City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Pick, J.M. (1980). The interaction of financial practices, critical judgement and professional ethics in London West End theatre management 1843-1899. (Unpublished Doctoral thesis, City University London)

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/7681/

Link to published version:

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

City Research Online: http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/ publications@city.ac.uk

THE INTERACTION OF FINANCIAL PRACTICES, CRITICAL JUDGEMENT AND PROFESSIONAL ETHICS IN LONDON WEST END THEATRE MANAGEMENT 1843 - 1899.

John Morley Pick, M.A.

Thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the City University, London. Research undertaken in the Centre for Arts and Related Studies (Arts Administration Studies).

October 1980.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements 4

Abstract 5

One. Introduction: the Nature of Theatre Management 1843-1899 6

1:a The characteristics of managers 9

1:b Professional Ethics 11

1:c Managerial Objectives 15

1:d Sources and methodology 17

Two. Income 29

2:a Size and locations of theatres 31

2:b The apportionment of the auditorium 39

2:c Prices of admission 46

2:d The length of the run 53

2:e Income from sources other than tickets 58

2:f Factors inhibiting the maximisation of income 65

Three. Expenditure 80

3:a Hiring a theatre 81

3:b Hiring actors 84

3:c Payment to authors 87

3:d Scenery 90

3:e Stage Staff 92

3:f Publicity 95

3:g Insurance and Legal Costs 98

Four. Cash Control and accounting 104

4:a Budgeting 104

4:b Financial systems 114

4:c Accounting 117

Five. State Subsidy 127

5:a The financial arguments 131

5:b The arguments over critical standards 134

5:c State support and professional ethics 137

5:d Conclusions 140

Appendix One. Alphabetical list of West End Managers 1843-1899 149

Appendix Two. West End Theatres included in the study. 159

Appendix Three. Long Runs - London theatres in each decade 162

Appendix Four. Primary Source Material and its location 172

Appendix Five. Contemporary published sources 176

Newspapers, magazines and journals. Select List. 176

Accounts written by contemporaries. Select List. 177

Published lectures and pamphlets. Select List. 180

Contemporary Biographies and works of reference. A Select List. 181

Book List 182

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

I am grateful to my colleagues in Arts Administration Studies, Centre for Arts, City University for their help and advice ; I have been particularly grateful to Dr. Michael Hammett, whose work on Wilson Barratt's Grand Theatre Leeds management interlocks with this study. I have had much help and advice from colleagues in the Society for Theatre Research, and I was particularly indebted to detailed help before and after my paper on Samuel Phelps' management, given to the Society in February, 1978. I have been conscious of the kindness of many of the present managers of London theatres, who have offered help where they can, and have allowed me to view private documents.

Of the many libraries and librarians in London who have helped me I am most conscious of my debt to the staff of the Enthoven Collection at the Victoria and Albert Museum, particularly Ms. K. Aylmer, and Mr. A. Latham, who have searched for me and given me access to materials at a difficult time for them, when the collection is closed to the public. I owe also a particular debt to the staff of the manuscript room at the British Museum, and finally to my wife who found time to check through drafts of the work in spite of having just finished research of her own.

I grant powers to the University Librarian to allow this thesis to be copied in whole or in part without further reference to me. This permission covers only single copies made for study purposes, subject to normal conditions of acknowledgement.

ABSTRACT.

This study describes in detail the context - physical, social and artistic - in which the London theatre managers concerned with the West End formed their ethical, critical and financial beliefs about the correct way to run a theatre, between 1843 and 1899. It analyses in detail the methods of creating and controlling income, of notions of expenditure and budgeting, and of the ways in which accounts were kept and in which they were used for information. Together with a description of these practices the thesis analyses the social aspirations of the influential managers, and argues that their desire to belong to an artistic elite at times distorted their critical judgement, and certainly led them in some cases to establish techniques of theatre management which were not serving the art, nor were efficient in business terms, but which contributed to their aspirations to higher rank.

