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THE DESIGNER IN THE THEATRE

By Lee Simonson

I. ARTISTS AND ART-ARTISTS

The Hon. John R. Hylan, while mayor of New York, made a valuable contribution to the vocabulary of art criticism. He invented the term “art-artist.” It has been too little used. The distinction between an art-artist and an artist is a real one, as I realized afresh while getting together the drawings and sketches for this exhibition of theatre art. An art-artist consciously produces a work of art that is wholly aesthetic in its appeal and is designed to arouse only a special sense, the aesthetic sense, which is a purification of our ordinary sensations of touch and sight. These are habitually impure because contaminated by associations and desires which have nothing to do with art, so that for centuries the majority of persons preferred to look at pictures of Madonnas rather than portraits of melons, just as in seeking for beauty in their environment they were inclined to contemplate mountains rather than mole hills. The immense labor of art criticism in the last fifty years has aimed to end this anomaly, to purify art and our experience of it. Art has been successfully divorced from use, beauty from subject matter, and the aesthetic emotion disentangled from the extraneous emotions that once created heroes, heavens and hells. The aesthetic sense is now cultivated by an arduous process of contemplation, of which a select number of connoisseurs and art critics is capable. They decide whether or not a painting or statue is sufficiently pure to be known as a work of art. The art-artist’s statues on pedestals or pictures in gold frames, like children dressed for a party, usually have no place to go until they are invited to an exhibition where the judgment is made. The public is then invited in, so that it may learn to recognize a work of art after being told what a work of art is.

Unfortunately there is still no general agreement as to how pure pure art can be or exactly what form the purification is to take. Until recent years at least the professional critics proved extremely unreliable. They invariably ridiculed, damned or ignored the work of every aesthetic innovator, who was as a rule first recognized by poets or novelists such as Gautier, Huysmans, Zola, George Moore or Gertrude Stein, and was then widely acclaimed as an artist only after he had died in poverty like van Gogh, in obscurity like Cézanne, or was being
trundled about in a wheelchair like Renoir in his old age. Even the innovators themselves often failed to recognize one another. Manet (according to Vollard) once remarked to Monet, “As a friend of Renoir you really ought to advise him to give up painting. You can see for yourself how little aptitude he has for it.”

The purification of art is now so holy a cause that the fate of art is more important than the fate of the artist. As one English critic, Mr. Wilenski, has put it: “The first stage in art appreciation is to distinguish the work of a hack painter from that of a true artist... It is always hard to distinguish contemporary artists. It is much easier to pick out the true artist of a period that is past. When an artist has been dead for thirty or fifty years we can see him in relation to his period and to the other artists who have worked before.” Which perhaps helps to explain why during the last century so many geniuses among painters earned such princely livings only after they were dead. The great painter is accorded the privilege of martyrdom; we make sufficient amends by beatifying him thirty or fifty years too late. Our museums tend to become heavens where the pure artists are ranged in eternal hierarchies around the throne of Art, like saints seated in immutable tiers at the feet of God. Our exhibitions are dress rehearsals for a Last Judgment. And a work of art to-day, more than ever before, is either a sacred relic or a living mystery.

Before attempting to review the work in this exhibition, done for the theatre during three centuries by painters and architects, it is well to remind ourselves that even in their own day they were not art-artists, but artists, content to be necessary craftsmen, and rarely needed as an incentive the conviction that they were producing a work of art or contributing to the development of art history. Their work with few exceptions was ordered and paid for by actors and theatre managers because it could add to the glamour and the excitement of an actual performance in a theatre, and they, like the public that enjoyed and applauded a stage setting, were quite unconcerned as to whether or not the original sketch was worth preserving. Indeed, designs for stage settings were as unimportant to the public which created a demand for them as were the architects’ plans for the cathedrals in which the same public worshiped, or as the shipwrights’ models for the galleons that opened new horizons and brought back gold from the Indies. In this respect designs for the stage are not unlike many of the objects now classified as works of art in our museums, objects that could not have been collected while they were being produced without pulling chairs from under the worthies who were sitting on them, dismantling priests, violating tombs or dese-
crating altars. Designs for the theatre are impure art, now known derogatively in aesthetic circles as applied or decorative art, and are produced by much the same process which to-day gives us buildings or bridges that also express the taste, the temper, and the culture of an epoch. Like a bridge or a building they are so much a part of contemporary life that their aesthetic value cannot be wholly isolated in an exhibition hall; they have often been destroyed, lost or forgotten long before anyone realized that they might be important landmarks in the aesthetic development of a nation or a continent.

But so persuasive is our new-found concern for the purity of art that it is safeguarded even by our customs authorities, who recently decided that the material in this exhibition was not entitled to free entry, even temporarily, into this country. These drawings, in the eyes of the guardians of the Port of New York, cannot be considered as original works of art; they are merely an intermediate step in the production of something essentially commercial. And this ruling has been, on a previous occasion, sustained by a decision of the United States Supreme Court. Thus a painting which may have been sold and resold with mounting profits for successive owners and picture dealers can be brought into this country as a pure expression of beauty and appropriately hung in a museum. This is not a commercial enterprise but the disinterested process by which the pure in art is shunted to its ultimate shrine. The design for a stage setting, on the contrary, is tainted with commercialism from its inception and can safely be let in, like any other dubious character, only under bond.

But whether or not these drawings and sketches are art according to our modern definition of it, they are art in the antiquated sense of the term: they created a succession of pictorial conventions which made a reproduction of life more real than life itself. Like many works of art in periods less aesthetic than our own, they were part of an act of interpretation; their aesthetic values were determined by the art of the theatre of which they were a part, where they did enhance the grace and the gaiety, the glitter and the glamour, the terror and the sublimity of human experience. Many, even of the more recent designs, are the architecture of worlds we could no longer inhabit even if they were again embodied on the stage, the geography of lost kingdoms whose rulers we have deposed. Considered apart from their original rôle, as purely graphic art, these drawings can do no more than indicate their most expressive qualities that originally illustrated a vision of life which they helped to intensify. They are primarily working drawings. Even the drawings made for ideal rather than actual
stages are not self-sufficient but anticipations of an event: they are planned to make more significant the miming of life that is to take place within their projected confines.

This exhibition therefore is perhaps rather for the theatre-goer than for the aesthete. It may serve to revive our awareness of the variety and intensity of life as it has been lived in the theatre of yesterday and to-day. It may, by the record of unflagging fecundity of invention, reassure us that the designer in the theatre is occasionally creative, although necessarily so much less so than the creator who evolves a purely pictorial method of recording the importance of an apple, a tree or a naked woman. It may also serve as an augury that designers for the theatre of tomorrow will probably succeed in creating forms that can illustrate or symbolize the spectacle of human destiny as playwrights of the future conceive it.

II. CUPBOARDS AND PORTFOLIOS

Scenic designers to-day as in the past show a certain degree of indifference or contempt for the records of their productions. Many of the most important have been mislaid or lost. In an epoch when almost every other form of art is produced only to be exhibited, it was almost staggering to find artists completely indifferent to the need of exhibiting their work. Much of it I had to dig out of cupboards and old portfolios. It was difficult to get many of the designers to go to the expense of mounting these loose leaves. Framing in most cases was out of the question. Picasso told me he couldn’t be bothered to look for the designs of “Le Tricorne.” They were somewhere in his studio. But he couldn’t take the time to find them. Besides he was very lazy. Derain refused categorically to send any of his ballet designs. They were too unimportant. As an art-artist he could be certain they were not art. Adolphe Appia’s epoch-making designs are kept in a portfolio in the Musée d’Art et d’Histoire of his native city Geneva, in an annex to the library where they can be seen only on request. It has seemingly never occurred to the curators of that institution, who show tiled stoves, helmets and halberds, that these drawings are worthy of wall space as part of a permanent exhibit open to the public. Many of the designs of Inigo Jones, now among the treasures of the Duke of Devonshire’s collection, are spattered with flakes of scene paint just as they originally came from some scene painter’s workshop. Evidently they were also working drawings and not worth preserving carefully in their own day.
Only in the Soviet Union was it evident that contemporary stage settings were considered worthy material for a museum. Almost every theatre maintains its own museum, where models of its most important productions are preserved in chronological order. But there the difficulty was of another sort. Several of the more important theatre museums were closed preparatory to moving to new quarters.

I corresponded for three months before going abroad and traveled through half of Europe for two months. I should have corresponded for six months and stayed abroad a year. The exhibition is therefore incomplete. Many of the gaps have been filled by loans from private collections. Many remain. In the short space of time that I could stay abroad I was unable to arrange other loans with absentee owners, to trace many drawings, to get in touch with many artists and directors. Nevertheless the exhibition does give a fairly complete picture of the development of stage design from the 16th century to the present day. And it is possible to indicate on the basis of the examples displayed what the trend of that development has been.

III. DESIGNERS AND DOCTRINES

Scene painting, like painting of easel pictures in Europe, has evolved about an effort to enhance by reproduction our awareness of the third dimension. Painting in the Orient could remain flat without becoming insignificant. In the Occident painting could only become significant by perfecting methods of intensifying our sensations of plasticity, of three-dimensional form receding in space, ultimately filled with all the vibrations that refracted light could add to enveloping color. The sources of our aesthetic satisfaction are, as Bernhard Berenson defined them, tactile values and space composition. Most modern art criticism is based on his assertions originally made in 1896 in the Florentine Painters. “To realize form we must give tactile values to retinal sensations . . . the artist who gives us these values more rapidly than the object itself gives them, gives us the pleasures consequent upon a more vivid realization of the object. The chief business of the painter, as an artist, is to stimulate the tactile imagination. Unless it satisfies our tactile imagination, a picture will not exert the fascination of an over-heightened reality. . . . Space composition is not an arrangement to be judged as extending only laterally or vertically on a flat surface but extending inward in depth as well. Ordinary composition reduced to its elements, plays upon our feeling for pattern. Space composition is much more potent.” Or as Clive Bell summarized
the same convictions for the next generation when he exploited the phrase “significant form,” “Pictures which would be insignificant if we saw them as flat patterns are profoundly moving because in fact we see them as related planes.”

The fascination of over-heightened reality: to achieve this is also the dream of every worker in the theatre whether author, actor, director, or scene designer. But the centre of every dramatic presentation is already a living, three dimensional object—the actor. The designer’s plastic problem therefore is a special one: to achieve an aesthetic unity between the actor and the world in which he moves. Since no stage is large enough to make the dimensions of this world absolute, the pictorial methods of illusion capable of stimulating our tactile imagination come into play.

The illusion with which pictorial stage setting began was the illusion of perspective. Its laws were rediscovered by the Renaissance as a result of the revival of interest in the classic theatre and the styles of classic architecture. Stage design was at first a by-product of architecture; the first text book of stage design is a chapter in Serlio’s treatise on architecture published in 1537. The standard settings for tragedy and comedy are exercises in architecture, that by a combination of solid constructions such as columns, steps, obelisks, roofs, and overhanging cornices, together with painting in perspective, contrived to convey the spaciousness of a public square on a stage platform 17 feet in depth. Vasari’s Lives contain descriptions of a number of contemporary settings more spacious and more elaborate, among them one that combined “a number of streets, palaces, temples, loggias and fanciful erections of all kinds... so perfectly represented that they did not look like things feigned... but entirely real and of noble extent.” To create settings that seemed real and of noble extent was the ambition of the first Italian scene designers, who were echoed in England by Inigo Jones in his designs for Jonson’s court masques and Davenant’s operas. To the accepted architectural compositions of the day Inigo Jones added a typical English sensibility for landscape composition which the devices of perspective painting made possible. As a contemporary chronicler describes one setting: “the scenes behind seemed a vast sea from the horizon of which was drawn by the lines of perspective, the whole work shooting downward from the eye; which decorum made it more conspicuous and caught the eye afar off with a wandering beauty.”

Had the literary imagination of the Baroque been a classic one, its scenic designers might have achieved a formal architectural setting that seemed of noble
extent and entirely real. But the literary imagination of the period promptly out-
grew its classic models and became romantic, abandoning the classic unity of
time and place for the kind of dramatic story that required incessant changes of
scene. The need of quick scene-shifts prompted scenic artists to exploit the illu-
sion of perspective painting and to abandon even an approximation of solid
forms. The stage became a world of painted perspectives, framed in painted
wings that converged towards a vanishing point on a painted backdrop, leading
the eye to horizons that could catch the eye afar off with a wandering beauty.
The delights of this symmetrical and balanced world, its stately distances and its
towering heights, can be traced in the drawings of Berain, Vigarani, and the
Bibienas, from the Drottningholm Theatre Museum. In the work of Despréz we
can also trace the mounting romantic impulse particularly in landscape compo-
sition, the tendency to rely more and more on paint, less and less on even the sem-
blance of architectural pattern, until in his later designs for the historical pa-
geants of his royal patron, staged in the Drottningholm palace theatre at the end
of the 18th century, he anticipated the methods that became traditional through-
out Europe and remained unchallenged for nearly a hundred years.

By the middle of the 19th century one could not speak of scenic design but
only of scene painting which degenerated into lifeless literalism. Many of Des-
préz’ early settings are still preserved at Drottningholm. Like his sketches they
are delicate in key, in tint a rosy grisaille or light sanguine with subtle gradations.
A formal unity of tone is kept throughout. The total effect, particularly
under the mellow candlelight of the period, emphasized by the converging lines
of the architectural composition, maintains the illusion of form and space by the
very delicacy of the painted indication. Fifty years later the prevailing academic
palette with its dingy greens, murky browns, its rigid delineation of every detail
and its leaden cast shadows, destroyed any illusion of atmospheric distance even
on a backdrop. The increased illumination of the stage, due to the introduction
of gas lighting, dissipated whatever illusion might have survived. Perspective
scene painting became its own parody, a trompe l’oeil that no longer deceived the
eye. George II, Duke of Saxe-Meiningen, felt obliged to issue instructions to the
members of his court theatre company, warning them not to get too near the
scenery; not to make gestures too violent lest they cause a house front to shake,
not to lean on painted tree trunks or door posts for the same reason; not to stand
too near a perspective backdrop where a hip might be on a level with a first
story window or an elbow touch a chimney or a rooftop.
By 1870 this aristocratic amateur had completely revolutionized current methods of stage setting and become the father, or perhaps one should say the grandfather, of the so-called modern movement. He did this by making the actor the unit of his stage compositions, establishing as the basis of design the pattern of movement throughout a play. He developed the plasticity of his actors, particularly the movements of mobs and crowds, took Berlin by storm with a performance of Julius Caesar, repeated his triumphs on successive tournées in all the theatrical capitals of Europe, and profoundly influenced not only Antoine but Stanislavsky who was then about to start his Moscow Art Theatre. To the modern eye his settings are still literal and academic in many details, but they are nevertheless fundamentally architectonic, conceived not as painted pictures against which the actor moves, but spaces built about the actor in which and through which he moves, so that the general pattern of continued and interrelated movement, defined by surrounding planes and broken and varied stage levels, gives a continuous emotional force to any production. The Duke of Saxe-Meiningen's drawings were remarkable for their day because the actors are almost always indicated in them as an integral part of the stage composition, an essential part of the setting. The setting consists in the relation between the actors and their surroundings. An aesthetic unity was established by fundamentally relating the actor to the world in which he moved, which was no longer a picture of space but an arrangement of spaces that, in Berenson's words, stimulated the tactile imagination.

