

New Readings in Theatre History

Jacky Bratton

*Professor of Theatre and Cultural History
Royal Holloway, University of London*



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa
<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Cambridge University Press 2003

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2003

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Plantin 10/12 pt. *System* L^AT_EX 2_ε [TB]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Bratton, J. S. (Jacqueline S.)

New Readings in Theatre History / Jacky Bratton.

p. cm. – (Theatre and performance theory)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 79121 9 – ISBN 0 521 79463 3 (pb.)

1. Theatre – Great Britain – History – 19th century. 2. Theatre – Great
Britain – History – 18th century. 3. English drama – 19th century – History
and criticism. 4. English drama – 18th century – History and criticism.

I. Title. II. Series.

PN2594.B73 2003

792'.0941'09034 – dc21 2003048478

ISBN 0 521 79121 9 hardback

ISBN 0 521 79463 3 paperback

Contents

<i>List of illustrations</i>	page x
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xi

Part I Background

1 Theatre history today	3
2 British theatre history: 1708–1832	17
3 Theatre in London in 1832: a new overview	36
4 Theatre history and Reform	67

Part II Case studies

5 Anecdote and mimicry as history	95
6 Theatre history and the discourse of the popular	133
7 Claiming kin: an experiment in genealogical research	171
<i>Notes</i>	200
<i>Index</i>	231

Illustrations

1 Playbill for Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, 7 November 1831	<i>page</i> 42
2 Playbill for Theatre Royal, Haymarket, 12 July 1830	46
3 Playbill for Royal Olympic Theatre, 5 October 1831	51
4 Playbill for Royal Albert Saloon and Standard Tavern and Tea Gardens, 13 February 1843	56
5 Playbill for Coburg Theatre, 29 December 1819	62
6 Playbill for Surrey Theatre, 13 August 1830	65

Illustrations reproduced by permission of the V&A Picture Library.

1 Theatre history today

For more than a decade now theatre history has been, rather belatedly, coming to self-consciousness about knowledge. We still do not well know what we are supposed to be doing, what we can seek to know, what, in fact, we are talking about. There have been huge claims for the centrality of the discipline to the liberal education; and simultaneously the discovery by academic and professional institutions that fewer and fewer people are interested in it in its established form.¹ This uncertainty may or may not be linked with a more general concern about the fate of theatre itself, loudly asserting the vital importance of live performance in a world of increasingly virtual reality. Our realisations of doubt seem to trail a long way behind the theoretical disputes in wider historical studies, where the death and rebirth of narrative, for example, appear to have happened before anyone in the backwater of theatre seriously considered that one might do without it.² But since the 1980s academic theatre history has been increasingly uneasy, and there is no longer any consensus about such a shared endeavour, its terms of reference or its historiography. Spats take place. Despite many years of the digestion of Foucault and Derrida, not to mention writers more closely interested in the field, like Greenblatt and Orgel, it was still possible in 1999 for the respected theatre historian Robert D. Hume to refer to New Historicism as ‘an unfortunate complication’³ and to assert a version of the credo of the positivist which he calls ‘Archeo-historicism’ in the face of the widely held consensus about the non-neutrality of facts.⁴

Robert Hume is by no means alone in maintaining an antiquarian interest in the stage. At the opening of the twenty-first century many disparate, sometimes mutually discrediting, activities are going on. On the one hand, major undertakings in

