describes and champions constructivism as a replacement for what he considered the decadent and limited two-dimensionality of the "Mir Issustva" scene painters of the pre-Revolutionary years. Using his own designs, as well as the work of Ivan Vakhonim, Victor Kiseler, Alexander Fomin, and Alexei Rudnyev, he explains constructivism in practice and in relationship to the national purpose. The illustrations are particularly worthy of study. He links the designs to the work of the TRAMS, Blue Blouse reviews, and the activity of the Pan-Russian Association of Theatrical Artists. Actually, almost as much space is devoted to the organization and activities of the amateur youth and independent workers' theatre as to the tenets of constructivism.

87. Leyda, Jay. "Alexander Tishler: Creative Stage Design." Theatre Arts Monthly, XVIII (November, 1934), 842-48. Illus.
In the 1930's Tishler was best known in Russia for his work in the national minority theatres and for the development of truly native designs. As the article describes and illustrates, he concentrated on a union of national forms with the national materials for motif. The design for Fuente Ovejuna utilized a playing space shaped like a basket and structures faced in basketry. Although the text is brief, there are many illustrations.

88. Margolin, S. "The Artist And The Theatre." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 6 (1934), 42-52. Illus.
This is a clearly written and reliable statement of the Soviet viewpoint on design in the 1930's. It is accompanied by illustrations from the work of Rabinovich, Favorsky, the Stenberg brothers, Akimov, Tishler, Levin, and Ryndin. Margolin isolates the characteristics and compares the schools of "Mir Isskustva" (Benoit, Golovin, Bakst, Supunov) with constructivism. He regards the former as design without social consciousness, and the latter as instruction in the development of artistic thinking. The required and achieved synthesis of graphics and architecture, the blend of constructivism and decoration, is labeled "scenic architecture" and is analyzed in the work of Tishler, Levin, Akimov, and Ryndin.

89. "News From The Soviet Socialist Republics." World Theatre, I (1951), 156. Illus.
See entry number 333 for complete annotation.

90. "The Optimistic Tragedy." World Theatre, VIII (1959), 287. Illus.
This is a photograph of Bossoulaiev's design for The Optimistic Tragedy. The design won the Theatre of Nations Trophy for Best Stage Design.

91. "Pictorial News From Russia: A Portfolio." Theatre Arts Monthly, XIX (June, 1935), 431-38. Illus.
There are eight full-size illustrations on these pages with information on the plays depicted, the participating theatres, directors, designers, etc. The productions include Pogodin's Aristocrats, Fletcher's The Spanish Curate, Shakespeare's King Lear, Ostrovsky's Storm, and Bulgakov's adaptation, The Pickwick Club.

92. Pojarskaia, Militza. "Soviet Stage Design in the 20th Century." World Theatre, X (Autumn, 1961), 223-50. Illus.
This is an important article, for its thirty-eight illustrations, for the opinions advanced by its text, and because of the scarcity of similar materials. The editors of World Theatre believed that the article was "the first complete panorama, since the revolution, of the development of stage design in the U.S.S.R."

Underlying the significant collection of names, movements, and achievements is a running (and sometimes confusing) account of the controversy between the relative merit of painters and non-painters. The author condemns the early constructivists and abstractionists but is unable to pass over the achievements of the contemporary designers who did not qualify as painters. She summarizes or rather reconciles her arguments by predicting a coexistence united in socialist realism for both schools. Stanislavsky is quoted in calling for stage convention and "an aftertaste of truth."

The designs are analyzed by decades, with special sections on Shakespearean stage production, Akimov, depictions of the heroic struggle of the war years, and the New Soviet theatre beginning in the 1950's.

"Towards the end of the 1940-50 decade and even during the following years, two opposing trends--both equally faulty--have been observed in some stage productions: on one side, a tendency for too sumptuous, pompous and clumsy scenery, and on the other, an inclination towards realism."

"The fear of modern conventionalism, and scorn for the law of the stage, the habit of considering scenery only as a series of decorative panels, such are the errors which contributed till quite recently to the diminuation and impoverishment of the Soviet theatre, which fought tenaciously against them and finally succeeded in eliminating them."

93. Sayler, Oliver M. "Constantin Korovin." Theatre Arts Magazine, April, 1920, pp. 154-55. Illus.

In what is an illustrated resumé rather than an article, Sayler praises the work of Korovin and points to the characteristic Russianness of his use of color and design in the painted drops and sets used in the treatment of folktales for opera and ballet.

94. Sayler, Oliver M. "Tudor Twelfth Night in Russia." The Drama, X (October, 1919), 3-7.

See entry number 340 for complete annotation.

95. Theatre Arts Magazine, April, 1923, pp. 165-68. Illus.

This is a series of illustrations, photographically depicting scenes from the

productions of The Mexican at the Proletcult, and Phèdra, Romeo and Juliet, and Adrienne Lecouvreur at the Kamerny Theatre.

96. Theatre Arts Magazine, March, 1924, pp. 205-08. Illus.

This is a series of four sketches by Andreyev, done in Berlin for German movies. A native Lithuanian, Andreyev designed for the Moscow Art Theatre, the First Studio, and for the State Theatre. There are descriptive captions for each illustration.

97. Theatre Arts Magazine, January, 1926, pp. 53-56. Illus.

See entry number 253 for complete annotation.

98. Theatre Arts Magazine, October, 1926, pp. 755-58. Illus.

See entry number 181 for complete annotation.

99. "Theatres of the Soviet East: A Portfolio." Theatre Arts Monthly, XX (September, 1936), 731-34.

See entry number 182 for complete annotation.

100. Stepanov, Valerian. "New Russian Theatres." Theatre Arts Monthly, XVIII (September, 1934), 674-83. Illus.

"New Russian Theatres," appears in an issue dedicated to theatre architecture. Stepanov reflects on the guiding ideas and similarities in a number of projected plans for new theatres all over Russia. The key is the concept of the "Transformable Theatre," with highly adaptable audience seating and a flexible stage space. Most of the plans are united by an effort to provide close contact between the audience and the actors. The theatres discussed and illustrated include a theatre for Meyerhold, the Central Theatre of the Red Army, the Kharkov Opera House, and the Little Theatre of the Palace of Culture (already built at the time).

101. Strong, Anna Louise. "The Cubist Theatre of Moscow: As It Looks To An American Layman In The Audience." Theatre Arts Magazine, July, 1923, pp. 224-27.
This was not only seen by a layman but is also best read by a layman. Largely, the article is a description of the plot and production of Harlequin As King, at the Kamerny Theatre. The purpose is to shed light on Tairov's theatrical conceptions and on the nature of the theatre's popular appeal. The author tries to get at the underlying philosophy and the production scheme, but is more successful in the description of what she has seen.

102. "Theatre In The U.S.S.R." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 6 (1934), 105. Illus.
See entry number 254 for complete annotation.

103. Wolfson, Martin. "Types and Make-Up In The Russian Theatre." Theatre Arts Monthly, XV (April, 1931), 339-42. Illus.
The written text is more like an oversized caption for the six illustrations. Wolfson emphasizes that most of the dramatic material employs types rather than individuals, and as such the make-up quickly identifies the character. Old czaristic figures or imperialists were caricatured in make-up, historical Russian figures closely duplicated, and contemporary proletarian individuals created on the basis of studies of people in the streets.

Directing and Directors

Books

104. Alpers, Boris. The Theatre Of The Social Mask. Translated by Mark Schmidt. New York: Group Theatre, Inc., 1934. pp. 157. (Typewritten.)
"A great deal of Meyerhold will be difficult to understand for the future historian. Theatre is an art which is not easily grasped by historians of a later generation. Much of what is characteristic and essential lives only for the contemporaries. In particular, the one that will study Meyerhold will have to deal with a variegated material, contradictory estimates, characteristics and unintelligible descriptions."

In the compilation of a bibliography such as this one, the above quotation is an appropriate and intelligent caution. The historians of the modern Russian theatre are often reflected in their books as awestruck crusaders or as reporters sifting events through personal values. The accumulation of names and dates, plays, production data, and lists of personnel (which is considerable even for such a large and active theatrical nation) does not recreate the performances themselves. Perhaps the most relevant personal guides are the writings of the theatre practitioners themselves.

As relates to Meyerhold, the statement is of particular significance. The contrast of statements and reactions is found not only in his work as a whole but in the attempt to discover his direction and to explain what many writers felt were the abrupt and frequent embracings of new forms. Most of the texts on the Russian and Soviet theatre view Meyerhold in a passionate and vigorous manner, but fail to explain what it is that he did (beyond simple definitions of biomechanics and constructivism). Alpers, in this monograph, attempts to relate all of Meyerhold's work in the first quarter of the twentieth century by explaining the place of his productions in the theory of the social-theatrical mask.

The author literally and metaphorically sees the mask as a symbol of completeness. The features are immobile and final. As such, the mask can be made to represent the close of a historical period. He compares this to Meyerhold's "characters" who, in the period of "storm and stress" and in the period of "historical apparitions" were devoid of inner movement. All his productions represented a halt in development, a backward glance. Alpers views the early works (Dawn, The Forest) as representative of the use of satirical works to ridicule the aesthetic admiration of the romantic characters of the past. In the period beginning with Bubus (1924-25), the furious action was displaced by static pictures and expressive but frozen figures. Here, according to the author's theory, Meyerhold assembled the remnants of the past and conserved them in "motionless but expressive panopticon pictures for the instruction of the new generation." With the figure-actor mask in all periods, Meyerhold eliminated the

illusion of authentic life on stage and pitted an "altered versimilitude" against the realism of the Moscow Art Theatre.

Using the same production profiles as Alpers does, it might be possible to conclude that Meyerhold's early work depicted the rushing impetuousity of the first years of the Revolution, and that his later, static "looking into the past" works were really a prophetic indication of the eclipse of art by what he saw, through an historical perspective, as the inevitable social direction inherent in the emerging Soviet political style. This would eliminate the idea that the cause of Meyerhold's waning popularity was the old-fashioned, isolated quality of his artistic credo and support the possibility that this unpopularity rested in his suggesting that the problems of the past were still the problems of the present. A hint to Alpers' approach and to his conclusions about the influence of Meyerhold lies in a statement on socialist realism, which he wrote "is not satisfied with a perfunctory external staging of an agitational theme, but aims to draw deeply from the material of modern life in its complexity and variety."

105. Bakshy, Alexander. The Path of the Modern Russian Stage. London: Cecil Palmer and Hayward, 1916. pp. 243. Illus.
See entry number 185 for complete annotation.

106. Ben-Ari, Raiken. Habima. Translated by A. H. Gross and I. Soref. New York: Thomas Yoseloff, Inc., 1957. pp. 253. Illus.
See entry number 163 for complete annotation.

107. Carter, Huntly. The New Spirit in the Russian Theatre: 1917-28. London: Brentano's, Ltd., 1929. pp. 350. Illus.
See entry number 189 for complete annotation.

108. Freeman, Joseph; Kunitz, Joshua; and Lozowick, Louis. Voices of October: Art and Literature in Soviet Russia. New York: The Vanguard Press, 1930. pp. 317. Illus.
See entry number 196 for complete annotation.

109. Gladkov, Aleksandr. "Meyerhold Speaks." Translated by Karen Black. Pages From Tarusa: New Voices in Russian Writing. Edited by Andrew Field. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963, 310-22.

The book is a translation of an anthology which appeared in Russian in 1961 and was quickly withdrawn. It is a collection of Soviet prose and poetry intended to serve as a representation of the important currents in contemporary Soviet literature. "Meyerhold Speaks" purports to be a reproduction of notes on some of V. E. Meyerhold's utterances at rehearsals and in conversations as recorded by Aleksandr Gladkov. It is an interesting and lively collection of thoughts and comments spoken by Meyerhold in the mid-1930's on his theatrical ideas; the theatre people of his time; and public and professional reactions to his work. "The art of the theatre does not progress, but only changes its means of expression in relation to the character of an era, its ideas, its psychology, its techniques, its architecture, its fashion." It is no wonder that a book of spirited, new writings considered to be reactionary by the Soviet government should contain the name and words of Meyerhold though he be dead some twenty-three years before its publication.

110. Gorchakov, Nikolai M. The Vakhtangov School of Stage Art. Translated by G. Ivanov-Mumjiev. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 195?. PP. 206. Illus.

Nikolai Gorchakov was Vakhtangov's student, friend, and professional colleague. He stage-managed Turandot (Vakhtangov's last production before his death), to which a considerable part of this book is dedicated. Throughout there are occasional warnings such as "my reminiscences are . . . fragmentary" and indications that the book is an expansion of notes the author took on matters that were of personal interest. To me this is less a problem than is the influence of idolatry. The book can be of considerable value if it is approached with a method for reading and a machete. It is very easy to relax into the text as one would a green room story and subsequently find that the passions have obscured what amounts to a great deal of fact and analysis. I would suggest that the last chapter be

read first. Here the author draws on the specific points that have been made, organizes them, and presents them in a specific relationship.

Gorchakov writes, "But the originality of Vakhtangov's productions did not lie solely in these methods or in their external appearances. It lay in the fact that for each of them he sought, long and arduously, the most expressive form, the only possible form which he considered could fully express the idea of the particular play, its style and genre. He considered this his main task." This quotation is well-illustrated by the description of the staging of Chekhov's The Wedding as compared with the staging of Gozzi's Turandot. Furthermore, much of the text provides an insight into how Vakhtangov taught the Stanislavsky method of acting without subscribing to the solitary production point of view of the Moscow Art Theatre. The techniques he used to train his actors exemplify how he personalized "the method" and repeatedly adapted it to the particular group of students. Most interestingly and repeatedly described is his method of participating in rehearsals as one of the characters in the play. If indeed Gorchakov has not given too much credit, Vakhtangov seems to have had a fabulous instinct for creating the exact étude or improvisation which would solve a given actor's problem. The various stories and descriptions reveal his emphasis on determining rhythms for the play, scene, character, beat, etc. as the search for the grain of the role. This was often accomplished through the concretization of intellectual obstacles through improvisation, and the direct use of Vakhtangov as an actor. His methods reappear today in many forms, but the essence remains the use of improvisation in the teaching of acting. In the chapter on Turandot, Gorchakov quotes from a conversation on cerebral activity and creative freedom: "'Will you four come here please,' Vakhtangov called the masks. 'Why is it you couldn't do anything an hour ago and now you can? You don't know? Well, I do. When we started our impromptus the first time, you tried to think them up. I don't deny the importance of thinking, inventing, or planning, but if you have to improvise on the spot, . . . you must act and not think. Its actions we must have--wise, foolish, or naive, simple or complicated, but action."

The chapter on the staging of Turandot illustrates how Vakhtangov arrived at his directorial conceptions; how he efficiently used assistants and acting coaches; how he arrived at his rehearsal sequences; and his relation to the design elements of production. Overall, the book is quite helpful in comparing and contrasting Vakhtangov with Stanislavsky and Meyerhold (though the latter is not discussed in the text itself).

111. Houghton, Norris. Moscow Rehearsals: An Account of Methods of Production in the Soviet Theatre. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1936. pp. 291. Illus.
See entry number 200 for complete annotation.

112. Jelagin, Juri. Taming of the Arts. Translated by Nicholas Wreden. New York: Dutton, 1951. pp. 333.
See entry number 203 for complete annotation.

113. London, Kurt. The Seven Soviet Arts. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938. pp. 381. Illus.
See entry number 207 for complete annotation.

114. Markov, Pavel. The First Studio: Sullerzhitsky-Vakhtangov-Tchekov. Translated by Mark Schmidt. New York: Group Theatre, Inc., 1934. pp. 80. (Typewritten.)
See entry number 265 for complete annotation.

115. Meyerhold, Vsevolod. Meyerhold On Theatre. Translated and edited by Edward Braun. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1969. pp. 336. Illus.
"The aim of this book is to provide the English-speaking reader with a comprehensive selection of Meyerhold's writings, speeches and other utterances on the art of theatre and the cinema. The selection has been made from all the material published in Meyerhold's lifetime and in the years since his death up to 1968." Meyerhold On Theatre represents a valuable selection of materials accompanied by well-documented critical commentary. As the author indicates, it is only an introduction, but it is a much needed one-stop source. The twenty-nine selections are grouped according

to period and idea and are introduced by essays which place the writings in the context of the times. There are also clarifying footnotes, general notes, and a bibliography of principal English and Russian works devoted in part or whole to Meyerhold.

Braun attempts to document reports of productions and to clear up myths where possible. In Yuri Yelagin's Taming of the Arts (see entry number 203), and also in Yelagin's biography of Meyerhold, Dark Genius, a version of Meyerhold's famous speech to the All-Union Conference of Stage Directors (June, 1939) is presented, based on Yelagin's own notes. The passage, valiant words of Meyerhold's refusal to recant in the face of government opposition to his experiments, has been popularized in such texts as John Mason Brown's Dramatis Personae. Braun, however, says that Yelagin's book is incorrect in other places not dependent on his own observations and that the passage is totally at variance with extracts from other sources which indicate that Meyerhold "finally committed the act of total contrition so long demanded of him."

This collection, though not his complete works, reveals the essence of Meyerholdia. One can find the director's own pronouncements on naturalism; on Stanislavsky (whom he never failed to praise); on the comic and social mask; on commedia dell'arte; on the concept of plastic movement; on biomechanics (" . . . only through the sports arena can we approach the theatrical arena"); and on the importance of the sense of musicality (one of the most distinguishing elements of his work). Through these words we can also learn of the personality of "Dr. Dapertutto" who unceasingly experimented with the very essence of form in art. Production notes include passages on such controversial works as The Inspector General, The Masquerade, The Dawn, Mystery-Bouffe, Molière's Don Juan, and the plays of Mayakovsky. These notes indicate the nature of Meyerhold's shifts as well as the nature of the threads that ran through all of his work. It is these threads which cause one to wonder whether Meyerhold's work indeed anticipated Brecht, Piscator, Artaud, and Grotowski.

116. Sayler, Oliver M. The Russian Theatre Under The Revolution. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1920. pp. 273. Illus.

See entry number 219 for complete annotation.

117. Simonov, Reuben. Stanislavsky's Protégé: Eugene Vakhtangov. Translated by Miriam Goldina. New York: DBS Publications, Inc., 1969. pp. 243.

Eugene Vakhtangov died in 1922, leaving behind a small but brilliant production record and a significant influence on the Russian theatre. He combined realism with a theatrical flexibility in presenting the ideas of post-Revolutionary Russia. His work on the Dybbuk for the Habima Theatre and on Princess Turandot for the Third Studio of the Moscow Art Theatre, the last productions before his death, have received increasing analytical attention over the past five decades. As illustrated in the book, his ideas placed him between Stanislavsky and the staunch anti-realists, Meyerhold and Tairov, but he is felt to have transcended all three. His "theatre of representation" combined Stanislavsky's early emphasis on the actor's inner technique with a physical and vocal discipline and creativity or outer technique. Indeed, it is quite possible that Stanislavsky's late writings on working from the outside in owed a great deal to the experiments and statements of his cherished student, Vakhtangov. The latter's stylistic approach synthesized the realism of the Moscow Art Theatre and the "formalism" of Meyerhold. The synthesis, "fantastic realism," is described in the text in Vakhtangov's own words: "The correct theatrical means, when discovered, gives to the author's work a true reality on the stage. One can study these means, but the form must be created, must be the product of the artist's great imagination-fantasy. This is why I call it 'fantastic realism.'"

The author, Reuben Simonov, was a student of Vakhtangov's and continued his mentor's tradition as a director and head of the Vakhtangov Theatre in Moscow. The material, written as a tribute, was completed in the early 1950's but not given to the translator until 1963. Miriam Goldina (herself having studied and worked with Stanislavsky and Vakhtangov) is well known for her translation of Gorchakov's Stanislavsky Directs (see entry number 34).

In three parts, Simonov concentrates on Vakhtangov's conceptions and methods of direction for Chekhov's A Wedding, Maeterlinck's The Miracle of St. Anthony, and Gozzi's Princess Turandot. It is interesting to read Gorchakov's The Vakhtangov School of Stage Art (see entry number 110) and the Simonov book sequentially. Simonov brings to Gorchakov's detailed anecdotal description of rehearsal incidents an analysis of Vakhtangov's theoretical concepts, a discussion of the director's feelings about other forms of theatre in his time, and an idea of how Vakhtangov's work affected later productions in the theatre named for him. The discussion of Princess Turandot is particularly helpful in understanding the similarities and differences between Stanislavsky and Vakhtangov. The section on A Wedding illustrates Vakhtangov's methods for the continuous adaptation of materials to the changing conceptions and changing needs of changing times. Throughout, the author is perceptive in his analysis of the director's use of specific techniques such as rhythm in attaining a "chiseled clarity of action," a "graphic theatricality."

Finally, in addition to the text, the reader is supplied with a detailed chronology of Vakhtangov's life and theatrical career as actor, teacher, and régisseur.

118. Tairov, Alexander. Notes of a Director. Translated and with an introduction by William Kuhlke. Florida: University of Miami Press, 1969. pp. 153. Illus.

This is an important work, as it represents the first publication of Tairov's notes in English. First published by the Kamerny Theatre in 1921 in Russia, it appeared two years later in an authorized German translation. The "notes" apply to the period between 1914 and 1920, the first years of the Kamerny Theatre.

The translator provides a well-written and highly informative twenty-one page introduction. He complains of the necessity of having to provide so much background and extends his observations to the general lack of knowledge about other such innovators as Meyerhold and Vakhtangov. Certainly, materials by or about these men are much fewer in number than books by or about Stanislavsky, but the

comment seems most relevant in relation to Tairov. The introduction serves to provide biographical material about both Tairov and the Kamerny Theatre (which lasted, with relocations and reopenings, from 1914 to 1950!); places the writings in the context of the director's own work and that of others operative in the Russian theatre at the time; and relates Tairov's theatrical ideology to the work of the theatres in Western Europe. In addition, Kuhlke prepares the reader for discovering the relevance of writings completed in 1921 to current issues in American theatre. He states, "The stifling hold of realism on the stage is once more being challenged by new forms of playwriting as well as by production; decentralization is increasing rapidly, and the need for new schools of acting to train artists for new theatres and new forms of theatre is urgent. And so we find ourselves returning once more to the still untapped reservoir of information about one of the great periods of experimentation in the history of Western theatre, not out of mere antiquarian curiosity, but out of a pressing need to profit from the experience of a cadre of theatrical genuises who faced problems similar to ours."

In the "Notes . . . ," Tairov deals with the actor, the director, music, scene design, costuming, the role of literature in the theatre, and the relationship of the spectator to the work of art. Tairov lies between Meyerhold, whom he severely criticizes, and Stanislavsky; between formalism and realism. His synthesis implies that the key to good theatre lies not solely in the audience's mind nor solely on the stage but in a "dynamic interaction between the audience and the stage." Of contemporary interest is Tairov's evaluation of the place of the play. For him literature had little importance in the theatre. His theatre was not to act "as a purveyor of literary works through the mouths of actors," and at best, the play was raw material. The section on the director is actually only a definition of the actor-director dependency and of the actor's creative freedom. This was prompted by Meyerhold's treatment of the actor as a kind of scenic clay. Tairov's own idea of the actor fell between Stanislavsky's "perezhivanie" and the schematized portrayal of emotion. "The scenic figure is a synthesis

of emotion and form brought to life by the creative fantasy of the actor." Another interesting section, which reveals the source of official government dissatisfaction with Tairov's early work, is the last chapter, on the spectator. Kuhlke concludes that, "It was Tairov's tragedy that his whole view of the theatre was aesthetic, not social, at a time when the concern of his society was just the reverse." In the last chapter, Tairov refers to communal theatre, the theatre of spectator participation, as a step backward in the theatre. In his theatre the spectator functioned only as an observer. Ideally, he points out, theatre art can be created without an audience.

It should be remembered that the Notes of a Director does not extend to Tairov's ideas and work in his later years, in the Soviet era, but is an example of the pre-Revolutionary period, perhaps the freest period in Russian theatre.

Articles and Periodicals

119. Andronikov, Iraki. "Solomon Mikhoels: Actor, Director, Critic." Soviet Review, I (October, 1960), 36-41.

See entry number 7 for complete annotation.

120. Aronson, Gregor. "The Tragedy of Cosmopolite Tairov." The Russian Review, XI (July, 1952), 148-56.

In 1949 Alexander Tairov found himself a victim of a Politburo patriotic witchhunt which denounced "pro-western anti-marxists." Aronson provides a good biographical summary of the perilous thirty-year life of the Kamerny Theatre and a documentation of its demise. He describes Tairov's playhouse as "an isolated isle, foreign to its Soviet surroundings." Tairov had been threatened many times before, but the indictment appearing in Soviet Art (reprinted in this article) sounded the death knoll. In 1950, after having been taken over by the government, the Kamerny became the Pushkin Dramatic Theatre of Moscow. Tairov died a month before the theatre reopened.

121. Bakshy, Alexander. "Russian Dramatic Stage." The Drama, XIX (February, 1919), 31-61.
See entry number 228 for complete annotation.

122. Bakshy, Alexander. "Vsevolod Meyerhold and the Soviet Theatre." Dial, No. 84 (January, 1928), 25-30.
In a slight description of the characteristic methods of the exponents of "formal theatre," Bakshy calls on the essays in The Theatrical October to illustrate Meyerhold's use of constructivism to depict the Soviet social and political movement. Constructivism is compared with Evreinov's psychological theatricalism and with Tairov's aesthetic experiments. While embracing Meyerhold's work, he criticizes all of Tairov's early presentations, preferring instead the "theatrical realism" in the latter's staging of Desire Under the Elms. Bakshy fails to point out that all of what he calls the Soviet Theatre existed long before the Revolution.

123. Ben-Ari, Raiken. "Four Directors and the Actor." Theatre Workshop, I (January-March, 1937), 65-74.
Raiken Ben-Ari worked on almost every production of the Habima Theatre when it resided in Moscow. In 1937 a book of his memoirs was published in Yiddish (available in English as of 1957). This article is supposed to be a translation of a chapter from the volume entitled Habima, but it does not correspond with the text. This version takes the form of a series of questions about the Russian theatre answered on the basis of Ben-Ari's own experiences. The questions include: (1) What methods must one use in order to produce a play according to the Vakhtangov method? (2) What briefly constitutes Stanislavsky's system? (3) To what extent did Vakhtangov follow Stanislavsky and where did they part? (4) What is Meyerhold's theory and where does it coincide or depart from Stanislavsky and Vakhtangov? (5) What is constructivism? By and large the replies are factually correct, but they are in no way as inclusive as the queries. The scope of each question is too great for all to be comprehensively covered in a nine-page effort.

124. Clurman, Harold. "Conversation With Two Masters: From An Informal Diary of a Five Week Stay In The Soviet Union." Theatre Arts Monthly, XIX (November, 1935), 871-76.

The conversations are partial transcriptions of interviews with Stanislavsky and Meyerhold. The interviews elicited comments on working procedures, acting training, personal habits, and approaches to dramatic literature. There is little here of a unique nature or not previously covered in existing general sources.

125. "Danchenko Directs: Notes on The Three Sisters." Theatre Arts, XXVIII (October, 1943), 603-06.

Valdimir Glebov, then Assistant Director of the Moscow Art Theatre, sent a ten-page telegram to Theatre Arts containing the "Notes . . . " Danchenko analyzes the play to illustrate the elements to manipulate when making a revival contemporary. He discusses the three truths: the social truth (the modern Soviet world outlook), the psychological truth, and the theatrical truth. The notes do not go beyond the plans and goals of the revival to any working or rehearsal ideas.

126. Efros, Abram. "The Russian Theatre and Its Artists Since the Revolution." Translated by H. L. Gordon. Parnassus, I (February, 1929), 6-9. Illus.

See entry number 79 for complete annotation.

127. Ehrenburg, Ilya. "People, Years, Life: Selections From Memoirs." Soviet Review, II (July, 1961), 20-27.

Chapter 18 of Ehrenburg's memoirs is entitled "Meyerhold and the Theatre." Ehrenburg's relationship with Meyerhold (according to the author) ranged from stormy controversy to intense friendship. He began working with the régisseur in 1920 in the Theatre Department of the People's Commissariat of Education (TEO) which Meyerhold headed. One of the few intimate portraits of Meyerhold in English, the lively commentary on his work makes for an interesting comparison to the usual weighty conjectured academic analyses of trends and themes in his work.

128. "The Eugene Vakhtangov Theatre." World Theatre, XVI (1967), 184-88.
See entry number 238 for complete annotation.

129. Fagin, Bryllion. "Meyerhold Rehearses A Scene." Theatre Arts Monthly, XVI (October, 1932), 833-37. Illus.
Most of the articles in Theatre Arts Monthly dealing with transcriptions or faithful reproductions of working sessions involving the personnel of the Russian theatre are both interesting and valuable. Here we find Meyerhold rehearsing Erdmann's Suicide. The reader gains an insight into the régisseur's use of improvisation, his intuitive feeling for the key to a given moment, and his employment of the rehearsal as a fluid technique in his "search for style."

130. Gard, Robert E. "The State of the Soviet Stage: How A Director Redeems Social Realism." Theatre Arts, XLV (April, 1961), 60, 79, 80. Illus.
The play is Arbuzov's The Optimistic Tragedy, the director Gheorgi Tovstonogov, and the theatre, the Gorky Drama Theatre. Gard provides a plot summary and a play analysis, and aims at illustrating how the director's clever staging and ingenious blending of theatrics with the theme made for an impressive production. Except for the graphic illustrations, however, the article remains short on the "how" part of the title.

131. Gladkov, A. K. "The 225th Studio." Translated by Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood. Tulane Drama Review, IX (Fall, 1964), 22-23.
Allegedly, this piece was noted down by Gladkov from comments made by Meyerhold at a rehearsal of Boris Godunov on November 28, 1936. Meyerhold comments on his work as an actor at the Moscow Art Theatre and those rehearsal situations during which Stanislavsky revealed his expertise in finding the actor's problem and in supplying the étude that would solve it. When queried about Stanislavsky's obeisance to realism, Meyerhold recalled the beautiful lyric moments Stanislavsky obtained in The Seagull. He is also quoted as saying that, "Any stereotyped approach is bad, even if it is based on Meyerholdism."

It was said in the teens and the twenties that Meyerhold and the Moscow Art Theatre were at opposite poles. As the title of this article is meant to indicate, the régisseur himself placed them both on the same continuum. On the other hand, he expressed the opinion that the real polar relationship existed between his theatre and the Kamerny. In 1936 he accused Tairov of developing the first theatre of socialist realism. This is probably a reference to Tairov's production of The Optimistic Tragedy.

132. Graham, Kenneth L. "Meyerhold And Constructivism In The Russian Theatre." Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIX (April, 1943), 182-87.

"Our artists must throw down the brush and compass, and lay hold of the axe and hammer for the shaping of that new stage which must be the pattern of our technical world--Meyerhold." In a clear synthesis of materials, Graham sketches, the historic background, social and political link-up, and the methods of biomechanics and constructivism as Meyerhold practiced them. The definitions are vague but the point summaries of characteristics and examples of their use serve as good explanations. In a "dramatically organized event of life" Graham labels biomechanics as the actor training which provides the physical adaptation necessary for the production--a "machine for theatricalizing social life." Much of this material is based on Huntley Carter's New Spirit in the Russian Theatre (see entry number 189).

133. Hoover, Marjorie L. "A Mejerxol'd Method--Love for Three Oranges (1914-1916)." The Slavic and East European Journal, XIII (Spring, 1969), 23-41.

"The theatrical theatre is such that the audience does not for one moment forget that the actor it sees is acting, and the actor does not for one moment forget that he has before him a theatre, beneath his feet a stage, and at his back a set."--Meyerhold (1908)

In addition to his accomplishments as an innovative theatrical revolutionist, and to his work as a director, Meyerhold was a teacher of actors and directors. Although his teachings were not as systematized as Stanislavsky's, and although we know little about the actual

application of his principles, there is ample evidence that his work in instructing actors and directors spanned well over thirty years and was invested with a definite method. Miss Hoover, in another excellent article (see entry number 134) uses recent materials and the careful inspection of pre-Revolutionary writings to promote new research into Meyerhold as a valid source for the modern tradition.

"Love for Three Oranges," named for the 1761 Gozzi scenario, was a magazine, or rather a bulletin, published, for a time, under Meyerhold's editorship. Between 1914 and 1916 Meyerhold was responsible for nine issues which provided information on theatrical purpose, curriculum and educational statements relative to his acting school, the Meyerhold Studio. Using these issues, the author explains what the régisseur taught his pupils and how he achieved continuity throughout his teaching career. Hoover relates class work and studio production to Meyerhold's investigations of rhythm, movement, stage space, folk theatre devices, the grotesque, and the concept of the "obraz" or key idea.