To Adolphe Appia this was merely preliminary. He conceived light itself as a plastic medium. His theories parallel in theatrical terms the discoveries of the impressionist and neo-impressionist painters as to the importance of vibrating light in establishing the tactile values of forms and projecting them in space. Paint and painted illusions had no place in Appia's theatre. Paint was nothing more than pigment to receive and reflect light. The color of the setting was the color of the light that filled it and was reflected from its surfaces, light that fluctuated subtly in endless gradations, keyed to the emotional pitch of the scene. A setting became a composition of forms related in space by the quality of the light that bound them together; its fluctuations, by the dramatic opposition of vast shadows and concentrated high lights, created monumental masses and then blotted them out until they were towering silhouettes or hung like mirages in the heavens. Berenson had written in 1896, "The direct effect of space composition is not only almost as powerful as that of music but is brought about in
much the same way.” In 1899 Appia wrote: “When stage pictures take on spatial forms dictated by music they are not arbitrary but have the quality of being inevitable.” In Appia’s drawings for Wagner’s operas—among the most beautiful done for the modern theatre—stage setting achieves the direct emotional force and the fluidity of music.

They seem verifications of Pater’s dictum “All art constantly aspires towards the condition of music.” Yet they evoke a world that is not diaphanous or intangible, but as massive as the mountain tops, as vast as the starry spaces beyond them; here solid as stone and there palpitant as sunlight in a forest. The total effect is an illusion, for any form of stage setting, like every other effect in the theatre, is an illusion, but aesthetically it is a more perfect illusion, recreating so subtly and yet so monumentally in its pervading forms the world we live in. We are able to project ourselves into a stage equivalent which seems to move from “dawn to noon, from noon to dewy eve” and to heighten by its atmospheric mood the emotions that the actors are embodying in their persons.

The theories and the designs of Appia completely released the imagination of the modern stage designer. Most of my fellow critics however declare this was not accomplished until Gordon Craig published his more grandiose vistas, particularly the monolithic variations shown here, of which he wrote, “These etchings were made by the artist in the spring of 1907 and represent his most serious work. Connected as they are with his dream of an Ideal Theatre, they in no way have anything in common with the modern stage.” “We must translate Movement through the medium of inanimate forms and there produce once more an Impersonal Art which shall take its place by the side of its two sister arts, Music and Architecture.”

The modern theatre, nevertheless, in contrast to this Ideal Theatre, has remained personal, with the animate actor as its cornerstone. Most of the variations of modern stage design are variations of the perceptions of the Duke of Saxe-Meiningen and Adolphe Appia: the actor in motion as the basis of the total stage picture; the design, a space composition that can enhance the total pattern of movement and heighten its emotional intensity; light as a plastic element, binding the whole in a unity of mood. The influence of Appia’s vision can be discerned in any number of recent productions, whether Reinhardt’s “Dantons Tod” or Jessner’s “Othello” and “Richard III,” “The Tidings Brought to Mary,” “Man and the Masses” or “Faust” at the Theatre Guild; in this exhibition in any number of designs, such as Robert Edmond Jones’ drawings for
Hamlet” and for “Green Pastures” where the light of hope beats upon the black faces and the massed brown robes; in Hofman’s settings for the theatres of Prague, in Norman-Bel Geddes’ projects for “King Lear” and the towering pinnacles for “La Divina Comedia.”

But there have been counter currents—the impulse towards decoration and the impulse towards abstraction. The modern painter, with a revivified palette and a new-found technique of impressionistic suggestion of form, looked at a dingy stage and proceeded to enliven it. The Russian painter Golovin was among the first with his gleaming golden Kremlin for “Boris Godunoff,” and eventually inspired the decorative debauch of the Ballets Russes. Fantasy of every kind has flowered flamboyantly everywhere in the theatre at one time or another in recent years; echoes and variations of almost every new school of painting, neo-impressionism, cubism, vorticism, futurism, expressionism, have found their way onto painted backdrops. But the theatre has also reflected the more formal preoccupation of cubism and abstract design in its stage architecture and simplified its stage structures. The third dimension has been stratified into the barest plinths and platforms, or reduced to the skeleton constructions that dominated the Soviet Theatre as recently as five or six years ago. Even then, like a skull, constructivism seemed to grin at its own death. The more recent Soviet designs, including those of its revolutionary theatres, when they are not frankly decorative, achieve a sober solidity which might be dubbed a new realism.

There has also been a tendency to deny altogether the necessity that the stage must suggest a world or create any illusion whatsoever, whether of three dimensional form, however abstract, or of composition in space. The stage, say these theorists, is always the stage, a performance is always a show. Let us be conscious of the fact, underline and outline the inherent artificiality of play acting and achieve a theatre frankly theatrical. The actor is a mime, his stage nothing more than a platform of one kind or another. The more clearly and nakedly we reveal it, the less illusion of any kind we strive for, the more effective will the performance be. The variations of these doctrines run all the way from Vakhtangoff’s “Turandot,” the designs for which I could unfortunately not procure, to the deliberate naivety of Heythum’s settings for “The Merchant of Venice” among others.

Theories multiply, doctrinaires cross swords and the theatre lives on. Which of its possible lives it may develop into a dominant method of production is perhaps indicated in this exhibition. If so I am unaware of it. I have selected none of
this material to prove a theory, to indicate an aesthetic trend or to vindicate any school. I have borrowed wherever I could the work of men who were the acknowledged leaders of their native theatres and who impressed it with their imagination. And the artistic imagination in the theatre, like the artistic imagination everywhere in the modern world, is brilliant, at times overpowering, but short winded, veering incessantly under the winds of doctrine; is given to grandiose hopes, to violent experiments and equally violent reactions, unsustained as it is by a unified vision of man and society.

But the theatre that has died so many deaths continues to live many lives. This exhibition is a partial record of that vital and varied life, an echo of the intensity of life that we can vicariously achieve in the theatre, when we shuffle off the coil of our own egos, purge ourselves with laughter or with tears, grow wiser or wittier than we are, know love, pity and terror, dream and desire triumphantly. Such emotions are, alas, not wholly aesthetic and are undoubtedly impure. But the technique of achieving that emotional release is the art of the theatre. The design of a stage setting is an integral part of that art, and for that reason, if for no other, perhaps worth being recorded and remembered.
In the year 1633 William Prynne, most resolute and uncompromising of Puritans, published an enormous quarto volume of more than a thousand pages (double column) entitled Histriomastix. In this he declared categorically that all plays were inspired by the devil, that all theatres were temples of sin, that one of the really popular amusements of Hell was a series of dramatic performances, and, in particular, that every actress was a “notorious whore.” This last judgment got him, and others, into serious trouble. Certainly his statement, unqualified and unadorned, was an injudicious one when, but a few months previously, Queen Henrietta Maria had been taking part in plays and masques at court. Queens do not like being called such names; and we need not wonder that the worthy Prynne was haled before the Star Chamber, there to be sentenced to lose his ears. Earless he was set in the pillory, but in his loss he was destined to become a popular martyr. One more piece of fuel had been added by the Queen and by her King, Charles I, to that smouldering heap which was soon to blaze forth in general revolt. Charles I lost his head in causing Prynne to lose his ears.

The Puritan attack on the stage was largely due to the facts that the theatre generally had become, by the year 1633, a toy of the aristocracy and that royalty spent vast sums of public money in amusing itself with court masques. Richly glorious these masques must have been, the jewels glittering in the myriad candle lights and the rich silks shimmering as queens and princes and lords recited their lyric words or stepped gravely on the floor to dance. At best, however, they were but ephemeral things intended to be the vehicle for courtly acting in moments of diversion, and being so, their real splendour has utterly vanished. Only in two ways has something of them been preserved. In the printed texts composed by Ben Jonson, Sir William D’Avenant and others, we get the words that were spoken; while, more importantly, in the wonderful series of designs executed by Inigo Jones we have at least the basis on which was reared the magnificent stage spectacle of the seventeenth century. Six of these designs (preserved at Chatsworth, the home of the Duke of Devonshire) have been secured for the exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art.

Manifold is their interest. That they possess an intrinsic value of their own
will be obvious to all who visit the exhibition; but Jones was not merely an artist—he was as well a keen stage craftsman. He borrowed, certainly, from the flourishing theatres of Italy, but in borrowing he always added, giving to what he copied the grace of an individual touch. Through his inventive genius the masque in England became more than a mere replica of Italian Opera and Intermezzi. He tried out various ways of shifting scenery; independently of others he evolved that framework which later became the proscenium arch. Had he not been there to guide and inspire, the masque in England might have assumed a more literary development. As it was, Inigo Jones so imposed his personality upon the form that Ben Jonson, who had at the beginning given due credit to his scenic collaborator, growled out contemptuously that “painting and carpentry are the soul of masque,” withdrew himself into his own study-shell, and, like a school-boy who will not play, moped and sulked.

Here at the very beginning of stage spectacle (for of that the Elizabethan playhouse was almost wholly innocent) is the age-long quarrel between the dramatist and the scenic artist—at least between the scenic artist and the dramatist who refuses to play the game. Jonson was surly, proud of his literary skill, suspicious of all that was not poetry. Shakespeare, greater than he, knew better. When the masque splendour in the reign of King James first came to dazzle men’s eyes, Shakespeare, with his keen sense of theatric value, immediately seized on it and made it serve his own purposes. The Winter’s Tale introduces its masque of shepherds; Cymbeline has its masque-like vision; and in The Tempest it is a masque of airy spirits that provides the occasion for one of the loveliest speeches ever written for actor to interpret:

“And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,
The cloud-capp’d towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherits, shall dissolve,
And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff
As dreams are made on, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep.”

Though Inigo Jones’ theatrically solemn temples and gorgeous palaces, raised in Whitehall to gladden the eyes of ladies and their lords, have faded like a dream, one wrack of time is left in these designs. The actual scenery, built at enormous
cost, has perished, and the jewels worn by the actors (one lady is said to have had half a million’s worth of gems on her person) no longer glitter on the lovely costumes. But in Inigo Jones’ sketches we can get at least a faint vision of what once had been. Here is Oberon’s fairy palace, first concealed in rocks and then opened to reveal delicate pillars and fantastically flimsy gateways; a moonlit landscape is put before us in one, in another a wealth of architectural detail such as was beloved in the seventeenth century, and in still another “a horrid Hell, the further part terminating in a flaming precipice, and the nearer parts expressing the Suburbs.” On some of the Chatsworth sketches splashes of scene-painters’ distemper still remain, for these were the actual designs used in the execution of the scenery. We may admire them for their beauty of line alone, but, in addition to that, those who are interested in the theatre may view these sketches with increased interest in that through them we are permitted to enter backstage of the royal playhouse at Whitehall, where for the first time painted scenery was adequately displayed before an English audience.
Some special glamour, which has no connection with aesthetic values, surrounds those waifs among works of art that have been lost and found again. It is as if Fate had changed its mind, and the public had been made privy to high transactions of the gods, so when mislaid treasures come to light they are enhanced by their one-time nearness to oblivion.

This is true of some seventy drawings in this exhibition, though that is of course not the reason why they are here. They were brought from the Drottningholm Theatre Museum because they are unique, and because no international exhibition of Theatrical Art would be complete without them.

But in a more special way they are here for reasons beyond these of immediate interest, since they are really here because an inquisitive and sagacious scholar set out from the library in Stockholm one day in 1920 to hunt for a portrait he had heard was stored away in a cluttered old lumber room in the Winter Palace at Drottningholm. Fortunately for the world Dr. Agne Beijer knew treasure when he saw it. The lumber room turned out to be a forgotten Eighteenth Century Theatre, and its litter a collection of scenery and drawings that has become, under his wise curatorship, one of the sights of Europe. His cautious restoration has given to the whole place a special and lasting fascination which these drawings here reflect.

For in the genial enigmas of time and place that confront every traveller it is curious and paradoxical that a playhouse dedicated to illusion should evoke so powerful a sense of past reality as this Drottningholm theatre evokes of the Eighteenth Century. Even the most casual and insensitive visitor must feel in its auditorium the sentience of other times, that compelling quality of living that eludes even the acute evidence of more historic places. Lorenzo’s seat amidst Gozzoli’s chapel frescoes furnishes no Renaissance ghost for subtle understanding, any more than Napoleon’s throne room does, or the countless scenes strewn over the world, once animated by breathing greatness. They are dead in time;

* Acknowledgment and thanks are accorded Mr. Albert Boni for permission to use in this article some material which has appeared in Creative Art.
preserved like mummies of lost illusion. We may be touched by them, for many different reasons, with a vague nostalgia, but they never live for us. At Drottningholm only a threshold offers easy barrier across a hundred and fifty years.

Something of this has to do, no doubt, with the inscrutable nature of theatres. Deserted, they lay upon the spectator a spell of their own, a hint of fundamental make-believe to which they stand, even empty, for silent witness. On the Queen’s Island, outside of Stockholm, this little theatre does more than that, for it clings tenaciously to its own century, preserved in a sort of temporal vacuum. It is unique because it is physically intact. Its wooden machinery is as useful as it ever was. Its thirty settings have Eighteenth Century illusion in them because they were built for that illusion. They exist, so it exists, and its rows of benches for a vanished court present no greater denial of life than the empty benches of any modern theatre. A spectator is all that is needed to bring it to life and a spectator naturally steps across the threshold.

Essentially this is due to an accident of dynasty. When the Bernadottes took the throne of Sweden they preferred not to use this palace; so in the early part of the Nineteenth Century this theatre, which was built in 1764 for the sister of Frederick the Great and which still carries her initials in the fresh colors of its curtain, was forgotten in one of those happy lapses of memory to which even nations are subject. Wherefore the royal toy of Gustavus III, whose predilections have recently subjected his ardours to modern psychoanalysis (with no small discredit), was forgotten along with its scenery, its stage designs, its costumes, and all the affectionate paraphernalia of a monarch who boasted, modestly enough for a monarch, that his was one of the two imaginations in Sweden. Desprez rejoiced in the other, and Desprez was the sponsor at Drottningholm of its obvious French influence.

Thus the playhouse remained for more than a hundred years a storeroom for royal rubbish, until the presiding deities of art relented and sent Dr. Beijer on that wayward errand which was to produce such unexpected results. When he realized what he had found he clung to it with admirable obstinacy, cajoled money for restoration and support from astonishingly reluctant officials, and now presides serenely and affectionately over its assured destiny.

The wooden benches, which he found in a century’s jumble, have been sorted and arranged according to the rank of their former occupants. Each has its original label, showing the social position of those entitled to sit on it. The rows rise in a gentle incline from the royal enclosure to the back wall, marked with the
privileged tickets of those forgotten attendants, from cavaliers to ladies-in-waiting near the front, to the palace servants in the rear, and including, midway, such picturesque entitlements as “Keeper of the King’s Great Watch” and “Palace Barbers.” One bench alone raised a point of precedence, a row reserved for “Ladies Not Yet Presented to the King.” A more liberal modern arbiter has put them nearer, perhaps, than Gustavus himself, with those same troublesome predilections, might have wished. Critics, obviously, were not necessary in a regal world of so many dilettantes.

These benches, of some three hundred places, fill the long and narrow auditorium, with two spaces where curtains could be drawn to shut off parts of the audience. One curtain could be closed immediately behind the royal enclosure for most private censorship; a second could shut out the palace servants from their paternal, but cautious, guardians.

The auditorium, with its Corinthian pilasters at the proscenium, blends perfectly into the stage so that players and playgoers seem to occupy one room—prophetic of later stagecraft. Six boxes depend from the side walls for use of the royal family, when it preferred to see without being seen. Two of the boxes have latticed grills to make them virtually impenetrable to unwanted observers.