The last section of the study describes and analyses the various arguments at the end of the century about state subvention, and state aid for the (London) theatre, for the insight this gives on the financial, ethical and critical beliefs prevailing in the West End theatre community. It comes to the conclusion that the narrowly middle class audience, the expensive production, and the genteel methods of managing this influential group of theatres existed not because of any economic or social necessity, but because the managers had collectively willed it to be so. Moreover this period of management has particular importance for us, because so many of its limited principles and methods have been accepted as normal theatre practice in our own century, and have continued to limit our theatre, artistically and socially, because of the limitations of nineteenth century arts administration.

1980.

ONE

INTRODUCTION : THE NATURE OF THEATRE MANAGEMENT 1843-1899

As Professor Booth has remarked, the 'economic and business aspects of nineteenth century theatre organisation have hardly been touched'. (1) This study is centrally concerned with those aspects of theatre management in the West End of London between 1843 and 1899 and aims 1) to illuminate the context in which the practices of nineteenth century theatre management developed, ii) to describe financial practices in the leading West End theatres, and iii) to describe the implications of those practices and their interaction with the avowed ethical standards and critical judgements of the managers of the period.

Many writers about the period have described it as if the managers in London's theatres were carried along by currents of public taste over which they had no control, and as if the growing complexity of budgeting, of controlling expenditure or of producing higher income were at best a series of devices for accommodating shifts of public mood.(2) This study aims to show that the reality was much more complicated, but that the theatre became what it was by the turn of the century because of a clear ambition on behalf of the influential managers to achieve a certain status for the theatre, and that this manifested itself in a series of decisive management decisions taken not in response to public attitudes, but formative of them. In our time, when we often profess a desire to make the theatre once more a general pastime, we are able to discern those elements in managerial practice which have made the practice of theatre-going one which appeals almost exclusively to a minority audience that is middle class and highly educated.

Although these practices often exhibit themselves in economic and business decisions, it would be unsatisfactory to describe those decisions in isolation. To be understood they must be placed in historical context, and for their importance to be appreciated we must frequently examine the public motive (or its lack) for these actions. The researcher must, like the managers who form the central interest of the study, be concerned with legal aspects of management as well as perceptions of changing public mood, must be concerned with the public language of

theatre in addition to its financial practices. The study must make the assertion that just as the play and its reception affect the pricing, the publicity and the box office practices, so do those practices in turn affect what is written, and what is accepted and what is played. A fine mind such as Henry James is not turned to writing stuff like the second act of <u>Guy Domville</u>(3 because of the imperatives of some intangible dramatic tradition, but because the theatre in his time was so ordered that James believed (in part)that in that building, with that kind of audience paying those prices and with those expectations aroused, that was the kind of stuff that would be heard. The St. James was not decorated, nor were the seats priced, nor the advertising written as a result of some poll of popular taste,or with a disinterested concern for a literary tradition, but because Alexander had a clear notion of the social and artistic milieu in which he wished to operate , and a clear idea of the kinds of people that he wished to enter his theatre.

The <u>Theatres Act 1843</u> i) ended the monopoly of the patent theatres and ii) gave the Lord Chamberlain's office power to licence all theatre buildings for dramatic entertainment in the cities of London and Westminster. Theatrical management, which formerly had been a practice undertaken in London only by the lessees of the two patent houses, or by the (somewhat raffish) entrepreneurs who ran the 'illegitimate' houses, now developed as a profession in two ways. By the end of the century the West End theatres had grown in number from some five or six to more than thirty, so the profession grew in size and it became possible for a person to manage several different theatres in the course of a professional life. Second, it became significant enough to develop its own ethical codes, and for its members repeatedly to claim credit for various managerial innovations and 'improvements'

The date 1899 has been chosen as the end of the study because the purchasing of Irving's individual interests by the parent Lyceum company marks a significant end of a half century of domination of West End theatre by individuals. In the twentieth century it has become common for theatres and their productions to be owned by family concerns and by business companies. Moreover a survey of changes indicates that 1899 may be regarded as an appropriate date on which to end because the financial, social and ethical practices of West End theatre management were generally established by 1899 and have shown remarkably little alteration since then. The managerial practice and control that Macready exercised was quite different from that exercised by Wyndham or Tree ; however both Tree and Wyndham would recognise quite easily most practices of West End theatre management in the 1950s, and a considerable part of modern management. (4)