"Theatricalism was common to Evreinov, Tairov, Vakhtangov, and Kommisarzhevsky but none began so early nor practiced so long with such consistent greatness as Meyerhold this theatricalism. Certainly none except Stanislavsky quite achieved Meyerhold's importance as a teacher of actors and directors."

134. Hoover, Marjorie L. "V. E. Meyerhold: A Russian Predecessor of Avant-Garde Theatre." Comparative Literature, XVII (Summer, 1965), 234-50.

"By advocating the exposure of the illusion, activation of the audience, play with the mask, the restoration of a wealth of devices from the past as well as the innovation of contemporary techniques, Meyerhold helped to end the century-and-a-half predominance of the realistic convention and to inaugurate the contemporary era in theatre." Meyerhold rejected the use of the terms "formalism" and "theatre theatricalism" as descriptive of his work. In an excellent article, the word "uslovnost," used to mean "consistent" is advanced as the key to Meyerhold's contribution. The word has been used by Russians to mean "convention" but it has also been used to mean "consistent" as in a device that is

consistent with all of theatre convention. The author concentrates on the latter usage and clearly illustrates Meyerhold's integral and continuing employment of "consistent" theatrical devices as applied to the modern theatre of his own time. With relation to the title of this piece and to plays Meyerhold produced, Hoover elaborates on pictorialism, gigantism, multiple uniformity, the "Gestus," episodic structure, area spotting, the "grotesque," and chronometrage. This is a thorough, well-documented, and insightful piece of work.

135. Houghton, Norris. "Theory Into Practice: A Reappraisal of Meierhold." Educational Theatre Journal, XX (October, 1968), 437-42.

Houghton's reminiscences lead him to a brief statement on the essential characteristics of Meyerhold's genius. The author deals with what he regards as the Russian director's two major contributions and with his tie to Brecht.

The first contribution is labeled as Meyerhold's manipulation of the physical equilibrium of the stage scene as a means of accomplishing a dynamic theatricality. Houghton writes about Meyerhold's staging techniques and reproduces the definition of Biomechanics formulated by the Meyerhold Theatre in the 1930's.

Secondly, the author discusses Meyerhold's "absorption in the spectator and in the problem of spatial relationships that the presence of an audience and the performers in the same place at the same time presents."

The tie with Brecht is presented as a general statement on both men's insistence that the spectator always be aware that what occurs on the stage is not to be confused with real life. He encourages more research in the area of comparison between the two great figures. For more on this topic the reader is advised to look at entry number 134.

136. Knebel, Maria. "Becoming a Director in Five Years." World Theatre, XVI (January-February, 1967), 62-63.

"A director has to be an intellectual of the greatest possible culture . . . he attends courses in Marxist-Leninist aesthetics, history, philosophy, historical and dialectical materialism, history of the literature, history

of the theatre, of the plastic arts, of music. . . ." This is an outline of the exhaustive five-year director training program at the Lunacharski Institute of Dramatic Art. In addition to the technical and literary courses, the student undergoes extensive actor training ("No one who does not feel himself to be an actor can truly direct an actor."). Knebel presents an enviable program of both course-work and numerable practical apprenticeship opportunities.

137. Kuhlke, William. "Vakhtangov and the American Theatre of the 1960's." Educational Theatre Journal, XIX (May, 1967), 179-87.

"Today in the United States . . . , we find ourselves fighting Vakhtangov's battle all over again--struggling to be free of a remarkably obstinate realistic tradition and yet understandably reluctant to turn the theatre over to the seven foot marionette and the electrical engineer."

Using Vakhtangov's work with "fantastic realism" and explaining how it was used as a synthesis of realistic content and original expressive theatrical form, Kuhlke calls for a study of the Russian director's work, not as an artifact but as a significant and imaginatively powerful answer to the stultifying grip of verisimilitude in this country.

Background information is provided on the theory and practice of Vakhtangov's solution in such productions as Turnadot and The Miracle of St. Anthony. Vakhtangov is compared and contrasted with Meyerhold and Stanislavsky in order to isolate the unique characteristics of his work.

138. Lozowick, Louis. "The Theatre Is For The Actor: An Iconoclast's Methods in Moscow." Theatre Guild Magazine, October, 1929, pp. 34-35.

See entry number 13 for complete annotation.

139. Lozowick, Louis. "V. E. Meyerhold and His Theatre." Hound and Horn, IV (October-December, 1930), 95-105. Illus.

Lozowick traces the meeting points of the political and theatrical revolutions, attempting to indicate the social meanings of Meyerhold's uses of biomechanics, constructivism, stage space, rhythm, and the

manipulation of objects. The best sections of the article are the detailed descriptions of Meyerhold's productions of Cocu Magnifique and The Inspector General.

140. Malnick, Bertha. "A. A. Shakhovskoy." The Slavonic and East European Review, XXXII (December, 1953), 29-51.

See entry number 247 for complete annotation.

141. Martin, John. "How Meyerhold Trains His Actors." Theatre Guild Magazine, November, 1930, pp. 26-30. Illus.

See entry number 20 for complete annotation.

142. Meyerhold, Vsevolod. "Farce." Translated by Nora Beeson. Tulane Drama Review, IV (September, 1959), 139-49.

"The public comes to the theatre to see the art of man, but what kind of art is it to walk on the stage as one really is? The public expects fantasy, acting, skill, and instead sees either life or slavish imitation to it." In an interestingly written position paper, Meyerhold calls for writers and producers to understand the theatrical framework and to utilize the "cabotinage" of the market place, the commedia stage, and the festivals. He speaks out against literary slavery and accuses the Russian dramatists of simply moving the viewer from the library to the auditorium without altering the material. One can read in these lines the origins of Meyerhold's break with the Moscow Art Theatre, and the thinking that propelled him toward endless experiments with the basic elements of theatre art.

143. Meyerhold, Vsevolod. "From On The Theatre." Translated by Nora Beeson. Tulane Drama Review, IV (May, 1960), 134-47.

The two translated sections are Meyerhold's comments on The Naturalistic Theatre and The Theatre of Mood, and The First Experiments of the Conventional Theatre. These deal with his work from 1902 to 1907. The above selections and a great many more can now be found translated and edited in one volume by Eric Braun. For a complete annotation see entry number 115.

144. Meyerhold, Vsevolod. "Meyerhold Orders Music." Theatre Arts Monthly, XX (September, 1936), 694-99. Illus.

The order is to Shebalin, the composer, for Meyerhold's production of La Dame aux Camelias. Taken from a series of letters discussing the whole musical plot, they illustrate the considerable musical knowledge and operatic background Meyerhold possessed.

145. Meyerhold, Vsevolod. "Meyerhold to Chekov." Translated by Nora Beeson. Tulane Drama Review, IX (Fall, 1969), 24-25.

See entry number 281 for complete annotation.

146. Mirsky, D. "Dos Passos in Two Soviet Productions." International Literature, III (1934), 152-54. Illus.

See entry number 329 for complete annotation.

147. Okhlopkov, Nicolai; Tovstonogov, Gheorgi; and Zavadsky, Yuri. "Three Great Soviet Producers Pay Tribute." World Theatre, XII (Summer, 1963), 88-94. Illus.

We learn little from these testamonials about Stanislavsky or about the producers. Tovstonogov's contribution is the best written and reminds the reader that Stanislavsky never professed to be tied to a "system" but was always refining, testing, and reviewing. Considering the source, this may actually be a plea for more experimentation and variety in the contemporary Soviet theatre.

148. Rybakov, Yuri. "Old and New Trends in Productions." World Theatre, XVI (January-February, 1967), 23-34. Illus.

"Our theatre is nurtured on rich and powerful traditions." Here the reader will get an idea of who the reigning directors are considered to be and how they are disciples of or related to former Soviet greats. Rybakov claims that all of modern production hearkens back to the early Soviet theatre. Even the freest rendering of the classics is charged with a debt to the discoveries made by the early Stanislavsky-Danchenko productions. Gheorgi Tovstonogov, an internationally recognized director, is viewed as a fusion of Stanislavsky and Meyerhold, the

first such since Vakhtangov. Tovstonogov and others such as Okhlopkov, Ravenskikh, Akimov, and Zavadsky are analyzed and contrasted.

149. Sayler, Oliver M. "The Deeper Roots of the Russian Theatre." The Bookman, L (December, 1919), 108-14.

See entry number 250 for complete annotation.

150. Sayler, Oliver M. "Meyerhold and the Theatre Theatrical." Bookman, L (November-December, 1919), 350-56.

In addition to biographical and personality sketches of Meyerhold and Golovin (one of Meyerhold's primary designers), this well-written article contains a number of translated passages from Meyerhold's writings. These include working notes for the production of Molière's Don Juan and an article from the journal, For the Love of Three Oranges. The former deals with the theory of reviving a classic "in the prism of its own time," and the latter houses Meyerhold's arguments with realism in a review of the Moscow Art Theatre First Studio's production of The Cricket On The Hearth. A partial production list notes the plays Meyerhold directed at the Kommissarzhevaskaya Theatre from 1906 to 1908, and his work at the Imperial Theatres in Petrograd (St. Petersburg).

151. Tovstonogov, Georgii. "Chekhov's 'Three Sisters' at the Gorky Theatre." The Drama Review, XIII (Winter, 1968), 146-55. Illus.

Tovstonogov is a contemporary director of the Gorky Theatre in Leningrad, and an editor of the Soviet review, Teatr. "It seems to me that those who defend the old classic productions are confusing the works themselves with one way of producing them. A dramatic experience dies when the theatrical form for it dies, and it revives when the theatre finds it a new form." This article deals with the author's conception for and defense of reviving the Russian classics, and particularly, his own efforts to overcome the tendency toward clichéd Chekhovianism. The play is analyzed in terms of form and idea, and in relation to Tovstonogov's use of cinematic staging (use of the revolving stage to focus, pan, and present things from different angles). Of particular

interest are the director's interpretations of the meaning behind the external reproduction of life and verisimilitude, and his methods for concretizing these in the staging.

152. Tovstonogov, Gheorgii. "New Solutions For The Theatre." The Soviet Review, III (March, 1962), 40-48.

The mood of this piece bespeaks a call for reviving the spirit of investigation that made the pre-Revolutionary theatre unique. The article itself is the author's summary of his address to the Leningrad Branch of the All-Russian Theatrical Society, delivered in 1961, on the problems of the artistic expressiveness of productions on a contemporary theme. Essentially, Tovstonogov was calling for a reapplication of Stanislavsky's "method," but with the infusion of an understanding of more contemporary conventions. In analyzing the Soviet Man of 1961, the author found him undemonstrative, and thus felt that acting needed to be precise and terse in action and word, brief and economic, utilizing suggestion, and developing the "silence zone," (the physical action or the union of word and action).

153. Tovstonogov, G.; Okhlopkov, N.; Akomov, N., and Simonov, R. "Directing in Today's Theatre." Soviet Life (February, 1963), 55-57. Illus.

These are abridged comments, taken from a forum on stage directing and its problems, which appeared in Russian in Teatr magazine. Each of the régisseurs comments on what he feels requires the most attention to insure the quality of the Soviet theatre.

Tovstonogov argues for the importance of the playwright and against the director who fails to be limited by the play itself. "It is the author of the play who sets the limits of our imagination, and a director who goes beyond these boundaries deserves to be punished for cheating the playwright."

Okhlopkov is concerned with the drama, but urges the playwrights to deal with individuals. He encourages them to forsake the two-dimensional positive hero and to reveal character with "psychological complexity."

Akimov, a famous designer as well as a director, faults the theatre for failing to develop a contemporary style. He attributes this to the failure to adapt existing technology to theatre architecture and design.

"Only when our theatres have thoroughly modern stages with thoroughly modern equipment will we see the birth of a modern theatrical style, one in which both the mechanics and the artistry of the theatre will be a harmonious whole."

Reuben Simonov, a disciple of Vakhtangov's, calls for an elevation of the actor's artistry. He complains that many young actors lack "inner technique," and can only rant and rave rather than express the emotional experience.

154. Turner, W. L. "Vakhtangov: The Director as Teacher." Educational Theatre Journal, XV (December, 1963).

This article is a summation of Vakhtangov's basic theories and methods of teaching acting and directing. It provides a profile of the man's personality and of his all too brief period of production. Within this context, Turner touches on "fantastic realism," a comparison with Stanislavsky, and the evidence of a synthesis of the theories of Meyerhold and Stanislavsky in Vakhtangov's work. Vakhtangov is seen in relation to his effect on his students, and the effects of his productions on the Soviet society as a whole.

155. Vakhtangov, Eugene. "From The Notebooks." Theatre Arts Monthly, XX (September, 1936), 679. Illus.

These are two excerpts from documents collected by the director's theatre after his death, in preparation for publication. One section deals with flexibility in acting and scenic movement, and the other is a precise, clear statement of "fantastic realism," the production concept that established Vakhtangov's position as a mediator between the approaches of Stanislavsky and Meyerhold.

156. Vishnevsky, A.; Korchaguina, D.; Alexandrovskaya, E.; Monakov, N.; Pashennaya, V.; Pevstov, I.; Radlov, S.; Satz, N.; Sushkevich, B.; Tairov, A.; and Uzhivy, N. "Actors and Producers Speak of Their Work." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 6 (1934), 60-69.

See entry number 369 for complete annotation.

157. Zakhava, B. E. "Principles of Directing: Part I." Theatre Workshop, I (April-July, 1937), 43-55.

B. E. Zakhava, a director in the Vakhtangov Theatre well known for his production of Pogodin's Aristocrats, deals in this two-part essay with the principles of the Russian company system and with the director-actor relationship.

Part I supports the supremacy of the collective and the reinforcement of the actor's creativity. Above all, Zakhava condemns an approach such as the "single will" or a Sologub or a Craig or a star actor. He regards such individuals as the "offspring of the 'rugged individualism' existing in bourgeois society at the decline of the capitalist system." Pages are spent isolating and eliminating all the other artists of the theatre in order to prove that the actor is the only one who is indispensable. "The contributions that go to make up the art of the theatre are essential only so long as they furnish material for the creative activity of the actor." Zakhava's theories are a synthesis of Stanislavsky and Vakhtangov. He alludes to other practitioners (Meyerhold and Tairov) in denying the importance of the actor's body or his soul. "The material of the director's creativeness is the creativeness of the actor."

158. Zakhava, B. E. "Principles of Directing: Part II." Theatre Workshop, I (September-October, 1937), 14-33.

This section of Zakhava's "Principles . . . " considers the director's job as a carefully chosen and planned stimulus to evoke a truthful response from the actor. The director's task is the elimination of the obstacles to the actor's creativity; Zakhava outlines the aids the director can employ toward this end. These include a description of playing an action, biography, explaining and demonstrating, attention, muscular freedom, justification, falsehood, playing emotions, and creative mood.

159. Zavadsky, Yuri. "Conversation With a Young Régisseur." Theatre Arts Monthly, XX (September, 1963), 726-30.

This is less a conversation than a dialogue between a high priest and a neophyte. In this form, Zavadsky, then the director of

the Rostov Dramatic Theatre, comments on his working methods, his view of the actor, and the distinguishing differences between Meyerhold, Stanislavsky, and Vakhtangov. To Zavadsky, Meyerhold's exacting laws produced "little Meyerholds" and not actors, whereas Stanislavsky depended upon the actor as a creative individual, and Vakhtangov sought a union of the two strengths.

Unpublished Materials

160. Beeson, Nora Beate. "Vesvolod Meyerhold And The Experimental Pre-Revolutionary Theatre." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1960.

It is the hypothesis of this paper that Russian theatre between 1900 and 1917 embodied all of the theoretical, human, and experimental sources of whatever success the Soviet theatre experienced in the first decade after the Revolution. In short, Russia's unique and seminal contribution to world theatre had little to do with Soviet influence.

Beeson begins with the state of the theatre in the Imperial houses in the 1800's and the evolution of the "realistic" response as it was produced by Ostrovsky, Shchepkin, Stanislavsky, and Danchenko. This in turn is contrasted with the growth of non-realistic experimentation, which is placed in the context of world art, art and aesthetics in general, Appia, Fuchs, Craig, Diaghilev and the thrust of the symbolist movement in art, poetry, and theatrical theory and criticism (Briusov, Ivanov, Sologub). In addition to the five and one-half chapters on Meyerhold's work from its beginnings in Stanislavsky's studio in 1905, there are also separate sections on Evreinov and Tairov.

Meyerhold's emphasis throughout his work was visual and spatial. He worked to create an original theatrical art which would be "always faithful to the conception of an abstract, mechanical unrealistic presentation of the human being." With reports, documentation, and commentary on many of Meyerhold's productions (Hedda Gabbler, Soeur Béatrice, The Show Booth, The Life of Man, Tristan Und Isolde, Orpheo et Euridice, Elektra, Don Juan, The Masquerade, and Columbine's Scarf), the author

presents an excellent synthesis of the links in all of Meyerhold's experiments, and an evaluation of the concrete achievements as well as the controversies in his creations. In addition to material on the productions in the Stanislavsky Studio, at the Imperial Theatres, and in the studios of Dr. Dapertutto, Meyerhold's writings are represented in excerpts from On Theatre, in production notes, and in an annotation of the Love For Three Oranges (the magazine he edited in 1914 and 1915).

In the chapters on Tairov and Evreinov, a clear statement of similarities and differences in theory, direction, and production work emerges, as well as a framework for viewing the experiments of all three régisseurs. A helpful appendix lists all of the plays done by each man. The data include the play, the author, the director, the designer, the place of staging, and the date of production.

161. Kuhlke, William. "Vakhtangov's Legacy." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1965.

Kuhlke, who is also known for his excellent translation of Tairov's Notes of a Director (see entry number 118) makes another valuable English language contribution with this dissertation on Vakhtangov. The stated and achieved purposes of the paper are to identify Vakhtangov's place in the modern theatre, and to present in English translation sections from Vakhtangov's own notes, letters, and articles.

The most interesting of Vakhtangov's writings deal with actor training and with the director's ideas on the supremacy of the actor's position in the theatre. Vakhtangov's thinking on plasticity, faith in the unconscious and the use of improvisation, coupled with Gorchakov's description of the director's work on The Wedding, as written in The Vakhtangov School of Stage Art (see entry number 110), comprises some of the best material on acting craft in world theatre literature. In his short lifetime Vakhtangov was considered by many to have been the most gifted teacher of the Stanislavsky system. Kuhlke ably contrasts Stanislavsky and Vakhtangov as to the use of "inner feeling" and "psychological realism."

In total, the paper provides original material and a good contextual commentary on:

Vakhtangov's sources (a perceptive evaluation of just where Vakhtangov lay between Stanislavsky and Meyerhold); his work prior to the Revolution; his writings on the relationship of art to society; the conception and staging of The Dybbuk and Princess Turandot; and an attempt to determine from Vakhtangov's deathbed conversations with his students the actual meaning of "fantastic realism."

The reader is also supplied with a life and work chronology for Vakhtangov in the form of an appendix to the text, and with illustrations from the production of Princess Turandot.

National Republic and Minority Theatres

Books

162. Ayvasian, Kourken. The Theatre in Soviet Azerbaidzhan. New York: Research Program on the U.S.S.R., 1955. pp. 29. (Mimeographed.)

This pamphlet is devoted to providing historical information on Azerbaidzhan drama, and to illustrating the destructive Soviet influence introduced under the guise of support for national minorities. Section I, "Pre-Soviet Azerbaidzhan Theatre," is concerned with theatrical activity, the nature of the repertory, and the acting style in the late 1800's. The author emphasizes the work of the playwrights Akhundov, Vezirov, and Akverdov, and the talents of Zaynulov, a noted tragedian.

Section II, "The Soviet Era," analyzes the drama, the acting style, and the theatre's effectiveness as a whole so as to illustrate the artistic and political difficulties that arose in complying with the demands of sovietization. The works of Dzhabarly, Aydun (The Bridge of Fire, Yashar), Vurgun (Vagif), Ibrahimov (Hayat), and Rustam (Nabi, the Brigand) are summarized and dissected for factuality. "The distortion of fact in Vagif, The Bride of Fire and other historical plays was scarcely noted by the general public, which was not well acquainted with the historical occurrences treated in these plays." Ayvasian's criticisms of the literature deal with structural unity, visual concept, dramatic action, character development, and verbal expression. Though he places the blame on the

plays, the author faults the acting for being rhetorical, presentational, and caricatured. It is claimed that the Soviet acting institutes placed greater emphasis on philosophical indoctrination than on native style and language facility.

The last section, "The Political Status and Living Conditions of Actors in Soviet Azerbaidzhan," dwells mainly on the activities of the NKVD police and how they drove the reknowned actor Sharifov to commit a chilling suicide in his solitary confinement cell where he had been isolated as a "political undesirable" for refusing to play two assigned roles.

163. Ben-Ari, Raiken. Habima. Translated by A. H. Gross and I. Soref. New York: Thomas Yoseloff, Inc., 1957. pp. 253. Illus.

The Habima Theatre was founded in 1919 in Moscow and experienced a brief but exciting life in Russia, where it achieved the status of State Theatre. Ben-Ari, who worked on almost all of the Russian productions of this internationally known company, wrote this history in 1937. It is annotated here because in addition to the information on the Habima itself, the book contains material on the work Vakhtangov and Stanislavsky did with this theatre. Vakhtangov's production of The Dybbuk at the Habima represented the company's first major success, and is equally important to the short history of the director himself. Ben-Ari writes on Vakhtangov's theories, methods of actor training, ideas of theatricality, and the concepts and exercises employed in rehearsing the Dybbuk. This includes études used for developing and defining thematic situations and character studies. Stanislavsky was also important to the theatre, both in support and actual production assistance. He gave a series of informal lectures to the company which were accompanied by laboratory sessions used to teach the playing of basic emotional and realistic situations. Ben-Ari writes clearly and admiringly of these sessions, and also includes a separate chapter on "The Stanislavsky System." For a while, until he became ill, Stanislavsky also supervised a production of Jacob's Dream at the Habima. His rehearsal techniques are outlined. Within this history of the company's activities in Russia, Europe,

America, and Israel, are descriptions and comparative statements on the theories and practices of Vakhtangov, Stanislavsky, and Meyerhold (who never actually directed the Habima). The author communicates the professional worship of these men and the virtually hypnotic power they had over the actors they directed.

164. Bradshaw, Martha, ed. Soviet Theatres, 1917-1941: A Collection of Articles. New York: Research Program on the U.S.S.R., 1954. pp. 371.
See entry number 186 for complete annotation.

165. Macleod, Joseph. The New Soviet Theatre. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1943. pp. 242. Illus.
See entry number 209 for complete annotation.

166. Seduro, Vladimir. The Byelorussian Theatre And Drama. New York: Research Program on the USSR, 1955. pp. 517. Illus.
A great deal has been written in Russia about the encouragement and help given to establish autonomous theatres in national republics, and to the "development of all manner of indigenous expression in the arts among minority peoples." Emphasizing a history of regimentation, encumbrance by fear, and sterility under socialist realism, Seduro strikes out against the Soviet claims and attempts to illustrate how the Soviet pattern of development in the arts since 1917 has been repeated in the history of the Byelorussian theatre and drama. In a highly detailed and documented work, the reader, after a background of Byelorussian cultural history beginning with the middle ages, is exposed to the early years after the Revolution, the valiant efforts by the Byelorussian people in the twenties and early thirties to maintain an independent nationalistic approach to writing and performing, and "the final enforced submission to the cultural dictates of the Party which today has turned the Byelorussian theatre and dramatists into dull and boring instruments of government propaganda."
The history of the Byelorussian theatre is systematically developed, revealing the origins of various theatres; the repertory, complete with discussion of many of the individual plays; styles of production; actor

training; and biographical data on numerous dramatists, directors, and actors. The sixty-three chapters of information and commentary are divided according to the following classifications: The Pre-Soviet Byelorussian Theatre; The First Byelorussian State Theatre; The Second Byelorussian State Theatre; and Uladislau Halubok's Byelorussian Travelling Theater. The text is accompanied by a Bibliography of Byelorussian Dramatic Literature; a Bibliography of Books and Articles on Byelorussian Theatre and Drama (together, the bibliographies contain over five hundred entries of works written in Russian and Byelorussian); a Transliteration Table; an Index of Dramatic Literature; and a section of over fifty photographs of productions and personalities.

Articles and Periodicals

167. Amaglobeli, S. "Revolutions in Drama As Seen In The Contemporary Georgian Theatre." Pacific Affairs (July, 1930), 661-67.

The sovietization of a national republic via the theatre and the efforts to create a revolutionary repertory for a Georgian dramatic heritage "steeped in an atmosphere of classical and nationalistic plays" is the theme of Amaglobeli's essay. Unlike most articles written on the theme of national minority theatre, this one reveals some of the struggle involved in implanting a Proletariat theatre in a hostile environment of opposing and long-lived varying cultural habits and mores. In 1922, K. A. Mardjanov became the head of the Georgian theatre. Much of the text is devoted to his work as a director and producer of eclectic styles, fantasy, operetta, and what he called "synthetic theatre." While Amaglobeli establishes that his work had no class basis and that realism was not his forte, Mardjanov is complimented for being able to utilize "exceptional expressiveness" to satisfy the demands of the various classes of audiences. Included in the report are outstanding examples of Georgian repertory as produced by the Second State and Rustavelli theatres, with occasional production notes and records of critical acceptance.

168. "At The Gypsy Theatre Moscow, U.S.S.R." Theatre Arts Monthly, XXIV (April, 1940), 264-65. Illus.
This is a small collection of illustrations of productions of Carmen and The Gypsies, as performed at the Gypsy Theatre.

169. Flanagan, Hallie. "The Soviet Theatrical Olympiad." Theatre Guild Magazine, September, 1930, pp. 10-13, 62.
The Olympiad brought a great many national minority theatres and rural professional theatres to Moscow for performances, discussions, and planning. The event was not intended for the public but rather for the benefit of the practitioners themselves. The author provides a clear description of the purposes and organization of the event and tries to communicate the spirit of the participants. The meetings to discuss future plans, and the Soviet theatre in general, are represented by admittedly free translations of addresses by Petrov (director of the State Academic Theatre), and Petrovsky (a dramatic critic).

170. Gorelik, Mordecai. "Theatre Outpost, U.S.S.R." Theatre Arts Monthly, XVII (January, 1933), 44-48.
The effect of theatre and specifically communist themes on the lives of simple peasants in rural Russia is romantically depicted. The village is Shchedrin, and the play is performed in a synagogue by youngsters for the townspeople. Gorelik tries to show how the melodramatic and politically simplistic theme actually renews the souls and gives courage to the peasants. We have Gorelik's word.

171. "Gypsy Theatre Stages Pushkin Classic." International Literature, XI (1938), 93-95. Illus.
The text is only a one-page review of the then seven-year-old Romany Theatre's production of Pushkin's poem, The Gypsies. However, the accompanying four large photographs of the play may be of more use to the researcher.

172. Leyda, Jay. "The Rustavelli Theatre." Theatre Arts Monthly, XX (January, 1936), 60-73. Illus.
The depth of this article makes it unique to this magazine, whose emphasis admittedly is not that of a scholarly journal. Nonetheless, the historical background and the fullness of detail are in the tradition of the publication's

earnestness and enthusiasm for world theatre. The Rustavelli, or First State Georgian Theatre, is an example of a non-Russian Soviet enterprise. Named for a twelfth century Georgian poet, its work encompassed more than the cultural products of its own people. Leyda discusses its most famous productions up to 1935, including Lanura and Anzor (an adaptation of The Armoured Train). An interesting note describes a collective improvisation method including the evolution of a script which yielded such productions as Tetwald.

173. Lozowick, Louis. "The Jewish Theatres of Russia." Theatre Arts Magazine, June, 1927, pp. 419-22. Illus.

This is a look at one aspect of the national minority theatres. Lozowick lists three companies: the Jewish State Theatre of White Russia, the Jewish State Theatre of the Ukraine, and the Jewish Kamerny of Moscow. He includes a discussion of three of the characteristic plays done by these groups with illustrations and biographical sketches of the designers. Represented are Souhker Ber Ryback (designer of On The Confessional Chain and The Purim Play) and M. Falk (designer of A Night In The Old Market Place).

174. Lozowick, Louis. "Soviet Gypsy Theatre." Theatre Arts Monthly, XX (April, 1936), 282-87. Illus.

In commemoration of the Soviet Gypsy Theatre's fifth year of production, Lozowick presents an outline of the company's background and development. Dealing mostly with musical thesis drama, the company's repertory included Life On Wheels, Between Fires, Pharoah's Tribe, and an adaptation of Carmen.

175. Lozowick, Louis. "The Theatre of Turkestan: Old Forms Serve New Needs." Theatre Arts Monthly, XVII (November, 1933), 885-90. Illus.

An oft-repeated theme in Russian theatre articles in this magazine is the methods employed to achieve sovietization among the national minorities in remote areas through the use of theatre. This example covers the spread of "culture" in Soviet Asia through dramatized incidents and the celebration of technology.

176. Nikolayev, V. "Theatre In The Colhoz." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 6 (1934), 83-88.

Rural areas, primitive villages, and national minority settlements were frequently the most difficult areas to sovietize. The theatre became one of the strongest media for uniting people and selling them on socialism. At first, travelling theatres serviced the collective farms, but ultimately, professional rural resident companies were set up along with colhoz dramatic circles (amateur theatre clubs). The bulk of this article deals with the mechanics of development, including statistics, organization, subsidy, establishment of the repertory, training and guidance for the clubs, relationship to government agencies, and reciprocal relationships with permanent urban companies.

177. Osnos, Yuri. "The Kirghiz Dramatic Theatre." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 9 (September, 1956), 22-25.

The Kirghiz is a highland country in the northeast of Central Asia, and is a Soviet republic. The article indicates how the drama reflects the advances of these originally nomadic people since the October Revolution, and the organization of theatres and training institutes in one area of the country. The plot descriptions of such plays as The New Joys and The Daughter of Alubek illustrate that these works reflect more of the desired sovietization and the mainstream of socialist realism than of native culture. The author also describes and provides background for some of the country's leading performers, and critiques some of the recent productions.

178. Schwartz, Sulamith, and Hanoch G., eds. "Bamah Theatre Art Journal." Bama (1939), 1-48.

This is a special edition, English publication of Bama, which is the Theatre Art Journal of the Habima Circle in Palestine. The publication was issued in honor of the Habima's twentieth anniversary. Started in Russia in 1918 as one of the Moscow Art Theatre's studios, and guided by Vakhtangov, the Habima remained in Russia until 1926. The issue contains a series of articles, listed below, which sentimentalize and hearken back to the beginnings. In addition, they express a debt to Stanislavsky and Vakhtangov and talk of what

was hoped to have been a Hebrew and Zionist Renaissance. The reader will be supplied with the names of the original personnel; an expression of the spirit of the endeavor; and reminiscences about Stanislavsky's addresses and Vakhtangov's rehearsals. For more complete annotations, see the entries for individual articles.

Foreword
"In The Beginning." As told by Hannah Rovina to G. Hanoch
"Habima on its Twentieth Anniversary." by Issac Gruenbaum
"Bialik on Habima, The Legacy, Reminiscences of Stanislavsky." by Bialik
"Leaves From A Moscow Diary." by Chemerinsky

179. Seton, Marie. "The Evolution of the Gypsy Theatre in the U.S.S.R." Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society, XIV (1935), 65-72. Illus.

In 1931, guided by Russian theatre artists and with the backing of the Commissar of Education, the Moscow State Gypsy Theatre was established. The purpose was threefold: encouragement of national minority art; the breaking down of social prejudices; and the furthering of the sovietization process. The article describes the initiation of the company, its particular problems, and the first productions, Yesterday and Today (a political review) and Ethnological Studies (a collection of popular songs and dances). Though neither of these were legitimate plays, the efforts won the company a small theatre building of its own. Seton reports on subsequent established productions, including the first real gypsy play, Germano's Life On Wheels, and an adaptation of Merimée's Carmen. The critical reliability of the article is open to question. It closes with the statement, "Without exaggeration the First State National Gypsy Theatre of the Soviet Union is the most remarkable theatre in the world."

180. Strong, Louise. "The Theatrical Olympiad in Moscow." Theatre Arts Monthly, XIV (December, 1930), 1037-50. Illus.

In 1930, the Soviet Union sponsored the Olympiad of National Theatres, in which fifteen of its national groups from all over Russia performed in Moscow for one month. These

groups did not entertain the public, but performed for each other in the interest of improving their own techniques. Strong provides the background for the purpose in sponsoring national minority theatres, and the nature of the organizations themselves. Specifically, the article concentrates on the Uzbek Dramatic Musical Theatre, the Armenian Theatre, and special emphasis is given to the Georgian State Theatre and the Jewish State Theatre of White Russia. The author discusses the various methods of approach and contrasts the Georgian group's emphasis upon "movement of the body" with the Jewish Theatre's emphasis upon the "movement of the soul."