But the stage itself is a mechanical marvel of strange survival. Even among modern stages it is enormous, designed for the production of opera, and it has a depth of nearly sixty feet. It rises steeply so that when an actor was upstage he was, in the original and literal sense, up. Its candle footlights, made from moulds preserved in the theatre’s museum, could be dropped below stage level, and other candles, mounted on the wings in brackets that can still be worked on chains, shed upon the ancient sets a gentle glow that is suggested, more safely now out of respect for the antique, by small electric candles.

Old thunder machines are still workable, reminiscent of a forgotten inventor who, resenting the duplication of his device by a thieving manager, coined the reverberant but literal phrase that he was “stealing his thunder.” Papier mâché waves, turning upon eccentric drums, suggest accurately the heaving urgency of the sea. The gods came down from heaven on jovial clouds, a trifle solid nowadays, perhaps, but duly and impressively Olympian, and devils popped up (with the assistance of sweating stage hands below at a back-breaking windlass) from infernos that must have seemed dark enough in those innocent times.

Furnishings, stoves, pianos, and even actors (perhaps the best of them) were painted charmingly and quite efficiently upon the canvas backdrops, making up
that Eighteenth Century world of illusion that is potent now because it brings us not only to its place but to its time, and helps us to peer with our own eyes through the key-hole of ancient make-believe into a lost world of graceful reality.
The stage setting is a reflection of a period; it combines architectural, landscape, and figure elements. Its artistic evolution possesses a significance over and above its application in the theatre for it represents an illuminating cross-section of the history of art as a whole. In the forms and methods known to us to-day it is some three hundred years old. The forms of the baroque, rococo, classicism and naturalism can be seen outlined in its development as a sort of abbreviated chronicle. Galli-Bibiena and Karl Friedrich Schinkel, Quaglio’s generation and the masters of Fritz Erler’s school (ca. 1900) all shaped the theatre sense of their time. One made use of rustling splendor because the theatre, to him and to his age, was intensified, festive life and being; other designers employed austere lines expressing simplicity and greatness. Some paid a painfully accurate attention to historical truth, seeking to do justice even to stylistic details. Others again deliberately emphasized the bare essentials to make the stage setting truly serve the play. Splendor, austerity, authenticity and economy were consecutive dominants in scenic design. But in the second quarter of the Twentieth Century the theatre lays claim to the right of staging the theatre work of art, no matter what its period or its locale, in a manner determined solely by the thinking and emotions of our times. This means breaking with many a beloved tradition; but an age that seeks new forms and content of life is always compelled to blaze its own path.

Only in the distant future is any sort of goal to be discerned. There are, however, contemporary forces with a rightful claim to our attention. These forces can be reduced to the formula, perhaps, of transforming passive impressions into active expressions. We no longer want so much to delineate a form, as to evoke its meaning; not an image of the original, but as close an approach to the prototype itself, as is possible with the limited means available to human kind. The grandiose fiction, the gigantic As If, which the theatre has been and is, thus attains an even more powerful content, since the execution of such an aim can only consist in presenting symbols in place of superficial realities. This holds true beyond a doubt both for the spoken and sung theatre piece. This trend has

* Herr Merbach assembled the German section of this exhibition.
been aided—at least in Germany during the last few years—by numerous eco-
nomic necessities everywhere affecting the complicated and costly operation of
the theatre. The need for saving had to be harmonized with the necessity for
giving the theatre its due: the adequate presentation of the play. Thus do ideal
and practical demands of the day meet! It is untrue that in doing this a virtue is
being made of necessity. Luckily enough, the creative will, arising out of the age,
harmonizes with ineluctable influences of an external nature.

Adolphe Appia, the most important of whose settings are shown in this exhi-
bition in authentic models, sought to follow this symbolic path more than thirty
years ago in staging Richard Wagner’s music dramas. Wagner’s scenic visions
stemmed from a period in which the German historical painters Piloty and Ma-
kart determined the forms prescribed for heroic events. They had a considerable
influence upon the historical naturalism of the Meiningen school, as the exam-
ples exhibited here demonstrate. Appia, however, deviating from the traditional
Wagner cult, began to create the settings for these music dramas “out of the
music’s spirit,” that is he transferred the monumental lines of the interwoven
motifs of the music to the stage setting, thus underscoring this symbolic music,
“interpreting” it, and really completing Wagner’s “total work of art.” Adolphe
Appia (died 1928) therefore became a pioneer and a stimulating force for the
scenic design of to-day. His John the Baptist fate did not allow him to achieve
final fulfillment, as it was only in very rare cases that he was able to put his cre-
avtive ideas into actual settings.

Fritz Erler, whom we mentioned above, developed the “style theatre” around
1910 in the Munich Künstlertheater, in conformity with the limited space avail-
able on that stage. He let the dramatic flow play in a wholly neutral framework,
or he used only what was absolutely necessary to project a “stylized” atmos-
phere. This was the road to expression, from Impressionism to Expressionism—
but at the end of this road there stood the symbol. This is illustrated in two ex-
amples which cannot be shown in this exhibition. They deal with the cathedral
scene in Goethe’s “Faust,” Part 1. In this scene the style theatre endeavored to
convey the impression of a church or a chapel with suggestive means. It there-
fore offered an adumbration of the reality; not a nave with towering pillars
that are lost in a twilight darkness, but a single column with a picture of the
Virgin. An Expressionist stage setting, which seeks a single “expression” and
raises it into a symbol, created (as in the design of Ludwig Sievert in Frankfur-
am-Main), a gigantic cross, filling the otherwise empty stage and even bursting
it apart as it leaned forward slightly. It is the symbol of all suffering and of all salvation. Gretchen, as the personified misery of mankind, crouches in all her futility and annihilation at the foot of the cross; the sinful, guilty individual almost disappears under the crushing weight of the burden upon her—and yet she is to become a guide to ethical-spiritual salvation.

Hans Sturm, who did stage settings in the former Düsseldorf Schauspielhaus under the direction of the late Luise Dumont, expressed a tragic-festive flow of events in the last act of Hebbel’s “Herodes and Marianne,” a tragedy of two congenial persons unable to understand each other, by eight or ten large illuminated cubes, using nothing but an empty space, on different levels, as the “arena” for the actors. This same designer employed a symbol of the Alps—a spiral drawn in a giant arc and interrupted by steps—for Byron’s “Manfred” and his spiritual path along the heights. In Sturm’s work we thus see the same creative will at work upon the play.

When Leopold Jessner began his highly original stage designs in the Berlin State Theatre some fourteen years ago, he discovered the now much-abused stairway as a poetic symbol. It was the conquest of a third dimension on the stage: height as well as breadth and recession. Now the whole effect could be intensified by elevating the actors. On the other hand, the steps made possible the achievement of a hitherto unattained differentiation of all scenic forces. A relationship of dependence, for instance, could now be given an illuminating and penetrating effect, by placing the persons involved on different steps. Scenic events of many types were thus accentuated.

The same urge and the same goal hold good for the opera of our day. Appia’s endeavors pointed the way; here and there, it is true, he went too far in his otherwise altogether justifiable desire to avoid all that was superfluous. When he proposed to eliminate even the swan in a stage setting for Wagner’s “Lohengrin,” he affected the inner “romantic” life of the action, cutting it to the heart. On the other hand, the austere lines and the scenic design and continuity of the “Bauhaus” staging of “Fidelio” (State Opera House, Platz der Republik, Berlin, November 1927) by the late Ewald Dülberg, who died only a few months ago, represent a happy solution of a typical “salvation” opera, whose uninterrupted continuity of action requires the greatest tension.

The stage settings of topical operas, such as Krenek’s “Jonny Spielt Auf,” work with scenic methods which symbolically express only the barest essentials tangibly, leaving it to the audience to obtain the intended impression. This path
is quite usable for the heroic music drama as well, as was shown, for example, by the productions of Wagner with settings by Johannes Schröder (in Bochum and Duisburg in 1927). It was evident in a Lohengrin production (in Darmstadt 1929) staged by Schenk von Trapp. In this opera the castle courtyard of the second act all too often becomes the more or less successful imitation of a historical reality. In Darmstadt this solution was consciously avoided by creating a wall broken up by many windows, one of the men-at-arms appearing in each window. This yielded a stage setting that broke with all tradition, without losing appropriate dramatic effectiveness.

Thus, much that is new in scenic design is under way.
"They order these things better on the Russian stage."

Is that too familiar a refrain? Well, if it is, I cannot help it. I hardly thought myself, after fifteen years of service as interpreter of the Russian theatre to the western world, that I should ever again find a new case justifying this verdict. But I have. And the fact that I have is almost as exciting to me as the specific terms of the verdict. It is one more proof of the astonishing vitality of the Russian theatre.

This thing I've suddenly become aware they order better in Russia is the relationship of the designer to the producer on the stages of Moscow and Leningrad. As nowhere else in the world, the Russian stage designer is a true collaborator in the art of the theatre. As a corollary to that fact, here is another: Nowhere else have the greatest contemporary painters rallied so freely to the challenge and the opportunity of the theatre.

These conclusions may have been self-evident to others, and they must have been latent in my own consciousness, but I hit upon them quite unexpectedly in the course of trying to rationalize for myself the idea of an exhibition of the art of the theatre devoted primarily if not exclusively to stage design—to stage settings, stage costumes, stage lighting. This visible and physical sector of the composite art of the theatre is only one of four partners, the others being the playwright, the actor and the producer. You can't very well exhibit the contributions of these other partners—except in action on the stage of a theatre. An exhibition of the work of the stage designer, therefore, demands some statement of his relationship to these partners, especially to the one whom we call the producer, if it is to be something more than a stage designer's holiday, a glorification of one phase of the art of the theatre.

Relationship? That's what started the questions—and educed the verdict. Just where, I asked myself, does the stage designer come in, as they order things in Russia? The relationship must be very nearly perfect to be so unobtrusive as to escape my conscious attention all these years. I journeyed back in my memories and records.
Yes, there at the very birth of the Moscow Art Theatre, thirty-five years ago, were the celebrated contemporary painters, Victor Simoff and Nikolai Krimoff and Mstislaff Dobuzhinsky, providing backgrounds in the mood of spiritualized realism for the productions of Stanislavsky and Nemirovitch-Dantchenko, just as if they had always been integral parts of a perfect partnership. I doubt whether dramatic history will ever show a more extraordinary instantaneous collaboration of independent talents: directors, playwrights, actors—and scene designers.

Then and there began a practice which has followed down the years of the modern Russian theatre: In Russia, stage design is not—is never—a thing in itself; it is always the visual embodiment of a theory of the theatre. In Russia, stage design did not get out of hand; and, for that reason, it has never provided an argument, as it once did in this country, for conservative opponents of the modern theatre to denounce the whole movement as a stage designer’s barbecue. Furthermore, since there were always producers, proceeding on the lines of clear-cut theories of the art of the theatre, Russian stage designers never had to become producers on their own account in order to create opportunities for self-expression, as they have occasionally been tempted to do in America, usually with disastrous consequences. Russian producers, fortunately, have always provided a constant challenge to Russian stage designers.

This is neither the place nor the time to analyze the various and varied theories of the theatre which have come and gone or stayed on the Russian stage in the last third of a century. It will be sufficient to name the outstanding theories and the producers most closely associated with them, and to cite the artists who collaborated with them in providing the desired scenic backgrounds.

The first major revolt against the spiritualized realism of the Moscow Art Theatre was led by Vsevolod Meyerhold who withdrew from the protection of the Sea Gull* to found his own Studio Theatre and later, in St. Petersburg, to reach his first great pinnacle as producer for Vera Kommissarzhevskaya. “The theatre theatrical,” he called it; “stylization” is the more prevalent term. And to visualize this highly stylized revolt against realism he called on the services of such leading contemporary painters of the “Mir Iskusstva” and other secessionist groups as Anisfeld, Bondy, Sudeykin, Kulbin, Shervashidze, Korovin, Sapunoff, Bilibin, Denisoff and Dobuzhinsky, finally settling down to almost exclusive partnership with Alexander Golovin.

* Emblem of the Moscow Art Theatre.
Meanwhile, in western Europe, but soundly Russian for all that, Michel Fokine under the phoenix-wings of Diaghileff was calling to similarly sympathetic cooperation in caparisoning the lavish romanticism of the Russian Ballet such painters as Benois, Bakst, Roerich, Golovin, Korovin, and Anisfeld.

In due course, cubism, futurism, pro-unism, expressionism and even suprematism swept up into Russia from Europe or spontaneously sprouted in Moscow or St. Petersburg, turning the radicals of "Mir Iskusstva" into conservatives without the bother of moving a millimeter. But the new left wing painters were not long without a theatre of their own, for Alexander Tairoff was at hand with his Kamerny Theatre, founded on a comparable dramatic theory, and destined to be the congenial stage home of Alexandra Exter, preceptress of our Boris Aronson; of Sudeykin, of Kuznetsoff, Larionoff, Gontcharova, Kalmukoff, Lyentuloff, Miganadzhian, Yakuloff, Vyesnin, Stenberg and Ruindin.

A somewhat germane movement on the lyric stage, carrying expressionism into the hidebound opera, was the Musical Studio of Nemirovitch-Dantchenko which reached its height in the productions of "Carmencita and the Soldier" and "Lysistrata," familiar to American audiences, and particularly in the architecturally expressionistic settings of Rabinovitch.

The latest phase, constructivism, remains to be considered. First formally championed by Meyerhold in one of those startling volte-faces which have characterized his career, this cross between the pictorial and the architectural, practically eliminating the former at times and paring the latter down to its skeleton, was foretold in certain early productions at the Kamerny and is the occasional credo to-day of the Vakhtangoff Theatre and Akhmetelli's Georgian National theatre, as well as of Meyerhold. In the nature of the case, the designer for the constructivist theatre is a stage carpenter and engineer rather than a painter, and it is for this reason that fewer names of general artistic significance appear in the records of these stages than formerly. Akimoff, Stepanova, Dmitrieff and their fellows are not and probably never will be easel or mural painters. Even as far back as Rabinovitch and "Carmencita," the stage designer as a highly specialized creative artist had made his appearance. In any record or analysis of the Russian theatre of the past decade, it is impossible to ignore this new kind of stage designer whose art begins and ends within the theatre. Whether or not he is a painter in the conventional sense, his relationship to the producer is on the same cooperative plane of mutual confidence, mutual respect and mutual enthusiasm with the producer.
For a time, during the days of compulsory propaganda in the Russian theatre—roughly from 1925 to 1932—certain prophets predicted the displacement of all other theories of the theatre by that of constructivism, since this bold, direct and dynamic form of dramatic expression seemed best suited to the use of the theatre as a political forum. With the unconditional return of the theatre to the artists during the past year, however, the older traditional theories of the theatre have regained their former prestige, and, with them, the traditional artists have again come into their own alongside the engineers of constructivism. They never did wholly disappear, but it is particularly significant to realize that the Moscow Art Theatre for its recent incomparable production of Gogol’s “Dead Souls” chose as its scenic artist the same Victor Simoff who had designed the settings for “Tsar Fyodor Ivanovitch” and the first plays of Tchekhoff away back in 1898.

It is significant to note, too, that in spite of the dislocations of Revolution and the finally futile drafting of the theatre for direct political purposes, the same main underlying theories of theatre have cut clean across revolutionary lines and have persisted unbroken through social upheaval, taking color from the successive phases of that upheaval only as it is natural for the theatre to reflect the topics and the points of view of its day. And, just as theory has persisted, so has the practice of close and mutually stimulating cooperation between producer and designer, to the end that the Russian stage designer still holds to-day a position unique on the stages of the world.
THE AMERICAN THEATRE AND ITS DESIGNERS

By John Mason Brown

More than a hundred years ago, a general's son with a forehead like a bay-window and plenty of new ideas with which to fill it, wrote a brief prose preface that was taken as seriously by the budding Romantics of Paris as if it had been a sequel to the Book of Revelations. In the course of this inflammatory tract, he chanced to observe that "the place where this or that catastrophe occurs becomes a terrible and inseparable witness thereof; and the absence of silent characters of this sort would make the greatest scenes of history incomplete in the drama."