documentary history still roll forward. Scholars under the aegis of the Records of Early English Drama still cull materials from medieval documents and present them as self-verifying facts.⁵ The continuation into the next century of the massive calendar of eighteenth-century performances, *The London Stage 1660–1800*,⁶ is still projected, as *The London Stage 1800–1900*, and has produced one publication, *The Adelphi Theatre Calendar, Part 1, 1806–1850*⁷ as an earnest of its intent to list every performance in every theatre as its predecessor did (or asserted that it did – in fact *The London Stage* fails to include most performances in taverns, public halls and other spaces, or indeed in theatres beyond the patent houses). Computer technology seductively offers new possibilities of the comprehensive publication of data: the Adelphi microfiche have been translated into an on-line database; many other initiatives are beginning. On 10 June 2002, for example, at the London Theatre Museum, *Backstage* was launched, an on-line catalogue, reaching right down to the names on the playbills, that covers the theatre holdings of a large number of British libraries.⁸ Beside the work of compilation, that of synthesis and definition moves slowly forward. Attempts – to which this book is in some ways related – are being made in many countries of Europe to write national theatre histories.⁹ Books have appeared which question the grounds on which such histories are being written, and either, as in Thomas Postlewait and Bruce A. McConachie's *Interpreting the Theatrical Past*, suggest ways to use new historical methodologies, or, as in the ingenious structure of Simon Shepherd and Peter Womack's *English Drama, a Cultural History*,¹⁰ offer contextualisation of their own history by reviewing the constructions of previous writers alongside their own new interpretations. Meanwhile, books about the much more developed field of performance theory now often contain some move towards the inclusion of a theorised theatre history; and the first volumes of new kinds of history, taking up the most obvious developments in historical writing – feminist, *analiste*, New Historicist or cultural/anthropological studies, for example – have been published.¹¹ So developments in historiography and performance theory are at last beginning to filter into examinations of long-past theatre events, and from that a new hybrid, which might become a historiographically challenging and exciting new mode, begins to emerge. But no new direction or

set of procedures has so far been agreed; the performance falters; and the audience is becoming impatient.

Binary thinking in the twentieth century: theatre as 'ritual and revelry'

My first intention is to move backwards, and consider the historiography of the theatre as shaping the peculiar situation not only of the discipline today, disputatious, excited and unsettled as it is, but also the current state of the theatre, its equally troubled object of study. I hope to approach British theatre history by examining how it came to be written as it is, considering the forces that determined and shaped it in the nineteenth century, as part of the hegemonic battle for possession of the stage itself; and then to suggest a new historicising of the field, undertaken from a different position. One cannot, of course, change the course of past events, and reverse the direction taken by theatre performance and reception within western culture; but it is my hope that an understanding of the cultural determination of one influential and sometime highly regarded national theatre and its history will enable a clearer understanding of why theatre and its historical study are where they are today.

Underlying the organisation of the field of theatre history is, unsurprisingly, a series of binary assumptions. On the institutional level, the calendaring activities mentioned above are the legacy of the first mode of academic study of theatre history, which is usually fathered upon Max Hermann. His Theaterwissenschaftliches Institut in Berlin, founded in 1923, set out the model for the rigorous study of documented facts about the material remains of theatrical life – theatres or their ruins, promptbooks, designs, bills, costumes and so forth. According to its dogma, history lies in the artifactual record; nothing can be known without sufficient factual documentation.¹² This principle is still powerful, and is restated in Hume's 1999 volume cited above: he maintains strongly that satisfactory 'archaeo-historical' work is entirely dependent upon the first-hand study of adequate amounts of primary documentary evidence.¹³ The work done under its banner is indeed rigorous; to see this rigour at work one has only to consult the 1987 Society for Theatre Research edition of the first book that offers detailed British theatre facts,

John Downes's *Roscius Anglicanus* of 1708, which Hume edited with Judith Milhous. The editors were expressly intending 'to help the reader follow Downes without being misled'.¹⁴ Every date, every name has been checked against other sources; no page of the text is without a substantial footnote, many of them containing more words than those of the original text. But beyond such facts, one might learn very little about Downes, or directly about his colleagues the actors, the plays or the culture in question from this book. The binary observed in this model of theatre history is a strict divide set up between this 'scientific' activity, susceptible of concrete proofs and never venturing beyond demonstrable facts, and the critical activities of students of the drama, who interpret and study the written texts in the light of the facts generated elsewhere. The theatre historian is expressly debarred from considering the plays that were put on by the people she or he studies, except in clearly limited and defined, factual ways.