181. Theatre Arts Magazine, October, 1926, pp. 755-58. Illus.

Five photographs, with captions, depict the Moscow Habima Theatre. Specifically, close-ups illustrate the use of stylistic make-up design and scenic tableaux in The Wandering Jew, The Deluge, and The Dybbuk. The group performed in New York during the winter of 1926, after leaving Russia permanently.

182. "Theatres of the Soviet East: A Portfolio." Theatre Arts Monthly, XX (September, 1936), 731-34. Illus.

Together with a paragraph of introductions and captions, Theatre Arts presents a portfolio illustrating the national theatres of the Eastern Republics. The series includes Othello at the Turkist Art Theatre, Hamlet at the Uzbek Academic Theatre, Shah-Namé at the First State Theatre of Armenia, Bride of Fire at the Crimean State Tartar Theatre Studio, In The Sands of the Karakum at the Turkoman State Theatre, Alman at the State Opera Theatre of Armenia, and Zhigden at the State Buriat-Mongolia Theatre.

183. Tikhonovich, V. "Theatre Culture of the Peoples of the U.S.S.R." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 6 (1934), 70-80. Illus.

This is a good article to compare with Vladimir Seduro's book on The Byelorussian Theatre and Drama (see entry number 166). It is Tikhonovich's contention that the pre-Revolutionary Russian autocracy and bourgeois attitudes inhibited the flourishing of national minority cultures, while Soviet know-how,

encouragement, and substantial monetary, professional, and social support helped establish minority theatres in one hundred and fifty languages. Seduro recognizes the energy and funds but maintains that, for the Byelorussians at least, the Soviets subverted efforts at anything but a Soviet repertory. He claims that all national republic theatres were extensions of socialist reconstruction and handy control devices for achieving sovietization in areas far from the main capitals.

This article covers the cultural and technical obstacles to the establishment of the minority theatres, and the methods employed by the Soviet government to overcome them. It is filled with lists of plays and personalities from the various national repertories and companies. Reports are on the styles of such operations as the Georgian Rustavelli State Theatre, the State Jewish Theatre, the Uzbek Academic Theatre, the Gypsy State Theatre, and the Chinese Young Workers Theatre of the Far East.

184. Yazykova, Tatiana. "The Khamsa Theatre At Tashkent." World Theatre, I (1951), 72.

Tashkent, home of the Khamsa Theatre, is the capital city of Uzbekistan. This half-page "history" illustrating the repertory, style of presentation, and key successes through the years commemorates the theatre's thirtieth anniversary.

Pre- and Post-Revolutionary Russian Theatre History

Books

185. Bakshy, Alexander. The Path of the Modern Russian Stage. London: Cecil Palmer and Hayward, 1916. pp. 243. Illus.

I can find little in this text to recommend it. At the outset the author indicates that he is neither a scholarly researcher nor has he a practical knowledge of the stage, yet what little there is in this book on the Russian theatre is an attempt at critical appraisal and analytic and theoretical discussion rather than simple reportage. His purpose in writing is basically to express a philosophy of art and to apply its principles

to staging in the Russian theatre. He discusses the principle of form and idea and, through the concepts of continuity and discontinuity, establishes that "the subjective role of the spectator determines the form of the work of art." He dwells on the interaction between the work of art and the spectator, the changing attitude of the spectator and the form of art in mutual relationship. The problem of theatre is one of "the relationship between the stage and the auditor, expressed in terms of space." Although this is a relevant and valid idea and applicable to the experiments made in Russia, the author's application does not search thoroughly enough, nor does he prove the hypothesis through documented measurement of effect. Bakshy's application of the idea to the Russian theatre is limited by the nature of his writings on the innovators themselves and the paucity of people included in the study. Chapters Two through Six deal with the use of space in the naturalism of the Moscow Art Theatre and the subjective illusionism in Meyerhold, Evreinov, and Reinhardt(?).

One gets the feeling throughout most of the early chapters that Bakshy prefers the objective illusionism of the Moscow Art Theatre, and that for all his analysis of the use of space as form, he does not much care for experimental theatre. Finally, in the conclusion to Part I (Part II is a series of essays on Craig, Ivanov, and film), he comes out in favor of film as the answer to all the theatre's spatial restrictions. He refers to the "kinematograph" as a form of theatre. He concludes with the following personal appraisal of film's future: "There will be no complete continuity and no 'theatre of action' in the kinematograph, as the position of the spectator, the actor and the play will be strictly defined as against each other. For such reason, if for no other, I particularly welcome this new development of the art of the theatre and I do so the more willingly, because I am a convinced spectator, jealous of my own personality, and eager to watch a spectacle, but never to act in somebody else's show."

The factual information is correct but sketchy. In some sections there is more written about the Classical and the Medieval periods than about the Russian theatre of the 1900's. A reader interested in information, historical

analysis, or the definition of the various production theories in the pre-Revolutionary Russian theatre is advised to begin first with sources of a more general historical orientation.

186. Bradshaw, Martha, ed. Soviet Theatres, 1917-1941: A Collection of Articles. New York: Research Program on the U.S.S.R., 1954. pp. 371.

Although, as this bibliography indicates, there has been considerable work done in chronicling the Soviet theatre, the quality varies in almost equal proportion. Some of the work is propagandist; some by disgruntled Westerners looking for the promised land; and some by awed visitors whose experiences have been carefully controlled. As is mentioned in Bradshaw's preface, the contributors whose works were translated in this volume were all practitioners in the Soviet theatre and they speak of facts not potentially knowable to most non-Russian scholars. This series deals with the early and middle periods of the post-Revolutionary theatre as the reporters are men who emigrated after 1940. Also in the preface, Bradshaw presents a concise outline of political control of production and repertory as background for understanding the essays that follow. The two partial quotations reproduced here from her conclusion are perceptive summaries of the thread of the articles. She feels that the words of these men reveal a "great diversity of style of the modern Russian stage in the process of monolithic monotony" and "a picture of an extraordinarily vital theater making a heroic attempt to meet the needs of a new audience and express the transformation of life taking place in its homeland." Below is a list of the collected articles.

"Moscow Theatres, 1917-1941." by Orlovsky

Includes discussions of the Moscow Art Theatre and all three studios; the Meyerhold, Maly, and Kamerny Theatres; and the specific movements and problems of the 1930's.

"The Red Army Central Theater in Moscow." by Volkov

Reports on the goals, organization, and repertory of this military theatre.

"Training Actors For The Moldavian and Bulgarian Theatres, 1934-38." by Yershov

This article gives insight into the purpose and significance of the national republic theatres.

"The Theater in Soviet Concentration Camps." by Ramensky
The material includes portraits of the actors, the type of plays performed, and the audience relationship.
"Birth and Death of the Modern Ukranian Theatre." by Hirniak
This is another report on the Soviet control over the expression of national cultural history and mores under the guise of promoting freedom for all minorities.

The volume contains an index to all the subjects covered and to all the plays, by author. The bibliography is selective and reliable.

187. Brown, Benjamin W. Theatre at the Left. Providence: Bear Press, 1938. pp. 105.
"These brief essays are designed to supplement rather than rival such an excellent study as Norris Houghton's Moscow Rehearsals. The turbulent flux of material on the theatre of the U.S.S.R. surges with contradiction. The Theatre at the Left does not pretend to chart this flood with finality; it lays no claim to presenting a comprehensive or definite exposition of the Soviet drama. It is hoped, however, that the general reader, unfamiliar with the very foreign ideals of utilitarian aesthetics, may gain from these few pages a more sympathetic understanding of this mighty and confusing movement in stagecraft and a more enthusiastic appreciation of (not necessarily a belief in) the different but idealistic standards of this Theatre at the Left."
Using the major classifications of more inclusive texts, the author provides the general reader with a concise statement of the condition of Soviet theatre as of 1938. This is a book of brief essays the scope of which extends from the purpose of the theatre after the Revolution to an evaluation of the theatre as art versus the theatre as a social lever ("It is a theatre of revolution which is attempting to change the lives of men and not explain them. ART is a weapon.").
In The State As Producer, the concentration is less on the organization of a state subsidized operation than on the promotion of a variegated program. Brown contrasts the work of the Moscow Art Theatre with that of Meyerhold, Okhlopkov, Tairov, and Vakhtangov. The

terminology used to discriminate between movements is unnecessarily labelistic. In this chapter we find such terms as illusion-disillusionment, outward theatre-inward theatre, psychological synthesis-counter realist, etc.

Other chapters deal with children's theatre; the contrast between nineteenth century forms of opera and the emerging musical drama of Nemirovitch-Danchenko; the socialist function of producing national and international classics (including a list of such plays produced in 1936 in Moscow, and a comparison of the Moscow Art Theatre's staging of Tolstoy's Resurrection with the Vakhtangov Theatre's Hamlet); the drama resulting from the Revolution and the subsequent civil war (Optimistic Tragedy, Armoured Train, Lyubov Yarovaya, The Fighters, Intervention, The Days of the Turbins, and Egor Bulychev); national minority theatres (Jewish, Gypsy, Kazakstan, and Georgian); and the new subject theatre brought about by collectivization (Bread), the "new domesticity" (Inga, Squaring The Circle), and the politicising of individualism (Fear).

The best thing about this book is the author's critical facility. It is often reserved but, unlike many books written in this period, it is not overwhelmed in its judgments by the sheer amount of activity taking place. For example, in discussing the chronicle plays, Brown makes an important point that could apply to much of the early Soviet theatre. He says that, "Some few there are of these Civil War chronicles which legitimately may make a bid for a place in world-theatre repertory. Because of the careful production and liberal interpretation current in the Soviet Union, the shoddy qualities of a text may be disguised by the radiant materials of performance to such a degree, indeed, that glittering appears like true golden lustre." Brown is quick to indicate where propaganda has destroyed art, where there is an absence of real playwriting and construction, and where the Marxian deus is in evidence. The last chapter and summary, though very brief, is an objective approach to what was for many in the 1930's a blinding ray of theatrical light.

188. Capon, Eric. Actors and Audiences In The Soviet Union. Leicester: Russia Today Society, 1943. pp. 19. Illus.

This little pamphlet presents itself as a short sketch of the primary aspects of the Soviet theatre. The author touches on the Soviet audience; the stature and training of actors; and descriptions of the Moscow Art Theatre, the Vakhtangov Theatre, the Theatre of the Red Army, the State Jewish Theatre, the Kamerny Theatre, and several others including provincial and republican playhouses. The author sets himself up as a qualified evaluator, but the criticism is masked and biased. Here, for example, is the analysis of Meyerhold's accomplishments: " . . . an extraordinarily gifted producer who was given years of unremitting support until it was noticed that except for a handful of rather detached intellectuals the Moscow populace were not much interested in his very formalistic productions."

The text is accompanied by an eight photograph inset of various aspects of the Soviet theatre.

189. Carter, Huntly. The New Spirit in the Russian Theatre: 1917-28. London: Brentano's, Ltd., 1929. pp. 350. Illus.

The overriding impression one gets from reading this book is that of the author's conceit. In the Introduction, he establishes himself as the only person capable (at that time) of writing on the Russian theatre with authority. In addition, he points to the Soviet theatre as proof that his sociological theory of theatre was prophetic. The book is filled with statements about theatre with a capital "T" versus theatre with a small "t." One such statement reads: "Russian people are instinctively dramatic. It is not extravagant to say that there is more real theatricalized life expression in the Russian street and open spaces, in the cafés, in short in the life of the people than in all the theatres of Western Europe put together." The choice of wording is at times confusing, as in the use of "actualism" and "conditionalism" used to compare the theatrical right and left. At other times the wording is condescending, as in the classification of the major portion of the population as "the common-folk." If you can get by all of this and can separate out the

facts from the author's determined purpose of acclaiming the new Russian society as the end of man's searching for meaning, you will find a great deal of historical information in this text, as well as a frequently detailed analysis of a vital theatrical era. The appendices, for example, contain records of foreign tours; notes on film distribution; a list of the plays produced in Moscow and Leningrad from 1917 to 1928; a list of Bolshevist authors and their plays for the same time period; and a critical series of notes on other books on the Russian and Soviet theatres published as of 1929.

"The primary aim of this book is to make an analysis and synthesis of the New Theatre. It also advances a thesis and uses the Russian Theatre to illustrate it. The thesis, simply put, is that the Theatre (the term includes the drama) when fulfilling its true vital function is an indispensable part of the social organism. And its popular function today is to interpret the new and practical sociology which is a feature of present day society."

The book is divided into four parts. Each part contributes to the metaphor of the Building Plan of the Theatre (which, the author explains, has nothing to do with architecture!) in order to trace its social purpose alongside a decade of Soviet history. Part I, The Planning of the Theatre, describes the theatre's utilitarian purpose and gathers the historical and modern materials used in 1917. Part II, Building The Theatre, is concerned with two developmental stages: theatre as a "fighting machine" and theatre as a "microcosm of the new social world of economic determinism." Lunacharsky, Meyerhold, Tairov, Granovski, and Stanislavsky, referred to as "The Big Five," are analyzed in their roles as builders. Twenty-five pages is given over to Meyerhold, including a good chronological outline of the influences on his work from 1898-1923. Part III, Completing The Theatre, 1923-23, essentially outlines the Bolshevist practical sociology as it was established in the works of "The Big Five," and the "Left Theatrical Organizations" (Theatre of the Revolution, Trade Union Dramatic Theatre, Mass Theatre, Living Newspapers). Finally, Part IV, The Complete Theatre, looks to the future and predicts a spiritual theatre with science as God. In this final section there are two chapters on cinema and radio which are called "the two auxiliaries."

Carter did not see the theatre's purpose (Soviet or otherwise) as aesthetic, but only as constructive. For him the Soviets had proved that the technical evolution from militancy to economic reconstruction was quickened and made successful by the forging of a new tool: Theatre--with a capital "T."

190. Carter, Huntly. The New Theatre and Cinema of Soviet Russia. New York: International Publishers, 1925. pp. 288. Illus.

The author states his purpose, which is to "analyze and synthesize the theatre which has been established in Soviet Russia since the Russian Revolution of 1917 and which is the direct outcome of that . . . event." The organizational scheme involves classifying the theatres of Russia in politically conceived divisions, termed Left (Revolutionary theatres, Proletcult theatre, Political Satire theatre, Club theatres, Theatre of Improvisation, Open Air, Street, and Mass Theatres); Centre (Moscow and Petrograd Theatre, Children's Theatre, Jewish and State-supported Progressive theatres); and Right (Old Bourgeois theatres, Moscow Art Theatre and Studios). These are further analyzed in relation to the dominating personalities (Meyerhold-Left, Lunacharsky-Centre, Stanislavsky-Right); and the varying roles of the actor in the new theatres.

I find it personally amusing that in this as in other early texts there is evidence of a determined effort to find passionate labels for movements and ideas. In Carter's book, for example, Meyerhold is called a "mystical anarchist," Lunacharsky a "cultural revolutionist," and Stanislavsky an "emotional insurrectionist."

The author, apparently struck with the magnitude and promise of the Soviet theatre, was intent on stimulating theatre people everywhere to pay closer attention to Soviet aesthetics and the theatre itself. Thus, the theme of theatre as social servant and as the people's tool rather than as a means of "acquisitive gain" is the thread of the text.

In addition to covering theatre, there is also a section on the development of the cinema.

Unfortunately, the reader is not provided with a bibliography, but Carter has included six very useful appendices. These include

transcripts and sections of statements by Lunacharsky; documents from the All-Russia Union of Art Workers; and of symposia held by the author in Russia. There is also a typical weekly theatrical poster and a list of the productions presented in Moscow and Petrograd from 1917 to 1923.

191. Dana, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Drama In Wartime Russia. New York: National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, 1943. pp. 48.

This is a kind of hands-across-the sea pamphlet, designed to indicate the nature of theatrical activity in wartime Russia, to glorify the efforts of the Soviet peoples, and to act as both a national and international tribute to the allied goals.

The seven short chapters are titled, "Soviet Theatre at War"; "From The Present To The Past"; "Moscow Theatres in the War"; "The Seige of Leningrad"; "In The Ukraine"; "A New Playwright"; and "The Theatre International."

Throughout the book, Dana describes the history of wartime performances in all the Russian conflicts and offers anecdotal accounts of the heroic performances of actors, singers, and dancers under fire.

The initial discussion of the wartime repertory is divided into three classifications: pre-World War II invasions of Russia; the Nazi invasion; and the invasion of Russia's allies and the goals of the war of liberation. The bulk of the material is devoted to the wartime relocation and operation of the theatres in Moscow, Leningrad, and the Ukraine. Some eighty to ninety plays are listed and/or discussed concerning the drama of the beseiged cities. The plays listed in the chapter on Moscow include Our Moscow, Girl From Moscow, Soul of Moscow, Sky of Moscow, Moscow Nights, The Battalion Goes West, and The Stars Cannot Fade. A similar chapter on Leningrad includes lengthier plot summaries for such works as The House on the Hill, Ruza Forest, The Smoke of the Fatherland, and The Citizen of Leningrad.

"In The Ukraine," illustrates the thematic development of the rescue workers and the guerilla fighters. Specific mention is made of the accomplishments of Alexander Korneichuk (author of Platon Krechet, and The Front), a dramatist who was a three-time Stalin Prize

winner and the Assistant People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs.

"The New Playwright," is a sketch of Constantine Simonov, who was a war hero and whose The Russian People was produced both by the Moscow Art Theatre and the New York Theatre Guild.

The text ends with a testament to Russia's efforts to defend an international culture. This is supposedly supported by the presence of the works of Shakespeare, contemporary British playwrights, and such Americans as Odets, Hellman, and O'Neill in the Soviet repertory.

192. Dana, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Handbook on Soviet Drama. New York: The American Russian Institute, 1938. pp. 158.

This book was prepared as a preliminary project for a longer illustrated book on Soviet drama. "It begins with an account of the different theatres in the Soviet Union and a bibliography of the books and articles about them and then proceeds to give accounts of new productions in the various fields of drama." The several sections deal with Theatres, Plays, Operas, Ballets, and Films. All of this is preceded by an introduction which elaborates upon and glorifies the contributions of the post-Revolutionary Soviet government to the already established tradition of the Russian theatre. Information is given under main classifications in each section and there are content descriptions of at least one line for every play, film, and ballet listed. The plays are also listed under categories such as "The Revolution," and "Reconstruction And Social Problems," with opening passages of commentary in each case. The specific articles and books listed in the handbook are not annotated. The author has used both Russian and American libraries for the compilation. The reader will find that most of the texts listed originated in Russia, while the periodical literature is primarily American. As a whole, the book is a very useful place to begin research for many aspects of the Soviet theatre.

193. Derjavine, Constantin N. A Century Of The State Dramatic Theatre, 1832-1932. Leningrad: Leningrad State Publishing House, 1932. pp. 120. Illus.

This small volume was issued as a centenary history of an Imperial theatre (the Alexandrinsky Theatre) which became a Soviet Academic theatre after the Revolution. The history of the theatre's repertory is broken down into many periods and analyzed to show changes in ideology from the time of the aristocracy to the solidifying of the socialist ideal. The essay reads like a history of the inevitable decay of bourgeois values and the rise of the proletariat, with the inclusion of the theatre's work as exemplification and documentation. Much of the introduction is about socialism, Russian history, and the allegiance of the theatre art to the construction of the classless society. Derjavine, relying on the plays themselves but sometimes alluding to scenic representation and acting style, traces the philosophy of the repertory from its initial dedication to "patriotic exploits of the heroes of an idealized Russian history" through democratic dramas of the Realist school, operetta, psychological conflict drama, ideological reactionism, plays of social relevance, and the emergence of a Soviet drama, to the depiction of a "struggle for the renascency of man on a basis of an individual and collective consciousness reconstructed by Revolution."

The text is accompanied by an attractive set of twenty engravings of plays produced at the State Dramatic Theatre over the one hundred year period.

194. Dickinson, Thomas H. The Theatre In A Changing Europe. London: Putnam, 1938. pp. 492. Illus.

I have avoided discussing sections in general history texts, as in most cases these represent basic adaptations of more primary sources. This book, however, is a collection of twelve chapters, each written by a separate author who was a specialist in his or her field. Although the chapters are still capsules, they reflect carefully chosen material and a trained point of view. In the case of the chapter on Russia, I believe the framework provided to be a solid one for study. Chapter

II, "The Russian Theatre," contains two sections. The first, "The Theatre of Soviet Russia," is by Joseph Gregor (whose other works including the huge survey The Russian Theatre are annotated in this paper), and the second section, "Note on the Development of Soviet Drama," is by H.W.L. Dana. The latter is not included in this annotation as it deals solely with the dramatic literature. Gregor's section contains some fifty-one pages and covers many topics, movements, individuals, productions, and play scripts. The basic theme is that of the determination of the Russian theatre's inner value for itself, for Europe, and for the world. The author traces the real theatrical revolution from its origins with the Moscow Art Theatre in 1897 through the changes in the early Soviet years into the 1930's. As indicated in the summation, the organization emphasizes the theatre as literature, the theatre as science, and the theatre as organization. Throughout, Gregor concerns himself with the effect of the October Revolution and socialist reconstruction on the poor quality of drama that followed. The following is a list of the topics and types of information the reader can expect to find in this section. (This is not an all-inclusive list but does highlight the points of interest.) Such information includes quotations from Tairov's address to the International Congress of the Royal Italian Academy in Rome on the "new social order" and the October Revolution; pre- and post-Revolution statistics on the number of theatres in Russia; quotations from Vakhtangov's diary relevant to formalism, Meyerhold, and Soviet Drama; Fülöp-Miller's description of the events of the public mass spectacle The Storming of the Winter Palace; samples of the plays performed between 1922 and 1929 at the Moscow Art Theatre, the Kamerny Theatre, the Theatre of the Red Army, the Dramatic Theatre, the Theatre of the Revolution, and the Jewish State Theatre; an outline of the ideology of the VZSPS (All Trade Union Theatre) in relation to doctrinnaire plays; and a discussion of the relationship between cultural and spiritual changes from 1900 to 1930 in Russia and the development of scenic art and theatrical architecture.

An appendix for the book as a whole but readable by specific country lists the related

and referred-to theatres and theatrical organizations, directors, artists and technicians, actors, dancers, playwrights, and chief plays of the period.

195. Flanagan, Hallie. Shifting Scenes of The Modern European Theatres. New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1928. pp. 280. Illus.

The eighty-page section on "Russian Theatre," entertainingly achieves an expression of the spirit and atmosphere of the twenties. Miss Flanagan communicates the vital quality of productions dedicated to the concept that "the audience is the play." She creates a Slavic feeling for a theatre that was religiously dedicated to the Revolution and the revolutionary. She balances this with a chapter on Stanislavsky, his own place in the Russian history, and his feelings at the time toward the conflict of the "old" and the "new" theatre. In addition, the author provides a contrast of the styles of the symbolically oriented Moscow Art Theatre II (also known as the First Studio) and the pure expressionism of the Kamerny Theatre. In handling the latter, there is a brief but interesting account of Tairov's concept of acting. The section concludes with a description of the characteristics of theatre in Leningrad and St. Petersburg.

196. Freeman, Joseph; Kunitz, Joshua; and Lozowick, Louis. Voices of October: Art and Literature in Soviet Russia. New York: The Vanguard Press, 1930. pp. 317. Illus.

The complete book is described as a "preliminary sketch . . . which outlines the leading tendencies." It was created at a time when the authors felt that, although there was ample material on Soviet sociological, social, and economic policy, the United States suffered from a noticeable lack of objective cultural and arts reporting on the occurrences since the 1917 Revolution. Chapter III, entitled "The Soviet Theatre," is written by Lozowick and Freeman and is some forty-two pages in length. Included are brief sketches of the Academic Theatres; the Moscow Art Theatre; Vakhtangov's Theatre; The Jewish Kamerny Theatre; Tairov's Kamerny Theatre; Meyerhold (the most heavily emphasized figure in the chapter); the Little Theatre; the Proletcult Movement; the Theatre

of the Moscow Trade Unions (MGSPS); Peasant theatres; marionette shows; and Children's Theatre.

197. Fülöp-Miller, René, and Gregor, Joseph. The Russian Theatre. Translated by P. England. London: Lippincott, 1930. pp. 384. Illus.

One of the unique aspects of this book is that it contains four hundred illustrations. The illustrations are divided into fourteen picturial sections, covering theatres, movements, and personalities. The text is divided into a discussion of the social context of the Russian theatre from the late nineteenth century through the beginning of the Revolution, and "an analysis of the methods of artistic representation." The latter includes the development of theatre buildings, production design, acting techniques, etc. The text and illustrations combine to offer a highly comprehensive and clearly written source work. For an interesting critical reaction to the book and the qualifications of its authors, the reader is directed to an article by Huntly Carter entitled "A New Principle in Play Production: The Classics in the Russian Theatre of Today." (See entry number 75.)

198. Gorchakov, Nikolai A. The Theater in Soviet Russia. Translated by Edgar E. Lehrman. Edited by Ernest J. Simmons. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957. pp. 480. Illus.

Nikolai Gorchakov was a former Soviet actor, and, more importantly, a directorial assistant to both Vsevolod Meyerhold and Alexander Tairov. This book is both an attack on the Bolshevik manipulation and destruction of Russian theatre and an attempt to provide the kind of historical account and objective study that could not (according to the author) be created in the Soviet Union. Indeed, this book was the first and remains the most complete and authoritative study of the Russian and Soviet theatre written in English outside the U.S.S.R.

The wealth of material is structured by a definite set of objectives. The developments of the Soviet theatre are studied in relation to the trends, ideas, and innovations of the pre-Revolutionary Golden Age and the systematic enslavement of the theatre; in comparison to the Party policy view of historical research;

and as a reflection of the prolonged resistance of the Russian artists to bolshevism. The first four sections of the text deal with the nineteenth century and pre-Revolutionary theatre; the role of the theatre in the first ten years after the Revolution; the fight to avoid Party restrictions of the theatre's aims in the second decade; and, finally, "The Tragic Ending," in terms of creative freedom and innovation during the Stalin years. The material on Stanislavsky, Meyerhold, and Tairov provides an excellent analysis of style and methodology. As a whole, the pre-twenties section on the "great innovators" in thorough and exciting.

The author also provides a play synopsis and discussion of production and social ramifications for almost every important play written and performed during the period covered by the text. The bibliography contains one hundred entries of books and articles, but all of the sources cited are in Russian. If there is any drawback to this volume, it is perhaps the abundance of philosophizing, though in a book dedicated to revealing the subjugation of an art to a dictatorship this may be unavoidable.

199. Holme, Charles G. Art in the U.S.S.R.: Architecture, Sculpture, Painting, Graphic Arts, Theatre, Films, Crafts. New York, London: The Studio Publications, Inc., 1935. pp. 137. Illus.

As the title reveals, this volume concerns more than theatre. This entry is concerned with pages 87-94 comprising an illustrated text by J. M. Nikonov, and with an additional and most welcome fifteen-page photo album containing thirty illustrations of plays done at the Kamerny Theatre, the Meyerhold Theatre, the Vakhtangov Theatre, the Moscow Art Theatre, the Moscow Trade Union Theatre, the Moscow Theatre For Children, and others. The article describes the theatre since the Revolution, and is quick to state that the pursuit of socialist realism has not prevented a variety of trends in staging. Nikonov cites the work of Tairov and Meyerhold as proof of this variety. The illustrations contain designs by such as Golovin, Ryndin, Tishler, Rabinovitch, and Favorsky.

200. Houghton, Norris. Moscow Rehearsals: An Account of Methods of Production in the Soviet Theatre. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1936. pp. 291. Illus.

"Being neither critic nor historian, I have attempted to make a record of the Soviet theatre not externally from the standpoint of an observer and a recorder of effects, but internally through the eyes of a participating craftsman."

Houghton enjoyed the theatre and scrutinized its practices. His study was limited to Moscow but at a time when there were forty professional theatres operating, and more than that number of playhouses in the city. The author's observations are analytical, internally comparative, and while objective, highly appreciative of the events witnessed. Houghton sees the effects of the performances on the viewer without a bias to protect but with a professional and a trained curiosity. Until the appearance of Gorchakov's book (see entry number 198), this was the best single source in English.

The content of the text is helpful in the study of specific movements and individuals. In early chapters the author relates the construction and operation of the Kamerny, Maly, and Meyerhold technicums for teaching acting and compares these operations with the Stanislavsky system. In the case of the latter, he discusses physical development, relaxation, concentration, actor contact, development of imagination, emotional recall, rhythm, and the "grain of the role." Perhaps the most informative sections, both for their content and for the effect of the material on the author, are those that deal with the directors. Meyerhold, Tairov, Vakhtangov, and Okhlopkov's approaches are defined and compared. In relating Meyerhold to Stanislavsky, he writes, "Meierhold's adventure into art has been solitary; where he is gone there will be no one to succeed him. His contribution was that of producing the impetus to theatrical revolution and it is a contribution which has been completed." This was most certainly true in comparison with the collective efforts and the results of the Moscow Art Theatre, but it would be interesting to analyze this statement in relation to the succession of ideas and the revolt against naturalistic form in other countries in the

decades following. The text attempts to pinpoint the specific differences in each man. Houghton comments on the "theatre theatrical" approach of Tairov; Vakhtangov's translation of Russia's theatrical heritage into the concept of the Soviet stage; and Okhlopkov's merger of the spectator and the actor.

The remaining segments deal with design, playwriting, and the future of the Russian theatre. Analyzing conception versus execution in design, the text covers constructivism, naturalism, formalism, and the eclecticism of socialist realism. The chapter on playwriting makes a point which has remained of primary interest. On the one hand, Houghton writes that "when we come to playwriting we have reached the low point of the Moscow theatre." Later, though referring to more than just the literature, he writes that the Soviet theatre was made great by converting propaganda into art. "What the mourners for the lost freedom of expression in Soviet Russia fail to realize is that life as the Soviet artist sees it is the realistic life of the Communist State. So far as the liveliness of its art is concerned, the Soviet theatre is neither the better nor the worse for its government control." I often wonder if the directors, actors, designers, and innovators of the Russian theatre were not in part spurred to their creativity and experimentation by the very absence of art in the literature. It is valuable to compare the just-quoted statement with the theme and mood of Houghton's "postscript," Return Engagement, which was written in 1962 (see entry number 201).

Finally, in addition to an interesting and clear style, the generous helping of anecdotes and theatre-goer's reactions makes this a highly readable book.

201. Houghton, Norris. Return Engagement: A Postscript to "Moscow Rehearsals". New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962. pp. 214. Illus.

Return Engagement is the result of a three-month visit to Moscow made some twenty-five years after the voyage that produced Moscow Rehearsals. As before, the author concentrates on the "life, training, and the work of the artists in the dramatic theatre." Houghton is quick to caution the reader to make comparisons on the basis of the realization

that the author has undergone as much or more change as has the subject matter.

The book is indeed a postscript, and it is most beneficial for the reader to digest these volumes sequentially. The underlying theme of this book is that the Soviet theatre has failed to make any progress in the intervening quarter of a century because the Russians could not subscribe to a belief in the freedom of expression. Houghton again turns to the playwrights and says that "Of all the artists of the Soviet theatre, its dramatists make the least distinguished contribution." I refer my reader to a quotation on freedom of expression in my annotation of Moscow Rehearsals (see entry number 200), and ask that it be compared to the following one, from the chapter "Plays and Playwrights Today," in Return Engagement: "If then I am persuaded that writers, like the public at large, are committed to communism, how can I attribute the inferiority of contemporary dramatic output to a lack of freedom? My answer is that dialectical materialism seems to me to impose a narrowness upon one's vision of man and of life that thwarts the creative spirit. The will to conform is alien to the will to conceive. In yielding his freedom to an omnicient state, even voluntarily or unconsciously, an artist forfeits one of the surest wellsprings of his creativity. I am convinced that this is the reason why in all the arts communism has produced so few great figures."

Houghton revisits in theory and activity the Meyerhold, Vakhtangov, Okhlopkov, and Moscow Art Theatre traditions. He again compares them to each other and to their directions in the early 1930's. In relation to then and now, there is coverage of five training institutes --those attached to the Maly (Shchepkin School), to the Moscow Art Theatre (Nemirovich-Danchenko School), to the Vakhtangov Theatre (the Shchukin School), to the Central Children's Theatre, and to the State Institute of Theatre Arts.