Though it would be ridiculous to pretend that Victor Hugo had the aesthetics of modern stage decoration in mind when he dashed off this foreword to "Cromwell," the fact remains that, without meaning to, he did stumble upon two observations which, since the advent of the so-called New Movement, have been taken more or less for granted by both audiences and designers. Night after night we sit before productions in which—in Hugo's words—the settings of our scenic artists, who are worthy of the name, contribute vitally to the pleasures of the evening by functioning not only as "inseparable witnesses" of the action but as "silent characters" in the drama that is being acted.

These visualizations of the playwright's world speak as eloquently to the eyes of their beholders as does the dramatist for whom they speak to the ears of those who listen to his words. In terms of line and color, but above all else in terms of the selection which betrays the talents of their creators, they give form and substance to what is at once significant and atmospheric, individual and emphatic in the little realm which, for a few brief hours, the playwright has staked off as his own and to which we, as members of the audience, are anxious to surrender as the most willing of willing subjects.

What we are apt to forget in a theatre that has so high a standard of visual competence as our own, is that this very competence was once a new idea which was worth fighting for and that the frequent lack of inspiration in our stage settings of to-day is due not to the designers who have fashioned them, but to the dictaphonic playwrights and the unimaginative theatre-goers who refuse to grant these scenic artists opportunities which are worthy of their best talents.

When the so-called New Movement first touched these shores, our stages
were set by hacks who devoted their lives to painting wings and backdrops in perspective, and to turning out interiors and exteriors which were so devoid of dramatic sense and sympathy that to understand their worthlessness, those of us who have been reared in a different tradition are nowadays compelled to consult the back files of such a vanished periodical as "The Theatre." Then, and only then, can those of us whose sole knowledge of the older settings is derived from their survival on the stages of small town stock companies or in the cheaper vaudeville houses, claim to have any comprehension of what scenery in this country was like before it took advantage of the vivid palettes of the distinguished Russian artists who at the turn of the century were treating their backdrops like glorified canvases, and of the selective and revolutionary theories of such all-important men as Craig and Appia.

When the New Movement first reached this country it was really new. It came as a challenge, was hot with protest, and possessed that magical contagion which invites alignments. It found the theatre divided against itself, with the younger men eager to respond to its new doctrines, and the older ones looking upon them with the distrust with which age and caution are always ready to welcome innovation. To them they seemed unnecessary, slightly ridiculous and somewhat seditious, in as much as they stressed the importance of such upstart crows as the director, and, even more especially, the designer.

There can be no denying that on several occasions our newly recruited designers did allow their sense of self-importance to go to their heads. As they experimented with color and with Cubism, with Impressionism and Expressionism, with stylized settings and with Constructivism, they undoubtedly did declare their occasional scene-maker's holidays at the expense of the plays which they were setting and the actors with whom they were working. But their rebellious attitude was on the whole as healthy as it was natural, and hastened, as nothing else could, the changes in production standards which these scenic artists were determined to effect.

The first days of excitement over such designs as Joseph Urban's backings for "The Love of Three Kings," or Mr. Jones's "The Man Who Married A Dumb Wife," or Mr. Simonson's "Maitre Patelin" have long since passed. So, too, have those post-war years of breathless expectancy in the theatre when Mr. Jones won admiration for his beautiful settings for "The Jest," "Richard III," and "Hamlet"; when Mr. Geddes, who dreamed the magnificent dream his "Dante Project" represents, was experimenting with sculptural stages, and Mr.
Simonson was helping to add lustre to the beginnings of the Theatre Guild by his backgrounds for “The Faithful,” “Liliom” and “Back to Methuselah.”

To the ranks of the designers already mentioned, and to such of their contemporaries as Aline Bernstein, Livingston Platt, Raymond Sovey, Cleon Throckmorton and Woodman Thompson, has come a second generation of scenic artists, headed by Jo Mielziner and Donald Oenslager, to whom a third generation is even now about to be added, with Albert Johnston as its already established leader. The New Movement is, in other words, old and the points for which it battled are now as dead as only victorious causes in art can be. But because of these men and women, and the high gifts they have brought the theatre, our contemporary stage is a far more stimulating and satisfying place than it would ever have been if they had not believed in themselves as artists, and if as artists they had not succeeded in having their say behind the footlights.

Where they were once unruly and the theatre they served was vibrantly experimental, they have fitted into the working needs of a theatre which is more conforming and which, for the present, seems to be animated by a credo that is no more exciting than the hope for success which the good production of a good play almost invariably wins. They are the willing and devoted servants of the plays they are called in to design. The blame is not theirs but the playwrights for whom they work, if they are forced so frequently to squander their talents on shabby kitchens and middle class interiors, or to function as second-rate interior decorators.

The best of them—as Mr. Jones has shown in “The Green Bay Tree,” and Mr. Geddes in “The Patriot,” and Mr. Simonson in “The Apple Cart,” and Mr. Mielziner in “The Barretts of Wimpole Street,” and Mr. Oenslager in “Forsaking All Others”—have managed to add silent characters to the dramatis personae and inseparable witnesses to the action even when they have had to bridle their imaginations to the factual demands of playwrights. Oddly enough, and in spite of all rumors to the contrary, the best plays of the last fifteen or twenty years are vitally connected with the work of the best designers.

But being artists, these men and women are entitled to their dreams. To find a release in a theatre of their own imagining, they have been compelled to escape into a world where they could design unhampered by the limitations of literal scripts, cautious managers, and unimaginative playgoers. Their dreams have taken the form of projects such as these newly fashioned ones which are included in this exhibition.
Dreams they may be, but they spring from discontent, an inner compulsion to state an ideal, and a capacity for living beyond the present. As projects they are hopes unrealized. But their chances of ever reaching realization depend first of all upon their having been hopes. By being stated on paper, they gain a special significance because they envisage the theatre of the present as some of its ablest servitors see it in their minds’ eyes. They may for that very reason point to its future. As Mr. Shaw said when he concluded his introduction to the Shaw-Terry Letters, “Let those who may complain that it was all on paper remember that only on paper has humanity yet achieved glory, beauty, truth, knowledge, virtue, and abiding love.”
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THEATRE ART OF THE RENAISSANCE AND BAROQUE

The designers are arranged chronologically. *An asterisk indicates that the item is illustrated by a plate bearing the same number.

SIXTEENTH CENTURY

SERLIO, Sebastiano (1473–1554) Italian
Born in Bologna, active there and in Venice; called to France by Francis I to work at his court; died at Fontainebleau.

1. DE ARCHITECTURA LIBRI QVI., Venice, 1569
Lent by Mrs. Edith Isaacs, New York

1A—Same work, English edition, 1611
Lent by R. Hall, Tonbridge Wells, England

2. Setting for a comedy: after an engraving in Serlio’s DE ARCHITECTURA; model by Mrs. Lee Simonson
Lent by the Dartmouth College Theatre Museum, Hanover, New Hampshire

PRIMATICCIO, Francesco (1504–1570) Italian
Born in Bologna, active in Mantua; called to France by Francis I and worked there until his death.

Eight costume drawings:
3—Pageant costume
4—Pageant costume
5—Allegorical personage for court pageant
6—Fame, allegorical personage for court pageant
7—Roman Knight
8—Warrior
9—Hermes and a Mourning Woman (Eurydice?)

BUONTALENTI, Bernardo (1536–1608) Italian
Born in Florence, active principally there, as well as in Pisa and Siena. His ingenious use of fireworks won for him the nickname "Bernardo delle Girandole."

SIX INTERLUDES, Florence, 1589:
11—The Music of the Spheres (engraved by Agostino Carracci)
12—Contest between the Fairies and the Muses (engraved by Epifanio d’Alfano)
13—Combat between Apollo and the Serpent Python (engraved by Agostino Carracci)
14—Appearance of Demons of Heaven and Hell (engraved by Epifanio d’Alfano)
15—Arion the Cither Player (engraved by Epifanio d’Alfano)
16—The Dance is a Gift of the Gods (engraved by Epifanio d’Alfano)
Lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

RICCIUS SENENSIS (Neroni) Italian

17. ORTENSIO; engraving, by Hieronymus Bols, of setting, Siena, 1589
Lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

JONES, Inigo (1573–1652) English
Born in London, studied in Italy; worked at the court theatre in Denmark; architect and theatrical designer under James I and Charles I of England; appointed surveyor-general of public buildings in 1615. See section The Masque Designs of Inigo Jones, p. 22.

*10—Knight of the Swan
Lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

*17 ORTENSIO; engraving, by Hieronymus Bols, of setting, Siena, 1589
Lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

43
18MASQUE OF BLACKNESSE (?), Ben Jonson; possibly a drawing for setting of first scene, "consisting of small woods and here and there a void place filled with huntings." The Masque of Blacknesse was presented on January 7, 1605. Chatsworth, No. 400: Border and Scene with a Stag Hunt

*19THE MASQUE OF QUEENS, Ben Jonson; drawing for setting, Scene II; presented, February 2, 1609. Chatsworth, No. 17

OBERON, THE FAERY PRINCE, Ben Jonson; a masque for Prince Henry, presented, January 1, 1611: two drawings for settings:

*20 —Scene I, "Nothing perceiv'd but a darke Rocke with trees beyond it; and all wildness that could be presented. Till above the Horizon, the Moon began to shew, and rising, a Satyre was seen (by her light) to put forth head and call." Chatsworth, No. 40

*21 —Alternate drawing for Scene I; Chatsworth, No. 44

22BRITTANIA TRIUMPHANS, Sir William Davenant; drawing for setting, Scene II: A Horrid Hell; presented, January 7, 1638. Chatsworth No. 260

*23LUMINALIA or FESTIVAL OF LIGHT, Sir William Davenant (?); drawing for setting, Scene I: Night; presented, February 6, 1638. Chatsworth, No. 308

Nos. 18 to 23 lent by the Duke of Devonshire, Chatsworth

SABBATTINI, Nicola

ITALIAN

23A PRACTICA DI FABRICAR SCENE (Technique of Making Theatre Settings), 1637

Lent by J. Kyrle Fletcher, Ltd., Newport, England

VIGARANI, Carlo

ITALIAN

24 Drawing for setting of an opera, Paris, ca. 1666

Lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

24A Drawing of the proscenium of the "Salle des Machines," Tuileries, Paris, ca. 1670

Lent by the Tessin Collection, Drottningholm

*25-26ATIS, Lully; two drawings for settings, Paris, 1675

26-27THESEUS, Lully; two drawings for settings, Paris, 1675

28ALCESTIS, Lully; drawing for setting, Paris, 1675

29 Drawing for setting of an opera, Paris, ca. 1675

Nos. 25-29 lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

VIGARANI (School)

30 Drawing of setting, Colonnade with Statues, Paris, late XVIIth century

Lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

ITALIAN SCHOOL (Anonymous)

31 Four drawings, designs for side scenes

32 Four drawings, designs for side wings

33 Drawing, design for stage equipment with backdrop on rollers

Lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

BÉRAIN, JEAN

FRENCH

Born in St. Mihiel, Lorraine; in 1674 received royal appointment and was commissioned by King Louis XIV to design decorations and costumes for court festivals and ceremonies.

34 ARMIDA, Lully; drawing for setting, Paris, ca. 1680

35 HESIONE; drawing for setting, Paris, ca. 1701

Nos. 34-35 lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

BÉRAIN, Jean and DOLIVET

FRENCH

Three drawings for settings, created in Paris in 1659 and sent to Stockholm for the theatre of Charles XII:

36 —Setting for comedies: village
37 — Setting for comedies: village
38 — Setting for serious pastorals
   Lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

BÉRAIN (School)
   Two costume drawings, ca. 1690:
   39 — Shepherdess
   40 — Shepherd or Gardener
   Lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

FRENCH SCHOOL (Anonymous)
   41 Drawing for setting, late XVIIth century
   42 Drawing for setting, ca. 1700
   Lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

IUVARA, Filippo (1676–1736) ITALIAN
   Born in Messina, studied in Rome under Carlo Fontana; became architect for King of Sicily. Active in Turin, Mantua, Milan, Rome and Portugal. Called to Madrid by Philip V in 1735 and died there the following year.
   Two drawings for settings, Rome, 1709:
   *43 — Open Heavens with Phoebus on High
   44 — Piazza Prepared for Nocturnal Illumination with Triumphal Arch and Chariot
   Lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

BIBIENA FAMILY (Galli da Bibiena)
   A family which for over a hundred years was pre-eminent in designing for the theatre. They were employed at most of the principal courts in the late XVIIth and XVIIIth centuries and were instrumental in spreading the Italian Late Baroque style throughout Europe.
   45 Drawing for setting, unidentified play
   Lent by Mrs. Edith Isaacs, New York
   46 Drawing for setting, unidentified play
   Lent by the Duke of Devonshire, Chatsworth

BIBIENA, Giuseppe Galli (1696–1756)
   Studied with his father, Ferdinando, and succeeded him in the service of the Archduke of Vienna. Active principally in Austria and Germany, died in Berlin while working for Frederick II.
   Two drawings for settings:
   47 — Interior
   *48 — Ancient City
   Lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

WACHSMUTH and others GERMAN (?)
   49 Child’s Theatre, about 1730–1740: five colored engravings on cardboard, comprising four miniature wings and borders with actors, and one backdrop, set in a grooved wooden stage; engraved by Martin Engelbrecht after designs by Wachsmuth and others. The original series consisted of 189 pieces in 51 sets, together with a proscenium.
   Lent by Lee Simonson, New York

MONTENARI, Giovanni ITALIAN
   49A DEL TEATRO OLIMPICO DE ANDREA PALLADIO IN VINCENZA:
   second edition, Padua, 1749
   Lent by J. Kyrle Fletcher, Ltd., Newport, England

DE LAJOUE, Jacques (1687–1761) FRENCH
   Active in Paris as painter and designer under the patronage of Mme. de Pompadour and Louis XV.
   50 Theatrical composition, ca. 1740
   Lent by the Tessin Collection, Drottningholm
   51 Another version of the same composition
   Lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

RÉ, Vincenzo ITALIAN
   52 Drawing for a setting, Prison, ca. 1750
   Lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

GALLIARI, Gabriele (1709–1790) ITALIAN
   Collaborated with his brother Bernardino at Turin; later worked at the Court Theatre, Vienna. Returned to Italy and was active in Bergamo, Turin and Treviglio.
   *53 Drawing for setting, A Cortile, ca. 1777
   Lent by the National Museum, Stockholm
CHALLE, Michelange Charles (1718–1778)
French
Architect and mathematician, active in Paris in the XVIIIth century.

54 Design for setting, Paris, ca. 1770
Lent by the Theatre Museum, Drottningholm

55 ARMIDA (?), Gluck; design for setting, last act, Paris, ca. 1775
Lent by the Theatre Museum, Drottningholm

THE FAMILY BOQUET, French, late 18th century
56–63 Eight costume drawings for the Royal Opera, Stockholm, ca. 1775: Shepherd, Muse, Venus, Princess, Adonis, Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt, Asmenias, Priest sent by the Gods, Apollo
Lent by the Royal Opera, Stockholm

XAVERY, C. J.
Dutch
63A HET ITALIAANSCH TOONEEL (The Italian Stage); ca. 1770
Lent by J. Kyrle Fletcher, Ltd., Newport, England

DESPRÉZ, Louis Jean (1743–1804)
French
Born in Auxerre, worked as painter and architect in Paris and Lyon. While travelling in Italy he met King Gustavus III and returned with him to Stockholm where he was employed until his death as architect, sculptor, painter and designer for plays and festivals.