The 'managers' about whom we talk are of several kinds. It is usual, though unhelpful for our purposes, to limit discussion of management to the general fortunes of a small group of actor managers of the period, and in discussing managers to concentrate entirely upon their avowed aims and overall strategies. In this study it will be the case that we shall examine both more widely and in greater detail the various restraints upon the managers, and shall use the term 'management' to cover both general strategies and the minutae of artistic and financial practice involved in carrying them out. To describe the nineteenth century theatre practices with accuracy involves recognition of management practices in entrepreneurship, in the establishment of routines, in problem solving and in the role of leader and risk-taker. (5)

Most of the theatres in our survey had three recognisable layers of management. First was the manager named as lessee, the person recognised as being responsible ; usually, although not invariably, that person was the entrepreneur, idealist and risk-taker. The establishment of routines was within the province of the business manager, or acting manager, who was in a form of partnership with the lessee. Minor routines were created and supervised by the lower tier of management, the section heads, box office heads and stage managers who , on an everyday level, were active in implementing the detail of general policy, and responsible for some problem-solving. Except when internal workings of a theatre affect the analysis we shall not make such distinctions, but shall refer generally (for example) to the John Hare management at the Criterion, understanding that many of the routines were invented and supervised by the Acting Manager, Mr Compton, or that box office problems were solved by his box office manager, Mr Abbott.

The West End theatres have been chosen not because there is fuller material about them - surprisingly there are fewer account books and managerial documents available than those available for some provincial and minor theatres - but because collectively the West End has shaped what our theatre is, and their business methods have in general led those of other theatres in other places. The definition of 'West End' is not geographically rigid. In the main the theatres in this study are in the area bounded by the Strand and Shaftsbury Avenue, but there are occasions when a theatre of the period fell outside that area but was in some way fashionable or influential ; thus the Court, the Old Vic and Sadler's Wells are included. Some theatres which existed within that area are omitted, notably some small music halls, and theatres which had so varied a policy as to merit attention in individual study rather than in one which aims to describe and analyse collective aims and methods. Thus we have not

referred to the minor theatres, except as a means of highlighting particular trends in the West End or of offering criticism of West End managers' policies. The theatres are listed in Appendix 2.

There can of course be disagreement over each of these boundaries. The theatre was not much different in 1900, and 1844 was to many people in the business depressingly like 1842 had been. Similarly the selection of theatres to count as 'West End' is arbitary to a degree ; a critic might argue that the 'Brit' was more influential than the Globe, for example, and certainly that it had its fashionable moments, but the grouping and the time have been chosen because they seem to define a natural entity, and as Dr. Rowell remarks, 'Such divisions are inevitably arbitrary, and where a natural division suggests itself, it is often convenient to accept it.' (6) Nevertheless I have not hesitated to go outside these boundaries when it is necessary to make contrasts or to find other support for the general thesis.

1:a The Characteristics of Managers

Between 1843 and 1889 licenses were granted to lessees of theatres, the 'responsible person' , to present theatrical entertainments, by the Middlesex, West Kent or Surrey Justices, according to the area in which the theatre stood. In 1889 the London County Council was formed, following the reorganisation ofpowers under the Local Government Act 1888, and from that date assumed responsibility for licensing all theatres in London. The exceptions were the remaining Private Theatres, and the two large Patent Theatres, Drury Lane and Covent Garden. Performances were also given from time to time without separate license in places of public amusement ; for example there were plays presented in the pleasure gardens.(7) The procedure was not complicated by which a man with some capital entered management, and Hollingshead was not alone in finding it too simple:

> 'Anyone can get a theatrical license by applying at St. James's Palace, paying the necessary fees, and getting the usual two householders to become nominal securities.'
>
> (8)

However licenses were refused upon occasion, when the applicant's financial means were inadequate, or the building judged unsafe.