By accident, Houghton also revisited the world of Natalia Satz. There is a fascinating account of his meeting her in a theatre audience after believing her to be dead for many years. The comment on her exile from and subsequent return to Moscow is not only an interesting sidenote but an insight into the Stalin years and the "thaw" that followed his death.

The author is careful to point out those advances made by the Russians in the early part of the century which, even without continued progress, are still advances over the rest of the world's theatre. Specifically, he treats the view of the theatre person as an honored member of the society; the ongoing analysis of the creative process; and the Russian theatrical ability to represent the past as relevant to the present.

202. Ivanov, E. G., ed. Sovetskij Teatr (Soviet Theatre). Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Iskusstvo, 1966. Unpaged. Illus.

Soviet Theatre is a small special issue pictorial magazine which illustrates the development of the Russian theatre from 1922 to 1965. The illustrations are grouped under the following headings: "Plays By Soviet Playwrights," Classics of the Peoples of the USSR on the Soviet Stage," "World Classics On The Soviet Stage," "Modern Plays By Foreign Playwrights On The Soviet Stage," "Juvenile Theatres," "Puppet Theatres," "Opera," "Ballet," "Operetta," and "Amateur Theatres." Captions for each are printed in Russian, French, and English, but only the Russian titles are found on the same page as the photos. In addition, there is an article (also in translation) accompanying the photos, by V. Komissarzhevskii. It is an overview of the glories and accomplishments of the Russian theatre, dealing with specific plays, productions, and individuals for each decade. The article briefly summarizes major occurrences in children's theatre, ballet, and opera as well. The writing is part of a showpiece and thus is protective and not very self-critical. Meyerhold, for example, is treated as an eccentric genius who "himself was very critical of his work and often warned his pupils against repeating his mistakes." I personally found the photographs themselves informative and enjoyable to view. The historian as well as the designer can benefit from a look at the stage pictures, designs, and styles of presentation.

203. Jelagin, Juri. Taming of the Arts. Translated by Nicholas Wreden. New York: Dutton, 1951. pp. 333.

Taming of the Arts is a compilation of observances and experiences by a once imprisoned and disenfranchised musician who

became a member of the Vakhtangov Company. He writes, based on his experiences, of the condition of theatre and music in the decade from 1930-1940. "The true significance of what has happened to art in Soviet Russia during that fateful decade is tragic, yet the reader might find much that will seem odd, ridiculous, and absurd."

By and large, the author's writings are anecdotal but allegedly factual sequences about the suffering of individual personalities. These portraits include such people as Shostakovich, Bulgakov, Tolstoy, and Dmitri Dorliac. The most valuable for our purposes is a report on Vsevolod Meyerhold. Yelagin provides an outline of Meyerhold's work in Russia and his productions and notable techniques. This leads up to a description of the conditions surrounding the liquidation of the great director's theatre and his own downfall. The chapter ends with an extensive quotation from the speech Meyerhold supposedly made to the First Convention of Theatrical Directors, a speech that prompted his imprisonment in June of 1939. The truth of this speech and other material in the text has been challenged by Eric Braun in his edition of Meyerhold On Theatre (see entry number 115).

Using the Vakhtangov Company as an example, Yelagin writes at length on the personal comforts, privileges, and excellent working and living conditions provided by the government for artists who complied with the Party wishes in the 1930's. The theatre was regarded as a mediator of social conflicts as well as a tool for education and internal propaganda. Consequently, the government marshalled all resources in order to guarantee contentment and high quality.

Most of the remaining material attempts to explain the effects of Stalin's programs and the "Yezhov terror" on the alteration and destruction of form and content in the Russian theatre. This includes an illustration of the functions of the various committees on art; the censorship practices; the process of merging theatres so as to phase out one or the other completely; and the nationalization of artistic style in the form of socialist realism.

204. Johnson, Priscilla. Kruschev And The Arts: The Politics of Soviet Culture, 1962-64. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1965. pp. 300.

There is no way to study the history of the Russian theatre in the twentieth century without being aware of the role of government interference and censorship in the arts. Nonetheless, if one reads a great deal about the Soviet theatre, it is possible to pass over the government's role and the concerns of the Soviet doctrine as a given and become more engrossed in the scope of the national theatre in Russia, the enormous financial and public support, and the resiliency of individual practitioners. What we read of the Soviet efforts in the last twenty years, from Russian reviewers and reporters and an occasional Western observer, carries with it the impression of great activity, a recovery from the Stalin years, and some loosening up as to the variety of style permitted by socialist realism. Priscilla Johnson's book, though containing less than a page on the theatre specifically, gives an excellent and well-documented account of the destructive and stultifying effects of Soviet politics on the Soviet culture as a whole. Censorship does not begin with the October Revolution (Stanislavsky knew difficulties in coping with the Czar's ministers), but the Soviet method of control, in the hands of the early Party bureaucrats, in the events of the Stalin thirties, in the boorishness and ambiguity of the Kruschev years, and in the more recent persecutions of "pro-Western" writers, is a fertile and permanent characteristic of what that event has wrought for intellectuals and artists. Kruschev And The Arts deals with a period from 1962 to 1964 and the effects of the de-Stalinization program on painting, sculpture, and literature. The first eighty-nine pages chronicle and interpret the developments and identify the protagonists. The remainder of the text is composed of translations of the literature, reviews, and plenary session speeches which exemplify and summarize the controversy. This is an important book which should be used as a filter and as a guide to the possibilities and limitations for art in Soviet Russia.

205. Komissarzhevskii, Viktor Grigorevich. Moscow Theatres. Translated by Vic Schneierson and W. Perelman. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959. pp. 219. Illus.

Books or articles on the Russian theatre by Russian authors often appear to be overbearingly propagandistic and self-aggrandizing. Nonetheless, they still provide an insight into the national purpose, and with a careful reading will reveal those movements and individuals of special concern. Komissarzhevskii's text, a capsule history of the first forty years of the Soviet theatre, is accompanied by an extensive photo outlay of production highlights for theatre, opera, and ballet.

The author fails in his few attempts at critical objectivity. Nothing can be permitted to appear all bad. The text is riddled with balanced statements--giving with one phrase and taking away with the next. Still, these statements are road signs to aesthetic questions and developments too well known internationally to be passed over, but too debatable as to the wisdom of their resolutions to be viewed objectively. The following is an insignificant but humorous example of the frequent "double talk": Komissarzhevskii, in writing about the American Everyman Opera Company's presentation of Porgy and Bess, states, "Although some of the naturalistic and expressionistic aspects of 'Porgy and Bess' reminiscent of some of the experiments of the early Soviet stage were alien to us, we could not help appreciating the parts in which the profoundly human folkart was in the forefront." Truman Capote, who accompanied the cast and was present at its opening performances in Moscow, wrote in his anecdotal account of the trip The Muses Are Heard that the Russians were virtually shocked into aphonia by the physical handling of human bodies, and that it was less the idea of folkart than seeing a band of Negroes which aroused interest.

Rather than criticize the obvious literary drawbacks to socialist realism, Komissarzhevskii writes that the "stage people misinterpreted the tasks of the struggle against formalist art." Unable to justify the effect of Stalin's regime on a once vital theatre, he condemns those few who created a "Stalin personality cult" and reduced the literary hero to a "cachectic state."

Regardless of the textual limitations I would highly recommend this book for its visual offering. The costumer, the designer, and anyone trying to capture more than an observer's reminiscences of past productions will find it valuable and exciting to see a glimpse of the work of the Moscow theatres. There are well over two hundred and fifty photographs and drawings of scenes, performers, designs, and notable productions. The text and captions include background on the shows, directors, and some fifteen theatres of the then thirty theatres operating in Moscow. The following list indicates the theatres whose repertories are represented: Bolshoi, Maly, Moscow Art Theatre, Vakhtangov Theatre, Mayakovsky Theatre, Central Soviet Army Theatre, the Mossoviet, the Central Puppet Theatre, Central Children's Theatre, and the Yermolova and Komsomol Theatres.

206. Kommissarzhevskii, Fedor F. Myself and the Theatre. New York: Dutton, 1930. pp. 205. Illus.

Myself and the Theatre is a fast-moving account of Kommissarzhevskii's personal experiences in the Russian theatre before and just after the Revolution and of his work in America and England. In many ways, the book is a multi-page complaint against the physical poverty of the theatre and the limitations of personal freedom that resulted from the Revolution. The author was equally disturbed by the "star system" conditions he encountered in Europe and America when he fled his native country. Although colored by the family tie and personal pride, Kommissarzhevskii provides an interesting description of his famous actor sister Vera and her theatre, in which Meyerhold worked for more than two years. Finally, there is also an explanation of the author's personal philosophy of production, which he calls "Synthetic Theatre."

207. London, Kurt. The Seven Soviet Arts. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938. pp. 381. Illus.

This book accepts much of the greatness of Russian art as reported by journalists and critics writing in the late twenties and early thirties, but is strongly aware of how movements in the latter years tended to destroy and sterilize all creative effort. Covering the "seven Soviet arts," London illustrates

how the dictatorship of a socialist bureacracy produced a violent cultural clash. The subject areas encompass music, literature, theatre, film, radio, opera, ballet, children's theatre, fashion, and architecture.

The text is divided into five parts and an epilogue. Part One provides the framework for the government's concept of how art should be developed, encouraged, and controlled. Chapters in this section discuss the developments leading up to the tight structure of the thirties; the function of the C. A. C. as a control and as an administrator; and the construction of the individual specialist associations--"the pillars on which the central committee rests."

Part Two, entitled "The Artistic Principles of the Stalin Regime," describes the clash between the new revolutionary political ideas and the stylistic principles of art. Essentially, the reader gets a translation of the argument over socialist realism versus formalism in terms of form and content, Western artistic ideas, and the revolutionary analysis of beauty in art as determined by the Lenin-Marx-Engels aesthetic. In the chapter on theatre of Part Three, "The Traditional Arts," the author dwells on the effects of the cultural organization on theatre as of 1936. The handling of movements and individuals is interesting in that London rates Tairov over Meyerhold and Stanislavsky and consequently deals with Tairov's work at some length. He includes a quotation from a personal conversation with Tairov in which the director states his views on synthetic theatre, socialist realism, and his own goals. There are also illuminating quotations from articles in Izvestia and Pravda stating the Party line on socialist realism and such "radicals" as Tairov. This chapter also manages to cover a report on the curriculum of the acting school of the Lunacharsky Institute and the types of acting exercises being used. In Part Five, on Children's Theatre, the author pays homage to the creative genius of Natalia Satz and presents a valuable personal statement in which Satz talks about the work done in the Moscow Children's Theatre.

Overall, the book is filled with interesting and documented material, but the reader will detect some confusion between what the author favors in the Soviet theatre and what he dislikes about the Soviet government.

208. Macleod, Joseph. Actors Across The Volga: A Study of the Nineteenth Century Russian Theatre and of Soviet Theatres in War. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1946. pp. 359. Illus.

Basically, this is a study of the Soviet theatres during World War II, with a preparatory partial historical background. The book is divided into five parts. The first two parts deal with the people and events of Russian theatre, including the serf theatres; the influences of France and Germany; the first private and court theatres; the strolling and touring players; and the provincial repertories The text is very anecdotal, but a good source of many small details, and contains such references as lists of early theatres, managers, and actors. The summary for this whole period is rather general, as is most of the critical appraisal of movements and ideas. The author tends to admire rather than to analyze. "At first all was static; and there were slave theatres. Then the localities woke up, with free and expert players gradually winning the people of the neighborhood to come to the theatre. A freer flow of people, now from place to place; but all is still very quiet in the landscape. . . . A place to admire the skill of the performer, not a place in which to find the truth. . . ."

The third and fourth sections cover the functions and movements of the Soviet theatres during the war. This thorough compilation deals with the groups performing at the front (the Vakhtangov Theatre, the Central Theatre of the Red Army, the troupes of the Navy fleet) and the relocating improvising organizations at home. So extensive was the war program at home that T.A.S.S. reported 800,000 performances at the front by 1945. Macleod covers the types of drama performed, puppet shows, circuses, and operas.

The final section encompasses the efforts made to use the theatre to strengthen the culture in war-time; to keep up the heritage; and to prepare, via socialist realism, for the rebuilding of the state. The author deals with the production of Russian classical works and Shakespeare; and with the international productions given to represent Spain, Italy, France, Germany, Scandanavia, the U.S.A., and Britain. In total, the book is valuable for its accumulation of data on the Soviet theatre during the war.

209. Macleod, Joseph. The New Soviet Theatre. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1943. pp. 242. Illus.

The "new" stands for the origins and influences of socialist realism, and the text is dedicated to showing its effects. The reader should be cautioned that Macleod not only discusses the movement but embraces it. The book is filled with data on production, and although most of the facts and statistics are faithful to their sources, the subsequent conclusions that are drawn are questionable. The following quotation from the first chapter will illustrate the author's purpose and methodology. The last line of the quotation leads one to question generalizations, in some cases based on productions not personally witnessed. "There are many books and articles about the Soviet theatre in its revolutionary period, the exciting terseness of the Proletcult, the dynamism of Meyerhold, and all those other frenzied theatre Solons who codified theatre laws for newly freed townslolk. There are many books and articles about the aesthetic delights of the formalist period, when abstract sets worthy of Leger or Braque, when strange chaos of bits and pieces used to frame behind dessicated units of humanity the collectivism of the crowd. But I know of no book since Norris Houghton's Moscow Rehearsals which even alludes to the fading of these ideas from the Soviet stage, certainly none which gives any detailed account of the astonishing tasks it has undertaken instead; and Houghton, though his book was published here in 1938, wrote of what he had seen in 1935. So I have pieced together from scattered articles and reports, from books and bulletins, and from what I know of the Russian theatre, and the U.S.S.R. in general, a picture of what I believe to be, though scrappy and limited, at any rate accurate in detail and correct in perspective."

The second chapter is dedicated to showing both what socialist realism is and what it is not in theory and on the stage. " . . . the representation must not be untrue, either to present to-day's fact or to the facts of the past; but it must express that truth in such terms that the worker audience of today gets a perspective of either the Socialism it is helping to build or of the factors of the past out of which that Socialism has come." The following six chapters analyze how this method

was adapted for a variety of national audiences in the Soviet Union including those in the areas of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Uzbekistan, Tadjikstan, Kirghizia, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, and the Arctic Circle. In each case an encyclopedia-like capsule is given about the people, land conditions, industry, customs, and the industrial leaps made under Communism. The author also illustrates how rural theatres were organized; how instruction and materials were gotten to outlying areas; and the procedure for touring employed by the companies and cells from the Maly, Moscow, and Leningrad Central Theatres. Chapter Six, entitled "Special Audiences" concentrates on the collective farms, on children, and on the subnational groups--Jews and Gypsies. Chapter Ten, "New Socialist Audiences," covers the minority audiences of the "liberated lands"--the Byelorussians and the Ukranians. For a completely different view of the effects of sovietization on the national republic and minority cultures, the reader is urged to read Vladimir Seduro's book, The Byelorussian Theatre And Drama (see entry number 166).

I would like to call attention to two references to activity in Children's Theatre which illustrate my earlier point about the author's bias and the questionable reliability of his observations. Mr. Macleod dedicates about ten lines to the work of Natalia Satz, whom he passes off as a secondary Meyerhold and who he accuses of presenting simpleminded, one-sided portraits of good buys and bad guys. Though her penchant for narrowminded propaganda can be borne out by the literature she wrote and produced at the Moscow Theatre For Children, his dismissal of her work and allusion to her removal in 1937 as probably the result of a limited ability fails to take into account the other observations and writings on the ingenuity and creativeness of her productions and total theatre approach to Children's Theatre. Norris Houghton, in Return Engagement, states that the source of Miss Satz's removal most likely had nothing to do with her theatrical abilities, but most probably with familial political ties. In another section, Macleod writes of Evgeny Shvarts' The Shadow as a good example of the effect of socialist realism on children's plays and fairy tales, and he cites the production done by Akimov in 1940 at the Leningrad Comedy

Theatre. However, The Shadow has been called "a profoundly shocking comedy or modern satire on social manners" by F. D. Reeve, and history tells us that the production was removed by the government from the Leningrad's repertory almost immediately after its first showing. These are only two examples of material the reader is urged to question.

Chapter Eight, "The Central Theatres of Moscow and Leningrad: Left Wing," represents the dissection and burial of the "abstract formalists" such as Tairov and Meyerhold. Whether or not this discussion is one-sided and whether or not one agrees with the logic or theatrical values under consideration, the text provides an insight into the specific arguments that were used to advance socialist realism and to urge the termination of "formalist experiments."

Using Okhlopkov as an example of experimentation that was "realistic" and socialist in its ideology, the author writes that " . . . when his productions were 'queer' it was the outcome of a logical process based not on theory like Meyerhold's but on a study of the individuality of the play in question and reflection about the best way to communicate it to the audience."

Chapter Nine reinvestigates the older traditional theatres--the Maly, Alexandrinsky, and the Moscow Art--and through a discussion of the production records attempts to demonstrate how they found their say and naturally embraced socialist realism. "It will be seen that Socialist Realism was never really very far from the Art Theatre's methods; one might also way it was the theatre's predestined mode, the only line it could take, yet only when Socialism was being achieved." The Moscow Art Theatre productions covered include Yegor Bulychov, Earth, Wit Works Woe, Tartuffe, and The Three Sisters.

Macleod also makes projections concerning figures whose work in the thirties indicated to him their probable prominence. Chapter Ten is devoted to Alexey Popov, head of the Theatre of the Red Army. An extensive analysis of his production of Taming of the Shrew is offered as an exegetical example of how socialist realism works with period drama. The following chapter deals with Radlov, Zavadsky, and Akimov (considered a formalist designer, but a social realist producer).

The final three chapters deal specifically with the literature: "New Writers and New Plays"; "A New Attitude Toward The Classics"; and "Shakespeare on the Soviet Stage." These chapters are heavy with information, but the organization is weak and at times confusing.

At the conclusion of the text, Macleod provides two appendices. The first is a description and presentation of statistics relevant to the building plan of the Central Theatre of the Red Army. At the time, this was a new building and aroused interest for its external shape (that of the Red Star), its interior decahedron stage plan, and its irregular hexagonal auditorium. (The Frontispiece for this book is a groundplan for the theatre.) The second appendix, entitled "The Debt of the National Republics to Stalin," is a tribute to the "vision and determination of Stalin," to whom the author attributes the Soviet Union's "strength and solidarity" in the 1940's. It is basically a reproduction of brief texts such as the "Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia." History has shown that Stalin's regime and the practice of socialist realism did not bring about the brave new world of theatre and dramatic literature that Macleod foresaw.

210. Markov, Pavel. The Soviet Theatre. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1935. pp. 176. Illus.

In approaching this book, one must strongly consider the source. Pavel Markov, aside from being the literary critic for the Moscow Art Theatre, was also the drama critic for Pravda, Izvestia, and Novy Mir. The publisher, in a prefatory note, tells the reader that most works on Russia are by visitors and that consequently "the lack of really precise and definite information has been as noticeable as the plethora of impressions." We are led to believe that this book is the real "how" of theatre in post-Revolutionary Russia. My predominant feeling upon finishing the book, however, was that the subject of theatre was an excuse for one hundred and seventy pages of hornblowing and flagwaving. Responsibility to the masses; theatre as the battlefield of the class war; the training ground of the socialist citizen; and the auditorium as the rallying place of the masses are phrases

indicative of most of the material throughout the text. They also reflect much of the basis for aesthetic judgment and the evaluation of theatrical trends both in Russia and internationally. In the last chapter, Markov writes " . . . one of the chief things about the work of the Soviet theatre is that it strives not merely to represent but to change the world." In addition, he writes " . . . under the Second Five Year Plan the theatre has been assigned the task of transforming the individual and bringing up the citizens of the socialist state."

Somehow, with typical Party-line logic, Markov manages to reconcile the diverse elements of the Vakhtangov, the Moscow Art, and the Meyerholdian approaches with the developing tenets of socialist realism. He somehow depicts the variety of Russian artists as struggling to find the truth in theatrical expression, and reports that most of them are headed in the right direction. Furthermore, he congratulates the Moscow Art Theatre for overcoming its pre-Revolutionary uselessness, and lauds Meyerhold as the "Shakespeare of Modern Russia." He considers Meyerhold and Stanislavsky as the main influences in the life of the post-Revolutionary Soviet theatre.

In addition, the book covers a variety of other theatres and artists, non-professional groups, and such special events as the open-air Mass Spectacles. I was impressed by his account of the progressive staging and audience involvement in use for children's theatre.

Although there is an obvious bias to this text, it is reasonable to assume that it closely reflects the thinking of the People's Commissariat of Education (then the regulating government agency for the national Soviet theatre) and is therefore quite worth reading.

211. Miller, Anna Irene. The Independent Theatre in Europe: 1887 to the Present. New York: Ray Long and Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1931. pp. 430.

The eighth chapter of this book is entitled "The Moscow Art Theatre and The Soviet Theatre of Russia." The latter half of the title stands for a survey of the experimental or "advanced playhouses" of Moscow. The material provides an overview and comparison of the developments in the conservative and radical theatres, but there is detailed information on the types of plays and styles of

production, particularly in such as the Kamerny and Kommissarzhevsky theatres. Miller begins with a biographical sketch of Danchenko and Stanislavsky and leads into the formation and evolution of the Moscow Art Theatre. The first section includes the goals, purposes and techniques of the company, and touches on the physical plant, training, foreign tours, and the production of the works of such playwrights as Chekhov, Gorky, Ibsen, and Hauptmann. In the second half, the author concentrates on illustrating the work of Meyerhold, Tairov, and Baliev. She also includes an explanation of Evreinov's monodrama. An interesting note is a reference to constructivism and biomechanics as developments in some part due to the Soviet economy, availability of materials, and the national attitude toward physical training.

212. Morozov, Mikhail M. Shakespeare on the Soviet Stage. Translated by David Magarshack. London: Soviet News, 1947. pp. 71. Illus.

This slim volume is dedicated to the symbiotic relationship between the Soviet Shakespearean scholar and the performer. The stage is considered the proper and necessary laboratory for literary analysis, and the audience, the final interpreters. Morozov was a Shakespearean scholar and professor at Moscow University, and, in addition to providing translations, he worked with actors and directors all over Russia in the mounting of new productions. His text contains a sizeable amount of information on the history of Shakespearean scholarship, translation, and stage production in Russia from 1748 to 1947. If anything is to be criticized, it is not the text's approach but what appears to be the national approach to Shakespeare. Productions seem to be less concerned with modern questions of universal relevance than with the necessity to make these plays grist for the socialist mill. Although there is continued emphasis upon the Soviet people's intuitive response to Shakespeare's greatness, the criticism and the production concepts are aimed at relating the Renaissance to the Revolution, Shakespeare to the collective, and plays such as Macbeth to the war effort.

The five chapters deal with the history of translation and production before the twentieth century; the important modern Russian

translators (Pasternak, Marshak, Shchepkina-Kupernik); the production record for the tragedies (Othello, King Lear, Hamlet, and Romeo and Juliet); the production record for the comedies (Taming of the Shrew, As You Like It, Comedy of Errors, Twelfth Night, and Much Ado About Nothing); the organization of Shakespearean research; the dissemination of materials and aid to the production groups; and Shakespeare at the Front. In addition to the material on the more well-known productions, Morozov utilizes an intimate knowledge of the work done throughout the national provinces. He makes an effort to contrast and compare the distinctive examples of the most frequently produced of Shakespeare's plays in Russia.

213. The Moscow Kamerny Theatre. Moscow: Intourist, 1934. pp. 20. Illus.

This is basically a photograph album of past productions with an introductory essay. Only the essay pages are numbered, but the text is accompanied by twenty-eight pages of sepia illustrations. The following is a list of the productions depicted (except where indicated, the names in parentheses are those of the designers): Sakuntala (Kuznetsov); The Merry Wives of Windsor (Lentulov); Salomé, Adrienne Lecouvreur, King Harlequin (Ferdinandov-costumer); Princess Brambilla (Yakulov); Romeo and Juliet (Exter); Annunciation (Vesnin); Phèdre (Vesnin); Giroflé-Girofla (Yakulov); Storm, Desire Under The Elms; Day and Night; Sirocco; Antigone (Naumov); All God's Chillun Got Wings (V. & G. Stenberg); Machinal (Ryndin); The Optimistic Tragedy (Ryndin); Egyptian Nights (Ryndin); No Surrender (Tatlin).

The essay provides a variety of information on different aspects of Tairov's operation. The author explains the director's philosophy of Synthetic Theatre and discusses how it affected the scope and variety of the repertory, and, in turn the range of the actors. A list of the company's first fifty-two productions is provided, complete with a breakdown as to style and international origins. In keeping with the international theme, an extensive series of quotations from the foreign press on the Kamerny's world tours of Europe and the Americas is offered, including the plaudits of Eugene O'Neill, Luigi Prolovorno, Leopold Hessner, Firmin Gémier, and others.

From the Soviet point of view, Tairov's early work was socially irrelevant and formalistic. He was believed to have begun a transition period with the production of some of the works of O'Neill (Desire Under The Elms, All God's Chillun Got Wings), and to have finally "arrived" with his production, in 1933, of Vishnevsky's The Optimistic Tragedy. A section of the essay deals with this important production.

214. Moskovin, I. The Soviet Theatre. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1939. pp. 32. Illus.

"All I have attempted is to give the most prominent features of one of the most significant developments in world culture--the Soviet theatre." This is a pamphlet-type publication, written by an actor from the Moscow Art Theatre, aimed at exportation and at informing the world's uninitiated as to the scope of the Soviet enterprise. Most of the material is composed of statistics, but there is some textual discussion of the growth of theatrical activity in the national republics; the repertory of the provincial theatres; touring operations; children's theatres; amateur productions; and professional companies in the cities. The reader will find many articles through the years reporting on numbers of theatres, size of audience, number of plays performed, and similar areas of status information. It would be wise to compare the data in a number of these articles within a specific time period in order to obtain a broader and more reliable idea of the actual growth patterns and emphasis.

215. Ruhle, Jurgen. "The Soviet Theater." Russia Under Kruschev. Edited by Abraham Brumberg. New York: Praeger, 1962. pp. 489-528.

The business of reading history is often confusing and frustrating. Theatre history, when it deals with the events themselves, is hearsay and a slave to the subjective perceptions of the viewer. The human factor is often complicated by translation and, in the case of the Russian theatre history, the difficulty is compounded by scattering of records, by intrigue, fear and capricious ideological shifts. In much of the material in English, translation or otherwise, the basic outline of

events is often repeated, but the specific details show incredible variety. It would seem that one can say anything about the Russian-Soviet theatre, and indeed, the complexity and dynamics of experimentation throughout the first two decades of the 1900's makes the interrelationships and shifts of style and form very difficult to trace and isolate. I have read of everything from Stanislavsky actor-coaching a horse to three separate accounts of Meyerhold's disappearance. Frequently, owing to a personal disbelief in repeated patterns of superlatives or strongly conflicting reports, I have cautioned the reader against being overly influenced by the sheer amount of theatrical activity. Within this volume is an article entitled "The Soviet Theater," by Jurgen Ruhle. It is for all of the above reasons that I lay out the ground rules for reading this article. The author was for six years an art editor and theatre critic in East Germany before gaining political asylum in the West in 1955. This article appears in an anthology consisting of selections from Problems of Communism, a bi-monthly journal published by the United States Information Agency. Given these conditions, in an article highly critical of the Soviet theatre, one must expect exhaustive care and documentation. Many of the hypotheses advanced and sources quoted are not substantiated in such a way. While I agree with the arguments this article presents, I am not satisfied with the approach. I have provided such an extensive preface to the annotation because I believe that the reader can learn something about Russian as well as non-Russian research in Soviet theatre history from this piece and its place in the general literature.

"Historians of the Soviet theatre of the 1920's advance two opposing theses: One school says that the brilliant artistry of the theater in that early period of the Soviet Union was but an afterglow of the Silver Age that preceded the Revolution, that the Bolsheviks simply had not yet had time to liquidate the Russian theater; the other school holds that the Soviet theater of the 1920's was a product of the Bolshevik cultural revolution, a testimony to the fertility that revolutionary ideas bring to the arts." The purpose of this article is to support the former thesis, one which is eminently supportable from both the events of the pre- and

post-Revolutionary years. The weakness of this article is in establishing the wealth of the so-called "Silver Age." The author treats the period prior to the "October in the Theater" and the work of Stanislavsky, Meyerhold, Tairov, and Vakhtangov in some eight pages, while the Soviet period up to 1958 is granted some thirty pages of text. The proportionate time spans do not justify the treatment. While the evidence here, as in other texts, impressively and depressingly illustrates the wasteland of Soviet dramatic literature and the pigheadedness that crushed a theatre of genius, there is not enough specific material here to illustrate the nature of the achievements that were disregarded and destroyed. At best we can evaluate the loss of creative freedom. The reader will find an excellent documentation of the superiority of the pre-Revolutionary years in Nora Beeson's dissertation "Vsevolod Meyerhold And The Experimental Pre-Revolutionary Theater in Russia (1900-1917)" (see entry number 160).

The brevity of the first section creates some confusion and contradiction with later statements. Despite his overall point of view, early on the author makes the statement that "even though the great Russian stage directors were well-matured in their ideas even before the Revolution . . . with the exception of Stanislavsky . . . all of them . . . derived from that upheaval creative impulses without which their rise to world fame would have been inconceivable." The most important achievements of these directors and movements such as constructivism can all be traced to earlier years. Vakhtangov embraced ethical but not political influences in his work, and died before the Soviet grip was firmly established. Tairov's aesthetic was not alien to the conception of revolution as such but was certainly not in line with Soviet purposes. It was the early work beginning in 1914 rather than post-Revolutionary conflicts that made Tairov famous. As for Meyerhold, the reader is directed to an article on the fundamental sources of his work by Marjorie Hoover which is also annotated in this bibliography (see entry number 134). To return to Mr. Ruhle's quote, "inconceivable" seems an inconceivable choice of word!

The greatest value in this article is to be found in the summary of the Stalin years

and the aborted Leninist renaissance in the early Khrushchev years. The author discusses the kinds of plays permitted, the trends in the literature, the identity of the persecuted, and the incredible cutthroat logic that passed for the dialectic which in turn determined the repertory and the operation of the theatre in Russian cultural life.

216. Rybakov, Yuri. The Soviet Theatre. Moscow: Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1968? pp. 62. Illus.

There is no publishing date provided, but from the text and some of the photographs it is obvious that this little pamphlet-like book was compiled no earlier than 1967. In addition to the sixty-two page essay, there is a separate unnumbered section of over fifty production illustrations. The text is divided into three sections: Early Soviet Stage Productions; Theatrical Education; and, After The War. The author supplies an adequate picture of what the Soviets consider the highlights of the twentieth century Russian theatre, starting with the origin of the Moscow Art Theatre and leading up to the "talented directors of the new generation"--Tovstonogov, Lyubimov, Simonov, and Efros.

The difficulties with this history are common to Soviet showcase documents. The demise of Meyerhold's theatre is attributed to the public recognition of the régisseur's failing abilities rather than to government disapproval, and the director's physical demise goes unmentioned. Tairov's early works are paid lipservice, while his "socialist realism" production of The Optimistic Tragedy is hailed as the highest tribute to his talent. As for the ignominious end of the Kamerny Theatre, once again there is no mention made. Half-truths and whitewashing should be no surprise to the experienced reader, but are acknowledged here as a caution to others. Texts such as this one can and should be used for production data, history, and the Soviet viewpoint; however, they must be compared with other documents for verification. Rybakov's glowing account of the 1930's and 1940's is a good example of what I mean.

The section on Theatrical Education is meager, both in space devoted and in content. I suggest that the interested reader see entry number 373.

217. Samarin, Roman, and Nikolyukin, Alexander, eds. Shakespeare in the Soviet Union: A Collection of Articles. Translated by Avril Pyman. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1966. pp. 275. Illus.

"The study of Shakespeare in the U.S.S.R. has developed in close contact with the arts of the theatre and translation. These three main trends which go to make up our understanding of Shakespeare--the work of our actors, producers and stage designers, of our translators, scholars and critics--are closely interwoven. . . . It is for this reason that, in this collection of articles, we have tried to give a typical selection from Soviet Shakespeareana by including works by poets, scholars, actors, and producers. Taken together, they give an idea of the main lines along which the study and interpretation of Shakespeare has developed in this country, and help us to understand the underlying significance of the development of Shakespeare studies in the U.S.S.R."