*64 QUEEN CHRISTINE; drawing for setting, Act I, Gripsholm, 1784

65–71 Seven sketches for settings and properties, ca. 1785
72 GUSTAF WASA, Naumann; drawing for setting, Stockholm, 1786
73–75 GUSTAF WASA, Naumann; three costume drawings, Stockholm, 1786
76–77 GUSTAF ADOLF AND EBBA BRAHE, Gustavus III and Kellgren; two drawings for settings, Stockholm, 1788
78 GUSTAF ADOLF AND EBBA BRAHE, Gustavus III and Kellgren; costume drawing, Stockholm, 1788
Nos. 64–78 lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

AENEAS IN CARTHAGE, Gustavus III and Kellgren; six drawings for settings, Stockholm, 1799:
79 —Prologue, Rock of Aeolus
80 —Prologue, The Fleet of the Trojans
81 —Scenes
82 —Scene
83 —Scene
84 —Scene
85 Drawing for setting, unidentified
Nos. 79 to 85 lent by the National Museum, Stockholm

LAMBERTI, Vincenzo
Italian
83A LA REGOLATA CONSTRUZION DE' TEATRI (Rules for the Construction of Theatres); first edition, Naples, 1787
Lent by J. Kyrle Fletcher, Ltd., Newport, England

PIOENEERS OF MODERN THEATRE ART
SAXE-MEININGEN, APPIA, AND CRAIG

DUKE GEORGE II OF SAXE-MEININGEN
Duke George II, 1826–1914, made Meiningen the center of progress in the theatre arts during the period 1870–90; see page 17.

86 DON GIOVANNI, Mozart; costume drawing for Masetto and Leporello
THE MAID OF ORLEANS, Schiller; two costume drawings:
87 —Lionel
88 — An Archer
N°s. 86 to 88 lent by the Cologne Theatre Museum

THE MAID OF ORLEANS, Schiller, four drawings for settings:
89A — Before Reims, without actors
89B — Before Reims, with actors
90A — Skirmish in woods
90B — Joan captured
Lent by the Civic Museum, Meiningen

THE PRETENDERS, Björnson; drawing for costumes of Norwegian Peasants
Lent by the Cologne Theatre Museum

91 THE PRETENDERS, Björnson; drawing for settings:
92 — Before Reims, without actors
93 — Before Reims, with actors
Lent by the Civic Museum, Meiningen

HERMANNSCHLACHT; two drawings for settings:
94 — Without actors
95 — With actors
Lent by the Civic Museum, Meiningen

APPIA, Adolphe
Swiss
Born in Geneva 1862; died in Zurich 1928. Worked chiefly in Switzerland, Germany and France; for many years associated with Jacques Dalcroze at Hellerau. See page 18.

THE VALKYRIE, Wagner; two drawings for settings, 1892:
96 — Act III, finale
97 — The Sleep of Brunhilde
Lent by the Estate of Adolphe Appia through the courtesy of the Museum of Art and History, Geneva

THE VALKYRIE, Wagner, three models for settings:
98 — Act I, scene 1
99 — Act II, scene 1
100 — Act III, scene 1
Lent by the Cologne Theatre Museum

THE RHEINGOLD, Wagner; drawing for setting, 1892:
101 — Valhalla
Lent by the Estate of Adolphe Appia through the courtesy of the Museum of Art and History, Geneva

THE RHEINGOLD, Wagner, three models for settings:
102 — Act I, scene 1
103 — Acts II and IV
104 — Act III, scene 1
Lent by the Cologne Theatre Museum

PARSIFAL, Wagner; three drawings for settings, 1896:
*105 — Act I: The Sacred Forest
*106 — Act II: Klingsor’s Dungeon
*107 — Act III: The Flowering Meadow
Lent by the Estate of Adolphe Appia through the courtesy of the Museum of Art and History, Geneva

Three rhythmic designs, 1909(?), for the Dalcroze Theatre, Hellerau

TRISTAN AND ISOLDE, Wagner; four drawings for settings, 1923:
111 — Act II, Opening Scene
112 — Act II, Isolde Extinguishes the Torch
113 — Act II, The Arrival of King Mark
114 — Act II, Finale

LITTLE EYOLF, Ibsen; drawing for setting, 1924:
115 — Act II

IPHIGENIA IN AULIS, Glück; four drawings for settings, 1926:
116 — Act I, Scene 1
117 — Act I, Scene 2
118 — Act II
119 — Act III

KING LEAR, Shakespeare; two drawings for settings, 1926:
120 — Acts I and II
121 — Act III

**ORPHEUS, Gluck; drawing for setting, 1926:**
122 — Descent to Hades

*Nos. 111 to 122 lent by the Estate of Adolphe Appia through the courtesy of the Museum of Art and History, Geneva*

**CRAIG, Edward Gordon English**

Born near London, 1872; has worked chiefly in London and Florence.

*123—134 Settings for an Ideal Theatre, twelve etchings, 1907

"These etchings were made by the artist in the Spring of 1907 at Florence and represent his most serious work. Connected as they are with his dream of an Ideal Theatre, they in no way have anything in common with the modern stage." (From the foreword to the portfolio in which these etchings were issued)

*Lent by Alfred Stieglitz, New York*

**AUSTRIA**

**BAHNER, Willi**

*VIENNA*

**TWELFTH NIGHT, Shakespeare; five drawings for settings, Civic Theatre, Vienna, 1929:**
135 — Hall of the Duke
136 — Street Scene
137 — The Harbor
138 — Olivia's Garden
139 — Room in Olivia's House

**140 CENODOXUS, DOCTOR OF PARIS,**

drawing for setting of Finale, Civic Theatre, Vienna, 1933

*Nos. 135—140 lent by the Artist*

**BESCHORNER, Irmgard**

*DRESDEN, VIENNA*

**141 MEASURE FOR MEASURE, Shakespeare; drawing for setting of Act V**

142—144 — , O'Neill (?); three drawings for settings

*Nos. 141—144 lent by the Artist*

**CZECHOSLOVAKIA**

**HEYTHUM, A.**

*PRAGUE*

*169 DESIRE UNDER THE ELMS, O'Neill; drawing for setting, constructed in stepped stages of which only the part where action occurs is lighted, State National Theatre, Prague, 1925, director K. Dostal*

**STRNAD, Oscar**

*VIENNA*

**KING LEAR, Shakespeare; two drawings for settings, Josefstadter Theatre, 1920—1927, director Reinhardt:**

*145 — Gloucester's Castle
145A — Lear before the House of Goneril

**146—149 HAMLET, Shakespeare; four drawings for settings, People's Theatre, Vienna, 1922**

*150—155 DANTON'S DEATH, Georg Büchner; six drawings for settings, People's Theatre, Amsterdam, 1922*

**156—167 JULIUS CAESAR, Shakespeare; twelve projects for settings, 1922**

**168 MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM, Shakespeare; drawing for setting, 1927, director Reinhardt**

*Nos. 145—168 lent by the Artist*

**THE GREAT GOD BROWN, O'Neill; two drawings for settings, State National Theatre, Prague, 1928, director K. Dostal:**

*170 — Brown's Office
171 — Scene by the Sea*
**MERCHAND OF VENICE** Shakespeare; four drawings for settings, State National Theatre, Prague, 1930, director K. Dostal:

*172 — Street in Venice

*173 — Ghetto

*174 — Shylock’s House

*175 — Belmont

176 **THE FATAL PLAY OF LOVE**, Capek; drawing for setting, State National Theatre, Prague, 1930, director J. Frejka

**ALADDIN**, Klocek; three drawings for settings, State National Theatre, Prague, 1933, director K. Dostal:

177 — Scene in a Bank

178 — Scene in a Casino

179 — Attic-room in a Slum

Nos. 169—179 lent by the Artist

**HOFMAN, Vlastislav**

180 **THE MAN WHO WAS THURSDAY**, Chesterton; drawing for setting, State National Theatre, Prague, 1922, director K. Dostal

181 **CHRISTINA**, Strindberg; drawing for setting, State National Theatre, Prague, 1922, director Hilar

182 **THE GAME OF LOVE AND DEATH**, Rolland; drawing for setting, State National Theatre, Prague, 1925, director Hilar

183 **ANTIGONE**, Sophocles; drawing for setting, State National Theatre, Prague, 1925, director K. Dostal

184—185 **HAMLET**, Shakespeare; four drawings for settings, State National Theatre, Prague, 1926, director Hilar

186 **THE DICTATOR**, R. U. R., Capek; two drawings for settings, State National Theatre, Prague, 1929, director Kodicak

187 **THE DEMON**, Dostoevski; three drawings for settings, State National Theatre, Prague, 1929, director Hilar

188 THE FATAL PLAY OF LOVE, Capek; drawing for setting, State National Theatre, Prague, 1927, director Hilar

189—191 **ELIZABETH OF ENGLAND**, Bruckner; drawing for setting, State National Theatre, Prague, 1922, director Hilar

192 **THE GAME OF LOVE AND DEATH**, Rolland; drawing for setting, State National Theatre, Prague, 1925, director Hilar

193—194 **ANTEONE**, Sophocles; two drawings for settings, State National Theatre, Prague, 1925, director K. Dostal

195—196 **MARCO MILLIONS**, O'Neill; two drawings for settings, Municipal Theatre, Prague, 1930, director J. Bor

197 **AMPHITRYON**, Giraudoux; drawing for setting, State National Theatre, Prague, 1933, director Hilar

198A—198B **OEDIPUS**, Sophocles; two drawings for settings, State National Theatre, Prague, 1931—1932, director Hilar

199A—199B **EMPEROR JONES**, O'Neill; two drawings for settings, Municipal Theatre, Prague, 1933, director Bor

Nos. 180 to 199 lent by the Artist

200 **CRIME AND PUNISHMENT**, Dostoevski; drawing for setting, Municipal Theatre, Prague, director Bor

Lent by the Municipal Theatre, Prague

**DENMARK**

**Nielsen, Kay**

201 **ALLADIN**, drawing for setting, 1917: Proscenium

**ALLADIN**, two drawings for costumes, 1917:

202A — Hindu Dancer

202B — Chinese Fiddler with Drum

Nos. 201 to 202B lent by Leicester Square Galleries, London
ENGLAND

BLANCH, Mrs. Lesley London
203 AMPHITRYON, Molière; drawing for setting

AMPHITRYON, Molière; four drawings for costumes:
204 — Theban Captain
205 — Sosia
206 — Jupiter
207 — Alcmena

*208 THE MERCHANT OF VENICE, Shakespeare; Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, Stratford, 1932; Komisarzhevsky director; drawing for permanent setting

*209 THE MERCHANT OF VENICE, Shakespeare; drawing for costume, 1932: Shylock

210 ROUGE ET NOIR; drawing for costume: The King
Nos. 203 to 210 lent by the Artist

CRAIG, Edward Gordon: See Pioneers of Modern Theatre Art, page 46

DEXEL, Walter London
MANN IST MANN, Bert Brecht, produced in Germany; two drawings for settings
211 — Act II, Pagoda
212 — Act V
Lent by Dr. Adolf Behne, Berlin
Courtesy the Artist

FRASER, C. Lovat London
213 Drawing for a permanent setting for Eighteenth Century comedy

214 MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING, Shakespeare; drawing for costume: Court Lady

215 AS YOU LIKE IT, Shakespeare; drawing for setting: Forest of Arden

216 THE BEGGARS’ OPERA, John Gay; drawing for costume, 1920: Lady of the Town

217 PILGRIM’S PROGRESS; drawing for costume, 1920: Devil

218 THE TEMPEST, Shakespeare; drawing for setting, 1921: Act II, Scene 1, Another Part of the Island

219 THE TEMPEST, Shakespeare; drawing for costume, 1921: A Strange Shape

220 MACBETH, Shakespeare; drawing for costume, 1921: Witch

221 THE DEVIL IS AN ASS, Ben Jonson; drawing for costume, 1921: Pug, the Lesser Devil

222 CROSSINGS, Walter de la Mare; drawing for costume, 1921: An African Fairy
Nos. 213 to 222 lent by Mrs. Lovat Fraser

JONES, Inigo: See section Theatre Art of the Renaissance and Baroque Periods, page 43

MESSEL, Oliver London
223 THE MIRACLE, director, Reinhardt; drawing for setting, 1932: A Tree

THE MIRACLE; three drawings for costumes, 1932:
224 — Hungarian Dancer
225 — Huntsman
226 — Companion of Robber Count

227 LA BELLE HÉLÈNE, Offenbach, director, Reinhardt; drawing for drop-scene, 1932: Gods and Goddesses

LA BELLE HÉLÈNE, Offenbach; six drawings for costumes, 1932:
228 — Grecian Athlete
229 — Grecian Maiden
230 — Juno
231 — Bachus, Maid to Hélène
232 — Achilles
233 — Masked Chorus

Nos. 223 to 233 lent by the Artist

RICKETTS, Charles LONDON
233a-b MACBETH, Shakespeare; two drawings for settings
Lent by Martin Birnbaum, New York

RUTHERSTON, Albert OXFORD
THE WINTER’S TALE, Shakespeare; four drawings for costumes, 1912:
234 — Courtier
235 — Country Girl
236 — Morris Dancers, man and woman
Lent by Lillah McCarthy, O.B.E., (Lady Keeble), London

237 THE WINTER’S TALE, Shakespeare; two drawings for costumes, 1912:
Clown and Country Girl
Lent by Kenneth Clark, Oxford

238 THE DOCTOR’S DILEMMA, Shaw; drawing for costume, 1913: Jennifer
Lent by the Artist

LE REVEIL DE FLORE, Pavlova ballet; two drawings for costumes, 1914:
239 — Costume for Pavlova
Lent by the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford

240 — Dancer
Lent by the Artist

241 ANDROCLES AND THE LION, Shaw; drawing for costume: Masked Slave
Lent by Lillah McCarthy, O.B.E., (Lady Keeble), London

SHERINGHAM, George LONDON
242 THE TEMPEST, Shakespeare; drawing for backdrop

FINLAND

WAREN, Matti HELSINGFORS
259-260 I AM GUILTY: A DRAMA OF SAUL AND DAVID, Maria Jothini;

243 TWELFTH NIGHT, Shakespeare; drawing for curtain, 1913: Street Scene
Nos. 242, 243 lent by the Artist

WILKINSON, Norman LONDON
A MIDSUMMER NIGHT’S DREAM, Shakespeare; four drawings for costumes, 1913:
244 — Puck
245 — Flute as Thisbe
246 — Moonshine
247 — Attendant
Lent by the Artist

LOVE’S LABOUR’S LOST, Shakespeare; two drawings for costumes:
248 — Scene of Taking the Oath
249 — Braggart and Page
Lent by Mrs. Arthur Heaton, Birmingham, England

250 THE TROJAN WOMEN, Euripides; drawing for costume, 1915: Chorus

251 IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS, Euripides; drawing for costume, 1915: Men Temple Attendants
Nos. 250 to 251 lent by the Artist

ZINKEISEN, Doris LONDON
C. B. Cochran revue, 1929; three drawings for costumes of the period of 1900:
252 — Sheila Wilson
253 — Jane Welsh
254 — Iris Brown
Lent by the Artist

NYMPH ERRANT, James Laver; four drawings for costumes of the period of 1830:
255 — Mrs. Jones
256 — Mrs. Huntington
257 — La Marchesa Bantalina
258 — Miss Corinelle Marcon
Lent by C. B. Cochran, London
In this section is included the work of many non-French designers who live in Paris. Other French designers are included in the section: Theatre Art of the Renaissance and Baroque Periods.