The many distinguished archaeo-historical writers have not undertaken this work, of course, with the intention of belittling the study of the play text. Rather the reverse. Intent upon establishing an academic discipline that could be respected in its own right, the objective of *Theaterwissenschaft* is that its products should be of use to the wider world, providing a secure knowledge on which critical, aesthetic and conceptual responses to literature could be based. However, as the title of Hume's book, *Reconstructing Contexts*, makes clear, this effectively sets up the discipline as the lesser term in a powerful binary: it is merely context to the text of literature. Thus the study of the theatre is always at the service of the written drama, its *raison d'être*. As I hope to show, this is a debilitating assumption; and, moreover, it has unintentionally given rise to much tedious and inferior work by lesser hands, which cannot claim any function beyond the gratification of an impulse to unearth, hoard and dispute over the detritus of the past. No knowledge *need* be dull; but exemption from the obligation to be critical, imaginative, alert to implication and synthetic of ideas in one's research has led too many scholars to an intellectual inertia, and the antiquarian pursuit of relics for their own sake.

The obvious conceptual challenge to *Theaterwissenschaft* comes, of course, from the direction of post-Modern and

post-structuralist thought, which questions the distinction between text and context, as well as the nature of fact, proof and evidence assumed in its quasi-scientific foundation. Again, the mainstream of historiographical revisionism has been there ahead of us, and one may find much recent work on the nature of historical truth, its rejection and reclamation, stemming from such moves as the questioning of 'grand narratives' in Jean-François Lyotard's *The Postmodern Condition* in 1984¹⁵ and moving on through an intricate and protracted debate which is not (of course) susceptible of closure. In this line of thought theatre history is especially susceptible to challenge, but at the same time, it seems to me, potentially especially well equipped to find constructive responses. The susceptibility stems from the consciousness, shared by even the most stubbornly myopic antiquarians, that our study is of something which is always-already irrecoverably lost. While political life, for example, was played out at least partly in documents that have been archived, poems, novels and play texts are still in the library, and local identity inheres in surviving rivers, houses, families, the theatrical performance is in essence evanescent, gone for ever. Joseph Roach notes theatre historians' tendency to strike notes of 'irretrievable loss' about the 'fragility of their subject', to express 'self-consciousness about the perceived contradiction of writing the history of so notoriously transient a form'.¹⁶ But the same writer, in his path-breaking cross-disciplinary study *Cities of the Dead: Circum-atlantic Performance*,¹⁷ shows that the subject of performance, if adequately theorised and imaginatively extended, offers wonderfully suggestive ways of dealing with its own absences. He begins with a quotation from the *annaliste* medieval historian Jacques Le Goff: 'Today documents include the spoken word, the image, gestures':¹⁸ what better than the theatre to provide a wealth of such documentation. In the course of his book, amongst many other things, Roach interprets a British theatre history even older than *Roscicus Anglicanus*, James Wright's 1699 *Historia Histrionica*. Milhous and Hume dismiss Wright's work as dilettante, containing only 'some useful scraps of information',¹⁹ but to Roach it is 'an exemplary meditation on popular performance as a measure of epochal memory'²⁰ and takes a place in his synthesis of cultural history alongside slave dancing places, effigies of Elvis Presley and the funeral of Thomas Betterton.

Popular performance: ‘theatre of pure diversion’

Roach’s invocation of ‘popular performance’ points to another important binary, and one with which I shall be particularly concerned: that between high and low, elite art and ‘the popular’. Tracy Davis argues that her fundamental reinterpretation of nineteenth-century theatre history in economic terms is necessary because it is still the case, in both Britain and America, that ‘theatre with “enlightened” goals is cast as the “other” to commercialized entertainment’.²¹ I would reverse the terms, and so the emphasis: the British critical assumption is still that commercialised entertainment is the Other of the art of theatre. This impacts upon current thinking about the arts in fundamental ways; and it interacts significantly with the historiography of theatre. Whatever the minor byways pursued by antiquarian theatre historians of subsequent generations, the *Theaterwissenschaft* exclusion of the text from consideration did not mean – why should it? – that the interest of the historian should challenge the standing of the texts of high art. As Marvin Carlson points out:

Traditional theater history developed in the shadow of European high culture of the late nineteenth century and almost universally accepted the values of that culture. Theater history was by no means considered a study of the phenomenon of theater in all periods and cultures, but a study of the production conditions of the already acknowledged major periods and accepted canon of European literary drama. The Greek and the Shakespearean theater were thus considered favored topics for historical investigation (as they still are), while the rich tradition of popular and/or spectacle theater, even in Europe, was ignored as undistinguished, decadent, or generally unworthy of critical attention.²²

The effect of this binary on, especially, the attitude to women in the theatre was wonderfully vividly expressed in 1931 by Rosamund Gilder, in a work whose recovery of important female contributions to past performance is still not superseded. It is, however, deeply embedded in the values of cultural hierarchy, and her language is richly suggestive of the effects of that tradition, even as she tries to break away from it and give proper attention to women in the theatre. She discusses women’s exclusion from Greek Golden Age performance, and adds:

[w]hile the official Greek theatre, forgetful of its sources in the cyclic dance and the dithyramb in which women had taken part, closed its doors to feminine participants in its elevated mysteries, that other theatre, forever effervescent at the heart of humanity, the theatre of pure diversion, continued its unfettered course. Ever since Eve invented costume, and, coached by the Serpent, enacted that little comedy by which she persuaded Adam that the bitter apple of knowledge was sweet and comforting, there has been something satanic in the very nature of theatre. Born of ritual and revelry, it is at once the child of God and the offspring of the Devil. We see it simultaneously reflecting the noblest aspects of the mind of man, stemming from his aspiration toward beauty and goodness and blossoming in the highest forms of art, and at the same time we find it creeping up from the gutter, befouling the image of its creator and reducing him to something a little lower than the beasts. In this double aspect it very fairly mirrors the larger human scene, and not least of all in its attitude toward woman. When, as in Greece, the nobler aspects of the theatre were closed to her, she came in, as was to be expected, by the Devil's way.²³

In such self-deprecatory terms Gilder outlines the history of the feminised Other set up by the theatre of male genius, of moral and sacred high art. She is concerned with the low estimation of women involved in theatre, but without challenging the binary thinking that has placed them in the inferior position.

The abjection of the 'theatre of pure diversion', and often all theatre whatsoever, is set out and explored at length in another classic text, Jonas Barish's *The Antitheatrical Prejudice*. Barish traces the prejudice he describes through its long philosophical and political history, but in the end sees it as a pathology, 'tenacious, elusive and protean in its own right, and springing, as it seems, from the deepest core of our being', an affliction which he sees as yet undefeated, since while 'the public may have lost much of its old suspiciousness of the theater' '[t]he theater remains suspicious of itself'.²⁴ In British scholarship explanations are always more likely to be sought in culture, and especially in class, than in psychology. With the new popularist turn of scholarship in the 1960s that became British cultural studies, the binary between sacred and profane art and the prejudice against entertainment and feigning were read as hierarchical, a matter of high and low. Hence there was a deliberate reaction, a move away from the prejudged, exclusory history of drama towards the study of 'folk'

performances, customs, festivals, street theatre and the spectacular and musical theatres of ‘the people’. In nineteenth-century history, music hall and melodrama became the focus of work that attempts to recuperate or to understand these commercial entertainments in relation to a ‘little’ or ‘popular’ tradition deriving from broadside ballads, street singing and tavern culture, or to place them in a social-historians’ context of class definition rather than in the history of performance.²⁵ The obvious problem here, of course, is that to invert a binary of this sort is not to abolish it; but also, and more damagingly still, the definition of ‘popular culture’ has become increasingly problematised as attempts have been made to theorise it within a more sophisticated cultural analysis. A single entity called people’s theatre has tended to vanish into ideological smoke, leaving popular theatre history without a coherent field of study.²⁶ But the implications of this particular binary opposition remain and are, I will argue, at the root of much of the hegemonic work done by modern theatre history ever since it was invented.