Appendix 1 lists the 248 lessees with whom this study is

concerned. The list omits groups and companies - although these are few they exist;Covent Garden was for example run from 1843 to 1847 by the Anti Corn Law League and from 1896 to 1899 by the Grand Opera Syndicate - and it excludes those many sublettings by the sitting tenants between major seasons or during the absence abroad of the major company. Some characteristics are important. Around ten per cent of the list only are women, for example. Second, it is obviously a position normally filled by a person working alone. There are joint managements but it is usual to find that after a few years the partners split and go into separate managerial work. Third, it is apparent from such a list that far from being a novel speculation West End theatre management offered something like a substantial career to a number of people. Thus the names of Batty (21 years), Chatterton (16 years), Clarke (16 years), D'Oyly Carte (19 years), Edwardes (13 years), the Gatti brothers (totalling 21 years), Harris (21 years), James (32 years), Mapleson (15 years), the Sangers (totalling 21 years), Thorne (21 years) and Hollingshead (18 years) must be added to those actor managers that are ritually touted as representing the entirety of nineteenth century management.

The duties of a theatre manager in the nineteenth century are first clearly recorded in 1813 when George Colman the younger was charged with incompetence by his fellow Haymarket proprietor, David Morris. In the Chancery hearing, the duties of the theatre manager were outlined as i) daily attendance at rehearsals, ii) reading and casting new plays, iii) creating a costume budget, iv) passing critical judgement upon new writing, and dealing with demanding authors, and v) supervising non-acting staff. (9) The important point was then established that even though he was not in the building, or had delegated responsibility, the named manager remains responsible for all that occurs in the theatre in contravention of the law. That principle, formed for the patent theatres, was accepted in theatre after 1843 and remains broadly true in modern theatre law.

That unrelenting responsibility is a theme which recurs throughout the century. In 1822 Brandon, defending the backstage expenditures at Covent Garden to Charles Kemble, justified Morris' £1,000 annual salary as manager by 'the incessant anxiety, the great personal risk and responsibility, the perpetual toil and labour attached to the situation' which had 'numerous and arduous' duties. (10) The manager moreover was expected to sustain a high moral tone. It was one of Macready's more succinct objections to Bunn that he was 'destitute of honesty and honour.' (11) Phelps was drained by his long management, although he 'disciplined' himself to bear 'a good deal' without

grumbling,[12] and the strain had 'begun to tell' on the Bancrofts[13]. before their early retirement. In a poignant pencilled note, now in the Johnson collection,[14] Irving scribbles down his overall losses, as being the vast sum he was 'out of pocket' after the 'longest of any' management, having burned himself out in a profession which, as Macready had earlier said, consumed 'health and all delight'.[15]

1:b Professional Ethics

In 1843, hearing that Bunn was to be lessee of Drury Lane, Macready thundered that it was 'shameful – to the art, actors, and the public'. Bunn's reputation has been somewhat rescued,[16] but the triad of responsibilities Macready suggested is an important one.

Increasingly in the period managers avowed that they were working towards the fulfilment of some ideal of 'theatrical art'. The word 'art' becomes crucial, meaning much more than high skill, rather meaning a state of sublimity in which the 'art' has become an agent for morality, for the higher education and for understanding of the human condition, while itself being a religious symbol for the educated and receptive mind. This transformation of the word exactly coincides with our period, as Raymond Williams points out:

> 'An art had formerly been any human skill ; but Art, now, signified a particular group of skills, the 'imaginative' or 'creative' arts. Artist had meant a skilled person, as had artisan ; but artist now referred to those selective skills alone. Further, and most significantly, Art came to stand for a special kind of truth, 'imaginative truth', and artist for a special kind of person, as the words artistic and artistical, to describe human beings, new to the 1840s, show.'
>
> (17)

In a general way most of the managers in our study wanted to be considered 'artistic', after the fashion of the Victorian age. There were occasional defaulters, for the division between 'art' and 'entertainment' was already being made, and it was Hollingshead who commented tangily in his last Gaiety manifesto (1885) that if 'the Gaiety has done less for the cause of art than one or two houses...it has done more for the pockets of

the profession, and those who live by theatres'.