This handsome volume contains a series of articles taken from interviews, periodicals, journals, and from larger works written by the individual authors. It is divided into two sections: "Shakespeare And The Study of Literature," and "Shakespeare And The Theatre." In keeping with the focus of this bibliography, the articles in the former section are not annotated but only listed below. Of the articles in the second section (which are annotated), the lengthiest also tend to be virtually literary critiques. Actually, there is little in the text directly applicable to production technique.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE STUDY OF LITERATURE

A. Blok: Shakespeare's King Lear
A. Lunacharsky: Bacon and the Characters of Shakespeare's Plays
I. Sksyonov: What Is The Question?
A. Smirnow: Shakespeare, the Renaissance and the Age of Brarroco [sic]
M. Morozov: On the Dynamism of Shakespeare's Characters
A. Anikst: Shakespeare--a Writer of the People
I. Anismov: Life--Affirming Humanism

SHAKESPEARE AND THE THEATRE

Konstantin Stanislavsky on Hamlet

This section is a transcript of an address made by Stanislavsky in 1938 to his acting students on creating the character of Hamlet. He emphasizes developing an ability to handle the language and provides instruction in correct diction and vocal technique.

Alexander Ostuzhev on Othello

This is an edited interview taken from a collection entitled Ostuzhev-Othello. It centers on the actor's life-long study of the play and the character in order to portray the Moor as an admirable and even loveable man.

Alexei Popov: Shakespeare And The Theatre

The book Taming of the Shrew by Popov is the source of this piece. It deals with the Red Army Theatre's staging of the play in 1940. It is the only article in the collection which actually treats the staging concept, emphasis, style, and movement patterns.

Galina Ulanov: My Juliet

Ulanova writes of her experience dancing the role of Juliet to Prokofiev's score.

Innokenti Smokturnovsky: Shakespeare In My Life

Smokturnovsky played Hamlet in a 1964 film made by the Leningrad Cinema Studio. These two pages are taken from an article in Teatr, and they indicate what the author used of Shakespeare's writings as director's notes to help him build the role.

Nikolai Okhlopkov: From The Producer's Exposition of Hamlet

In 1954, Okhlopkov directed a production of Hamlet at the Mayakovsky Theatre. This lengthy article, originally appearing in Teatr, analyzes the play as a sampling of the literature which champions socialist humanism.

Grigori Kozintsev: King Lear

This, the last in the series of articles, is actually a chapter from Kozintsev's book Our Contemporary Shakespeare, which was published in 1962. Kozintsev produced King Lear in 1941 at the Gorky Bolshoi Drama Theatre in Leningrad. The material does not describe the

production but is rather a representation of the director's preparatory socio-literary analysis of the play and the changing social order of Shakespeare's time.

The text itself is interspersed with a series of very attractive color plates of set designs for The Merry Wives of Windsor, The Merchant of Venice, Julius Caesar, Much Ado About Nothing, Othello, The Taming of the Shrew, A Midsummer Night's Dream, King Lear, Romeo and Juliet, Twelfth Night, and Hamlet. In addition, at the end of the book, the editors have provided a special section of fifty-three black and white production photographs for Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Antony and Cleopatra, Macbeth, Julius Caesar, Richard III, Romeo and Juliet, The Winter's Tale, Twelfth Night, The Taming of the Shrew, Much Ado About Nothing, As You Like It, A Midsummer Night's Dream, Two Gentlemen of Verona, and The Merry Wives of Windsor.

218. Sayler, Oliver M. The Russian Theatre. 2nd rev. and enl. ed. New York: Brentano, 1922. pp. 346. Illus.

This highly readable text displays the author's courage in gathering his material under fire, and gives the reader a sense of the excitement (without the usual melodrama) of a theatre person witnessing the developments in Russian theatre right after the Revolution. In addition to the usual materials covered by this type of text, Sayler provides a chaper on the history of productions of Russian drama in America from 1900 to 1920 by both the visiting Russian companies and the Americans.

The text describes the theories and production work of Stanislavsky, Meyerhold, and Tairov. Sayler analyzes and compares all of the theatrical movements in Moscow and Petrograd from 1917-1921 including accounts of the shows he witnessed and the directors he interviewed. It is interesting that in the early twenties, the author summarized his experiences by predicting the "termination of national isolation and rigid governmental control."

The reader is advised to see entry number 219 which is a complete annotation of The Russian Theatre Under The Revolution, the first edition of this text.

219. Sayler, Oliver M. The Russian Theatre Under The Revolution. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1920. pp. 273. Illus.

In this book, Oliver Sayler tries to convey a feeling for the excitement of the Revolution and how it affected the theatres of Moscow as they attempted to carry on immediately following the Bolshevik takeover in 1917-1918. In addition, he communicates his own feelings as a reporter literally under fire! The text is not so much analytical as thorough and true in its reporting. Much of the production description is accompanied by lengthy play synopses. The material, naturally, bears great similarity to The Russian Theatre by Sayler, which is a revised and enlarged edition of the basic form of this text, published in 1922.

The first six chapters deal entirely with the Moscow Art Theatre (The Blue Bird, The Three Sisters, The Cherry Orchard, The Lower Depths, The Village of Stepantchikov) and its studios.

Sayler remarks that his anti-realist instincts were silenced by the impeccable use of realism at the Moscow Art Theatre. He contrasts Stanislavsky, in theory and practice, with Meyerhold, Evreinov, and Tairov. Although he devotes three chapters to the Kamerny Theatre (Salomé, Azure Carpet, King Harlequin), it was his feeling that Meyerhold, Stanislavsky, and Evreinov were the major influences. His analysis of Tairov is based on a paraphrase of the régisseur's own notes as translated into French. Today's reader can find a complete English translation of the Notes of a Director (see entry number 118). The coverage of Evreinov contains the best biographical sketch of the author in English and a list of his written works and of the plays he directed. Sayler also freely translates the preface to The Representation of Love (published in 1910) entitled "Introduction to Monodrama." The chapter on Meyerhold is sketchy but useful for its list of plays he produced in various theatres between 1898 and 1917.

The picture is filled out by relating the major movements to the classical repertory, and to modern forms and personalities. The eighth chapter looks at the background of the Maly Theatre and Sumbatoff's presentation of the realistic tradition of Ostrovsky. Still

other capsules illustrate the ideas concretized by the Kommissarzhevskaya Memorial Theatre, the studio experiments of Baliev's cabaret "The Bat," and the pioneering light designs of Salzmann.

220. Slonim, Marc. Russian Theater: From The Empire To The Soviets. New York: Collier Books, 1962. pp. 382. Illus.

This industrious, if inconsistent, volume spans the Russian theatre from its origins in pagan rituals into the early German and French influences, through the evolution of the distinctive and multi-faceted pre-Revolutionary theatre, to the Soviet theatre of the 1930's. The period of greatest emphasis is 1890-1930. These chapters cover the development of the Moscow Art Theatre in contrast with the methods and styles of such other régisseurs as Meyerhold, Tairov, and Evreinov. They also contain clear statements and summations of such systems as biomechanics and constructivism. While none of this represents new scholarship, it does contain valid critical insights and is written in an animated style. The last chapter, also the lengthiest, describes the doctrine and practice of socialist realism, and the consequent destruction of pre-Revolutionary innovation. Although the author recognizes that the death of Stalin altered the dull and contrived repertory, and subsequently permitted creativity to emerge again, he concludes that "The Russian theatre still has a long way to go before it acquires a tenth of the freedom and variety it possessed in the twenties."

The excellence in some areas of the text succumbs to omissions and sloppiness in others. The early sections for example, up to the 1890's, are sketchy at best. Overall, the book would have benefited from Notes and a Bibliography. Finally, the reader is cautioned to watch for such errors as the statement that Stanislavsky and Nemirovich-Danchenko formulated their plans for the Moscow Art Theatre in 1898, when in fact, it was conceived in 1897.

221. Soviet Art in Wartime. Washington, D.C.: Information Bulletin of the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 1943. pp. 116. Illus.

The volume, in its entirety, covers music, drama, dance, literature, cinema, and

the graphic arts. Each section is comprised of a series of articles written by different artists. The section on drama extends from page 32 to page 55, and contains the following brief essays: "The Russian People"; "A Play About The Soviet People": "Our Women At The Front"; "The Theatre of the Red Army"; "Ukranian Actors at Stalingrad"; "The Moscow Jewish Theatre"; "Plans For the Moscow Art Theatre"; "The People Are An Eternal Source of Art"; "Actors of the Front"; and "A Children's Theatre in Embattled Moscow."

The supplement was created to demonstrate the great courage and purpose of the Soviet peoples in their war effort and to illustrate how a culture can thrive even in the face of Hitler. Indeed, most texts describe Soviet wartime theatrical activity as prodigious and determined with makeshift but continuous operations in all the battle zones.

The first three articles deal with Simonov's play The Russian People (which was adapted by Clifford Odets and performed by the Theatre Guild in America in 1942). "The most significant thing in this play about the Russian people is that it is nobly modest." The articles include a plot summary, production instructions, an analysis of the play's place in the wartime literature, and a description of sample acts of heroism that motivated its author. While the description of events and the evaluation of the importance of this play is often overly boastful and melodramatic, these articles are a good index of how the theatre was used to buoy morale and romanticize the national identity.

Another article, "Plans For The Moscow Art Theatre," written by Nemirovitch-Danchenko while he was safely bunkered in Tiflis, looks ahead to peacetime and projects plans for the Moscow Art Theatre. Peacetime would see the reopening of the "home of the Seagull," but other theatres did not fare as well. As late as 1953, there were fewer theatres operating in Russia than there had been in 1913.

In "Actors of the Front" and "The People Are An Eternal Source of Art," the authors describe how companies relocated outside of the major cities or were separated into touring cells which performed at the battlefronts. In general, these profiles discuss the actors' experiences and relate information on the specific plays performed and the methods of

production. The text is accompanied by some of the best photographs available of wartime theatrical activity in Russia.

222. Sovietskii Teatr (Soviet Theatre). Moscow: Izdatelsvo Iskousstvo, 1967. pp. 150. Illus.
An album of close to six hundred illustrations is advanced to illustrate the achievements of the Soviet theatre during the period from 1917 to the mid-1960's. It is accompanied by a three-page essay on the highlights of Soviet production, written by K. Rudnitsky. Some of the photographs, specifically those recording Meyerhold and Vakhtangov's early post-Revolutionary productions, have not been found elsewhere by this researcher. Most of the other photographs, in keeping with traditional Russian publishing practices, are of individual actors. The information provided by the English language captions is not as complete as the original Russian titles.

223. The Theatres of Moscow. Moscow: Seventh Printery, Undated. Unpaged.
This is a very interesting Russian album of photographs and drawings depicting various productions, artists, and theatres. "The pictures in this album do not, of course, give a comprehensive survey of all Moscow theatres. They are merely a pictorial table of contents, as it were, of the great book of Soviet dramatic art." There are seventy-nine reproductions covering the Academic Theatre; Theatres Created By The Great October Revolution; The National Theatres; Theatres For Children; Collective Farm Theatres; and New Theatres In Construction. There is no date of publication, but from the introduction and some of the photographs in the album, I believe this book to have been printed in 1936. The photographs communicate a considerable variety of design, staging, and acting style. Under each photograph is a caption listing the play and author, the producer, the designer, and the theatre at which it was performed.

224. Van Gyseghem, André. Theatre in Soviet Russia. London: Faber & Faber, 1943. pp. 220. Illus.
Van Gyseghem's writings are based on four visits to the Soviet Union, including a pre-war, year-long visit during which time he worked under Nikolai Okhlopkov at the Realistic

Theatre. At the time of publication, however, events had altered much of what Van Gyseghem had seen up to 1938.

This book covers a particular segment of Russian theatre history from the Revolution through the 1930's. The author provides an account of the work of major directors, companies, and playwrights including Meyerhold, Vakhtangov, Okhlopkov, The Moscow Art Theatre, the Maly, the Kamerny, the Theatre of the Revolution, the Trade Union Theatres of Moscow and the R.S.F.S.R., the national minority theatres, and the children's theatres. He gives an extensive personal description of the physical surroundings, the emotional atmosphere, and the nature of the personalities in connection with each movement and each theatre. Introductions to philosophies and methods are supplemented by extensive descriptions of key productions witnessed by the writer, and/or plot summaries for the purpose of comparisons. Examples of the scope of the material include a description of one of Meyerhold's biomechanical exercises "Throwing The Stone"; the curriculum of the Kamerny Theatre School of Moscow; Tairov's own comments on his production of Egyptian Nights; Ryndin's designs for the Kamerny; Akimov's Hamlet; Birmin's mounting of The Spanish Priest; Obraztsov's fascinating puppet shows; and Okhlopkov's flexible staging for Pogodin's Aristocrats.

225. Varneke, Boris V. History of the Russian Theater: Seventh Through The Nineteenth Century. Translated by Boris Brasol. New York: Macmillan, 1951. pp. 459.

"The account encompasses the history of the Russian theatre from its origins up to the end of the nineteenth century. This conforms to the program of the first year's study of the subject as set forth by the Central Administration of Educational Institutions. . . . In the arrangement of materials the greatest emphasis was placed upon the origin and development of realism on the Russian stage, which constitutes the fundamental and the most productive tendency of our entire art."

This was a classic book in Russia, used widely in schools as a text. It first appeared in 1908, was revised in 1913, and this translation is of the third Soviet edition, issued in 1939. As may be inferred from the first quotation, the revisions are the result of a

committee's suggestions (Central Administration of Educational Institutions of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R.), and thus is an indication of the unscholarly Soviet penchant for reworking facts in order to coincide with Party policy. Nonetheless, the text does not seem overpowered by Marxist addenda.

In general, the chapters are heavy with notes, information, and quotations, and the style of writing succumbs to the weight of the research. As to the translation, it has been described by some scholars as smooth and by others as pedestrian.

The emphasis of the history is on the development of native drama and on histrionic personalities in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, rather than on periodic movements and social influences. Varneke begins with the agrarian folk and ecclesiastical drama. He traces change and development through the plots and themes of the works of such playwrights as Sumarokov, Kynozhin, Nikolev, Fonvizin, Griboyedov, Pushkin, Lermontov, Gogol, and Ostrovsky. Of classical authors, Ostrovsky is established by Varneke (and perhaps by the Commission) as occupying "the first place on the Soviet stage." Performance tradition is heavily represented by information on the serf theatre, well-known actors and acting companies, and with an entire chapter on Shchepkin. Though certainly unintended, the data on and descriptions of government rule and censorship under the aristocracy, the bureaucratic management of the court theatres, and the miseries of the serf theatres promote thinking about parallels in the Soviet theatre of the 1930's.

226. Zelikson, Mikhail A. The Artist of the Kamerni Theatre: 1914-1934. Moscow: Ogiz, 1935.

I know only that there is indeed a book of this title and that it is listed in the Catalog of Printed Cards of the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress indicated in March of 1971 that Zelikson's book was not in its collection nor was it aware of a library in this country that did house the volume.

Articles and Periodicals

227. Bakshy, Alexander. "Latest Trends in Soviet Theatre." Russian Review, V (Autumn, 1945), 80-88.

Bakshy is primarily concerned with dramatic literature. Nonetheless, the summary of trends after the Revolution, up to and specifically during the 1940's, is helpful in evaluating the many social and political influences on the theatre as a whole. The reader sees the effect of the ideological stranglehold of the 1930's, the national martial goals of the war years, and the post-war reconstruction efforts. There are brief summaries of war and post-war plays considered to have been the most popular and the most successful.

228. Bakshy, Alexander. "Russian Dramatic Stage." The Drama, XIX (February, 1919), 31-61.

In an earlier theatre bibliography, this article was described in part as a "History of stagecraft in Russia from the mid-seventeenth century to 1919." The dates are right but rather than a history I would call it a hastily assembled frame for the article's real subject, which is a comparison of representational and presentational theatre, as practiced by the Moscow Art Theatre and Meyerhold respectively. Though not highly illustrated with references to productions, the summary of differentiating characteristics is thorough and clear. Bakshy pays particular attention to the disparate approaches to dramatic literature, linking Chekov to the Moscow Art Theatre and Maeterlinck to Meyerhold. The work of such men as Evreinov and Tairov is avoided (and I believe, mistakenly so) as the author considers theirs to be "isolated experiments."

229. Bakshy, Alexander. "Ten Years of a Revolutionary Theatre." Theatre Arts Magazine, XI (November, 1927), 867-75. Illus.

The emergence of a new proletarian audience and the subsequent nationalizing of the theatres is the background for Bakshy's analysis of the period from the October Revolution to 1927. He divides the emergent forms according to creative theory and to constructivist theory. The former was represented by the nationwide non-professional club and factory theatre, and the latter as a theatrical

organization of real life (art as action and the futurist revolutionism of Meyerhold). Bakshy writes that biomechanics and constructivism represented industrial activity on the stage (complete with overalls). The theatre was a tool for serving the revolution and shaping the sentiments of the new audience. His criticism of the constructivist achievement is based on the lack of depth in the dramatic material and the failure of the form to emerge as distinctly different and unique from the theatre of any other nation. The second argument appears quite narrow and goes unproven in the text. When evaluating Meyerhold, the connection must be sought not with other contemporary movements, but with the history of theatrical convention.

230. Barbisan, Gala, and Valot, Henriette. "The Soviet Theatre--Problems and Solutions." World Theatre, X (Winter, 1961-62), 15-27. Illus.
Authors Barbisan and Valot were the French translators of such Soviet "comedies" as It Happened in Irkutsk. This article was stimulated by the visit of the Vakhtangov Theatre to the Theatre of Nations in Paris. Despite the article's title, there is little real analysis of contemporary problems. Indeed, the piece suffers from the same melancholy and ideology-flaunting to be found in It Happened in Irkutsk. It seems that what is meant by problems is the difficulty in studying Soviet theatre. The ladies write of the troubles to be found in trying to analyze the huge Soviet audience, and of determining criteria for judging a national theatre whose purpose is political and social education. Most outsiders, they determine, do not understand or appreciate the Russian elements or the Russian purpose in Soviet drama. The article also contains a pseudo-critical, sketchy history tracing the Soviet dramatic theme from a theatre of events to a theatre of man, and discusses the relation of both to classical Russian drama.

231. Beiswanger, George. "Soviet Russia At War: Theatre and Film in Action." Theatre Arts Monthly, XXVI (November, 1942), 682-89. Illus.
One of the most amazing aspects of the total theatrical organization in Russia has been the mobilization effected during World

War II. Beiswanger illustrates the immensity and the courage of the operation, tracing the movements of state and military ensembles at the front. The reader will also find statements from Russian performers as to what it was like to perform for the soldiers. During the war, efforts were made in every field to make Russian history supply militant heroes and to establish a heritage of national courage and bravery. As the performers contributed their abilities, the dramatists too kept writing and developing this national image. The author comments on examples of the war literature such as Simonov's The Russians and Afiogenyov's On The Eve.

232. Bertensson, Sergei. "The Premiere of 'The Inspector General.'" The Russian Review, VII (Autumn, 1947), 88-95.

The history of Gogol's play was a very painful one for its author. In this essay, Bertensson describes Gogol's extreme displeasure with the vaudeville-like initial production at the Alexandrinsky Theatre in St. Petersburg and with subsequent misinterpretations; and how these incidents led to an obsessive sense of disgust and pain. Gogol, "had not at all wished to make fun of the established order of government, but only of those who deviated from this order."

233. Buchwald, Nathanial. "The First International Olympiad of Revolutionary Theatres." International Literature, IV (October, 1933), 137-42.

Moscow was the gathering place for agit-prop revolutionary theatres from all over the world. For a period, the Blue Blouse Brigades were used as politically instructional devices in club houses, factories, and outlying areas all over Russia. This article deals with the organization of the event; the participants; the goals of docu-drama; style of presentation; and the specific operation of the Soviet TRAMS (Workers Youth Theatres). There is an interesting critical emphasis on the general need for more intensive character portrayal and greater understanding of theatrical convention in the work of these groups. The Soviets themselves were to discover that, for similar reasons, the one-dimensionality of the living newspaper-approach rapidly exhausted its appeal.

234. Bulletin of the Society For Cultural Relations With The U.S.S.R. London: Society For Cultural Relations With The U.S.S.R., 1953-1955. (Mimeographed.)

These six issues, dated from July 1953 to October 1955 but not following a specific chronological schedule, contain translations and abridgements from Russian periodicals and reports, some of which were in turn compiled from still other journals. Below is a list of the articles appearing in each short issue. Any incomplete bibliographical listing is the fault of the original issues.

July, 1953 (Number 1)
"Soviet Audiences." translated by Anne Collingwood
"With The Help of 100 Switches." by Kameney
"Soviet Drama Today."

June, 1954
"Soviet Ballet and Ballet Dancers."
"Satire As A Weapon." by A. Maryamov
"What Makes For Good Plays." by K. Simonov and others.
"Theatre Going In The Soviet Union."

September, 1954
"Stage and Screen Acting." by V. Pudovkin
"Backstage Miracles." by N. Shelkan. A. Bronnikov, and A. Lev
"Reminiscences of Chekov." by Stanislavsky and Danchenko

January, 1955
"Training and Working Conditions in the Soviet Theatre."
"National Studios."
"The Urgent Needs of Soviet Ballet." by R. Zakharov
"New Plays and Productions."

June, 1955
"Repertoire Problems." by V. Pimenov
"Stanislavsky's Legacy." by V. Zavadsky
"Ballet and Contemporary Themes." by Dyatlov and Sibirtsev
"A Young Ballerina's Debut." by Timme and Karp

October, 1955
"Hamlet: A Soviet Producer's View." by Okhlopkov
"Recent and Forthcoming Productions."
"Awards and Appointments."
"Artistic Council of the Maly Theatre."

235. Burgess, Malcolm. "Russian Public Theatre Audiences of the 18th and Early 19th Centuries." The Slavonic and East European Review, XXXVII (1958), 160-83.

This article traces a rather boisterous theatrical beginning (not uncommon to other European countries) all the way to the establishment of the Petrovsky and Bolshoi theatres in the 1780's. Burgess centers the article on the court and public theatres of Moscow and St. Petersburg, illustrating how influences of European companies and stagecraft and ultimately the beginnings of a native theatre affected the state of being in both the pit and the box. In addition to being informative and making considerable use of diaries and logs kept by foreign observers, the article provides a number of excellent anecdotes of the Covent Garden and Drury Lane-brawl variety.

236. Carter, Huntly. "An Historical Sketch of the Theatre in Soviet Russia." Fortnightly Review, CXI (March, 1922), 498-508.

Carter has aimed in this article to illustrate how the Revolution and Soviet social ideology changed the Russian audiences and subsequently the forms of theatre. He chronicles events beginning in 1918 and leading up to the establishment of the Proletarian Theatre. The Proletarian Theatre is seen in the Cultural Theatre, Mass Spectacles, Studios, Independent Workers Theatre, and Children's Theatre. The discussion takes in the nationalization of established theatres; agit-prop reviews, repertory reform; Lunacharsky; and the development of mass audiences through ticket distribution to Trade Unions and industrial firms.

237. Deutsch, Babette. "The Russian Theatre Today." Theatre Arts Magazine, August, 1925, pp. 537-47.

Deutsch viewed the Russian theatre as a continuum stretching from theatricality to propaganda. The article makes statements about a variety of companies, classifying them according to this continuum. For example, Meyerhold

is seen as a propagandist handling social themes, Zemach and the Habima are said to reject propaganda for a theatre of social tragedy, and the Kamerny is categorized as an aesthetic enterprise without social relationships. Generally, the discussions are sketchy and the comparisons simplistic. The passing mention of some of the theatres also includes their directors, but in the case of the Third Studio and the Kamerny, Deutsch fails to identify or relate to Vakhtangov and Tairov directly.

238. "The Eugene Vakhtangov Theatre." World Theatre, XVI (1967), 184-88.

This article is divided into a tribute to Vakhtangov himself and the traditions of the theatre that took his name. The author aims at communicating the guiding aesthetic and temperament of the Vakhtangov throughout its existence. Examples of the approach are given in the description of the staging of Living Death and of Filumena Marturano. The author also treats the revival of Princess Turandot, Vakhtangov's last production before his death in 1922, as produced by his disciple Reuben Simonov on the eightieth anniversary of the director's death. Actually, given Vakhtangov's commentaries on the need to see a classic or a revival through the more modern times of its representation, this museum resurrection seems strangely alien to the director's teachings.

239. Fevralsky, A. "Non-Professional Theatre." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 6 (1934), 80-83.

The Soviet theatre distinguished between professional theatre, amateur theatre, and self-acting theatre. The last, also known as agit-prop, shock brigade, and Living Newspaper, theatre acted as a political and social extension of industrial establishments and public institutions. Using the TRAM or Theatre of Young Workers as the primary example, the author describes the kind of plays performed, the social function, company organization, subsidy, and relationship to other forms of theatre.

240. Flanagan, Hallie. "The Russian Theatre: One Theory As To Its Inspiration." Theatre Guild Magazine, June, 1930, pp. 46-47. Illus.

In the book The Russian Theatre, written along with René Fülöp-Miller, Joseph Gregor

advanced the proposition that "in the miniature art of the illuminator we can trace the main ideas expressed by the most modern form of the Russian theatre." Flanagan explains and amplifies this theory. She analyzes icon painting and draws parallels with existing Russian set designs. The article provides a good background for understanding the book in general. It indicates an interest in the theory, but is also properly cautious. "Provocative as is Gregor's theory, it cannot be held to account entirely for the astounding phenomenon of the revolutionary stage; it ignores the influence of the machine, the circus, and the cinema." One might also add that it fails to account for the influences of the symbolist movement of the early 1900's and of the theatrical work of Appia, Craig, and Fuchs.

241. Glade, Henry. "The Death of Mother Courage." The Drama Review, XII (Fall, 1967), 137-42. Illus.

This concise article traces the phases of Brecht's acceptance in Moscow from M. Straukh's production of Mother Courage at the Mayakovsky Theatre in 1960 to the nine Brecht plays in the Moscow theatre repertories as of the 1966-67 season.

Glade discusses the approaches to staging and acting Brecht as illustrated by the Straukh mounting, Lyubimov's Good Woman of Setzuan and Galileo, and the Student Theatre of Moscow University's presentation of The Resistable Rise of Arturo Ui. He points out that the most successful productions of the playwright, who only really became the vogue in Russia in the 1960's, are those that "have synthesized a new theatre from old traditions--Stanislavski and Vakhtangov--and current concerns, political and intellectual."

242. Glenny, Michael, and Kinsolving, William Lee. "Soviet Theatre: Two Views." Tulane Drama Review, XI (Spring, 1967), 100-16. Illus.

If one has been or is intending to read the World Reviews on Russia in World Theatre or similar accounts by Russians, it is suggested that these two articles be read before and after any others. Both views (which are not in contradiction as might be inferred) contain a great deal of historical summary, placing the activities of the late 1950's and 1960's in the perspective of the "elan of the 20's" as well as

in that of the boring, tired, unresponsive theatre that extended from the late 1930's right through into the 1950's. The emphasis lies with Tovstonogov, Lyubimov, Yefremov, and Akimov, illustrating the daring and iconoclasm that emerged with Khrushchev's de-Stalinization program. As well as providing numerous examples of the work of the contemporary directors, these articles contrast the newcomers with the state of the academic theatres--the Maly, the Moscow Art Theatre, and the Pushkin. Statistics update the records on numbers of theatres, companies, ticket prices, organization, etc. Illustrations depict the variety of style and the use of theatrical convention employed in the Gorky, Contemporary, Taganka, and Leningrad Comedy theatres.

243. Houghton, Norris. "Russian Theatre: Oneness and the Missing Element." Theatre Arts, XLVI (April, 1962), 12-16, 66-70. Illus.

This article is an excerpt from the final chapter of Houghton's book Return Engagement. The reader is directed to the annotation for this text (see entry number 29).

244. Isaacs, Edith J. R., ed. "The Soviet Theatre Speaks For Itself." Theatre Arts Monthly, XX (September, 1936), 663-752. Illus.

This special issue on the Soviet theatre contains all the articles listed below. Those pertaining specifically to production are annotated under the appropriate headings elsewhere in this paper. The reader may be interested to also read the World Theatre Russian issue (see entry number 255) at this time. The World Theatre issue coming some thirty-one years later, and in the post-Stalin period, offers updating and some interesting contrasts.

"A New Chapter in Dramatic Thought," by Vladimir Kirshon
"From the Notebook," by Eugene Vakhtangov
"The Actor and the Revolution," by Pavel Markov
"Meyerhold Orders Music," by Vsevolod Meyerhold
"The Designer in the Theatre," by Nikolai Akimov
"Gorky and Bulichov," by Jozef Youzovsky
"Conversations With A Young Régisseur," by Yuri Zavadsky
"Theatre of the Soviet: A Portfolio."

"Through Theatre To Cinema," by Sergei M. Eisenstein
"A Soviet Bibliography."
"The Soviet Theatre Record."

The following is an interesting editorial note appearing in Theatre Arts in 1944 on the effect of this special issue. "In September, 1936, after a year and a half of hard but fascinating labor, spearheaded by Jay Leyda then in Moscow, Theatre Arts published a special issue called 'The Soviet Theatre Speaks For Itself.' It was written entirely by leaders in each field of the Soviet theatre art and was illustrated with rare photographs. We were so sure we were presenting something of unusual interest that we ordered a large overprint. To our great chagrin nobody bought it. Even the newstands returned a large share of their supply. The extra copies so cluttered the office that we had soon to throw most of them away. The epilogue is the revealing part of this story. In the summer of 1943 (seven years later) orders began to pour into Theatre Arts' office for this issue, absorbing almost all that was left. It was evidently the victory of Russian armies against the Germans that made people rub their eyes and want to know more about Russia, and, incidentally, about Russian theatre."

245. Karpova, Susan. "The Story of Russian Theatre." Poet Lore, XXVIII (Spring, 1927), 77-95.

A bibliographical listing for an eighteen-page historical survey in this kind of journal is unusual and intriguing, but this one is not worth the interest. Written as if an anecdote to be told on a talk show, it is riddled with grammatical errors, misspellings, and useless generalizations. Shchepkin variously appears as Shekine and Schepkin; Huntly Carter is listed as Burtley Carter; and O. M. Sayler appears as Saylor. The author is generous with such illuminating statements as, "Russians have many failings; they also have their qualities. . . ." In discussing one of Carter's books, she writes, "Is this book reliable all through? Is it fair? To err is human and to be fair is not, and Mr. Carter is human." This article can be safely passed up.

246. Litovsky, O. "Sixteen Years of the Soviet Theatre." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 6 (1934), 3-10. Illus.

We are asked to believe that the pre-Revolutionary theatre was always in chaos--an art isolated from life "in the pursuit of aesthetic forms." A statistical report on the sixteen years gives information on the number of theatres, stage workers, buildings, training institutions, etc. The All-Union Theatrical Conference of 1927 is treated as a milestone in the development of a Soviet repertory. It has been illustrated that for many minority theatres it brought an end to individual cultural expression. The key ideas at that Conference were the elimination of "purely formalistic innovations" and the development of socialist realism, which it was maintained could enfold the "artistic differentiation of various theatres." Looking to the future, Litovsky outlined future plans for the use of socialist realism in "liquidating the survival of capitalism in people's conscience."

247. Malnick, Bertha. "A. A. Shakhovskoy." The Slavonic and East European Review, XXXII (December, 1953), 29-51.

"Prince Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Shakhovskoy was the most versatile man of the Russian theatre in the first half of the nineteenth century." This article provides not only a great quantity of important bibliographical material, but also a detailed picture of the conditions and practices of the Imperial theatre in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Malnick looks into all of Shakhovskoy's achievements and endeavors. He was a playwright, translator, adapter, critic, acting coach, producer, and important administrator. The article reveals his accomplishments from the development and encouragement of native language drama to bringing vaudeville to the Russian stage and establishing the theatrical journal, Dramatic Herald, in 1808. This piece serves as a highly interesting view of one of the Russian theatre's earliest "total" artists.

248. Malnick, Bertha. "The Origin and Early History of The Theatre in Russia." The Slavonic and East European Review, XIX (1940), 203-27.

The official history of the Imperial Russian theatre began with the establishment of the court theatre in 1756. There are a

great number of important dates in the relatively short history of the Russian theatre which can be analyzed as significant for a myriad of reasons. Many of these dates correspond to setbacks or awkward attempts to find a national natural dramatic outlet. Malnick begins demonstrating the nucleus of difficulty by documenting that "it was the extreme asceticism of the Greek Orthodox Church which really made the natural development of a national theatre possible." In the article she traces threads of drama in family ritual, in vertep or marionette theatre, in the school plays from Poland and Germany, and in the first secular plays produced for Tsar Alexis by the German, Johann Gregory in the 1660's. The author goes on to amplify the various directions and developments that were influenced by importing whole companies, professional theatres, and types of dramatic literature from Italy, France, and Germany. One gets a feeling from Malnick for the irony inherent in juxtaposing the novel innovations of the twentieth century Russian theatre with the fact that "the first performance of a Russian theatre before the general public for money" was not given until 1757.