That invention predates the twentieth-century *Theaterwissenschaft* movement; its British manifestation came into force at an easily pinpointed moment, the early 1830s, in the midst of change and modernisation on a very large scale. It was, indeed, one cultural aspect of the British response to the second wave of revolutionary change that was sweeping the rest of Europe. The British political outcome was the reformation of the parliamentary system, which was thought at the time to have staved off revolution; but many cultural changes were also part of that defensive response to the revolutionary impulse. It is my argument that at this particular point theatre history became a part of the hegemonic negotiation taking place at many levels in British culture, and that there was a vested interest in its reinvention in a particular mould – many of whose lineaments have survived until today, to the detriment not only of the historical study, but also of its object of contemplation, theatrical work itself.

The birth of our grand narrative

It was in the 1830s that the field became defined and its procedures set up so as to mark limits to what theatre is, and to establish it in a system of difference – text and context, high

and low, the written drama and the materiality of the stage. In a simple bibliographical sense this is very clearly the case, in that a flood of writings about theatre history began around the turn of the nineteenth century and came to a high-water mark with publications in the early 1830s. It is from these historians – Edward Malone, John Payne Collier, John Genest – that we have derived our sense of the shape and meaning of the British theatre.²⁷ Their books, multi-volumed, scholarly and obviously representing a serious investment not only of publisher's cash but also of cultural capital, time and status, are the first works about which the questions of intention, ideological determination and the cultural work being done by theatre history can be asked and answered in detail. They formed part of a heated debate in their own time, which amounted to a struggle for mastery of the stage. The success of certain historians and their allies in that debate has shaped and conditioned the British theatre. That success has arguably been a malign influence on the practice of theatre, its cultural work, even its funding and its training practices; it has certainly distorted our understanding of the development of theatre in Britain, and so poses a major challenge, standing in the way of a new understanding.

One may see this continuing legacy in the way that the institutions of the British 'National Theatre' are apparently set upon a foundation divided against itself on complex class lines – and also the lines Gilder calls the gulf between 'the child of God and the offspring of the Devil'. The battles are perpetual. The Royal Opera House, excitedly exposed to popular view in 1990s TV documentaries about mismanagement, is controversially funded from the taxes and the entertainments of the poor – the National Lottery. The Royal National Theatre is vilified by the critics for recharging its box office by staging spectacular revivals of American musicals. The resemblance to the disputes of the 1830s is startling. That link is also to be observed in the hostility of the 'writers' theatre' at the Royal Court to the spectacular West End, which in turn anxiously defines 'the fringe' and assigns to it inferior venues, small pockets of civic funding and minority audiences. History and heritage are repeatedly invoked by all sides, and university drama departments, amateur theatrical groups and educational and regional projects are all contenders not only for recognition, public money and/or

respect, but for possession of centre stage, the right to make their voices heard, their definitions stick.²⁸ All these disputes are in some sense the legacy of conventional theatre history that began in the nineteenth century.

The melodramatic ‘Decline of the Drama’

The continuing strength of the received way of reading theatre history can be gauged from the difficulties critics, performers and historians still have when they attempt to recuperate anything from the early nineteenth-century stage. A clear example is the problem of ‘melodrama’. Much has been written about the mode, or modality, or genre, or dramatic form that goes by this name, and it is undoubtedly a successful and dominant organising principle in much contemporary dramatic fiction on TV and film. It has been argued to exist in the highest reaches of the drama – the plays of Ancient Greece and the Renaissance²⁹ – but it is the characteristic dramatic form of the nineteenth century, and so it is caught in the inescapable trap of being the form of the drama in decline. ‘Melodrama’ is bad drama; it is the word used whenever a critic, trained or untrained, wishes to indicate that they think poorly of the art of the enacted fiction they are discussing, to deny it the universally praiseworthy character of being ‘realistic’, ‘true to life’.³⁰ Melodrama is the play not disguised as literature; theatre allowing its falsity and allure to show; the Devil’s way.