The apparent conflict between being artistic and being also a sound businessman troubled the Victorians as it troubles us. One of the strongest arguments for the establishment of disinterested State Aid was that commerce is necessarily antithetical to the higher art (see 5 below), but when a manager plainly was successful in both spheres they had to change the argument, and assert that the anxiety involved in balancing critical approval with mammon was too great a strain to put upon an unsupported individual. It was perhaps less of a practical difficulty than a difficulty of public relations. Managers were uncertain whether to appear inspired and feckless or hard-nosed and realistic ; thus caught between bohemia and grocery they issued long apologies, made speeches and wrote articles which endlessly explained the spiritual torments of their position, compounded as it was of sustaining the higher drama and totting up the pay box sheets. Those papers and speeches, by Bancroft, Irving and Tree in particular, read curiously now ; the tone of midget exhortation, occasional narrowness of vision, and endless repetition of small items of theatrical lore, combined as all of it is with the grandest and most universal of aims and the most soaring philosophies, is seen to be political. The analyses of this or that 'pressing question' are too often, in the direction we shall presently discuss, merely pointing the newly artistic profession away from its populist origins and towards its new social goals. The assumption is always that it was only in the nineteenth century that theatre had begun to find its 'proper' social base ; the key is always that the theatre must be seen to be moving 'onward and upward'. (18)

Towards the artists the leading managers adopted the roles of squire to worthy tenantry, rather than (as had not infrequently been the case) factory boss to hands. Like other managers Irving was called 'Sir', mixed with his fellow players uneasily, and rarely, and distributed presents and paternal greetings at Christmas. (19) The best account of the ritual, caste, and sense of precedence backstage at the Lyceum is left us by John Martin Harvey, who rejects the idea that in the Green Room all was conviviality and fellowship. Laurence Irving, in '<u>Henry Irving</u>' (20) offers for example the rosy view of Ellen Terry and the merry company. She, 'half angel, half imp', could 'one moment be laughing and gossiping in the green room and the next be bathed in her own tears upon the stage.' Her contemporary, Martin Harvey, is of a different opinion:

> 'I never remember Miss Terry visiting us, and it was very rarely that Irving appeared. If he did, the silence and the discomfiture were like that which the old-fashioned head master, Eden Philpott's Dr. Dunstan for instance, would create on the rare occasions when he would join his pupils, and the poor man's conversation would be narrowed down to 'Humph! All right? Quite comfortable here?' Everybody would answer with self-conscious grins and a murmured 'Oh quite sir, very comfortable.' Behaviour was, of course, impeccable.'
>
> (21)

Such gentility was restrictive, earning from G.B.Shaw the jibe that Irving's theatre was 'a back drawing room.' [22] It was however decidedly more comfortable and dignified than had formerly been the case, when actors' contracts had been forgotten at will, when they had been made to queue publicly for their wages, and when they had been treated by their own managements as raffish outcasts from respectable society.[23]

Towards audiences managerial ethics changed completely in our period, not because in each case the management was seized by a desire to make the theatregoer more comfortable and to serve him better, but because matters of safety, comfort, public health and the responsibilities of entrepreneurs were increasingly defined in law and improvements in each made mandatory. Our argument charts the ways in which West End managers came to seek, define and nourish a passive middle class audience in their theatres, but although much theatre rebuilding and decoration, much new seating and much sophisticated refreshment provision was undertaken with this end partly in view, some of it was also made compulsory by the State, as the great social reforms of the century had their effect upon management. As early as 1850 the Metropolitan Police were asked to report to the Lord Chamberlain on egress from London theatres, and at the same time London inspectors began to examine theatre premises to observe whether the new public health laws relating to sanitation, which had been engendered by Chadwick's Public Health Act 1848, were being kept. In 1855 the first annual inspection by an officer directly from the Lord Chamberlain's department, accompanied by a surveyor, took place. Chief points of that investigation were i) means of egress in case of fire, ii) good ventilation, iii) means of extinguishing fire, iv) safe hanging of chandeliers, v) cleanliness and order of the building. In 1856 managers received letters telling them of the results and asking for alterations where necessary. The directives were given regularly, and included in subsequent