249. Malnick, Bertha. "Russian Serf Theatres." The Slavonic and East European Review, XXX (1952), 393-411.

At its best, serf theatre both developed and transmitted native drama. At its worst, it was a decadent, degrading, cruel, power-abusing institution similar to any other form of slavery. Malnick, candidly and with considerable documentation, provides an insight into how the form emerged and developed, and examples of how several of the companies functioned. The phenomenon existed throughout the late eighteenth century and the early nineteenth century, with as many as one hundred and seventy-three of these theatres in existence in the late 1700's. The style and type of each theatre was most often dictated by the mania of the particular owner, although purpose, taste, education, and intended audience frequently entered into the decisions. On one level, the productions were simply glorified diversions, early models of conspicuous consumption which satisfied the desires of fabulously wealthy eccentrics. Some individuals however, such as Nikoloy Sheremetev, whose

theatre palace at Ostankino is detailed in this article, developed a plaything into a sophisticated art.

The author covers such topics as play repertory; the French influence; Vorontsov's theatre and the emergence of the "infant Russian drama"; individual serf actors and their training; ballet and opera in the serf theatre; and the history and techniques of some of the more prominent companies. "Serf theatre broadened the basis for the development of a native theatre. At their best, the serf theatres undoubtedly disseminated a theatrical culture that would otherwise have remained the monopoly of the educated gentry."

250. Sayler, Oliver M. "The Deeper Roots Of The Russian Theatre." The Bookman, L (December, 1919), 108-14.

The "deeper roots" translates into a short but informative and detailed history of the Maly Theatre (the Small State Theatre). The spotlight is shared with an equally detailed biography of Prince Sumbatoff, actor, director and playwright who is credited with having revived the "home of the classics" in 1908 when, owing to a weakened company and a decade or more of "made-over plays from the French," it had declined into an example of just what the Moscow Art Theatre had been created to overcome. Sayler's article includes information on the theatre's most famous productions such as Wit Works Woe (which the author insists on calling The Sorrows of the Spirit); and a report on the first two productions done after the Revolution, Salomé and A Florentine Tragedy. Finally, there are also sketches of the actors and playwrights associated with the famous old theatre since the 1840's.

251. Stepanov, Valerian. "Gostim: Russia's Experimental Theatre Museum." Theatre Arts Monthly, XXVII (September, 1933), 689-95. Illus.

The problem of preservation is one of the things this bibliography and all of its entries is about. Short of sound films for a permanent history of productions, we must rely on the highly imperfect memory and perceptive abilities of man. Gostim (the Museum of the State Theatre in the name of Meyerhold), organized in 1927, was "a scientific research laboratory for systematizing documentary material for the purpose of studying and displaying the creative

methods of the experimental theatre itself. . . ." Stepanov explains the museum's approach to saving and using materials, and relates the background of the collection. At the time, there were great plans for the expansion of the museum as part of a projected new architectural stage space theatre to have been built for Meyerhold. The theatre never materialized. In general, Russia has been systematic and industrious in maintaining materials in theatrical libraries and museums.

252. Svobodine, Alexander. "The Last Ten Years Output." World Theatre, XVI (January-February, 1967), 35-42. Illus.

The stress in output has been on youth--young performers and the growth of young companies. The author illustrates the trend with the Sovremenik Theatre, which came into existence in 1956, and the Taganka (living for some time in an officially uncertain environment), and with the description of the influx of young actors playing major roles in the established companies (Maly, Mossoviet, and Vakhtangov theatres). Utilizing opportunities for a "one man show," young performers have had a chance to express individual aesthetic principles regardless of company bent, without feeling that individual development necessitated a change of affiliation. The trends and themes are also discussed in relation to the theatres in the Republics.

253. Theatre Arts Magazine, January, 1926, pp. 53-56. Illus.

A series of four photographs represent the genre of the "Living Newspaper." They include the productions of Hands Off China! and The Zinoviev Letter. These are good illustrations of the type of tableaux and scenic presentations utilized by this short-lived form which indicated the role Bolshevism had assigned to the theatre.

254. "Theatre In The U.S.S.R." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 6 (1934), pp. 105. Illus.

This is a special edition of the bulletin dedicated almost entirely to the theatre during the post-Revolutionary years. Although the articles contain little of a critical nature, there is an abundance of information, a strong presentation of the Soviet theatrical ideology,

and a large number of good illustrations. Below is a list of the articles. Each is annotated separately under the appropriate heading.

"Sixteen Years of the Soviet Theatre," by O. Litovsky
"Soviet Drama," by N. Oruzheynikov
"Our Dramatic Theatres," by Y. Sobolev
"Opera and Ballet in the Soviet Union," by E. Braudo
"The Artist And The Theatre," by S. Margolin
"Soviet Writers on the Soviet Theatre," by V. Vishnevsky and others
"Actors and Producers Speak of Their Work," by A. Vishnevsky and others
"Theatre Culture of the Peoples of the U.S.S.R." by V. Tikhonovich
"Non-Professional Theatre," by A. Fevralsky
"Theatre in the Colhoz," by V. Nikolayev
"Theatrical Education," by D. Kalantarov
"Theatrical Museums," by N. Ulovich
"Foreign Opinion on Soviet Theatre," by An-Yang and others

255. "Theatre In The U.S.S.R." World Theatre, XVI (January-February, 1967), pp. 104. Illus.

The entire issue is dedicated to the Russian theatre. Below you will find a list of the articles it contains. The annotations appear elsewhere under the appropriate headings. In keeping with the form of this bibliography, there are no entries for the articles on dramatic literature, opera, or ballet.

This is an important issue for its recognition of the Soviet theatre, and a good status survey for the student. It will prove interesting and profitable to compare this edition with the special issue on the Russian theatre prepared by Theatre Arts, in 1936 (Sept., 1936).

"Aspects of the Soviet Theatre," by Mikhail Tsarev
"Diversity in Soviet Drama," by Inna Vichnevskaia
"Old and New Trends in Production," by Yuri Rybakov
"The Last Ten Years Output," by Alexander Svobodine
"Contemporary Opera and Its Problems," by Boris Pakrovski
"New Paths in Soviet Ballet," by Boris Lvov-Anokhine

"Theatre For The Young Audience," by Irina Segedi
"Becoming A Director in Five Years," by Maria Knebel

256. Tsarev, Mikhail. "Assets of the Soviet Theatre." World Theatre, XVI (January-February, 1967), 2-10. Illus.

"The problems of the truth of life in art, of the positive hero, of present-day heroism, of the nature of Socialist ethics and of Socialist humanism, of authentic and illusory innovation are of passionate interest to the Soviet man of the theatre." At the time of this article's writing, we are told by its author, there were one hundred and twenty-six thousand theatre companies performing in forty-five languages in Russia. If one gets the impression that everyone in Russia was either performing or in the audience, Mr. Tsarev is equally desirous of depicting a national theatre that covers all the bases of literature, production, innovation, and international commitment. The reader will find information on contemporary Soviet drama; the production of foreign playwrights; the Stanislavsky legacy; the extensive provincial theatre operation; participation in such groups as the I.T.I., the International Puppet Union, and the International Children's and Youth Theatre Association; and the history of the staging of world classics in Russia. To the accusations of being a propagandistic theatre, the author replies that such is indeed the case, but that it is propagandistic about the ideals of peace and socialist humanism.

257. Ulovich, N. "Theatrical Museums." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 6 (1934), 94-96.

As an example of the dedication to the preservation of Soviet accomplishments in the arts and to a scientific approach to change, this section of the special edition of the V.O.K.S. Bulletin deals with theatrical museums. While it touches on the operations of specific theatre-associated museums including the Maly, the Moscow Art, and the Meyerhold, the primary concern is with the Bakhrushin Theatrical Museum in Moscow. The type and organization of holdings is outlined, as are the special exhibits and programs. In addition, the reader is informed of future plans for the use of photography and cinema to record complete productions.

258. Vacquier, Tatiana I. "The Russian Theatre." Sewanee Review, XXXIX (January-March, 1931), 39-53.

This article attempts a great deal more than it achieves. The relation of events begins in the seventeenth century and ends shortly before 1920. At best providing an outline for the general reader, the hurried style, scattering of superlatives, and bounding approach to events and individuals makes the commentary sometimes confusing and sometimes superficial. Meyerhold's activities following his stay at the Kommissarzhevsky Theatre are summarized (or rather brushed off) by saying that "The theatre was no more a temple to him but the opposite extreme--a grotesque puppet show." The author incorrectly concludes that "his creative efforts seem to have degenerated." Although, in general, she points out many highlights and characteristic features of the first two decades of the 1900's, the events are presented more as chaotic happenings than as outgrowths or reactions to one another.

259. Von Szeliski, John J. "Lunacharsky and the Rescue of Soviet Theatre." Educational Theatre Journal, XVIII (December, 1966), 412-20.

"This article is intended to provide a biographical sketch of Lunacharsky, outline the information of early Soviet policies towards the theatre and 'approved' playwriting, and evaluate Lunacharsky's position in that shaky artistic evolution."

Although specific in pointing out Lunacharsky's weaknesses and the blinding quality of his intense belief in an inevitable world communist future, the author attempts to prove that the Commissar's humanist sensitivities, organizational abilities, and efforts to maintain "a Bolshevik spirit without being destructive," stand as evidence of his success in keeping the early Soviet theatre from succumbing to mere "violent artistic radicalism."

The Moscow Art Theatre

Books

260. Bakshy, Alexander. The Path of the Modern Russian Stage. London: Decil Palmer and Hayward, 1916. pp. 243. Illus.
See entry number 185 for complete annotation.

261. Boleslavski, Richard, and Woodward, Helen. Lances Down. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1932. pp. 296.
Richard Boleslavski came to America (to use Harold Clurman's term) as a "truant from the Moscow Art Theatre." Together with Maria Ouspenskaya, he started the American Laboratory Theatre. He was the first man to teach the Moscow Art Theatre acting techniques in America. In addition to the shows he directed in New York in the '20's he also directed some seven films in Hollywood before his death in 1937. The theatre student knows him best for his book Acting, the First Six Lessons, and for various articles in Theatre Arts Magazine. Lances Down does contain chapters entitled "The Moscow Art Theatre" and "Our Studio," but the material is incidental and anecdotal. The book is a vivid account of the horrendous and bloody fighting that broke out between the Reds and the Whites following the Revolution. Boleslavski recalls what he observed in Moscow and describes his reactions. Aside from incidentals on Boleslavski's audition for the Moscow Art Theatre and the life of the apprentice, there is little in the book on the Soviet theatre.

262. Edwards, Christine. The Stanislavsky Heritage: Its Contribution to the Russian and American Theatre. New York: New York University Press, 1965. pp. 345. Illus.
See entry number 33 for complete annotation.

263. Fovitzky, Alexsiei Leonidovich. The Moscow Art Theatre and Its Distinguishing Characteristics. New York: A. Chernoff Publishing Co., 1922. pp. 46. Illus.
In this brief text, the author successfully communicates the accomplishments and the spirit of the Moscow Art Theatre; what it meant to the Russian theatre in the early 1900's; and the response of its devotees. Subjects of the

study include the characteristics of literary interpretation and the development of "perejivanie" in the Moscow Art Theatre; Stanislavsky's goals and some of his training methods; the theatre's repertory; and a general history of the first twenty-four years of production. The history shows a good understanding of themes and the threads that connected the various and diverse periods in the Moscow Art Theatre's early history. The discussion of the meanings of some of the plays in relation to their staging at the Moscow Art Theatre is not quite as successful. Fovitsky's acceptance of Stanislavsky's ideas about The Cherry Orchard are opposed to much of the subsequent scholarship and to Chekhov's own feelings and intentions. The considerable coverage of the Stanislavsky-Craig Hamlet depicts the Prince, through a lens of Russianization, as a "Knight of the Holy Ghost"(!) The literary critique, in general, is in march tempo and filled with slavic melancholy.

In the working notes, including quotations from the dramatist Yartzev's diaries, we gain some insight into the almost mesmeric effect Stanislavsky had on his workers, and into the type of improvisatory and concentration-building exercises he employed.

264. Grigoriev, Boris Dmitrievich. The Faces of Russia. Berlin: Sinaburg and Co., 1924. pp. 106. Illus.

In 1923 the Moscow Art Theatre visited Paris and there a Russian emigrant painter, Boris Grigoriev, was reunited through the performances with his past and his memories. The experience provoked him to do a series of paintings and sketches, mostly of the performers themselves, and these portraits form the reason for this book. Some of them were executed in the theatre and some in Grigoriev's studio where the actors often came to make themselves up and to dress. The sketches are striking both in the use of color and in line. Many utilize a cubistic rendering of the planes of the face. The accompanying text (written by Louis Réau, Claire Sheridan, André Levinson, Claude Farrère, and André Antoine) is of only casual interest. Most of the commentaries, when not on Grigoriev himself, are impassioned descriptions of characterization and style in the three plays performed--Czar Feodor, The

Cherry Orchard, and The Lower Depths. One of the writers is André Antoine of the Théâtre Libre. His reaction to the Moscow Art Theatre was to feel that, although unaware of each other's work, the Free Theatre and the Moscow Art Theatre had been pursuing the same ends. The following is a list of the portraits included in this volume: Kochalov as Czar Feodor Joannovich; V. Loujski as Boris Godounov; P. Bakshev as Vasska Pepel (Lower Depths); V. Loujski as the Hatter (Lower Depths); V. Kachalov making himself up for the part of Czar Feodor; Mrs. Knipper as Nastassja (Lower Depths); I. Moskvin as Sniegirev (Brothers Karamazov); N. Podgorni as Peter Trofimov (The Cherry Orchard); I. Alexandrov as the Actor (Lower Depths); I. Moskvin as Czar Feodor Joannovich; portrait of V. Loujski.

265. Markov, Pavel. The First Studio: Sullerzhitsky-Vakhtangov-Tchekhov. Translated by Mark Schmidt. New York: Group Theatre, Inc., 1934. pp. 80. (Typewritten.)

There is a lot to wade through here, but a close reading yields valuable information on the activities of the Moscow Art Theatre's First Studio, an enterprise which eventually became the Moscow Art Theatre Number Two. The typed manuscript is full of spelling errors, multiple transliterations of the same name, switches to double spacing from single spacing, and, in general, suffers from poor editing. The translation occasionally succumbs to such phrases as "indwelling saturatedness of character," and the language describing individuals is frequently chokingly heroic. One last caution should note the difficulty of successfully conveying an actor's style and his method of creating a role. A section of the text is devoted to the work Michael Chekhov did as an actor for the First Studio as a way of portraying the nature and stylistic bent of the Studio. Markov analyzes the actor's characterizations individually and comparatively, but I nevertheless find it hard to completely comprehend such descriptions as "pathological quality." The reader is advised to read this section in conjunction with Chekhov's own book on acting, To The Actor.

In the first two parts of the text, Markov deals with the birth of the studio principle and with the evolution of its style

and development into a "theatre." This evolution is seen in the work of Sullerzhitsky and Vakhtangov. To the general theatre researcher, the name of Sullerzhitsky is not as well known as that of Vakhtangov. Nonetheless, the former, as the first head of the Studio, and as its spiritual leader, had a great effect on Vakhtangov's own work. Sullerzhitsky taught the acting students and supervised all the productions until his death in 1916. Markov describes his teaching methods, his view of the "system," and the first five plays produced under his guidance. "The actors have come to love their laughter, their tears, their terrors, moreso than that which is the source of it. . . ." The words are Sullerzhitsky's, and the result was a penetration of psychological realism beyond the recognizable signs and symbols. Markov saw this penetration as the fostering of a style which was "psychological to a fault . . . ;" a strange intimacy which seemed to find "significant in the insignificant." In the author's discussion of Vakhtangov, the man's view of life is often clearer than his philosophy of theatre. There are, however, some direct quotations and analytical statements which help to contrast Vakhtangov with both Sullerzhitsky and Stanislavsky. He did not want the theatre to be a copy of life but rather to "function as a substitute for life. . . . The audience must feel that it is in a theatre and not in Uncle Vanya's house. . . . The actor should not embody things to the destruction of his own personality." In recreating the director's Studio productions of The Deluge, Rosmersholm, and Eric XIV, the author emphasizes Vakhtangov's expressionism; his use of a "scenic framing for the psychological kernel."

266. Nemirovitch-Dantchenko, Vladimir. My Life in the Russian Theatre. Translated by John Cournos. New York: Little, Brown, Inc., 1936. pp. 358. Illus.

The playwright, critique, dramaturge, and co-founder of the Moscow Art Theatre's book can be classified in many ways. It is neither pure autobiography nor pure chronicle. It is more a collection of memories of men, events, and ideas. In a loose, anecdotal, and folksy way, Nemirovitch-Danchenko presents his life and the life of the Moscow Art Theatre in

their inextricable relationship. It has been said that My Life In Art shows a wholly different Moscow Art Theatre and thus illustrates the conflict between Danchenko and Stanislavsky. On the contrary, the differences in personality and primary interests complement one another in these two volumes to give a total picture of the diversity that was to be unified in the greatness of achievement. The author writes a great deal about his encounters with people who were closely tied to the Moscow Art Theatre. Three of the text's five sections are based on his dealings with Chekhov, Gorky, and Tolstoy respectively. Other material includes the famous meeting between Stanislavsky and Nemirovitch-Danchenko which gave birth to the Moscow Art Theatre; the company's first European tour to Germany and Czechoslovakia; the division of responsibility between Stanislavsky and Danchenko; and an infinite number of capsule portraits of performers and others the author met in his work with the Moscow Art Theatre and the Musical Studio.

267. Miller, Anna Irene. The Independent Theatre in Europe: 1887 to the Present. New York: Ray Long and Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1931. pp. 430.

See entry number 211 for complete annotation.

268. Sayler, Oliver M. Inside The Moscow Art Theatre. New York: Brentano's, 1925. pp. 240. Illus.

The author's primary emphasis is upon the development of Danchenko's Moscow Art Theatre Musical Studio. Seven chapters are given over to a discussion of lyric drama, synthetic theatre, and the actual productions staged by 1925--The Daughter of Madame Angot, La Perichole, Lysistrata, Carmencita and the Soldier, and Love and Death. Sayler elaborates on the developments of each production in separate chapters. He deals with the poetry, the composers, the social impact, and the designs (including very interesting material on Rabinovitch's constructivist designs for Lysistrata). One chapter is dedicated exclusively to the examination of the concept, historical background, and implications of the Synthetic Theatre. Danchenko's methods and theories are discussed in the light of the writings of the Greeks, Nietszche, Mosel, Wagner, and Craig.

Other sections of the book report on the Moscow Art Theatre's visit to America; Sayler's biographical notes and impressions of Danchenko and Stanislavsky; and an overview of the total Moscow Art Theatre operation in the mid-twenties.

269. Sayler, Oliver M., ed. The Moscow Art Theatre Musical Studio of Nemirovitch-Danchenko. New York: Morris Gest, 1925. pp. 31. Illus.

This interesting souvenir program deals with the background, compositions, and performances of lyric drama as witnessed in this country in 1925 when Morris Gest succeeded in bringing the Musical Studio to New York. The booklet contains the following items: "The Story of the Moscow Art Theatre Musical Studio" by Dr. Sergei Berthensson (Vice Director of the Studio); a portion of Sayler's Inside The Moscow Art Theatre on Danchenko's life and work; a synopsis of the repertory prepared by Danchenko and Berthensson (The Daughter of Madame Argot, La Perichole, Lysistrata, Carmencita and the Soldier, Love and Death, Aleko, The Fountain of Bakchi-Sarai, and Cleopatra); Lyric Drama; The Synthetic Theatre by Yuri Sakhnovsky; elaborated descriptions of Aleko, and Carmencita and the Soldier; a brief Who's Who of the major performers; and a selection on the scenic designers and their techniques. The booklet is heavily illustrated with photographs of the personnel, scenes from the repertory, and full-color lithographs of sets, costumes, and chorus groups.

270. Sayler, Oliver M. The Russian Theatre Under The Revolution. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1920. pp. 273. Illus.

See entry number 219 for complete annotation.

271. Stanislavski, Konstantin. My Life in Art. Translated by J. J. Robbins. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1948. pp. 351.

See entry number 42 for complete annotation.

Articles and Periodicals

272. Bakshy, Alexander. "Russian Dramatic Stage." The Drama, XIX (February, 1919), 31-61.
See entry number 228 for complete annotation.

273. Carter, Huntly. "The New Age of the Moscow Art Theatre." Fortnightly Review, DCCXXXIII (January, 1928), 58-71.
"The object of this article is to tell the story of the forces and circumstances that saved the Moscow Art Theatre and directed it along its new path." Carter claims to be concerned with the first ten years after the Revolution and the special circumstances, beyond Lunacharsky's protection and the public regard for Stanislavsky's world wide reputation, that kept the Moscow Art Theatre from being destroyed by what the author calls the "Communist iconoclasts." The article is interesting and does contain material not found elsewhere in the periodical literature, but, in truth, its information is about general conditions and forces which affected all the theatres after the Revolution. Until 1920, the new Bolshevik government was too troubled elsewhere to watch the theatres closely. Also, in the early years, it was easy to justify the continued production of the classics by employing the proper parenthetical inserts in the playbill. Carter has reproduced many examples of these interpretations, such as "Tsar Fedor Ivanovitch (an attack on kingcraft); Lower Depths (picture of lodging-house life under the Tsars, but objected to by the Bolshevists on account of its christian doctrine of love and forgiveness)." It seems more to the point, however, to say that the "special circumstances" really involved Stanislavsky's capitulation or acquiescence--a manifestation of his sense of survival. Carter met with Stanislavsky after the latter returned from America. "I had already seen several of his present-day productions, which testified quite plainly to his deepening revolutionary interest--an attitude which, he explained, he could not avoid if he wished, because the public demand was for Left stuff, and he must play Left stuff or shut up shop."

274. Chekhov, A. "Tchehoff Letters About Plays and Players." Translated by Louis S. Friedland. Theatre Arts Magazine, VIII, February, 1924, pp. 91-97.

These letters are actually snatches and excerpts numbering seven altogether. The most informative for the purposes of this study is part of a correspondence with Nemirovitch-Danchekno, in which the playwright tells the régisseur who (and why) to cast in the Moscow Art Theatre's production of The Cherry Orchard.

275. Chramoff, Alexander. "Moscow Art Theatre." The Liberator, VI (February, 1923), 15-20.

Chramoff's ideas and conclusions are a hit and miss affair. In sketching the accomplishments of the Moscow Art Theatre and its relationship to other Soviet theatrical movements, Chramoff makes questionable judgments. He regards the Meyerhold and Evreinov theatres as examples of operations where the dramatist reigned supreme and the Kamerny as the capital of stage decoration. Evreinov, though a playwright, focused his concern on the audience member; Meyerhold was frequently accused of disregarding the author entirely (The Inspector General); and Tairov, at the time of this article, had published his notes, in which he emphasized the importance of the actor's soul and creativity. In evaluating the Moscow Art Theatre's collective artist approach, the author fails to note just how strongly Stanislavsky controlled the operation.

There is an interesting note to Chramoff's description of the effect of the Revolution on the Moscow Art Theatre: "The Moscow Art Theatre could not become the theatre of the Revolution. Nevertheless, the great Russian Revolution carefully preserved it, as living brilliant illustration of the best traditions and achievements of Russian art and as the very best creation of the bourgeois period, now about to depart into the realms of musty history." The first statement is indeed true, but not because the Soviet government did not pressure the theatre. It tried many times and sometimes successfully to alter the repertory. It has been written in later years by foreign observers that the Moscow Art Theatre's museum-like productions were often more "musty" than the history they reflected.

276. Dana, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. "50 Years of the Moscow Art Theatre." Soviet Russia Today (February, 1949), 15-18. Illus.

The celebration of the Moscow Art Theatre's fiftieth anniversary in 1948, regally celebrated all over Russia, was the occasion for Dana's survey of the theatre's activity since 1898. He relates the theatre's history to the changes in Russia and to a half-century of literary and artistic movements. For purposes of organization and emphasis, the time is divided into five, ten-year periods: "The first decade with the great plays of Chekhov and Gorky; The somewhat groping years that followed the Revolution of 1905; The reorganization and readjustment after the Revolution of 1917; The series of great revolutionary plays from 1927 to 1937; and The period of Nazi invasion and of reconstruction." The plan is more impressive than the content, which is a few paragraphs of praise for each decade.

277. D'Auvergne, Jean. "The Moscow Art Theatre." Fortnightly Review, XCV (January-June, 1914), 793-803.

In an article admonishing the English for not attempting to learn and adapt the lessons of the Russian theatre, the author has written a concise if not insightful summary of the Moscow Art Theatre's first fifteen years. Like many other articles written during this period by foreign students of the Russian theatre, the subjective considerations of the Moscow Art Theatre's achievements and what these were felt to portend for the theatre's future are interesting as historical documents.

278. Hapgood, Elizabeth Reynolds. "Two Orphans in Moscow." Theatre Arts, XXXIV (October, 1950), 31-35. Illus.

Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood was Stanislavsky's official English translator, and here she provides an interesting English version of a stenographic record kept of rehearsals at the Moscow Art Theatre for the melodrama The Two Orphans. The reader is treated to Stanislavsky conducting improvisatory exercises on blindness and achieving objectives in a melodrama.

279. Lunacharsky, A. V. "Stanislavsky, The Theater And The Revolution." International Literature, X-XI (1938), 151-58.

Lunacharsky was among those who protected Stanislavsky against the charges that the Moscow Art Theatre failed to embrace the Revolution and maintained a bourgeois repertory long after 1917. The first "acceptable" play was Vishnevsky's The Armoured Train, which was not produced by the Moscow Art Theatre until 1927. Lunacharsky, a playwright, Marxist critic, and Commissar of Education, chronicles the forty-year history of the Moscow Art Theatre and uses the testament to ward off productions of The Last Days of the Turbins (which is strange, as the government attacked Bulgakov, the author, for sympathetically depicting the Whites), and The Armoured Train, and chides the Soviet playwrights for not providing the theatre with more of these kinds of plays. While Lunacharsky admits that the Moscow Art Theatre had not attained a sense of "militant human action," he suggests that progress was being made.

280. Malnick, Bertha. "The Moscow Art Theatre: A Jubilee--1898-1948." The Slavonic and East European Review, XXVII (May, 1949), 563-70.

The fiftieth anniversary of the Moscow Art Theatre served as the basis for an article which places the founding of this theatre into the perspective of the theatrical environment of the late nineteenth century, and shows through its evolution how this particular theatre brought Russia to a point of world preeminence. Malnick begins with the immediate background of the famous meeting of Danchenko and Stanislavsky in 1897 and illustrates the nature of their first plans and actions. The remainder of the article deals with the emerging repertory; individual personalities; and the specific contributions made by Stanislavsky and Danchenko to the collective effort. This is purely a piece written in respect and praise. The author has not chosen to indicate the effect on the Moscow Art Theatre of the Revolution, later rival companies, or the relationship of the quality of production to socialist realism and the sterility of the Stalin years.

281. Meyerhold, Vsevolod. "Meyerhold to Chekhov." Translated by Nora Beeson. Tulane Drama Review, IX (Fall, 1969), 24-25.
This is a brief letter Meyerhold wrote to the playwright, praising his considerable talents and accusing the Moscow Art Theatre production of The Cherry Orchard of failing to understand and realize the purpose and themes of the play.

282. Mitchell, John D.; Drew, Gorge; and Mitchell, Miriam P. "The Moscow Art Theatre in Rehearsal." Educational Theatre Journal, XII (December, 1960), 276-84.
This article reports and records the observations of the authors upon viewing rehearsals at the Moscow Art Theatre and training procedures at the Moscow Art Theatre School. They watched primarily the work of Victor Stanitsyn, who was conducting rehearsals for Battle On The Road. The purpose of the visit was to see first-hand how the Stanislavsky system is employed by his disciples. "From all that was said and from all that was observed, we came away from Moscow thinking that in their striving to create great and inspiring performances the stage directors of Moscow concern themselves less with the 'method' and more with maintaining their ensembles of actors playing in repertory."

283. "Moscow Art Theatre Today." Theatre Arts, XXX (February, 1946), 117-20. Illus.
Forty years after the premiere production, the Moscow Art Theatre revived The Three Sisters. This is a portfolio of scenes from the rehearsals and the production itself.

284. Nemirovich-Danchenko, Vladimir. "The Staging of a Novel." Theatre Workshop, I (September-October, 1937), 7-10.
The Moscow Art Theatre's adaptation and staging of Tolstoy's Anna Karenina is the subject of this very brief article. The playwright and co-founder of the Moscow Art Theatre touches on the reasons for the project and justifies the textual emphasis and cuttings.

285. Osanai. Kaoru. "Gordon Craig's Production of Hamlet at the Moscow Art Theatre." Translated by A. T. Tsubaki. Educational Theatre Journal, XX (December, 1968), 586-93.

This is a translation of a memoir written in 1913, complete with an introduction describing the background and the work of Osanai in attempting to create Western theatre in Japan.

The actual memoir is a highly detailed report and analysis, scene by scene, of the use of Craig's screen set. Osanai describes the multiple uses of the screens; the use of platforms and areas; all the important light and color changes for the set and the costumes; the visual forms of staging; and those aspects of acting interpretation which particularly struck the viewer. The report is written with obvious admiration for and devotion to Craig's and Stanislavsky's ideas, but remains scholarly, if not critical, in its attention to creating a cogent historical document.

286. Ostrovsky, N. "The Moscow Art Theatre: A Model." Theatre Arts Magazine, August, 1917, pp. 178-82. Illus.

This basic outline of the aims and administrative operation of the Moscow Art Theatre was intended to serve as an example of the best model for the American art theatre, particularly the "little theatre." Ostrovsky sketches the three stages of the Moscow Art Theatre's production work (up to 1917), indicating these to be Chekhovian realism, symbolism (The Blue Bird), and modified realism ("attempting to interpret the realistic play spiritually.").

287. Pierce, Lucy France. "The Seagull Theatre of Moscow." The Drama, IX (1913), 168-77.

The author's enthusiastic response to the Moscow Art Theatre is indicative of the feelings of many early observers who were taken with Stanislavsky's work and the promise of the modern Russian theatre, in general. Although the article does include material on the Moscow Art Theatre's purpose, organization and public reception, this material is scant. As a measure of early enthusiasm, the piece can be useful but later more inclusive histories should be consulted.

288. Rogoff, Gordon. "The Moscow Art Theatre: Surprises After Stanislavskii." Reporter, XXXII (March, 1925), 49-50.

Mikhail Kedrov said to Ossia Trilling, in 1964, "We in Russia do not hold with some so-called pupils abroad. Take the case of Lee Strasberg in America. He stood still for twenty years and Stanislavsky would have been the first to repudiate him, had he been alive." Viewing the history of "method" instruction in America, criticism of the same, and productions of Chekhov in this country, Rogoff reviews and describes his pleased surprise at the accomplishments of the Moscow Art Theatre, witnessed during their visit to America in 1964. He points out that the revivals of Chekhov had not stood still for Stanislavsky and he describes the reinterpretation of the text and the staging. Most articles on the Moscow Art Theatre written after the 1930's discuss museum-like resurrections, but Rogoff goes beyond this to offer some interesting observations.

289. Sayler, Oliver M. "An Old New Theatre And A New Old Theatre." Theatre Arts Magazine, IX, October, 1925, pp. 694-99.

The physical facilities of the Moscow Art Theatre and the Komodie Theatre of Berlin (a new building in 1925) are compared. The illustrations include a groundplan of the Moscow Art Theatre and photographs of the exterior and interior. Sayler also describes the layout of the stage, house, offices, and other related areas.

290. Sayler, Oliver M. "Dictatorship For The Moscow Art Theatre." Theatre Arts Magazine, February, 1926, pp. 105-08.

Some six years after presenting an article which included the statutes of the Cooperative Society of the Moscow Art Theatre, Sayler reports the change in organization and management that took place in 1925. Nemirovitch-Danchenko's role as the singular leader, responsible for the total operation of the Moscow Art Theatre's various parts (Studios One and Two, the Musical Studio, the Dramatic School and Studios, etc.), is compared and contrasted with the cooperative autonomy experienced by the group in earlier years. A chart, taken from Sayler's book Inside The Moscow Art Theatre, illustrates the new structure.

291. Sayler, Oliver M. "The Moscow Art Theatre: Production and Organization in Stanislavsky's Playhouse." Theatre Arts Magazine, October, 1920, pp. 290-315. Illus.