**BAKST, Léon**  
Born in Russia, 1868; died in Paris, 1924.

261 SADKO, Rimsky-Korsakov, 1911; drawing for costume: Boyar  
*Lent by Mrs. E. C. MacVeagh, New York*

262 GOOD-HUMORED LADIES, D. Scarlatti, Russian Ballet, Rome, 1917; drawing for costume: Constanza  
*Lent by M. Knoedler and Company, New York*

GOOD-HUMORED LADIES, D. Scarlatti, Russian Ballet; three drawings for costumes:
- 263 — Battista
- 264 — Mariuccia
- 265 — Mendiant

266 **THE SLEEPING PRINCESS**, Tchaikovsky, Russian Ballet, London, 1922; drawing for setting: The Baptism Scene  
*Nos. 263 to 266 lent by Mrs. John W. Garrett, Baltimore, Maryland*

**LE MARTYRE DE SAINT-SÉBASTIEN**, Paris, 1922; two drawings for costumes:  
- 267 — (?) Prince with Negro Page  
- 268 — Mesopotamian Dignitary  
*Lent by Mrs. E. C. MacVeagh, New York*

269 SCHÉHÉRAZADE, Rimsky-Korsakov, Russian Ballet, Paris, 1910; drawing for setting  
*Lent by George Blumenthal, New York*

**BARSACQ, André**  
*270-272 **VOLPONE**, Ben Jonson; three drawings for settings, 1928; Théâtre de l’Atelier, Paris*

**VOLPONE**, Ben Jonson; four drawings for costumes, 1928:  
- 273 — Leone, Captain of the Fleet  
- 274 — Magistrate  
- 275 — Soldier  
- 276 — Valet

277 **THE BEAUX STRATEGEM**, George Farquhar; drawing for setting, 1930: Act II, Balcony of the House

**THE BEAUX STRATEGEM**, George Farquhar; three drawings for costumes, 1930:  
- 278 — Count  
- 279 — Lady  
- 280 — Innkeeper

281 **THE SON OF DON JUAN (?), José Echegaray; three drawings for settings**

**THE RAPE OF LUCRECE**, André Obey; three drawings for costumes, 1931:  
- 282 — Collatine  
- 283 — Tarquin  
- 284 — The Narrator  
*Nos. 270 to 284 lent by the Artist*

**BRAQUE, Georges**  
*285 **LES FACHEUX**, Auric, Swedish Ballet, Paris, 1924; model for setting  
*Lent by Paul Rosenberg, Paris*

**de CHIRICO, Giorgio**; see Italian section

**DERAIN, André**  
*286 **LA BOUTIQUE FANTASQUE**, Rossini-Respighi, Russian Ballet, London, 1919; drawing for curtain  
*Lent by Paul Rosenberg, Paris*

**DOBUZHINSKY, Mstislav**; see U. S. S. R. section
THE EMPEROR JONES, Eugene O'Neill; three drawings for settings, 1923:
287 — Forest
288 — At the Foot of a Great Tree
289 — Throne Room

THE ORESTEIA, Aeschylus; two drawings for settings:
290—291

THE ORESTEIA, Aeschylus; three drawings for costumes:
292 — Clytemnestra
293 — Aegisthus
294 — Taltubios

Nos. 287 to 294 lent by the Artist

GOLOVINE, Alexander: see U. S. S. R. section

GONTCHAROVA, Nathalie
Born in Russia 1881, has worked in Paris since c. 1914.

LITURGY, Russian Ballet, Lausanne, 1915; three reproductions of drawings for costumes:
295 — The Apostle Andrew
296 — The Apostle Matthew
*297 — Cherub

LITURGY, drawing for setting

ESPAGNE, Ravel, Russian Ballet, Rome, 1916; two drawings for costumes:
298 — Man
299 — Woman

Nos. 295 to 299 lent by Mrs. S. Bashkiroff, New York

COQ D’OR, Rimsky-Korsakoff, Russian Ballet, Paris, 1914; drawing
Lent by the Bakrushing Theatre Museum, Moscow

LAGUT, Irène

LES MARIÉS DE LA TOUR EIFFEL, Swedish Ballet, Rolf de Maré, producer, 1921; drawing for setting
Lent by Les Archives Internationales de la Danse, Paris

LARIONOFF, Michael
Born in Russia; has worked in Paris since c. 1914.

RENARD, Stravinski, Russian Ballet, Paris, 1922; drawing for setting

RENARD, Stravinski, Russian Ballet; three drawings for costumes:
303 — Pilgrim
304 — Nun
305 — Peasant

Nos. 302 to 305 lent by the Artist

LÉGER, Fernand

LA CRÉATION DU MONDE, Swedish Ballet, Rolf de Maré, producer, 1922; two drawings for curtains
Lent by Les Archives Internationales de la Danse, Paris

MEDGYES, Ladislas: see Hungarian section

PERDRIAT, Hélène

LE MARCHAND D’OISEAUX, Swedish Ballet, Rolf de Maré, producer, 1923; drawing for setting
Lent by Les Archives Internationales de la Danse, Paris

PICASSO, Pablo
Born in Spain; has worked in Paris since 1899.

PARADE, Russian Ballet, Paris, 1917; drawing for a Chinese costume
Lent by Les Fils de Léon Helft, Paris

LE TRICORNE, Russian Ballet, London, 1920; drawing for curtain
Lent by Paul Rosenberg, Paris

CUADRO FLAMENCO, de Falla, Russian Ballet, Paris, 1921; two paintings, originally parts of the curtain; painted by Picasso himself:
*311 — Theatre Box, Lady and Gentleman, on canvas, 76 x 57½ inches
312 — Theatre Box, Two Ladies, on canvas, 75\frac{1}{2} \times 54 \text{ inches}  
\text{Lent by Les Fils de Léon Helft, Paris}

de SEGONZAC, André Dunoyer \text{PARIS} 
LE MESSAGER, Henry Bernstein; three drawings for settings:
313 — Act I, In Uganda
314 — Act II, Small Drawing-room in Paris
315 — Act III, A Smart Restaurant  
\text{Lent by the Artist}

SOUDEIKINE, Sergei: see U. S. S. R. section

SURVAGE, Léopold \text{PARIS}  
Born in Russia; has worked in Paris since 1908. 

L’ÉCOLE DES FEMMES, Molière; four drawings for settings, 1922:
316 — House of Agnès, with Plan of Setting

VAKALO, Georges \text{PARIS}  
Born in Greece, works in Paris.

317 — House of Arnolphe, street side, House of Arnolphe, garden side  
\text{Lent by the Artist}

THE PEACE, Aristophanes, Théâtre de l’Atelier; six drawings for costumes:
318 — Life is a Dream, Calderón; two drawings for costumes:
319 — Rosaura
320 — Servant

GERMANY

DANIEL, Heinz \text{HAMBURG}  
*327 FAUST, Part I, Goethe; drawing for setting, 1931  
\text{Lent by the Cologne Theatre Museum}

PYGMALION, Shaw; drawing for setting, German State Theatre, Hamburg, 1932, director Günther Haenl:
328 — Setting for Acts III and V

COMEDY OF ERRORS, Shakespeare; drawing for setting, German State Theatre, Hamburg, 1933

MACBETH, Verdi; drawing for setting, State Opera, Hamburg, 1933, director Fritz Oskar Schuh:
330 — Act II: A Hall  
\text{Nos. 328 to 330 lent by the Artist}

GLIESE, Rochus \text{ESSEN}  
DER BLAUE BOLL, Barlach; two drawings for settings, 1930:
331 — Scene 3
332 — Scene 7

THE PORTUGUESE BATTLE, Peuzoldt; two drawings for settings, 1931:
333 — Penamakor
334 — The Widow’s Residence

THE CROWD SEEKS, Neumeyer; two drawings for settings, 1931:
335 — Setting for scenes 2, 3, 4, and 10
336 — Setting, Scene 7
337—339 THE CROWDSEEKS, Neumeyer; three photographs of settings, 1931

KING CUCKOLD, Kaiser; two drawings for settings, 1931:
340 — Setting for scenes 6, 7, 8, and 9
341 — Scene 11  
\text{Nos. 331 to 341 lent by the Artist}
GRETE, Heinz; Nuremberg
342 EURYANTHE, Weber; drawing for setting
THE MEISTERSINGER, Wagner; drawing for setting:
343 — Festival grounds
344 TANNHAUSER, Wagner; drawing for setting
345 A MIDSUMMER NIGHT’S DREAM, Shakespeare; drawing for setting
Nos. 342-345 lent by the Artist

GRÖNING, Karl
346 CARMEN, Bizet; drawing for setting, Act I, 1923
347 IPHIGENIA, Goethe; drawing for setting, Municipal Theatre, Altona, 1929
348 — Setting for Act II
349 — Setting for Act III
Nos. 346 to 349 lent by the Cologne Theatre Museum

HECKROTH, Heinrich; Düsseldorf
350 — FAUST, Goethe; drawing for setting, 1931:
351 DAGMAR; drawing for setting, Act I, State Opera, Dresden, 1932
352 — Scene: Lunatic Asylum
353 AIDA, Verdi; drawing for setting, Municipal Theatre, Essen:
354 DER FREISCHÜTZ, Weber; drawing for setting, Municipal Theatre, Essen
Nos. 350-354 lent by the Cologne Theatre Museum

HELMDACI, Heinz; Magdeburg
355 — DEROSENKAVALIER, Richard Strauss; drawing for setting, 1931:
356 — Room in the House of von Faninal
357 LOHENGRIN, Wagner; drawing for setting, 1932:
358 — Act II: Castle
359 KING FOR A DAY; drawing for setting, 1932
360 EGMONT, Goethe; drawing for setting, 1932:
361 — A Square in Brünel
Nos. 355-358 lent by the Artist

LOEFFLER, Edouard; Mannheim
359 — AIDA, Verdi; drawing for setting:
360 CARMEN, Bizet; drawing for setting
361 DON GIOVANNI, Mozart; drawing for setting
362 A MIDSUMMER NIGHT’S DREAM, Shakespeare; drawing for setting
Nos. 359 to 362 lent by the National Theatre, Mannheim

MAHNE, Adolph; Dresden
363 — ELGA, Gerhart Hauptmann; drawing for setting, 1920:
364 GÖTZ VON BERLICHINGEN, Goethe; drawing for setting, State Theatre, Dresden, 1932, director Gielen
365 — TROILUS AND CRESSIDA, Shakespeare; drawing for setting and photograph, State Theatre, Dresden:
366 — ACT III, SCENE 1: A Room in Priam’s Palace

JULIUS CAESAR, Shakespeare; three drawings for settings with photographs, State Theatre, Dresden:
366 — ACT I, SCENE 1 and 3; ACT III, SCENE 3: A Street in Rome
Nos. 363 to 368 lent by the Cologne Theatre Museum

MEININGEN, Duke George II: see section Pioneers of Modern Theatre Art

MUELLER, Traugott Berlin
THE BRIDE OF MESSINA; two drawings for settings, Municipal Theatre, Berlin:
369 — Scene 1
370 — Scene 3

THE NIBELUNGEN, Wagner; two drawings for settings:
371 — Act I, Scene 5
372 — Act I, Scene 6
Nos. 369 to 372 lent by the Artist

PILARTZ, T. C. Cologne
373 THE MAID OF ORLEANS, Schiller; drawing for setting, Cologne Theatre, 1932–1933, director Fritz Holl

THE LUCK OF THE FILIBUSTERS; drawing for costumes, Cologne Theatre, 1932–1933:
374 — Three Pirates

THE STREET WITHOUT AN END; drawing for setting, Cologne Theatre, 1933:
375 — Act I
Nos. 373 to 375 lent by the Cologne Theatre Museum

POELZIG, Hans Berlin
376 DON GIOVANNI, Mozart; drawing for setting

377 HAMLET, Shakespeare; drawing for setting

MUNKEN WENDT, Knut Hamsun; two drawings for settings:
378 — Act II
379 — Last Act
Nos. 376 to 379 lent by the Artist

REIGBERT, Otto Cologne
THE KING, Hanns Johst; drawing for four costumes, Kammerspiele, Munich, 1919:
380 — Four costumes: Author; Plasterer; Two Builders

FIESCO, Schiller; drawing for setting, Kammerspiele, Munich, 1920:
381 — Act I, Scene 5
382 A MIDSUMMER NIGHT’S DREAM, Shakespeare; drawing for setting, Kammerspiele, Munich, 1926

383 THE DEATH OF DANTON, Georg Büchner; drawing for setting, Kammerspiele, Munich, 1927

384 NACHFOLGE CHRISTI-SPIEL, Max Mell, Kammerspiele, Munich; drawing for setting

385 THRICE-DEAD PETER; drawing for setting, Kammerspiele, Munich, 1927
Nos. 380 to 385 lent by the Cologne Theatre Museum

SCHENK VON TRAPP, Lothar Wiesbaden
THE FLYING DUTCHMAN, Wagner; three drawings for settings, with photographs of drawings and of completed settings:
386 — Act I: By the Sea
387 — Act II: Room in Daland’s House
388 — Act III: Seashore near Daland’s House

389-390 ANGELINA, Rossini; two drawings giving elevation and plan of setting, with photographs of completed setting
Nos. 386 to 390 lent by the Artist

SAXE-MEININGEN, Duke George II: see section Pioneers of Modern Theatre Art

SCHROEDER, Johannes Hamburg
EMPEROR AND GALILEAN, Ibsen:
391 — Drawing for setting
392 — Photograph of setting
393-394 EGMONT, Goethe; two drawings for settings
Nos. 391 to 394 lent by the Artist
SIEVERT, Ludwig  
395 JUDITH; drawing for setting, Frankfort, 1921, director Richard Weichert  
*396 THE BROAD HIGHWAY, Strindberg; drawing for setting, Frankfort 1923, director Dr. Fritz Peter Buch  
*397 SALOME, Richard Strauss; drawing for setting, 1925  
398 THE NIBELUNGEN, Wagner; drawing for setting, Frankfort, 1925, director Dr. Lothar Wallerstein  
399 COSÍ FA ¡ TUTTE, Mozart; drawings for setting, Frankfort, Salzburg, State Opera, Vienna, director Dr. Lothar Wallerstein  
400 MACBETH, Shakespeare; drawing for setting: Castle  
Nos. 395 to 400 lent by the Artist

SOEHNLEIN, Kurt  
401 TURANDOT; drawing for setting, 1929  
402 ORPHEUS, Gluck; drawing for setting, 1930  
*403 MACBETH, Shakespeare; drawing for setting, 1931  
Nos. 401 to 403 lent by the Artist

SUHR, Edward  
MISSISSIPPI, George Kaiser; drawing for setting, People’s Theatre, Berlin, 1930:  
404 —Scene I: Warehouse in New Orleans  
405 —Battlefield near Leipzig, 1813  
LA VALLIÈRE, Janos von Mory; drawing for setting, Schiller Theatre, Berlin, 1933:  
406 —Scene 5: Camp in Flanders, 1750  
PRINCE FREDERICK OF HAMBURG, Heinrich von Kleist; drawing for setting, Hessian Regional Theatre, Darmstadt, 1933:

407 —Courtyard of a Castle, Berlin  
Nos. 404 to 407 lent by the Artist

TORSTEN, Axel  
408 BAYAZZO, Leoncavallo; drawing for setting, State Theatre, Karlsruhe, 1929  
THE FLYING DUTCHMAN, Wagner; drawing for setting, Suomalainen Opera, Helsingfors:  
409 —Act III: The Ghost Ship

409 ATHE MARVELOUS MANDARIN, R. Kreideweiss; drawing for setting, State Theatre, Karlsruhe, 1933  
410 THE MARVELOUS MANDARIN, R. Kreideweiss; costume drawing, 1933  
411 THE GLASS PRINCESS; costume drawing, 1933  
412 TEA COST; costume drawing, 1933  
413 THE CHEERFUL MYNHEER, costume drawing, 1933  
Nos. 408 to 413 lent by the Artist

WILDERMANN, Hans  
414 DON JUAN AND FAUST, Grabbe; drawing for setting, Municipal Theatre, Dortmund, 1919  
415 RIENZI, Wagner; drawing for setting, Opera House, Hamburg, 1930  
416 GIANNI SCHICCHI, Puccini; drawing for setting, Opera House, Breslau  
417 DER FREISCHÜTZ, Weber; drawing for setting, Opera House, Breslau, 1932, director Dr. Hartmann  
418 BORIS GODUNOFF, Moussorgsky; drawing for setting, Opera House, Breslau  
419 AMPHITRYON, Heinrich von Kleist; drawing for setting, Municipal Theatre, Dortmund  
Nos. 414 to 419 lent by the Cologne Theatre Museum
HUNGARY

FULÖP, Zoltán  
420 IRJA HADNAGY, drawing for setting, 1932; Studio Theatre, Budapest  
Lent by Charles Rosner, Budapest

MEDGYES, Ladislas  
421 THE SEVEN SONGS, Malipiero; model for setting; Théâtre des Mathurins, Paris, 1925

OLÁH, Gustave  
424-425 MINUTE OPERA, Darius Milhaud; two drawings for settings  
Lent by Charles Rosner, Budapest

ITALY

de CHIRICO, Giorgio  
426 LA JARRE, Swedish Ballet, Rolf de Maré, producer, Paris, 1924; drawing for setting

For other Italian designers see section Theatre Art of the Renaissance and Baroque Periods

LATVIA

MUNCIS, Jan  
427 — THE BLUE BIRD, Maeterlinck; drawing for setting, National Theatre, Riga, 1933:

PEER GYNT, Ibsen; drawing for setting, National Theatre, Riga, 1933:

SWEDEN

ÅHRÉN, Uno  
429 — Act VII  
430 — Act IX  
Lent by the Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm

GRÜNEWALD, Isaac  
431 — Asserato

*432 — Bourgognino  
*433 — Bourgognino  
*434 — Calacagno  
*435 — Dorio  
436 — Leonora  
437 — Lomellino  
438 — Male character  
439 — Male character  
440 — Male character  
441 — Female character

*442-448 FIESCO, Schiller; seven drawings for settings, Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm
ANTONY AND CLEOPATRA, Shakespeare; ten costume drawings, Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm:
449 — Antony
450 — Caesar
451 — Enobarbus, Philo, and Demetrius
452 — Dolabella and Proculeius
453 — Pompeius
454 — Proculeius
455 — Charmian
456 — Mariner
457 — Iras
458 — Servant of Cleopatra
459 — CAVALLERIA RUSTICANA, Mascagni; drawing for setting, Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm
460—461 SAMSON AND DELILAH, Saint-Saëns; two drawings for settings, Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm
462—464 SAKUNTALA, Reyer; three drawings for settings, Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm
Nos. 431 to 464 lent by the Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm

465—467 GREEN PASTURES, Marc Connelly; three drawings for Frieze of Promenade, Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm

468 GREEN PASTURES Marc Connelly; model for setting, Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm

469—471 MASTER OLOF, August Strindberg; three drawings for settings, Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm
Nos. 465 to 471 lent by the Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm

SJÖBERG, Alf
472 THE HOLY FAMILY, Rudolf Varnlund; drawing for setting; Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm
Lent by the Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm

SKÖLD, Otte
473—474 MEDEA, Euripides; two drawings for settings, Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm

MEDEA, Euripides; six costume drawings, Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm:
475 — Jason
476 — Jason's Escort
477 — Aegeus' Escort
478 — Chorus
479 — Chorus
480 — Chorus

THE FAITHFUL, John Masefield; two drawings for settings, Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm:
481 — Inside Kira's Palace
482 — Concert House
Nos. 473 to 482 lent by the Royal Dramatic Theatre, Stockholm

SWITZERLAND

APPIA, Adolphe: see section Pioneers of the Modern Theatre Art, page 46

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

483 THE PORCELAIN PALACE, scenario from Hans Anderson's story "The Nightingale;" model of setting, 1933

*484—488 THE PORCELAIN PALACE, scenario from Hans Anderson's story "The Nightingale;" five costume drawings, 1933
Nos. 483 to 488 lent by the Artist
BRAGDON, Claude  New York

*489  THE GLITTERING GATE, Lord Dunsany; drawing for setting, 1933

THE GODS OF THE MOUNTAIN, Lord Dunsany; two drawings for settings, 1933:
490 — Scene 1
491 — Scene 2
Nos. 489 to 491 lent by the Artist

DREYFUSS, Henry  New York

492  SALOME, Oscar Wilde; one large and six small drawings for settings, 1933

ENTERS, Angna  New York

493  SPANISH MEDIEVAL NIGHT’S DREAM; drawing for setting, based on the courtyard of the ruined palace of Charles V in the Alhambra, 1933

494  SPANISH MEDIEVAL NIGHT’S DREAM; six costume drawings, 1933: Medieval Night’s Dream, Auto da Fé, Pavana, Inquisition Virgin, Boy Cardinal, Santa España del Cruz

495  BALLET MACABRE; three figure drawings based on artists’ implements and model forms, 1933

*496  DIONYSIAN GREECE IN NEW YORK; drawing for setting with figures, 1932

497  PAGAN GREECE; costume drawing for Artemis, 1933

498  THE HOLY VIRGIN PURSUED BY SATAN; costume drawing, 1933

499  ODALISQUE; costume drawing, 1933
Nos. 493 to 499 lent by the Ehrich Galleries, New York

ESSMAN, Manuel  New York

500  TWILIGHT IMPERIALISM, Robert Medloe; drawing for setting with plastic stage, 1933

*501–502  THE TOWER, Herbert Biberman; two drawings for settings, 1933: Setting for a stage of mobile forms with simultaneous action on various levels

503  RAZZ MANHATTAN, Martin Eyre; drawing for Neo-Actualist setting with electric transcription broadcast of an historic event used as sound background, 1933

Nos. 500 to 503 lent by the Artist

GEDDES, Norman Bel  New York

KING LEAR, Shakespeare; five drawings of settings, 1917:

L 504 — Courtyard of Gloucester’s Castle, preliminary study

*505 — Courtyard of Gloucester’s Castle

506 — The Throne of Lear

507 — Between the Camps

508 — Hut on the Heath

KING LEAR, Shakespeare; two costume drawings, 1917:

509 — Duke of Albany
510 — Duke of Cornwall

DIVINE COMEDY, Dante; four drawings for settings, 1920:

511 — The Earth Opens
512 — Inferno
513 — The Gates of Purgatory
514 — Paradise

515–518  DIVINE COMEDY, Dante; four plaster masks, 1920

519  DIVINE COMEDY, Dante; photograph of settings showing stage structure, 1920

520  LAZARUS LAUGHED, Eugene O’Neill; model of setting, 1927

521  LAZARUS LAUGHED, Eugene O’Neill; five photographs of model of setting, 1927

522–523  LAZARUS LAUGHED, Eugene O’Neill; two costume drawings, 1927
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>524-533</td>
<td><strong>LAZARUS LAUGHS</strong>; forty drawings for masks, 1927</td>
<td>Eugene O’Neill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>AIDA; four drawings for settings, 1933:</td>
<td>Verdi</td>
<td>Act I, Act II, Act III, Act IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538-540</td>
<td><strong>AIDA</strong>; three costume drawings, 1933</td>
<td>Verdi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Act I, Act II, Act III, Act IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
<td><strong>AIDA</strong>; wooden model for setting, 1933:</td>
<td>Verdi</td>
<td>Act III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546</td>
<td><strong>KING LEAR</strong>; wooden model for setting, 1933:</td>
<td>Shakespeare</td>
<td>The Throne of Lear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td><strong>THEY SHALL NOT DIE</strong>; two drawings for settings, 1933:</td>
<td>John Wexley</td>
<td>Act I, Act II, Courtroom, Scottsville, Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551</td>
<td><strong>MACBETH</strong>; four drawings for settings, 1921:</td>
<td>Shakespeare</td>
<td>The Letter Scene (Lent by Sidney Howard, New York)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td><strong>HAMLET</strong>; drawing for setting, 1923:</td>
<td>Shakespeare</td>
<td>The Sleep-walking Scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Three Witches (Lent by Dr. Smith Ely Jelliffe, New York)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Banquo’s Ghost (Lent by Lee Simonson, New York)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556</td>
<td><strong>SWORDES</strong>; drawing for setting, 1922</td>
<td>Sidney Howard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>557</td>
<td><strong>HAMLET</strong>; drawing for setting, 1923:</td>
<td>Shakespeare</td>
<td>The Madness of Ophelia (Lent by Dr. Smith Ely Jelliffe, New York)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td><strong>DESIRE UNDER THE ELMS</strong>; drawing for setting, 1928</td>
<td>Eugene O’Neill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559</td>
<td><strong>THE GREEN PASTURES</strong>; drawing for setting, 1929:</td>
<td>Marc Connelly</td>
<td>The Prayer of Moses (Lent by Miss Lillian Gish, New York)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td><strong>LA GIOCONDA</strong>; drawing for setting, 1933:</td>
<td>d’Annunzio</td>
<td>The Sculptor’s Studio (Lent by Mrs. Frances G. Wickes, New York)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td><strong>SALVATION</strong>; drawing for setting, 1932:</td>
<td>Sidney Howard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td><strong>CAMILLE</strong>; drawing for setting, 1933:</td>
<td>Dumas</td>
<td>Marguerite’s Bedroom (Lent by Miss Lillian Gish, New York)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
<td><strong>OTHELLO</strong>; three drawings for settings, 1933:</td>
<td>Shakespeare</td>
<td>A Street in Venice (Lent by the Artist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Council Chamber (Lent by the Artist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Desdemona’s Bedchamber (Lent by the Artist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td><strong>OTHELLO</strong>; costume drawing, 1933: Desdemona</td>
<td>Shakespeare</td>
<td>Desdemona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GORELIK, Mordecai**

**JONES, Robert Edmond**
JORGULESCO, Jonel
THE TEMPEST, Shakespeare; three drawings for settings, 1933:
569 — Prologue
570 — Act II, Scene 2
571 — Epilogue

KARSON, Nat
THE OPERA RACKET, Walter Schmidt; three drawings for settings, 1933:
572 — Dungeon Scene
573 — Racketeer’s Jail Cell
574 — Mussolini’s Office
THE COLOR BOX, Ben Oakland and Milton Drake; three drawings for settings, 1933:
575 — Act I, finale, The Red Dawn, first movement
*576 — Act I, finale, The Red Dawn, second movement
577 — Dance Setting
Nos. 572 to 577 lent by the Artist

LAUTERER, Arch
THE VIKINGS AT HELGELAND, Ibsen; four drawings for settings, 1933:
578 — Act I, A Sheltered Place
579 — Act II, Gunner’s Feast Hall
580 — Act III, The Dais in Gunner’s Hall
581 — Act IV, The Burial Place
*582 THE VIKINGS AT HELGELAND, Ibsen; model for setting, 1933
Nos. 578 to 582 lent by the Artist

MIELZINER, Jo
THE YELLOW JACK, Sidney Howard; three drawings for settings, 1933:
583 — Field Laboratory, East Africa
*584 — Fever Victims, Cuba, 1900
585 — A Laboratory, London
THE RED GENERAL, Hermann Ungar; five drawings for settings, 1930:
586 — Waiting Room

Nos. 583 to 590 lent by the Artist

OENSLAGER, Donald M.
THE EMPEROR JONES, Eugene O’Neill; two drawings for settings, 1931:
590 — Before the Voodoo Altar
591 — Convict Scene
602 CASINA, Plautus; drawing for setting, 1932
Nos. 591 to 602 lent by the Artist

PETERS, Rollo
603 STEPHEN FOSTER, Mary Ward and Arthur Henry; drawing for setting, 1933
604-605 STEPHEN FOSTER, Mary Ward and Arthur Henry; two costume drawings, 1933
Nos. 603 to 605 lent by the Artist

REYNOLDS, James
606 ATHENA PROTECTRESS, drawing for setting, 1933
UNION OF SOCIALIST SOVIET REPUBLICS

PRE-REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD

The later work of Russian expatriates, Bakst, Goncharova, Larionoff, Suvage, is listed under France and the School of Paris. The U. S. S. R. exhibit arrived three weeks late so that it could not be cataloged with the material at hand. For this reason, also, the illustrated items bear no asterisks. Many corrections and additional information have been provided by Prof. H. W. L. Dana, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

DOBUZHINSKY, Mstislaff Moscow
626-629 SORROWS OF THE SPIRIT (GORE OT UMA), Griboiédoff; four drawings for settings, Moscow Art Theatre, 1906
Lent by M. Brodsky, Leningrad

GOLOVINE, Alexander Moscow
BORIS GODUNOFF, Moussorgsky; drawing for setting, 1908:

630 —Scene in the Kremlin
631 —House of Joy
632 —Last Scene

THE STORM, Ostrovsky; drawing for setting, 1912-1913:
633 —Interior
Nos. 630 to 633 lent by Bakrushin Theatre Museum, Moscow

SOUDEKINE, Sergei Paris
TALES OF HOFFMAN, Offenbach; two drawings for settings, 1909:
634 —Scene with the Dolls
635 —Scene in Venice
Lent by Bakrushin Theatre Museum, Moscow

THROCKMORTON, Cleon New York
THE EMPEROR JONES, Eugene O'Neill; four drawings for settings, 1933:
617 —The Edge of the Woods
618 —Convict Scene
619 —Hold of the Slave Ship
620 —At the Foot of a Great Tree

Nos. 612 to 616 lent by the Artist

WENGER, John New York
THE A WAKENING, Vera Gordova; four drawings for settings, 1933:
622 —Act I, Scene 1, Outside the Pagoda
623 —Act II, Scene 1, A Balcony
624 —Act II, Scene 2, A Salon
625 —Act III, Scene 2, Apotheosis

Lent by the Artist

THOMPSON, Woodman New York
612-613 IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS, Euripides; two drawings for settings, 1933
614-616 IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS, Euripides; three costume drawings, 1933

Lent by the Artist
POST-REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD

AKIMOFF, Nikolai
636 THE WIFE, Troneff; model for setting, State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad, 1926

637 ARMORED TRAIN; V. Ivanoff; model for setting, State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad, 1927
Nos. 636 to 637 lent by the Museum of the State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad

638-651 ROBESPIERRE, F. F. Raskolnikoff; fourteen drawings, State Theatre, Leningrad, 1931

652 LA BELLE HÉLÈNE, Offenbach; drawing, Little Opera, Leningrad, 1932

653 THE JUDGMENT, V. Kirshon; drawing, State Theatre(?), Leningrad, 1932

654-655 FEAR (STRAKH), Afinogenoff; two drawings, State Theatre(?), Leningrad, 1933

HAMLET, Shakespeare; four drawings for costumes, Vakhtangoff Theatre, Moscow, 1933:
656 — Hamlet
657 — Hamlet
658 — Polonius
659 — Countryman

HAMLET, Shakespeare; two drawings for settings, Vakhtangoff Theatre, Moscow, 1933:
660 — House of Polonius
661 — Act II

BORIS GODUNOFF, Moussorgsky; drawing for setting, not yet produced, 1933:
662 — The Inn
Nos. 638 to 662 lent by the Artist

CHUPIATCH
663 THE LUCRATIVE POSITION, Ostrovsky; model for setting, State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad, 1933
Lent by the Museum of the State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad

DMITRIEFF, A. I.
664 THE MEISTERSINGERS, Wagner; drawing, Opera, Leningrad
Lent by the Opera Museum, Leningrad

DMITRIEFF, A. I.: See also VYESNINE

KODOSEVITCH, Valentin
665-668 — OTHÉLLO, Shakespeare; four drawings
Lent by the Artist

KRUMMER
669 THE BATH, Mayakovsky; model for settings, State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad, 1930
Lent by the Museum of the State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad

KUSHNER
670 THE FLEA, Mayakovsky; model for setting, State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad, 1928
Lent by the Museum of the State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad

LEBEDEEFF
671 THE JEST, Sem Benelli; model for setting, State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad, 1923
Lent by the Museum of the State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad

LEVINE, Moisei
672-675 WOZZEK, Alban Berg; four drawings for costumes, 1927
Seven drawings for costumes, Little Opera, Leningrad, 1932:
676 — Merchant
677 — Boyar
678 — Armed Boyar
679 — Tsar
680 — Tsarina
681 — Peasant
682 — Peasant

64
THE FAIR AT SOROCHINSK, Moussovsky; drawing for setting

THE FAIR AT SOROCHINSK, Moussovsky; two drawings for costumes:
684 Woman
685 Woman

THE FRUITS OF EDUCATION, L. N. Tolstoi; eight drawings for costumes
Nos. 672 to 686 lent by the Artist

KAMARIHSKT MUZHIK; three drawings for settings, Little Opera, Leningrad, 1933
Lent by the Little Opera Museum, Leningrad

ALL QUIET ON THE WESTERN FRONT, Remarque; model for setting, State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad, 1932

JOY STREET, Zarchi; model for setting, State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad, 1932
Nos. 690 to 693 lent by the Museum of the State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad

LUTZE, V. V.