years i) footlights to be protected at all times, ii) no wing lights to be nearer the ground than four feet, and iii) it was recommended that women's dresses be made of uninflammable material.[24] Minimum requirements for public safety were finally made mandatory by the Metropolis Management and Building Acts Amendment Act 1878, which had a decisive effect upon the numerous music halls and a less dramatic but still important effect upon the building and alteration of West End theatres.

The state ensured that the finances of theatres were no longer a simple matter of adjusting expenditure and income with a free hand ; both income (2 below) and expenditure (3 below) became more complicated to calculate. Peel's budgets of 1842-5 had reintroduced the income tax, and although no P.A.Y.E. system existed, managers paid taxes upon their incomes, and it was a factor in calculating an acceptable salary for leading players. It was common for the proprietors in some theatres to pay the steadily increasing rates, and to add the sum on to the rent (see for example the description of Phelps' arrangement with the Proprietors of Sadler's Wells in 3, below) Some later managers paid them direct, including of course the new owner/managers . A third complexity was insurance. Managers insured their theatres and, as the custom of managers owning their own company scenery and costumes grew, it was common to insure those also. Speculative insurance businesses had been largely thrown out of business by The Gaming Act 1845, but that had the effect of raising premiums considerably, with the disastrous result that Irving was effectively crippled financially when the 1898 fire found him underinsured ('as an economy measure).[25] State intervention did not always inhibit theatre business ; the building boom in the West End in the last years of the century owed something to the ready availability of capital from the new building societies, securely permanent after the Building Society Act 1874, which had allowed the societies to shed the cumbersome business of appointing trustees to act for them and enabled them to become corporate bodies possessing full legal powers.

The ethical stance of managers thus came to be (in part) of solid and respectable professional men. It was one of the characteristics which separated the managers of 'art' from the managers in 'entertainment', who lived precariously still on the edge of the law. The division remains ; modern 'straight' theatres present public accounts, whereas nearly every major circus since the Second World War has suffered prosecution for tax offences.[26]

1:c Managerial objectives.

In significant ways the theatre stood apart as a business from the common run of Victorian practice. Although the authors had, like artists, founded a professional organisation, there was no substantial union of actors within the period, and between managers and actors there existed still a neo-feudal relationship. There was virtually no counterpart within the theatre to the Cooperative movement (which began in Rochdale in 1844), and such occasional movements as there were to break down the feudal order, such as the Actors' Cooperative at Sadler's Wells in 1889, soon collapsed.[27] The objectives of the managers were to work within the traditional parameters of theatre practice, while attempting to raise the status of the whole endeavour in the eyes of the informed public.

The managers were not concerned to be a part of the class struggle in any overly simple way ; they did not attempt to condition and limit the aspirations of their employees in such a way as to create a 'middle' or 'working' class. Theatre did not divide into competing classes. Rather (and the distinction is important) did the influential managers attempt to place themselves not within the upper class, but within the upper rank. Dr. Watson, following Asa Briggs,[28] makes the distinction:

> 'Industrialism was abolishing the ancient European rank system in favour of a new and more menacing adjustment into two or three vast blocs or classes defined by economic function - an alignment containing within itself at least a possibility of a civil war.' (29)