We may see the linkage of this to theatre history. Pre- and early twentieth-century accounts of melodrama and of the theatre which spawned it are obviously part of the Modernist project, the moment when the 1830s attempt to take possession of the stage for a particular class fraction finally came to fruition, with the importation of the plays of Ibsen and all that stood for. The followers of William Archer believed in the Decline, indeed the Death, of English Drama before their own arrival: ‘[we] are pretty safe, then, in setting down the twenty-five years between 1810 and 1835 as the winter solstice of the English drama’. Archer was aware, in a way, that he was carrying a programme begun in the 1830s to its logical conclusion, and observed that ‘[t]he period was more or less conscious of its own degradation’, citing a *Blackwood’s* article by ‘the Shakespearean scholar, Harness’ in 1825 on

the subject of the 'ignoble' modern playwrights.³¹ He had many followers; Augustin Filon, for example, announced 'had I not had his books as a guiding thread, I should have hardly ventured to risk myself in the labyrinth of theatrical history' where there is nothing but 'Theatrical "Reminiscences" . . . crowded with fictitious anecdotes'.³² Structuring his account of the stage around the plays he read, he found that the most ambitious of the 1830s dramatists – Bulwer Lytton – wrote 'literary melodrama; a detestable combination'.³³ Like most others, he accounted for their poverty as the fate of the dramatist in a situation where 'the new public which filled the theatres was gluttonous . . . [m]asterful, clamorous, ill-bred, uncouth . . . [t]he barbarians had begun to arrive; it was the first wave of democracy before which the *habitué*, the playgoer of the old school, was forced to flee'.³⁴

Given the elitist slant of this received history, it is not surprising that the foundational recovery work on melodrama was the product of the 1960s. Michael Booth was an enthusiast for melodrama who opened the eyes of a whole generation of theatre scholars. However, his analysis relies on a late Victorian aesthete, Jerome K. Jerome, for a typology of melodramatic characters, which inevitably belittles them, seen as they are through the condescendingly reversed telescope of a class-hostile intellectual sophistication.³⁵ To Jerome, melodrama was a joke; and most of the 'recuperative' studies of the subject that followed Booth condescended to be amused in the same way, where they were not led into even less helpful judgements by 'taking the plays seriously' in anachronistic critical terms. The recovery of contextual study followed, with the comprehensive work of Martin Meisel's hugely impressive *Realizations* as its exemplary text. After reading through this discriminating, meticulous and highly documented and illustrated study of the pictorial stage and its centrality in Romantic and Victorian culture, it comes as something of a shock when the last word goes to W. B. Yeats and his utter rejection of all stage effect that compromises or competes with the poet's verbal text; but the implicit explanation follows – 'the cinema took over the popular audience that had earlier supported the nineteenth-century pictorial stage'.³⁶ What belongs to 'the popular audience' is not art.³⁷

Writers coming from the literary field and not concerning themselves with how melodrama actually played may cope

better with finding ways to free it of the stigma of its history in the theatre. Peter Brooks's *The Melodramatic Imagination* is a groundbreaking text³⁸ in seriously theorised reading; but he is ultimately writing about the novel, his approach is psychological and semiotic, and he dismisses all stage melodrama after the 1820s as the form in decline, in theatrical hands. The latest major study is by Elaine Hadley,³⁹ who sketches this very history of the term and its critics before embarking on her examination of nineteenth-century culture's 'theatricalized dissent' with only one chapter on the theatre. Most of us whose focus is the history of the theatre can still be found joking, apologising, and explaining melodrama away; and every attempt I have ever seen to revive texts labelled 'melodramas' on the professional stage was similarly crippled by apologetic self-consciousness.⁴⁰ This attitude to the nineteenth-century stage presents itself, therefore, as a historical problem.