This article contains a translation of the "Statutes of the Cooperative Society of the Moscow Art Theatre." First penned in 1917, it represented the basic organization and type of management followed by the Moscow Art Theatre for many years before the Revolution. The document includes the goals, rights and duties of the members; guidelines for composition of the company; hierarchy of the management; voting procedures; use of general council; and the basis for the financial operation and distribution of operating funds and profits. In the body of the article, Sayler questions how long this kind of operation could continue unaltered, given the changing Soviet Civil Codes. The reader will be interested to look at "Dictatorship For The Moscow Art Theatre," in the February, 1926 edition of this magazine, in which Sayler reports on the complete change of organization and management demanded of the Moscow Art Theatre.

As to production, Sayler reports on the Moscow Art Theatre's physical set-up, flexible stage sections, the revolve, the plastic use of the proscenium, etc. He carries the theme of flexibility through to rehearsal schedules, and the use of the repertory system. There is also a sample program for a nine-day period in December of 1917.

292. Sayler, Oliver M. "The World's First Theatre." The Bookman, XXXXIX (1918), 434-40.

In the spirit of the title, Sayler pays tribute to Stanislavsky and to the Moscow Art Theatre's accomplishments in an intimate portrait of the activities and personalities of the "home of the Seagull," from its inception to the Revolution. The emphasis on passion as opposed to close analysis is closely related to Sayler's own experiences. As is more thoroughly illustrated in The Russian Theatre Under The Revolution (see entry number 219), much of Sayler's research was literally accomplished under fire in 1917 and 1918. He ably communicates the problems, the mood, and the courage of Stanislavsky and his company in economically and physically treacherous times.

293. Sobolev, Y. "Forty Years of the Moscow Art Theatre." International Literature, X-XI (1938), 159-70. Illus.

This article is in the same spirit as Lunacharsky's speech "Stanislavsky, The Theatre And The Revolution" (see entry number 279). Within a history of the Moscow Art Theatre's first forty years is the story of its gradual development into a Soviet theatre. To illustrate, Sobolev describes the productions of The Armoured Train, Yegor Bulychev, and Anna Karenina. He quotes Nemirovich-Danchenko as saying that "The Art Theatre remains basically clear, simple and vividly realist, just as it was before. The Revolution has deepened our understanding of art and made it bolder and stronger." The reader may be interested to compare this statement with Stanislavsky's comments to Huntly Carter on the "change" which is quoted in my annotation of the article "The New Age of the Moscow Art Theatre," (see entry number 273).

294. Tutaev, David. "Gordon Craig Remembers Stanislavsky: A Great Nurse." Theatre Arts, XLVI (April, 1962), 17-19. Illus.

Gordon Craig's famous collaboration with Stanislavsky on a production of Hamlet is the key subject in this transcript of Tutaev's BBC interview with the designer. Craig finesses the questionable success of the screens he designed for the production ("It was like bringing God Almighty into a music hall."), and talks about the use of a bad translation, his differences with Stanislavsky over characterization, and his evaluation of Stanislavsky's varying abilities in staging Chekhov and Shakespeare.

Surveys and Eyewitness Accounts of Soviet Theatrical Productions

Books

295. Bowers, Faubion. Broadway U.S.S.R. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1959. pp. 227. Illus.

This is an account of the author's visit to the Soviet theatres during the 1957-58 season. As an American theatre critic he reports on Ballet, Drama, and Other Entertainment. For some reason, the author classifies

Children's Theatre under Other Entertainment. The commentary, observations, and evaluations are undocumented and best serve the general reader. The text is freely laced with anecdotal amplifications and accounts of interesting encounters made with Russians during the stay. At times the reviewer seems very taken with the scope of the Soviet Theatre and at others is very quick to qualify and narrow his praise. Early in the Drama section he says that, "certainly no other country in the world exposes its people to so wide a variety of theatrical fare--either geographically in space or historically in time." However, he concludes from the level of production at the time of his visit that "Unless another Stanislavsky or Meyerhold comes along, we need little from the U.S.S.R. at the present."

The Drama section covers the production of European plays, an American play (Autumn Garden), Shakespeare, Russian classics, and Russian contemporary literature. The author provides a list of the Moscow theatres in order of their official recognition and rating. For the theatres he visited, such as the Moscow Art Theatre, he discusses the total operation and the style of acting and production. Throughout there is a consideration of each play, complete with a plot synopsis and a classification of its place in the general literature and in the specific repertory. Bowers also provides an interesting evaluation of the repertory concept and a conjecture as to its value to any other country. Where appropriate, Bowers employs historic sketches such as one on the theatrical innovations in Russia in the early 1930's and an account of the havoc of the Stalin years which kept the "expectations of the golden years from being justified."

296. Griffith, Hubert, ed. Playtime in Russia. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1935. pp. 249. Illus.

This is a collection of articles resulting from a visit to the 1934 Moscow Theatre Festival by a number of English critics and specialists. The word playtime is meant to cover more than just theatre, as the list of contributions below indicates. This annotation excludes the chapters on sport, music, cinema, ballet, and holidays.

1. "Introduction And A Word on Russia" by H. Griffith
2. "Programme of the Moscow Theatre Festival, 1934"
3. "Politics In The Theatre" by E. A. Baughan
4. "Some Russian Plays" by A. E. Wilson
5. "A Note On The Amateur Theatre Movement in U.S.S.R. Theatre" by Geoffrey Whitworth
6. "Some Impressions of the Ballet in Russia--1934" by Marie Rambert and Lesley Blanch
7. "The Soviet Cinema And The People: Their Social Unity" by Huntly Carter
8. "Music" by Dr. Heinz Unger
9. "Playtime Of The Child In Modern Russia" by Ethel Manin
10. "Sport" by P. E. Hall
11. "Crimean Holiday" by H. Griffith
12. "Conclusion" by H. Griffith

The most valuable chapter for the theatre researcher is probably Ethel Manin's on the education and acculturation of the Russian child. The material includes a discussion of the Moscow Children's Theatre's aims and programs; numerous quotations from conversations with Natalia Satz; and references to the scope of the operation including the children's consulting board, the professional touring brigades for Pioneer Camps, and the contents of the Quarterly Bulletin of Children's Plays Printed in Russia (then being put out by the International Union of Revolutionary Theatres). The author also touches on the content of the plays being presented such as The Negro Boy and the Monkey, Hiawatha, Robin Hood, and The Squealer. Other plot descriptions are offered, but without title identification. The writer's reactions to her visit are highly enthusiastic, critical of the propaganda emphasis, and indicative of the considerable degree of creativity and professional success that was achieved. It is interesting that she repeatedly compares the work of Natalia Satz to the ideas and writings of the English educator A. S. Neill (Summerhill).

Baughan's observations boil down to understanding why the drama was political but asking "why not forget politics in their plays?" The chapter brushes over Tairov's staging of The Optimistic Tragedy and Meyerhold's approach to The Inspector General and The Lady of the Camellias.

A. E. Wilson's chapter, thirty-three pages long, actually contains only thirteen pages on production material. The rest is background on the growth of Russian theatre, the extent of various enterprises, and the system of government subsidy. The plays on which he does comment include: Intervention, Egyptian Nights, Marriage of Figaro, Twelfth Night, and The Lady of the Camellias. As relates to the last play listed, he writes, "Meyerhold--the great revolutionary of the Soviet theatre--has apparently calmed down after his constructivist fever and the worst of his excesses that I saw was the production of The Lady of the Camellias. . . ." There are also quotations from Tairov and Meyerhold on the variety of approaches to dramatic conception and execution.

The "Note on Amateur Theatre" is just a note, written to explain that the brevity is the result of the fact that the author arrived in Russia only to discover that the approximately two hundred amateur clubs actually producing were all closed for the participants' vacations.

Articles and Periodicals

297. Altmann, Johann. "The Soviet Theatre Today." International Literature, 4-5 (1939), 170-81. Illus.

This is a classic demonstration of the party ideology's effect on theatrical criticism. The Marxist tag and the tenets of socialist realism are applied to a myriad of productions all over Russia. Altmann covers Shchepkin and Stanislavsky; an analysis and comparison of the two productions of Wit Works Woe at the Maly and the Moscow Art Theatre; and a three-year history of the most-produced Shakespearean plays. Lest a Soviet production be classified as without merit, the critic skirts controversial plays and tries to balance the impression. Subsequently, the article is filled with such hedging phrases as "striking though debatable," and "not fruitless." In a similar manner, he seeks to counteract impressions of Soviet displeasure with all the non-realistic theatres. The Kamerny's production of Stronger Than Death is called indicative of Socialist theatre; Meyerhold's Masquerade is

regarded as his liberation from symbolism; and the Jewish Theatre is lauded for its work with "anti-fascist barbarism" plays such as Sholem Aleichem's Tevye der Mikhiker(!).

298. An-Yang; Christe-Bennet, Helene; Boll, Andre; Durtain, Luc; Feldman, R.; Carnott, E. S.; Masferer-i-Canto, S.; Priacel, Stefan; and Salmoni, Andre. "Foreign Opinion on Soviet Theatre." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 6 (1934), 97-105.

The Chinese, French, Americans, and Eastern Europeans extol Meyerhold, Okhlopkov, the Worker's Theatre movement, and Soviet dramaturgy. The most informative piece is Durtain's observations on the alien style of the Moscow State Jewish Theatre. He comments on the successful use of the grotesque, the individuality of approach, and the obvious avoidance of a strictly revolutionary repertory. Indeed, the plays done by the State Jewish Theatre were very infrequently a showcase for the "new Socialist Jew."

299. Attoun, Lucien. "News Events: Fourth World Theatre Day in The U.S.S.R." World Theatre, XIV (July-August, 1965), 422.

March twentieth to April tenth is not exactly one day, but the Soviet program in celebration of the Fourth World Theatre Day extended over this twenty-day period. In this overview of the activities, created to emphasize the importance of the theatre to national life, we are also informed that the purpose and strength inherent in Soviet theatre emanates from the unceasing pursuit of realism. In total, the event was participated in by five hundred professional theatres, eight hundred people's theatres, and one hundred thousand amateur groups(!).

300. Becker, John. "The Russian Scene." Theatre Arts Monthly, XV (August, 1931), 627-33. Illus.

"The audience in Moscow . . . is composed of engineer-administrators, officeworkers, and manual workers, and these people want propaganda." Becker intimates that propaganda is faith and that the theatre has replaced the church. This position denies government scheming or maneuvering. In addition, it mistakes the Russian passion for theatre for indiscriminate taste. The author tries to

substantiate his position by pointing to the government's transference of interest to films and by predicting an increase in the autonomy of individual companies. He comments critically on three plays newly introduced in 1931 (The Last Decisive Combat, The Haul, and Poem of the Forge) and the efforts made by such as Meyerhold to unite drama and propaganda. Unfortunately, autonomy did not prove to be the keynote of the theatre in the 1930's.

301. Campbell, A. J. "Poets and Playwrights." Survey, XXXXVI (January, 1963), 68-76.

"This article is not intended to give more than a fleeting impression of some of the highlights, some of the problems, and some of the advances and setbacks of the contemporary Soviet theatre in the early 1960's--illustrated almost entirely from the Moscow background."

The fleeting impressions are well-written both stylistically and critically. Using specific productions, Campbell comments on the work of the Sovremenik (The Naked King, Moscow Time, Five Evenings), and the Akimov Comedy Theatre (The Shadow). He also summarizes and analyzes the drama of the 60's--standard heroic plays, black and white east-west plays, the drama of the "smiling, buxom, simple peasants," and the rare treatments of individual lives and problems.

"Save for the emergence of the Sovremenik, there have been few major institutional changes. At times some of the Moscow theatres are a little reminiscent of the two Irishmen who beg their friends to restrain them from hitting each other, a thing which for all their pugilistic antics, neither of them has the slightest intention of doing."

302. Choumov, N. "The Centenary Celebrations of the Birth of Stanislavski in the U.S.S.R." World Theatre, XII (Summer, 1963), 85-87. Illus.

The celebration of the centenary was marked by a great variety of events. Choumov chronicles the scholarly meetings, special events, plays performed by the Moscow Art Theatre, and the speeches given at the special meeting of the Soviet Committee for the Celebration of the Centenary of Stanislavsky's Birth.

303. "The Chekov Centenary In The U.S.S.R." World Theatre, IX (Summer, 1960), 100-01.
As an introduction to the issue, which is dedicated to the centenary, the editorial staff provides a partial listing of the Chekhovian productions (theatre, play, director-producer) staged in Russia for the anniversary.

304. Clements, Colin Campbell. "The Bat." Theatre Arts Magazine, October, 1921, pp. 275-78. Illus.
A brief sketch (more like an enlarged caption) indicates the orientation and mood of Baliev's supercabaret. The entry is worth seeing for the illustrations, which depict the concept of design for these review-type productions.

305. Craig, Gordon. "The Russian Theatre Today." London Mercury, XXXII (October, 1935), 529-38.
There is no real potential audience for this piece. It is undisciplined and confusingly organized. The reader will learn more about Craig's ideas than about the actual work of the Soviet theatre. The Moscow canvas is dotted with the author's impressions of the Maly, the State Jewish Theatre, and the Kamerny Theatre. In addition, the noted designer pays homage to Stanislavsky and Danchenko, and praises the serious ideals and creative opportunities in the Russian theatre.

306. Evguenov, E. "Theatre Notes: U.S.S.R." World Theatre, XV (1966), 74-76. Illus.
A lot of attention was attracted by Lyubimov and his youthful spirited work at the Taganka Theatre. Here the production under discussion is the total theatre approach he gave Ten Days That Shook The World. The author, in illustrating the staging techniques, comments that this treatment relies heavily on Vakhtangov, Brecht, Meyerhold, etc. He calls it "a young approach which is based on a solid tradition of the past." It is indeed from the past, if not a past that was valued by the Soviets!

307. Ferrer, Olga Prjevalinskaya. "Theatre in the U.S.S.R." Books Abroad, XXXIX (Summer, 1964), 297-302.
"Undoubtedly the ideological drama linked with the development of new regions had a basically lyrical plot and was the type of

play most frequently seen on the repertoire of Moscow and province theater. If criticism of present day deficiencies was far from being absent from the theater, it was more conspicuous in variety shows. During the last few years we have witnessed the development of a theater that has nothing or very little to do with indoctrination; it deals with human, universal subjects. The Russian public, and especially the young, manifests a preference for theater pieces of high calibre, where humanity's fundamental problems are aired, such as classic tragedies, or the engaged drama, which it would be a mistake to consider devoid of interest or aesthetic value because of political bias."

In 1964, the author toured Russia's theatres during the end of the regular theatrical season, for the entire summer season, and into the beginning of the new regular season in September. In these six pages, via listings, occasional complete plot summaries, notes on production, and occasional comment on public reception, she touches on over forty plays. The titles appear in Russian and English and information is related regarding the theatres that housed the plays. This, for its size, is a comprehensive view of the big city repertory and offers specific examples of the observations quoted above.

308. Frolov, V. "World Reviews: U.S.S.R." World Theatre, XII (Winter, 1963), 354-58. Illus.

As a preface to the notes on the season, Frolov chooses the appearance of certain new works (such as Pavlova's Conscience) and their popular acceptance to reaffirm the formula that the best plays feature a "trueness to life of the imagery and the situations." Space is devoted to the occasion of a heavy Brecht season, including Erwin Axer's direction of " . . . Arturo Ui." The production history of Brecht in the Soviet Union is an interesting one in the light of Brecht's own shifting political ideology.

309. Galenian, A., and Leonidov, I. "World Reviews: U.S.S.R." World Theatre, X (Spring, 1961), 82-88. Illus.

Although we are informed that 1961 marks the fiftieth anniversary of Tolstoy's death, the reviewers do not describe any productions done in commemoration. The big event of the

season was considered to be the production of Mother Courage, at the Mayakovsky Theatre. The authors also report on openings at the Maly, the Moscow Art Theatre, and the Kremlin Theatre. The review closes with a discussion of the touring activities of the Bolshoi, Maly, and Mossoviet theatres in the Ukraine.

310. Gilliam Florence. "The Kamerny Theatre of Moscow." Freeman, VII (May, 1923), 255-58.
See entry number 82 for complete annotation.

311. Gorelik, Mordecai. "The Horses of Hamlet." Theatre Arts Monthly, XVI (November, 1932), 883-87. Illus.
In this well-written report of the still famous Hamlet directed by Akimov at the Vakhtangov Theatre, Gorelik describes an eccentric production that was "provocatively brilliant, opulent, and muddled." He vividly describes such scenes as Hamlet deluding his enemies by appearing publicly "clad in a night-gown wearing a saucepan on his head and holding a carrot"; the appearance of a drunken Ophelia; and the use of real and papier-maché horses. These things provided a lush, robust and totally altered Shakespeare.

312. Griffith, Hubert. "Bolshevik Dramatics: The Surface of the Scene." Theatre Arts Monthly, XV (December, 1931), 1029-35. Illus.
Based on a very unscientific survey of mechanics and students, it is concluded that "This intensive propaganda is not more thrust on the public by the government, than it is demanded and desired by the public itself." Griffith uses this to conclude his observations on a month's stay in Russia. The article communicates how impressed he was by the phenomenal attendance and the enthusiasm of the audiences.

313. Hainaux, René. "Twelve Days in the U.S.S.R." World Theatre, XIV (November-December, 1965), 595-99. Illus.
In light of most of the articles in this journal written by Russians, Mr. Hainaux's observations, as he himself mentions, are surprising. His predisposed idea of Soviet theatre was contradicted by the majority of the plays he attended. He indicates that the plays were done in more than one style and that

thirteen of the shows he witnessed were produced without realistic decor. His comments on production methods and design cover Sholokov's The Soil Upturned, Byron's Don Juan (as directed by Akimov), Okhlopkov's production of Euripides' Medea, and Reuben Simonov's successful museum resurrection of the original Vakhtangov staging of Turandot. General conclusions touch on a variety of subjects, including the huge, non-elite, non-demonstrative audiences; the heavy use of open staging; the employment of follow spots regardless of style or staging; and the absence of any examples of what is classified as the "theatre of evasion."

314. Houghton, Norris. "Mr. Smith's Mission to the Land of the Bolsheviks." Theatre Arts, XXX (January, 1946), 25-34. Illus.

Mr. Smith was Edwin S. Smith, Director of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. Following his summer in Russia, he was interviewed by Houghton as to the general theatrical developments and the specific shows he saw. The article synthesizes printed programs he brought back and presents his observations on the techniques being employed by Zavadsky at the Mossoviet, and by others at the old Meyerhold Theatre. He reported that the general repertory in Moscow included works by J. B. Priestley and Lilliam Hellman; and that plans were being made for Okhlopkov to stage Oedipus Rex, while Electra would be mounted at the Vakhtangov Theatre. The illustrations are accompanied by generous captions which indicate the importance of the show depicted.

315. Houghton, Norris. "The Soviet Theater Today." The Russian Review, XXII (April, 1963), 139-48.

This paper is very much in the spirit of Return Engagement. " . . . there is no longer the exhilaration of discovering something unexpected, something new on the Moscow stages. We have been it before, either in Moscow in the thirties or elsewhere since." Houghton reports on those developments which he considered to be the newest and most promising. Such developments include the Sovremenik Theatre started in the late fifties by Yefremov and catering to young interests and life styles; and the continuing work of the Theatre of Satire. Russia's cultural isolationism and the effect that twenty years of party control and

"dreary sameness" has had on Russia's position as a leading figure in world theatre forms the basis for many of the author's concerns and observations in this article.

316. Kalitine, Nikolai. "World Theatre: U.S.S.R." World Theatre, II (1952), 63.
Other than the standard "new plays" report, this slim review contains a note on Shakespeare and other classic playwrights most frequently produced in Russia.

317. Karintzev, N. "World Reviews: U.S.S.R." World Theatre, I (1951), 61-62.
This article contains general information on a variety of theatres including the Maly, the Komsomol, the Pushkin, the Theatre of the Red Army, the Moscow Art Theatre, and the Vakhtangov. The coverage gives the reader an idea of the season's repertory. Sorov's Dawn Over Moscow, performed at both the Mossoviet and the Ermolova, is singled out as material for a commentary on the unifying purpose which socialist realism gives to all productions.

318. Khodunova, E. "World Reviews: U.S.S.R." World Theatre, XI (Summer, 1962), 214-18. Illus.
A typically busy year is represented, along with the additional highlight of the first Russian production of Medea as directed by Okhlopkov. Among the newly written plays, Khodunova focuses on The Colleagues by Aksenov at the Maly, and My Elder Sister by Volodine at the Grand Drama Theatre of Leningrad. She also reports on a revival of Lermontov's The Masquerade, also at the Maly; activity in the Republics; and the visit of Eduardo de Filippo's Neopolitan Theatre.

319. Leyda, Jay. "In Leningrad." Theatre Arts Monthly, XIX (March, 1935), 209-19. Illus.
This review of all the year's activity covers quite a bit of territory including theatre, opera and ballet. Leyda analyzes the State Theatre's repertory, and the efficiency and foresight shown in planning for future years. Also noted are the Leningrad Comedy Theatre, the Grand Dramatic Theatre, and the then rapidly developing new companies and club theatres such as the TRAM, Red Theatre, Radlov's Studio Theatre, and the

Leningrad Theatre For Young Spectators. In addition, he summarizes the productions of the military theatres, the Leningrad Music Hall, and the "ethnographic" theatre. The article efficiently depicts the degree and variety of the activity and the stylistic direction of the work. This article is even more useful if compared with similar articles on the Moscow seasons.

320. Leyda, Jay. "News From Moscow." Theatre Arts Monthly, XVIII (April, 1934), 281-94. Illus.

The "news" is an overview of the Soviet theatre's seventeenth season. In addition to information on new productions in drama, ballet, and opera, the article contains critical reviews of specific productions and comparisons of theatres (Kamerny and the Moscow State Jewish) for purpose and approach to production. Leyda reports on My Friend, Intervention, and Somebody Else's Child, which were the three most popular productions in Moscow in 1934. Combining theatre for young people with new young groups and groups young in spirit, Leyda comments on the rise of the Theatre of Working Youth, and the Worker's Art Theatre; Natalia Satz's Moscow Children's Theatre and the Theatre of the Young Spectator; and the Krasnoi-Presny Theatre (in which Okhlopkov directed). At this time the reader might like to read Leyda's review of the Leningrad scene, "In Leningrad," for comparison and perspective (see entry number 319).

Reading about plans for the repertory of the Vakhtangov, the Theatre of the Revolution, the Kamerny, and particularly the State Jewish Theatre, one gets the feeling from the article that this vitality, variety, and ambition was in no danger from social or political restrictions. History tells us, however, that within a few short years this "activity" would no longer reflect the variety and innovation of earlier days.

321. Malnick, Bertha. "The Soviet Theatre, 1957." Soviet Studies, IX (January, 1958), 245-55.

"The chief mistake in the theatre is now admitted to have been oversimplification of the concept of 'socialist realism,' and the nature of man is the root of the dispute. Socialist was taken for granted but everyone had their own idea of realism." With her usual thoroughness, Malnick reports on a theatre still

suffering the effects of the "grey years," a period of nearly two decades, and the initial post-Stalin efforts to revitalize a once unique and highly varied operation. The author tries to illustrate indications of this return to the spirit of Meyerhold (if not to his practices), a spirit of inquiry and innovation. The repertory in 1957 was primarily that of classical and historical spectacle, but new plays dealing with everyday emotions were appearing and gaining popularity. Included in the discussion of the status and directions of the Soviet theatre are such topics as decentralized control; the regulation of state subsidy; Okhlopkov's controversial Hamlet; general staging techniques; and an overview of the practices between Stanislavsky's death and 1957!

322. Mariane, Marina. "Theatre Notes: U.S.S.R." World Theatre, XV (May-June, 1960), 314-16. Illus.

The year 1966 was the tenth anniversary of the founding of the Sovremenik Theatre. In celebration, Galina Voltchek staged the first presentation of An Ordinary Story (adapted by Rozov from Goncharov's novel). Mariane also provides information on Korostelev's direction of Don Quixote at the Moscow Art Theatre, and the Vakhtangov Theatre's premiere of Leonid Maliowguire's My Ironic Feeling (based on the correspondence between Chekhov and his brother, his sister, his wife, and Gorky).

323. Mariane, Marina. "World Reviews: U.S.S.R." World Theatre, X (Autumn, 1961), 288-92.

Mariane reviews a variety of plays including Stein's The Ocean, which received two differing productions at the Mayakovski Theatre and at the Central Theatre of the Soviet Army respectively. Among other presentations, the author comments on the staging of The Ex-Urchins at the Central Theatre For Children; The Pig's Tail (a Czechoslovakian comedy); and Gheorgi Tovstonogov's mounting of the American scenario They Didn't Bend Their Heads by Douglas Smith.

324. Markov, Pavel. "Milestones of Moscow's Past Theatre Season." Modern Drama, III (February, 1966), 373-77. Illus.

The Soviet theatre year saw two major events: the Chekhov Jubilee and the appearance of Arbuzov's It Happened In Irkutsk. Markov briefly reports on the staging of the rarely

produced Platonov and on The Wood Goblin. Critical comment touches on Bohochkin's production of The Seagull, both at the Moscow Art Theatre. Arbuzov's play went on to be one of the most popular in the 1960's. Here, the author describes and contrasts the two initial Moscow stagings, Simonov's at the Vakhtangov and Okhlopkov's at the Mayakovsky.

325. Markov, Pavel. "Moscow Theatre Season." Modern Drama, II (December, 1959), 283-88. Illus.

Markov selects Korneichuk's When The Stars Are Smiling and Illinsky's staging of Thackeray's Vanity Fair, from the over twenty-five Moscow premieres, to discuss as samples of the season. Along with the usual seasonal review, he discusses the status of the Moscow Art Theatre; its work abroad; the production of The Third Pathétique; and the effect on the company of the influx of new and young members. The work of this theatre is compared with Okhlopkov's staging of Posodine's The Little Student Girl and Speshnev's The Day Cannot Be Stopped, both at the Mayakovsky.

This was also the season of the birth of Yefremov's Sovremenik Theatre (Contemporary Theatre), and information is provided on the company's purpose and style of production.

In the tradition of a good Soviet summary, all the varied production forms reviewed are reconciled in the statement: "Though each continues to work in the theatrical forms it has chosen, all are united by the trend of Socialist Realism."

326. Markov, Pavel. "Theatrical Moscow." Modern Drama, VI (September, 1963), 187-94. Illus.

This is a summation of the 1962-63 season in Moscow. There is little criticism or amplification here, but rather an attempt to provide a picture of the tremendous amount of theatrical activity that took place. Most noteworthy are the plot descriptions of newly written and produced plays. Markov covers European touring companies; contemporary comedies and psychological drama; American plays (Raisin in the Sun, The Assasin, Orpheus Descending); Okhlopkov's staging of Orestes; and the revivals of such Russian classics as The Storm, The Masquerade, and Wit Works Woe.

327. Marshall, Norman. "Amateur Theatre in Russia." Drama, LVI (Spring, 1960), 33-35.

The author visited Russia in December of 1959 and studied the history and organization of the extensive amateur program. He relates his visit to the scheme and type of production common in his homeland, Great Britain, and makes suggestions for possible adoption of certain Soviet techniques. Information is provided on how the network of clubs is developed and managed, where and how amateur companies perform, and touring opportunities. Considerable stress is placed on explaining the symbiotic relationship between professional and amateur theatre in Russia and on how this has provided a key to the latter's success.

328. Mauny, de, Erik. "Current Trends in the Soviet Theatre." Survey, LVII (October, 1965), 73-80.

Covering the Taganka, the Sovremenik, and the Komosomol theatres, de Mauny reports on the emergence of these new operations and the "new" régisseurs whose conceptions are seen to be in the spirit of Yefremov. Comparable discussion of the plays and styles of production can be found in many similar articles of the period, but this piece is of special interest owing to the author's criticism of the quality of acting in Soviet "avant garde" theatres. In support of his observations, he paraphrases and quotes from a similarly critical article by Gheorgi Tovstonogov, from a June issue of the newspaper Sovetskaya Kultura. "Purely acting successes in the Lenin Komosomol Theatre are few and in the Taganka Theatre, even fewer." Tovstonogov objects to the over-reaction to grey realism which brought with it an obliteration of the value of that which had already been learned and practiced successfully in the area of acting training. He calls for a return to the disciplined collective inquiry of the Studio situation.

329. Mirsky, D. "Dos Passos in Two Soviet Productions." International Literature, III (1934), 152-54. Illus.

On the surface, this is a standard review of two varying productions of the same play. The play is Dos Passos' Fortune Heights and the rival directors are Tairov and Alexander Diky. What is really being criticized is anti-realism and Tairov's "theatrical culture" approach.

Diky is praised for understanding and projecting the "social processes" of Dos Passos' play. Diky's own history of capitulation sheds light on the actual theatrical value of this article and the general criteria for much of the dramatic criticism in the 1930's. Diky was a student of Vakhtangov's in the Moscow Art Theatre First Studio. Though his early work was itself often considered expressionistic, during the Stalin years he dedicated himself to the Marxists. Within the Studio, Diky became the leader of the opposition against Mikhail Chekhov, who was then considered to be a reactionary idealist.

330. Morozova, N. "Theatre Notes: U.S.S.R." World Theatre, XIV (July-August, 1965), 406-16.

These reviews include plot resumés and comparative staging descriptions. The focal point of the notes is Boris Ravenskikh's staging of Sholokov's The Soil Upturned, done at the Pushkin Theatre. My Poor Marat, by Arbuzov, received varying treatments at the Leninsky Komsomol and at the Central Theatre of the Soviet Army. The latter theatre also produced Chekhov's The Cherry Orchard, in, to parphrase Morozova, an untraditional but thoroughly Chekhovian way (?).

331. Morozova, N. "World Reviews: U.S.S.R." World Theatre, XI (Summer, 1962), 392-97.

During the summer of 1962, Barrault and Renaud both brought companies to Moscow. In turn, the Soviet's exported the Maly to the Theatre des Nations in Paris, and the Vakhtangov to the twenty-first Drama Festival in Venice. This was also the year of the World Congress on Peace and Disarmament in Moscow. Morozova reports on the productions staged to mark the occasion: Women's Revolt (Hikmet and Komissarzjevski), My Heart Is In The Highlands (Saroyan), and Saturday, Sunday, and Monday (Eduardo de Filippo).

332. Murray, Ella Rush. "The Russian Theatre Under The Soviet." Carolina Playbook, I (December, 1928), 5-9.

There is more information here on the author's health while abroad than on the Russian theatre. Her critical facility is summed up in this quotation on the last scene of Roar China: "Had I known how trying the

last scene was going to be I doubt if these lines would ever have been written, as I am a sedulous avoider of horrors." Without distinction, she reports on Meyerhold's productions of Roar China, The Eyes of the Village, and an Antigone, which she fails to place either by director or theatre.

333. "News From The Soviet Socialist Republics." World Theatre, I (1951), 56. Illus.

The "news" is a series of four photographs of productions of The Unforgettable Year 1919 (Vishnevsky), The Vast Steppe (Vinnikov), The Government Inspector (Gogol), and Sadko (an opera by Rimsky-Korsakov).

334. Pilcher, Velona. "The Theatre of the Revolution." Theatre Arts Magazine, April, 1927, pp. 258-72. Illus.

Pilcher reports on the witnessing of such productions as Roar China, The Destruction of Europe, Le Cocque Magnifique, and a rehearsal of Meyerhold's adaptation of The Inspector General. In the case of the first two, the notes on the story line and presentation are lengthy. Unfortunately, this article succumbs to drippingly sophomoric and self-conscious verbiage. The author communicates her awe and the striking quality of the stage interpretations, but the article lacks depth in its analysis. We know this is a revolutionary theatre from the plot summaries, but the explanation of theatrical technique is replaced by an ethereal portrait of Meyerhold.

335. Pollock, John. "Glimpses of The Russian Theatre." Fortnightly Review, No. 5 (1920), 384-96.

The opinions and the type of information contained in this article are uncommon. The author, whose occupation and interests were not tied to a professional investigation of Russian theatre, found the Moscow Art Theatre stagnant. All the observations are based on the period before 1918. During that period, Pollock found the Maly's presentations of Ostrovsky and Griboyedov most consistently entertaining.

He was also very interested in what he described as "stock companies" operating throughout the provinces with the aid of what is termed "gastrolers" or jobbed in stars who roved from one company to another (such as the

Adelheim brothers). These companies are not rare finds but regular provincial operations utilizing people like Vera Kommissarzhevskaya who was unhappy with the type of roles she could play in Moscow. A great deal of the information here appears fresh or little written of but is actually appearing under less familiar titles, and as the title indicates, was viewed in glimpses.