BREAD, V. Kirshon; model for setting, State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad, 1930
Lent by the Museum of the State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad

MEDUNETSKY: See STENBERG

MEYERHOLD(?)

Mandate, Nikolai Erdman; model for setting, Meyerhold Theatre, Moscow, 1925; K. A. Soste, technician
Lent by the Bakhrushin Theatre Museum, Moscow

VYESNINE, Alexander(?)

STENBERG

700 ALL GOD’S CHILLUN (NEGR), Eugene O’Neill; model for setting, Kamerny (Tairoff) Theatre, Moscow, 1929
Lent by the Museum of the Kamerny Theatre, Moscow

STENBERG and MEDUNETSKY

701 THE STORM, Ostrovsky; model for setting, Kamerny (Tairoff) Theatre, Moscow, 1923–1924
Lent by the Bakhrushin Theatre Museum, Moscow

DSMIRINEFF, A. I(?)

SERFS, P. P. Gnedich; two drawings for settings, Little Theatre, Moscow, 1921:
702 Blue Interior
703 Gold Interior
Lent by the Museum of the Little Theatre, Moscow
UNKNOWN Leningrad

704 UNCLE TOM'S CABIN, after Harriet Beecher Stowe; model for setting, Theatre of the Young Audience (Children's Theatre), Leningrad (?)
Lent by the Museum of the Theatre of the Young Spectator, Leningrad (?)

UNKNOWN Leningrad

705 TOM SAWYER, after Mark Twain; model for setting, Theatre of the Young Audience (Children's Theatre), Leningrad (?)
Lent by the Museum of the Theatre of the Young Spectator, Leningrad (?)

UNKNOWN Moscow

706 THE RAILS ARE HUMMING, V. Kirshon; model for setting, Moscow Trade Union Theatre (M. O. S. P. S., formerly M. G. S. P. S.), Moscow, 1929
Lent by the Bakushin Theatre Museum, Moscow

UNKNOWN Moscow

707 THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER, Paul Raynal; model for setting, Kamerny (Tairoff) Theatre, Moscow
Lent by the Museum of the Kamerny Theatre, Moscow
ADDITIONS TO THE SOVIET SECTION OF THE CATALOG

GAMREKELI, Irakli

ANZOR, S. Shanashashvili; drawing for setting, Roustaveli Theatre, Tiflis, 1928, producer, Sandro Akmeteli

708 — Act III, Caucasian Village

*709 THE BUSINESS MAN; drawing for setting, Roustaveli Theatre, Tiflis, 1928, producer, Sandro Akmeteli

LAMARA; drawing for setting, Roustaveli Theatre, Tiflis, 1929, producer, Sandro Akmeteli

710 — Act IV

*711 TETNOULD, S. Dadiani; drawing for setting, Roustaveli Theatre, Tiflis, 1932, producer, Sandro Akmeteli

THE ROBBERS, Schiller; three drawings for settings, Roustaveli Theatre, Tiflis, 1933, producer, Sandro Akmeteli

712 — Act II, Scene 2, Bohemian Forest

713 — Scene 2, The Inn

714 — Setting

Nos. 708 to 714 lent by the Roustaveli Theatre Museum, Tiflis

KUSELOFF, M., see no. 747

LUTZE, V. V.

715 ALL QUIET ON THE WESTERN FRONT, M. Zagosky, after Remarque; model for setting, State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad, 1932, director, V. V. Lutze

Lent by the Museum of the State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad

NADAREISHVILI, S.

716 ABESALOM AND EUTERP; drawing for four settings, Roustaveli Theatre, Tiflis

717 ABESALOM AND EUTERP; drawing for two costumes, Roustaveli Theatre, Tiflis

Nos. 716, 717 lent by the Roustaveli Theatre Museum, Tiflis

NIVINSKY, I.

*718—721 PRINCESS TURANDOT, Carlo Gozzi (1722–1806), music by I. Sизов; four drawings for settings, Third Studio of the Moscow Art Theatre (Vakhtangoff), Moscow, 1921

Lent by Mme. Vakhtangoff, Moscow

PRINCESS TURANDOT; five drawings for costumes, 1921

*722 — Tartalia

*723 — Brighella

724 — Pantalone

725 — Truffaldino

726 — Costume

Lent by Mme. Vakhtangoff, Moscow

OTZHELI, P.

727—728 URIEL ACOSTA, Gutzkoff; two drawings for settings, Roustaveli Theatre, Tiflis, producer, K. Mardjanoff

Lent by the Roustaveli Theatre Museum, Tiflis

RINDIN, V.

729 THE UNKNOWN SOLDIERS, Leonid Pervomaiski; model for setting, Kamerny Theatre, Moscow, 1932, producer, A. Tairoff

THE UNKNOWN SOLDIERS, Leonid Pervomaiski; two drawings for costumes, Kamerny Theatre, Moscow, 1932, producer, A. Tairoff

730 — Soldier

731 — Man in evening clothes

Nos. 729 to 731 lent by the Museum of the Kamerny Theatre, Moscow

67
732  WE ARE STRENGTH; model for setting, Moscow Children’s Theatre, producer, E. Mei

WE ARE STRENGTH; two drawings for costumes, Moscow Children’s Theatre, producer, E. Mei

733 —White Children

734 —Yellow Children

Nos. 732 to 734 lent by the Children’s Theatre, Museum, Moscow

SHIPRIN, V., see no. 748

STENBERG, W. and G.  Moscow

*735—736 ALL GOD’S CHILLUN GOT WINGS (Negr), Eugene O’Neill; two drawings for costumes, Kamerny Theatre, Moscow, 1929, producer, A. Tairoff

Lent by the Museum of the Kamerny Theatre, Moscow

VARPEKH, M.  Moscow

737—739 WE WILL SETTLE IT BETWEEN OURSELVES, Ostrovsky; three drawings for settings, Theatre of the Young Spectator, Moscow, director, V. Kolesaieff

740—741 WE WILL SETTLE IT BETWEEN OURSELVES, Ostrovsky; two drawings for costumes, Theatre of the Young Spectator, Moscow, director, V. Kolesaieff

742—743 GUARD OF HIMSELF, Calderón; two drawings for costumes, Theatre of the Young Spectator, Moscow, director, L. Volkoff

Nos. 737 to 743 lent by the Museum of the Theatre of the Young Spectator, Moscow

VOLKOFF, B. U.  Moscow

744 THE RAILS ARE HUMMING, V. Kirshon; drawing for setting, Moscow Trade Union Theatre (M.O.S.P.S., formerly M.G.S.P.S.), Moscow, 1929

THE REVOLT, Furmanoff; drawing for setting, Moscow Trade Union Theatre (M.O.S.P.S., formerly M.G.S.P.S.), Moscow, 1927

745 —The Market

THE MOB, Shapovalenko; drawing for setting, Moscow Trade Union Theatre (M.O.S.P.S., formerly M.G.S.P.S.), Moscow, 1926

746 —The Bridge

Nos. 744 to 746 lent by the Bakhshin Theatre Museum, Moscow

KUSELOFF, M.  Moscow

747 MARRIAGE, Gogol; model for setting

Lent by the Museum of the Theatre of the Young Spectator, Moscow

SHIPRIN, V.  Moscow

748 CHERNI YAR, Afisogenoff; model for setting

Lent by unknown

CORRECTIONS IN THE SOVIET SECTION

693  For State Theatre (?), Leningrad, 1932 read State Dramatic Theatre, Leningrad, 1933

694  For not yet produced, 1933 read 1927, Leningrad Opera

695  For drawing, Opera read four drawings for settings, Little Opera

696  For two drawings for costumes read drawing for two costumes, Little Opera Theatre, Leningrad

700  For STENBERG read STENBERG, W. and G., for ALL GOD’S CHILLUN (NEGR), read ALL GOD’S CHILLUN GOT WINGS (NEGR)

706  See ADDITIONS TO THE SOVIET SECTION OF THE CATALOG, No. 744

707  See ADDITIONS TO THE SOVIET SECTION OF THE CATALOG, No. 729

OMISSIONS IN THE SOVIET SECTION

The following items were not sent by the U. S. S. R.

626—636, 638—651, 654—661, 653, 664—683, 684—690, 693, 694—699, 701—704, 705

68
PLATES

The plates bear the same numbers as the catalog. Not all of the works are illustrated.
20 INIGO JONES

OBERON, THE FAERY PRINCE
DANTON'S DEATH
DESIRE UNDER THE ELMS
SHYLOCK

THE MERCHANT OF VENICE
267 BAKST

LE MARTYRE DE SAINT-SÉBASTIEN (?)
311 PICASSO

CUADRO FLAMENCO
THE GLITTERING GATE

489 BRAGDON
GAMREKELI

THE BUSINESS MAN
THE UNKNOWN SOLDIERS

729 RINDIN
MUSEUM PUBLICATIONS

The books published by the Museum of Modern Art in connection with its numerous exhibitions form a concise library of living art, painting, sculpture, and architecture. The critical and historical notes, explanations by the artists, biographies and bibliographies contain information not readily found elsewhere. There is a wealth of illustration—over 893 plates of the work of over 300 modern painters, sculptors and architects. The Museum makes no profit on these books. It sells them considerably below the cost of production, as a part of its educational service to students and the public.

NINETEENTH CENTURY PAINTERS AND SCULPTORS

Cézanne, Gauguin, Seurat, van Gogh. The four great pioneers of modern painting. Critical and biographical studies by Alfred H. Barr, Jr. 152 pages; 97 plates; paper bound—$2.00

Homer, Ryder, Eakins. Essays by Bryson Burroughs, Frank Jewett Mather, and Lloyd Goodrich on these American "old masters." 68 pages; 34 plates; paper bound—$2.00

Corot and Daumier. Two painters much admired by living artists. Introduction by Alfred H. Barr, Jr. 128 pages; 108 plates; paper bound—$2.00


The Bliss Collection. Memorial Exhibition. Out of print

American Folk Art. Most comprehensive survey so far published about American folk art, including sculpture. 28-page introduction by Holger Cahill. Bibliography of 86 books and periodicals. 131 pages; 80 plates; paper bound—$1.50; bound in boards—$3.50

TWENTIETH CENTURY PAINTERS AND SCULPTORS

Painting in Paris. Foreword and critical notes by Alfred H. Barr, Jr. A succinct introduction to the work of the most influential school of living artists. 88 pages; 50 plates; paper bound—$2.00

Paintings by 19 Living Americans. This and the following catalog are anthologies of work by the best known contemporary American artists. Biographical notes by Alfred H. Barr, Jr. 88 pages; 38 plates; paper bound—$2.00

Painting and Sculpture by Living Americans. 67 pages; 34 plates; paper bound—$1.50

German Painting and Sculpture. Work of the leading German artists, with foreword and extensive notes by Alfred H. Barr, Jr. 91 pages; 49 plates; paper bound—$2.00

Lehmbruck and Maillol. Out of print

Murals by American Painters and Photographers. Essays by Lincoln Kirstein and Julien Levy. 62 pages; 61 plates; paper bound—$3.50
AMERICAN PAINTING AND SCULPTURE, 1862-1932. A selection from American painting and sculpture, divided about equally between 19th and 20th century works. Introduction by Holger Cahill. 128 pages; 79 plates; paper bound—$1.50; bound in boards—$3.50

AMERICAN SOURCES OF MODERN ART. Introduction on the art of ancient America and its relationship to the art of today by Holger Cahill. Bibliography of over 100 titles. 104 pages; 56 plates; paper bound—$1.50; bound in boards—$3.50

PAINTING AND SCULPTURE FROM SIXTEEN AMERICAN CITIES. Contemporary work by 119 artists, with biographies. Edited by Alfred H. Barr, Jr. 61 pages; 116 illustrations; paper bound—$1.00; bound in boards—$2.50

MONOGRAPHS ON INDIVIDUAL ARTISTS

HENRI-MATISSE. "Notes of a Painter" by Henri-Matisse; the only publication in English of these important observations. Critical essay by Alfred H. Barr, Jr. 128 pages; 82 plates; paper bound—$2.00; bound in boards—$3.00

CHARLES BURCHFIELD, EARLY WATERCOLORS. Foreword by Alfred H. Barr, Jr. and notes by the artist. 24 pages; 10 plates; paper bound—$1.00

PAUL KLEE. Out of print

DIEGO RIVERA. Out of print

MAX WEBER, RETROSPECTIVE EXHIBITION. Work by one of the most important American modernists. Foreword by Alfred H. Barr, Jr., and notes by the artist. 40 pages; 16 plates; paper bound—$1.00

MAURICE STERNE. Introduction by Horace Kallen and notes by the artist. Biography by Holger Cahill. 52 pages; 23 plates; bound in boards—$2.50

EDWARD HOPPER. "Notes on Painting" by Edward Hopper. Essays by Charles Burchfield and Alfred H. Barr, Jr. 81 pages; 48 plates; paper bound, $1.00; bound in boards, $2.50

ARCHITECTURE


RIVERA PORTFOLIO

DIEGO RIVERA—A PORTFOLIO OF COLOR REPRODUCTIONS OF MEXICAN FRESCOES. Notes by Jere Abbott. These are the first color reproductions published of the famous frescoes in Chapingo, Cuernavaca and Mexico City. Contains 19 full-color plates and 15 monotones—$25.00
Bound, Braunstein, Dec. 6, 1939