The problem, and how to tackle it

Hume prescribes such a problem as the starting point for scholarly investigation: 'A scholar needs to start by explaining the current state of understanding, and then tell us what is wrong or inadequate about it. What evidence is left out of account? What is misinterpreted? How can we improve our understanding?'⁴¹ I would push this further, with Peter Burke, and seek for 'an approach to the past which asks present-minded questions but refuses to give present-minded answers; which concerns itself with traditions but allows for their continual reinterpretation; and which notes the importance of unintended consequences in the history of historical writing as well as the history of political events'.⁴²

The problem can be restated through two paradoxical perceptions. The first is that the already canvassed observation made early in the nineteenth century and echoed by commentators and historians ever since – that the century suffered from 'the Decline of the Drama' and that its theatrical culture was disastrously undermined by a lack of good writing for the stage – was set running while the stage itself, the theatres built, memorable performances given and numbers of people seeing shows and professionally appearing before the public grew spectacularly.⁴³ Worth

and value and cultural significance were said to have disappeared from a theatre that was thriving, multiplying and serving ever-increasing numbers of spectators. Secondly, in a period where the received history denies any serious involvement of women in writing for the stage and lists only isolated examples of women in management, a period which habitually used the word 'actress' as a facetious synonym for 'prostitute', research today constantly turns up women whose contribution to theatre was substantial, innovative and decisive, but whose stories were not remembered or were inaccurately recorded.⁴⁴ I would like to establish what the connection might be between these two paradoxes; and that speculation begins with a reappraisal of the early writers of British theatre history, and the crucial period of theatrical development during which they wrote.

In the rest of Part I I will therefore argue for the dating of current theatre historiography from the first third of the nineteenth century, showing first that a different kind of historicisation, in the hands of theatre people themselves, preceded that period. Chapter 2 deals with that historical vision. Chapter 3 offers a contextualising materialist overview of the state of London theatre in the 1830s, and simultaneously attempts to model a new way of telling such a story, by means of the intertheatrical reading of contemporary playbills. Chapter 4 then examines what happened in theatre politics in the years of Reform, 1830–2, the moment when the previous historical practice was successfully challenged and discredited. It attempts to decode the assumptions and hegemonic processes at work in the creation of the modern history of the stage. I consider only the case of Britain – largely, indeed, London – because the historical practice then founded was constituted explicitly as nationalistic, concerned with issues of the formation of a new national identity. The concept of 'the National Drama' stems from the eighteenth century,⁴⁵ but took on a new force in the political arguments of the first half of the nineteenth. On a philosophical level what can be said to have happened is that around 1800 the idea of 'literature' came to depend upon a aesthetic of autonomy: the artist was envisaged as a unique and self-justified creative spirit. Such a conception of the necessary conditions for art results in a distrust of the theatrical as undermining the artistic autonomy

attributed to the writer. Such a polarisation can be seen as the philosophical justification of the reified separation of text and context in *Theaterwissenschaft*: the dramatist is the creative artist, the theatre should serve his genius.⁴⁶ In ideological terms a group of politically engaged writers, most obviously exemplified by the Radical Member of Parliament, novelist and would-be dramatist Bulwer Lytton, made a bid for control of the public sphere which included the voice of the stage, as part of the Radical turn of the 1830s. Their case was substantiated by an appeal to history, in the pursuit of which a history of the stage since the medieval–Elizabethan point of origin was written – a history which was not substantially challenged until very recent years, and has still not been overturned in respect of its analysis of its own period. And it was a necessary condition of the successful hegemonic control of the theatre that there was a binary division set up between ‘the popular’ and the theatre of art; that women’s work within the public space should be disguised, discounted or appropriated to male control; and therefore entertainment, embodied as female, became the Other of the ‘National Drama’ of male genius. It will be the work of the case studies in Part II to make approaches to theatre history that challenge and deconstruct (rather than simply overturn) this binary Modernist history.