336. "Postmark Moscow." Theatre Arts, XXV (November, 1941), 840-43. Illus.

These pages reproduce the contents of a letter received by the Society For Cultural Relations days before the Nazi onslaught. The notes describe the plays that managed to open; original plans for additional productions; and the results of the Second Shakespearean Conference held in Moscow by the All-Russian Theatrical Society in 1941. The illustrations are of Bulgakov's Don Quixote at the Vakhtangov, A Fellow From Our Town at the Moscow Komosomol, and of Mashenka as presented at the Mossoviet Theatre in Moscow.

337. Rowan-Hamilton, Norah. "Drama Under The Soviet Government." London Mercury, XX (September, 1929), 497-505.

In an overview of dramatic theories and outstanding characteristics, Hamilton touches on Meyerhold, agit-prop troupes, children's theatre, the Habima, Vakhtangov, and constructivism. The observations are clearly stated, but overall the text is too simplfied, too black-and-white in its evaluations of the people's responses, and often accompanied by erroneous conclusions. Bulgakov's play The Days of the Turbins is translated as "The Turbies" and many other plays are described without ever being identified by title. The claim is made that the Moscow Art Theatre had never left Russia, while Stanislavsky and the company appeared in America in 1923. The author is also faulty in her analysis of Vakhtangov's production of Turandot, in which she reduces the director's brilliant concept to mere avoidance of "bourgeois endeavors."

338. Rudnitsky, K. "Foreign Plays on the Soviet Stage." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 4 (April, 1956), 20-22. Illus.

This is an interesting, brief account of foreign drama produced or planned for production on the Russian stage in 1956. The Markov production of Halldor Laxness' play, A Lullaby Sold, is discussed in detail. Other plays listed or discussed (indicating their relationship to the contemporary repertory) include Witches of Salem (The Crucible), All My Sons, Little Foxes, The Ferellis Are Disturbed (Watch on the Rhine), Ladies And Gentlemen (Another Part of the Forest), Autumn Garden, Lizzie McKay (La putain respecteuse), and Nothing But Truth. There is a comment to the effect that Polish, Rumanian, and Bulgarian playwrights are also receiving production.

339. Saint-Denis, Michel. "Reflections on the Russian Theatre." Theatre Arts, XLII (June, 1958), 12-13, 72. Illus.

In the course of his candid observations concerning repertory, scenic design, and dramatic interpretation, Mr. Saint-Denis raises good questions concerning the critical taste of the Russian audiences, the effect on the drama of the isolation of the Soviet culture, and the degree of change that could be expected in post-Stalin years. The material is the result of the author's third visit, a trip taken in 1957, during which time he saw fourteen productions, and which motivated him to compare the Moscow Art Theatre's productions of Chekhov over the years.

340. Sayler, Oliver M. "Tudor Twelfth Night in Russia." The Drama, X (October, 1919), 3-7.

The First Studio of the Moscow Art Theatre, under the guidance of Vakhtangov, acted as a training school for Stanislavsky, but also developed its own ideology and production style. This article presents a thirteen-scene account of the setting and staging techniques for Shakespeare's Twelfth Night. It is accompanied by an account of the acting style and some of the individual performances. The design description is most useful.

341. Seton, Marie. "The Russian Scene: Soviet Theatres in 1933." Theatre Arts Monthly, XVIII (April, 1933), 367-77. Illus.

Seton's reconstruction of the development of Russian theatre practice and the penetration of revolutionary ideas contains many questionable statements. For example, she comments that the actors wore rags in Vakhtangov's Turandot because times were so bad. Gorchakov, in his book The Vakhtangov School of Stage Art, discusses the director's rejection of renderings for conventional costumes on the basis of a different stylistic concept for design. In describing the Russian reconstruction of the classics she speaks favorably of Akimov's Hamlet. As the reader may discover by reading Gorelik's article on Akimov (see entry number 311), Hamlet was virtually rewritten, and may be considered eccentric at best.

342. Singermann, Boris. "World Reviews: U.S.S.R." World Theatre, IX (Summer, 1960), 178-81.

The article contains a brief seasonal review of three recently opened plays: It Happened in Irkutsk (Arbuzov), The Unequal Struggle (Rozov), and The Sword of Damocles (Hikhmet). It Happened in Irkutsk was one of the biggest hits in Russia in the 1960's. This review describes three different original stagings it received.

343. Singermann, Boris. "World Reviews: U.S.S.R." World Theatre, IX (Winter, 1960), 358-63. Illus.

The amount and variety of year round activity in the Soviet theatre is emphasized in this report on the programs and tours for the summer months. During the summer, many of the Moscow-based companies tour the provinces, and provincial companies in turn travel to the major cities. In 1960, fifty-nine provincial productions were offered in Moscow alone, including those of the Rustavelli, the North Ossetia, and the Novosibirsk theatres, which are discussed in this review. Among the foreign visitors, Singermann reports on the Vieux Colombier, the Piccolo Teatro of Milan, the Sambo, and others. As in other "World Reviews," the reader should not expect detailed reports of production approach, but can gain access to what the Russians considered the most important events in the year's repertory, and thus piece together trends and ideological shifts.

344. Sobolev, Y. "Our Dramatic Theatres." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 6 (1934), 20-30. Illus.

Conceived as a review of the national repertory, the author isolates what he considers the focal points of the Soviet theatrical art. These primary areas include an avoidance of art for art's sake; the practical service of the construction of socialism; socialist realism; and the supremacy of the Russian actor. Within these divisions he outlines the production plans for 1935 for companies in Moscow and Leningrad; illustrates the concern for Russian and world classics; takes snipes at both the "infantile sickness of leftism" found in constructivism and the "naturalistic primitivism" of the Moscow Art Theatre; and traces the history of the Russian thespian from jester to priest to the Soviet teacher of art to the masses.

345. "Tickets Are Not For Sale: Theatre Under The Soviets." Theatre Arts Magazine, July, 1921, pp. 199-200.

The reader will find a listing account of the offerings in the major theatres of Moscow and Petrograd during the last ten days of February, 1921.

346. Trilling, Ossia. "An East European Travel Journal: New Trends in Production." World Theatre, VII (Autumn, 1958), 191-215. Illus.

As the title makes clear, this article is not devoted entirely to Russia, but pages 201-07 are most informative and quite explicit about the types of stage conventions employed in Soviet Russia at this time. In addition to the text, there are a large number of excellent photographs. Trilling's descriptions make certain that despite the common paying of "lip-service to the aesthetic akase, there were a great number of Meyerhold influenced and generally non-socialist realism productions." He gives examples from the director's works: Zavadsky's Masquerade, Okhlopkov's Hamlet and his Aristocrats, Simonov's Filumena Marturano, Pluchek's mounting of three plays by Mayakovsky, and Tovstonogov's restaging of The Optimistic Tragedy (originally done by Tairov).

347. Trilling, Ossia. "Leningrad After 250 Years: Some Healthy New Trends in the Russian Theatre." Theatre World (January, 1958), 37-38.

This very brief review of the season's highlights attempt to illustrate by describing the work of such a man as Tovstonogov that there is a return to freedom of style and method in the theatre, and a "new tolerance of the authorities towards experiment and heterodoxy in stage production." The author comments briefly on productions of the City of Glory, The Fox and the Grapes, Sixth Floor, Dangerous Corner, and City of Dawn.

348. Trilling, Ossia. "New Directions in the Russian Theatre." Contemporary Review, CCVII (October, 1965), 199-202.

The author is impressed with the trend toward the young, in both personnel and ideas. He notes some of the pre-Stalinist spirit in the divergent elements whose opinions of the modern theatre strongly divide the Russians. As examples of the mood and the movement, he describes the thrust of Lyubimov's Theatre of Drama and Comedy, Efros' Komsomol Theatre, Yefremov's Sovremenik, and particularly, the work of Tovstonogov's Leningrad Gorky Theatre. Tovstonogov is perhaps the motivation for this article, as at the time of its writing, his theatre was slated to appear at the Aldwych in London during the following April. Trilling is impressed by Tovstonogov's theatrical daring, outspokenness, and ingenious use of a modern approach to the scenic and to the literature. In the usual Trilling manner, this article presents a good deal of information very clearly.

349. Tutaev, David. "In Search of Everyman." Theatre Arts, XXXI (August, 1947), 35-37. Illus.

The critical views in this piece are hit and miss, primarily because the scope of the subject is too broad, while the space devoted is too meager. The report centers on the Soviet's difficulty in getting good contemporary plays into the repertory. In an effort to get closer collaboration between playwrights and companies, the former were appointed to various theatres as advisers. Leonov, Vishnevsky, and Simonov were appointed to the Maly, Kamerny, and Lenin Komsomol theatres, respectively. Tutaev makes no

comment, however, on the relationship between the quality of the contemporary drama and the difficulty of getting it produced.

Reports

350. The Soviet Theatre. Issued periodically by the Theatre Committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, 1946. (Mimeographed.)

The purpose of this mimeographed periodical was to provide a bulletin of exchange on American theatre practices for Russian colleagues and vice-versa. This issue, the only one I could locate, contains four articles: Organization of the Soviet Theatre by Thelma Schnee; The Current Season in Moscow and Leningrad--The Kamerny Theatre by Alexander Tairov; The Russian Theatre in the War--The Jolly Troupers by Vladimir Polyakov; and The Moscow Puppet Theatre by Sergei Obratzov. The Polyakov article is an interesting report on a troupe that lived at the front during the war and improvised sketches based on events happening at the time.

Theory and Criticism

Books

351. Brown, Benjamin W. Theatre at the Left. Providence: Bear Press, 1938. pp. 105.

See entry number 187 for complete annotation.

352. Evreinoff, Nicolas. The Chief Thing: A Comedy For Some, A Drama For Others in Four Acts. New York: Published for The Theatre Guild by Doubleday, Page and Company, 1926. pp. 226.

Although primarily a play script, this volume is annotated here for its preface, which briefly presents in Evreinov's words some of his non-realistic thinking on the instinct of transformation and the use of theatre in the psychological pursuits of everyday life. For example, he deals with role playing and theatre for the disadvantaged--" . . . since we are unable to give happiness to the unfortunate, we must at least give them the illusion of happiness." For more material on

his place in the pre-Revolutionary Russian theatre and a fuller presentation of his own writings, see The Theatre in Life (entry number 353).

353. Evreinoff, Nicolas. The Theatre in Life. Translated and edited by Alexander I. Nazaroff. New York: Brentano's, Inc., 1927. pp. 296. Illus.

Nicolas Evreinov, often called the Gordon Craig of Russia, who, along with Meyerhold and Tairov, developed the non-realistic theatre in pre-Revolutionary Russia, had written some seventy-five books and articles by 1924. In 1926, Evreinov emigrated to the United States and personally supervised this volume, which is an English condensation of the original Teatr dlia sebia, published in three volumes in Russia between 1915 and 1917. An editor's note indicates that this text also contains chapters reworked from other Evreinov writings, including The Theatre As Such (1912), Theatrical Novations (1922), and The Theatre in the Animal Kingdom (1924).

Sayler, in his introduction, writes of this book that it is "the first adequate statement of the psychological foundations of the revolt against dramatic realism." This volume explains Evreinov's theories of theatricality in life and of a pre-aesthetic instinctual response as the satisfaction of a homeostatic need. The text is divided into three sections: theatrical, pragmatic, and practical. The last section also contains three playlets from the repertory of The Theatre For Oneself. He analyzes human habits and practices so as to find parallels in the psyche to theatrical conventions and illusions. Evreinov regarded theatre as the stage management of life--the changing of visible phenomena into controllable and desirable images.

354. Flanagan, Hallie. Shifting Scenes of the Modern European Theatres. New York: Coward-McCann, Inc., 1928. pp. 280. Illus.

See entry number 145 for complete annotation.

355. Roberts, S. Soviet Historical Drama: Its Role in the Development of a National Mythology. Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff, 1965. pp. 218.

Although this excellent book deals primarily with the literature and I have chosen to exclude this area from the bibliography, it is annotated here because the reading of selected passages and chapters provides an interesting insight into the thinking and political goals of the Party from the Revolution through the Krushchev years, and thus offers a good background for understanding how the theatre was used as a tool and a weapon.

"Historical drama in its role as a vehicle for conveying the myth, as well as the myth itself, will be the subject of this study. We have already considered the reasons for the popularity of the genre. Now the aim will be to observe how the playwrights coordinated their artistic efforts with the ever-changing party line on historiography. What was the reaction of the critics and the public to the writer's choice of material and reworking of it? How closely did these critical demands correspond to those of Western critics who have written on the historical genre in belles-lettres?"

The reader is specifically directed to the Introduction and Conclusion, and to the chapters entitled "Lunacharskii Versus The Proletcult" and "Myth Serves The War Effort."

Articles and Periodicals

356. An-Yang; Christe-Bennet, Helene; Boll, Andre; Durtain, Luc; Feldman, R.; Carnott, E. S.; Masferer-i-Canto, S.; Priacel, Stefan; and Salmoni, Andre. "Foreign Opinion on Soviet Theatre." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 6 (1934), 97-105.

See entry number 298 for complete annotation.

357. Bakshy, Alexander. "Ten Years of a Revolutionary Theatre." Theatre Arts Magazine, November, 1927, 867-875. Illus.

See entry number 229 for complete annotation.

358. Carter, Huntly. "Spirit of Peace in Soviet Theatre." Aryan Path, IX (1938), 189-93.

It would seem that Huntly Carter must have had his own religious experience immediately prior to writing this piece. The spirit of peace is in religion and the author sees religion in the Soviet dedication to science; in constructivism; in the spiritual harmony of mass spectacles; in mass audiences; and in the national minority theatres. Unfortunately, the author greatly overestimated the value and philosophy of Soviet drama; underestimated the potential for armed conflict in the world liberation of the proletariat; and seemingly misunderstood the Soviet purpose in the promotion of the arts.

359. Carter, Huntly. "The Theatre and Class War in Soviet Russia." Labour Monthly, III (December, 1922), 365-372.

The prolific Carter is here concerned with identifying the characteristics of the transitional theatre evolving during the first years after the Revolution. He writes about the mass audiences; open-air spectacles; the removal of the void between the actor and the audience; and the lessening in the importance of personalities and deputies in the drama of the intelligensia. He compares the Soviet technique of developing a people's theatre with those of ancient Greece and contemporary Germany. With misguided spiritual fervor, Carter employs religious metaphors to review various stages of the transition, involving romantic, realistic, commedia, and symbolist influences.

360. Evreinov, Nicolas N. "New Ways In The Theatre." Translated by Louis S. Friedland. Theatre Arts Magazine, August, 1924, pp. 515-16.

These are a few notes illustrating only minor aspects of Evreinov's philosophy. He comments on the banality of a "mirror for life," calling instead for a crystallization of essential moments of life; and observes that people want an idealized, theatricized image of themselves even in their own mirrors.

361. Field, Andrew. "The Theatre of Two Wills: Sologub's Plays." The Slavonic and East European Review, XXXXI (December, 1962), 80-88.

Although this bibliography is not aimed at the drama, this article is included as it

deals primarily with Sologub as a theorist in relation to Meyerhold and Evreinov. It is therefore important to any study of the symbolist movement in Russian theatre. The text discusses Sologub's theories and plays as they reflect his loosely related dramatic ideas. Field analyzes the content and the staging of such plays as Van'ka, Victory of Death (Meyerhold's last production at the Vera Kommissarshevskaya Theatre), Night Dances, and The Gift of the Wise Bees. Sologub, opposed to any attempts at a return to classicism, emphasized the role of the playwright to the total exclusion of the actor. He suggested that the narrator or playwright himself read the play, while performers mimed or indicated the physicalization of the action.

362. Glagolin, Boris. "What is Constructivism in the Russian Theatre?" Translated by Dr. William Olen. The Drama, XX (1930), 242.

"The creation of a being--a Golem--a human mechanism, penetrating the mysteries of human life and victory over death; these are the problems of constructivism in art."

In this romanticized account of the evolution of constructivism, one is asked to believe such things as the theory that the associated development of Biomechanics was linked to a "fear of injury which taught the actor to become skillful." The article does not actually explain or describe constructivism as much as it hypothesizes about why it exists. The larger theme is a thorough denunciation of all illusionistic and realistic theatre and the suggestion "to live only for what can be touched and handled." Ironically, the illustration of a Glagolin production of The Dog in the Manger which accompanies the text, while certainly not realistic, is a far cry from orthodox constructivism.

363. "In What Style Should Chekov Be Staged?" World Theatre, IX (Summer, 1960), 111-48. Illus.

World Theatre selected the following list of questions to amplify the title query: (1) Is it necessary to produce Chekhov in the traditional and in fact dazzling style of the Moscow Art Theatre, which was in his day an experiment of the realistic movement? (2) If so, how does the creative role of the designer or producer express itself? (3) Is it possible

to present Chekhov in settings other than the traditional ones? (4) If so, what liberties can the designer or producer take? (5) What have you found stirring and exciting when you have had to put on a play by Chekov?

Twenty-two directors and designers from all over the world (including the Soviet Union) replied. The responses say more about realism and psychological realism than about Chekhov specifically, but in so doing indicate the continuing effects of the early work of the Moscow Art Theatre.

364. Korneitchouk, Alexander. "The Soviet Point of View." World Theatre, IV (Autumn, 1955), 48-50.

The point of view concerns an author's relation to his society. This document is a series of extracts from a report made by the dramatist to the Second Congress of Soviet Authors, held in Moscow in 1954. An editor's note calls attention to this as an important session in the evolution of socialist realism. Among other points, Korneitchouk spoke about nationalism and formalism (finding both equally alien to Soviet purposes); the positive hero as best constructed when the bearer of human weakness; and political theatre as best expressed in the form of social and human conflict.

As part of this article, the editors of World Theatre also reproduced Rostovsky's piece on the revival of Mayakovsky's The Bath, which appeared originally in the March-April edition of the V.O.K.S. Bulletin. In line with Korneitchouk's cautions and proposals, Rostovsky's observations indicate the actuality of the change in application of the idea of socialist realism as it affected theatrical style.

365. Lunacharsky, A. V. "Problems of the Soviet Theatre." International Literature, III (July, 1933), 88-96.

This text is a transcript (complete with parenthetical indications of laughter and applause) of a speech made to the Second Plenary Session of the Organization Committee of the All-Russian Union of Soviet Writers. "Static realism," "negative realism," and romanticism are compared with socialist realism for relevancy to achieving the "triumph of the classless society." The speaker cautions régisseurs against forgetting that the

expression of social content is more important than experiments with form. The speech is indicative of both the reigning dramatic theory and the source of official displeasure with such directors as Meyerhold and Tairov.

366. Sayler, Oliver M. "Theatre of Let's Pretend." Century, CIV (June, 1922), 276-84.

Baliev's "Bat Cabaret" transferred from Russia and named the "Chauve Souris" is the focal point of this discussion of the theatre theatrical. There is more here on Baliev's curtain speeches than on the actual productions. His performances and the idea of his satirical review simply serve as the springboard for the article's main intent, which is the proposal for the use of frank theatricality in America.

367. Sayler, Oliver M. "Theory and Practice in Russian Theatres." Theatre Arts Magazine, July, 1920, pp. 200-14. Illus.

Sayler regarded the prolific experimentation in the modern Russian theatre as its most important unifying element. In this article, he attempts to provide an overview of the types of theories and methods of testing characteristic of the period. He begins by trying to establish that Russian art and theatre specifically had long been "freer of aesthetic taboos" than that of any Occidental nation. In 1920, the interplay between theory and practice in Russia was indeed very apparent but we know that, unfortunately, in later years the nature of the experimentation narrowed considerably. He illustrates the discussion by tracing Stanislavsky's own periods of change through to the work of the laboratories like the Studio theatres. In dealing with Meyerhold, Sayler expresses the opinion that Meyerhold's work would only develop and continue if playwrights supplied him with contemporary themes. Contrary to his predictions, the Revolution did not provide the impetus for such a body of "theatre theatrical" literature. Also discussed in this article are Baliev, Tairov, Kommissarzhevsky, and Evreinov. Once again, Sayler concludes that the general Russian approach could serve as a model for a developing American theatre.

368. "Theatre People Reply To Our Inquiry." World Theatre, XIV (January-February, 1965), 51-52.

As a kind of international status survey on the influence of realism on the twentieth century theatre, the editors of World Theatre submitted the following series of questions to theatre practitioners in many countries including the U.S.S.R.: (1) Does your experience lead you to think that the theatre of tomorrow is tending toward a new realism? (2) Do the subjects with which this New Realism is concerned and the forms it assumes differ from those of the Realism that made its appearance during the second half of the nineteenth century? (3) Can you show us by means of concrete examples taken from your own sphere of activity, how this quest for a New Realism is made manifest?

Soviet individuals replying included Mikhail Tsarev (President of the Soviet Center of the I.T.I., and the Theatre Association of the R.S.F.S.R.), Oleg Efremov (founder of the Sovremenik Theatre), and Nikolai Cherkassov (a famous stage and film actor). Tsarev views the Soviet purpose as one of demonstrating "life in the forms of life itself." He makes it clear that the question is not one of a New Realism but only of Socialist Realism, in which yesterday, today, and tomorrow are not fixed and thus do not require revision. Efremov, on the other hand, evades the questions and refers the readers to the plays themselves. "The play determines the style of production. The theatre must be born again each time." With Cherkassov, we return to the hard line. For him, the theatre's only purpose is educating man, and he finds realism the only appropriate method for analyzing and understanding the world.

369. Vishnevsky, V.; Inber, Vera; Katayev, V.; Olesha, Y.; Pogodin, N.; Romashov, B.; and Tolstoy, Alexei. "Soviet Writers on the Soviet Theatre." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 6 (1934), 53-60.

This is a series of predictable endorsements of Soviet life and art. The praise encompasses the morality of Soviet dramaturgy; the value of the positive hero; the successful staging of classics through the determination of their social roots; the parallel development of drama and theatre as achieved by the force of the collective; and the emergence of social tragedy.

Training The Professional Theatre Worker

Books

370. Houghton, Norris. Moscow Rehearsals: An Account of Methods of Production in the Soviet Theatre. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1936. pp. 291. Illus.
See entry number 200 for complete annotation.

371. Houghton, Norris. Return Engagement: A Postscript to "Moscow Rehearsals". New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962. pp. 214. Illus.
See entry number 201 for complete annotation.

372. London, Kurt. The Seven Soviet Arts. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938. pp. 381. Illus.
See entry number 207 for complete annotation.

Articles and Periodicals

373. Gorbunov, Matvei, and Gershkovich, A. "The Teaching Of The Theatrical Arts." University of Toronto Quarterly, XXVIII (October, 1958), 65-75. Illus.
In a very impressive report, Gorbunov and Gershkovich describe the philosophy, organization, and methods of training for actors, directors, and critics in the higher theatrical schools. Although it could be better organized, the article contains considerable information on entrance requirements, faculty, and the curricula for a variety of programs. Most of the material applies to the extensive and intensive training of the director, who in Russia is the ideological art instructor for his cast or company. All phases of training from publicity to the choice of repertory and from flat construction to actor training, including all practical and apprentice work, are outlined by the authors. The reader will find the professional instruction given the critic in Russia thought-provoking in relation to the haphazard pursuit of similar skills in many other countries.

374. Kalantarov, D. "Theatrical Education." V.O.K.S. Bulletin, No. 6 (1934), 89-94. Illus.

One of the advances and advantages of the Soviet nationalization of the theatre has been the network of professional training institutions and the opportunity for great numbers to be prepared for and employed by companies all over Russia. This article discusses five kinds of training institutions operating in the 1930's. (For later developments in this same area, see entry number 373.) The institutions covered in this piece include theatrical technicums, state institutes of theatrical education, studios run by individual theatres, in-service work for already established theatre people in Soviet philosophy and ideology, and correspondence institutes utilized by outlying areas. Kalantarov compares curricula, length and organization of programs, and the primary characteristics that differentiate the purposes and approaches of the technicums, state institutes, and studios.

375. Knebel, Maria. "Becoming a Director in Five Years." World Theatre, XVI (January-February, 1967), 62-63.

See entry number 136 for complete annotation.

Reports

376. Tsarev, Mikhail. "The Education of Technicians in the U.S.S.R." A Report on the AETA Conference on Theatre Education and Development. Washington, June 14-18, 1967.

This, in the form of a postscript, is a one-page outline of the technical departments in the Nemirovich-Danchenko Moscow Art Theatre Studio School and the Ostrovsky State Institute of Stage Arts. Both of these are post-secondary institutions offering preparation in the areas of stage settings, scenery, construction, lighting, costuming, props, and makeup. Complete with knowledge in related fields of mathematics and physics, the trainee emerges as a "General Technical Engineer of Theatrical Affairs."

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

As has been demonstrated in the opening chapter, and as is illustrated by the content divisions of the major historical entries of the bibliography, the development of realism and the revolt against realism in the Russian theatre of the twentieth century has been such that it provides a microcosm of the directions and types of experiments indicative of all the theatres of our time. A characteristic of this entire period is aptly captured in Gorchakov's opening lines in the "Introduction" to The Theater in Soviet Russia: "If the Soviet theater of today is examined only from the quantitative standpoint, its state of well-being might seem unparalleled in the history of mankind."[1] The fury of activity and the national devotion of wealth and human resources to the theatre art is in part reflected by the great accumulation of written and graphic materials maintained and published in

---

[1]Nikolai A. Gorchakov, The Theater in Soviet Russia, trans. by Edgar Lehrman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1957), p. xii.

Russia. Although there has always been interest in the Russian theatre among English-speaking peoples, a comparison of this bibliography with the holdings of any major Slavonic collection or archive will readily demonstrate the paucity of materials available to the non-Russian speaking scholar.

It would seem, however, that this condition may be changing. Referring to entries number 115, 117, and 118, we find three very significant translations of works by and about major Russian figures which were published in 1969. As has also been noted in the Introduction, the last years of the 1960's saw an increase in doctoral research including James Symons' investigation of Meyerhold's productions from 1920 to 1932, and Jonathan Mezz's critical history of the Leningrad Theatre Institute.[2] In 1968-69, under the guidance of Herbert Marshall, Southern Illinois University established the Center For Soviet and East-European Studies In The Performing Arts. In addition to maintaining "a repository of information for interested scholars on heretofore untouched areas of Soviet and East-European cultural life," the center, with the assistance of various advisers and students, is directing its work toward filling the gaps in the archives and providing new

---

[2]Albert E. Johnson, ed., "Doctoral Projects in Progress in Theatre Arts, 1970," Educational Theatre Journal, XXII (May, 1970), 204.

materials in English.[3] In the area of new books and manuscripts, the 1970's will see, among other texts, a biographical study of Vsevolod Meyerhold by Marjorie Hoover; a dissertation on the Soviet reactions to the plays of Eugene O'Neill prepared by Harry Horner; a biography of Nikolai Evreinov by Helen P. Renick; another biography, of Solomon Mikhoels, a noted actor and director of the State Jewish Theatre, by Eileen Thalenberg; and a textbook on the Stanislavsky method of theatre production, entitled A Producer Prepares, written by Herbert Marshall.

While there is certainly no direct evidence of any causal relationship, the resurgence of interest in the Russian/Soviet theatre might well be linked to developments in Europe and America during the last two decades. The great interest in Brecht, Artaud, and Grotowski centers on principles and objective questions posed by Meyerhold as early as 1905. Investigations of architectural stage space and actor-audience relationships were being conducted by Tairov, Vakhtangov, and Okhlopkov before 1920. The development of resident repertory companies across the United States and the general trend toward decentralization could greatly benefit from a study of the firmly established Russian repertory system and the proliferation of individual community-based theatres there. As for

---

[3]Herbert Marshall, ed., "Bulletin of the Center For Soviet & East-European Studies In The Performing Arts," No. 1 (Spring, 1969), Southern Illinois University.

Stanislavsky, always very much a part of the American theatre scene in this century, it should be remembered that Creating A Role was presented in this country in 1961. The study of "physical action" and the revised ideas of Stanislavsky's last years have stimulated a reevaluation of our own training methods and, in turn, a new interest in the continued application of Stanislavsky's teachings.

As for further research, there are still many areas requiring close study, and existing documents requiring translation. The list of topics includes the activities of the Proletkult theatres and the theory of the movement; children's theatre and art education; identification and preparation of production notes and prompt book materials; translation of the writings of the régisseurs; and the presentation of the histories of any of a number of state theatres and national minority theatres. As an example of the kinds of needs these categories represent, the reader is directed to the following statement taken from the Bulletin of the Center For Soviet & East-European Studies In The Performing Arts:

> It is not generally realized that, today, over 50% of the population of the USSR are not Russians, but minority peoples. Many of them have proud traditions, older far than the Russians; and they are now eager more than ever that the outside world should learn something of their part in the present century, as well as the well-publicized Russians.[4]

---

[4] Ibid., No. 4 (Summer, 1970).

In addition to books and manuscripts, a widespread availability of original and reproduced visual and recorded materials would be a welcome addition to existing collections. Finally, and obviously, all theatre students would benefit from more regular reporting on production plans, repertories, and developments in theory and technique in the periodical literature. All of this is made more difficult not just by the language barrier (which is a given of any study of world theatre and an obstacle necessary to overcome if any nation is to insure itself against provincialism and narrowness of vision), but moreso by the political and social strain that has continually surrounded cultural exchange. The road to an appreciation of our fellow man's way of life is through a knowledge of his culture. The road to the greatest development of variety and achievement in human culture is through a sharing of that way of life.

APPENDIX

ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHIES

APPENDIX

ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHIES

a. Dossick, Jesse J. Doctoral Research On Russia And The Soviet Union. New York: New York University Press, 1960. pp. 248.

"The primary purpose of this monograph is to list the dissertation with a brief accompanying analysis of each classification. . . ." In addition, the author provides a supplement of bibliographical items and aids to further research for each section. At the time of publication there were only eleven completed dissertations on the theatre that Dossick could list, nine of which had been written during the 1950's.

Dossick feels that Gorchakov's text, The Theatre in Soviet Russia (see entry number 198) and the bibliography therein have no comprehensive competitor. He does, however, offer some other sources, both in Russian and in English, that are not identified by Gorchankov. As of the writing of this annotated bibliography, Gorchakov's text is still unrivaled.

b. Ettlinger, Amrie, and Gladstone, Joan M. Russian Literature, Theatre And Art: A Bibliography of Works in English, Published 1900-45. London: Hutchinson and Co., Ltd., 1947. pp. 96.

Part III of this bibliography is entitled "Studies in Russian Theatre and Art" and begins with a listing of fifty sources for drama, theatre, and film. The listing is obviously limited, but does touch on the most important sources and includes other books within which there are sections dealing with the Russian theatre. More than half of the references were published in the 1930's.

c. Horecky, Paul L. Basic Russian Publications. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962. pp. 313.

In total, this text is an annotated bibliography covering almost all of the general areas of interest in a cultural study as related to Russia and the Soviet Union. The theatre section also includes ballet, cinema, and circus. All of the theater works are listed in Russian, with an explanation in English of the title and the contents. Where a book has also been published in English, this is indicated in the annotation. There are twenty-three listings for theatre, one of which is the monthly periodical Teatr and one of which is the Encyclopedia of the Theatre. Bertha Malnick, who has written extensively on Soviet theatre, is responsible for the compilation. Her list emphasizes books dealing with historical development and the genesis and trends of theory for specific periods.

d. Horecky, Paul L. Russia and the Soviet Union. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965. pp. 473.

This is a companion to Basic Russian Publications. It acts as a bibliographic guide to Western-language publications. The compiler of the section on "Theater and Cinema," François de Liencourt, also authored the chapter in Literature and Revolution in Soviet Russia entitled "The Repertoire of the Fifties." There are thirty-three entries divided into the categories of General Reference Works and Bibliographies, Surveys and Histories of the Theatre (General, Pre-1917), The Soviet Period, Eyewitness Accounts, and Special Aspects of the Theater. Three of the listings are for Italian texts, six for French, and all the rest are for English sources.

SUBJECT INDEX

SUBJECT INDEX

Numerical Guide to Bibliographical Entries by Subject:

A

A, Continued

B

B, Continued

C

C, Continued

D

D, Continued

E

F

F, Continued

G

H

H, Continued

I

J

K

K, Continued

L

L, Continued

M

M, Continued

M, Continued

N

O

O, Continued

P

Q

R

S

S, Continued

S, Continued

T

T, Continued

U

V

W

Y

Y, Continued

Z

AUTHOR INDEX

AUTHOR INDEX

Numerical Guide to Bibliographical Entries by Author:

A

B

B, Continued

C

D

E

F

G

H

H, Continued

I

J

K

L

M

N

O

P

R

S

T

U

V

W

Y

Z