In our own century the 'straight' theatre has formed itself on occasion into power blocs and has created the system of professional groupings and unions which makes theatrical dispute similar to industrial dispute, but although at the end of our period there were signs that the music hall was aligning itself in that way,[30] theatre remained occupied with rank. Although arguments for theatre to have the same esteemed rank as that enjoyed by visual artists intensified with Irving, Harc and Tree, it was already the case that in 1843 the profession was indignantly insisting upon its claim to enjoy the same gentlemanly status. In their letter to Sir Robert Peel on behalf of John Sheridan Knowles the Committee of the Dramatic Authors Society wrote (24th. Jan. 1843) that working for the theatre was most

certainly of equal status with working in the other arts. [31]
The social position enjoyed by members of the R.S.A. was deeply envied, and aspirations to rank did not begin to falter until finally Irving was given his knighthood, which was taken to be a social benediction upon the entire profession. [32]

Professor Bottomore, in his study of elites, [33] separates three elites of recent times that have 'often been singled out as the inheritors of the functions of earlier ruling classes and as vital agents in the creation of new forms of society '. [34] The three elites are the intellectuals, the managers and the bureaucrats. The objectives of the influential core of theatre managers were not to enter the managerial elite, the 'keepers of the community's material welfare'. [35] They did not aspire to be a part of the developing industrial ideology of the nineteenth century, and the industrialists' language of 'labour', 'capital' and 'the market' is alien to them. Nor, as their uncertainty about State subsidy clearly shows, did they aspire to be government officials, or their agents, who form the core of the bureaucratic elite. [36]

Rather did they aspire, as artists, to join the ranks of the intellectual elite.(Their admiration of the French theatre, and its relation to government, is symptomatic of this, for as Aron has shown,[37] French intellectuals have particularly high social prestige). Of all elites it is the one that least demands homogeneous action and behaviour, and can best accommodate the divergent personalities of the art world. Most important, it is an elite which carried influence in Victorian England, while being detached from the more rigid duties imposed upon the managers and bureaucrats. The intellectual and artistic acquaintance that Irving sought [38] gives clear indication of the kind of membership this body had. Their praise and censure affected decisions in finance, in general ethical intention, and in critical judgement on the work presented. Thus Stoker gives clear accounts of Irving's relationships with Onslow Ford, R.A., Sir Laurence Alma-Tadema R.A., Sir Edward Burne-Jones, Bart. Edwin Abbey R.A. at some length, equal to the space devoted to his relationships with major writers (Browning, Whitman, Tennyson, Caine) and men of affairs (Beaconsfield, Burton and Stanley, Gladstone and Sir William Pearce); together those relationships are recorded as of being in total more significant than his relationships with the profession, or provincial managers. [39] A characteristic of this elite is that its members should be distinguished not by birth or conventional education, but by striking 'artistic' features, the

quality of the inner man thus communicating itself to initiates. Of all compliments recorded to Irving, those most deeply felt are those which assert that his 'features' record his sensitivity, artistry and high intelligence - the outward and visible sign that he was at one with the painters and poets of the Victorian art establishment. (40)

The means of conveying membership of this elite, and of earning a position of high rank, is by the constant display of the niceties of behaviour which were collectively termed 'refinement'. This is concerned more with display of intelligence in 'artistic' conversation, exhibition of particular and localised sensitivity to areas of art, and a high-minded unconcern for worldly matters, than it is concerned with displaying conventional Victorian morality. Irving's relationship with Ellen Terry, or his drinking (41) were no more disabling characteristics than Tree's regular attendance at London's brothels.(42) In a letter to Archer in 1901 Pinero says 'the most truly refined artists of my time - Coghlan, Bancroft, Wyndham and Irving - were not recruited from the ranks of Society at all, but were middle class men who went through the ruck of provincial apprenticeship'. (43) Interestingly he adds, 'I believe the cause of the drama's constant dealing with the 'upper classes' is to be found elsewhere'. (44) It is the argument of this study that the cause is to be found in the general aspiration to the high rank of membership of the Victorian intellectual elite, and that the artistic, social and managerial decisions taken at the core of theatre management became intermingled in practice, and developed their own high-sounding rationale,so the total managerial practices of this group, far from being seen as the shaping points for a century of our drama, are wrongly seen as hapless consequences of some high-minded groundswell of public taste, or even as irrelevant matters of business unconnected with the art.

1:d Sources and methodology

In general terms it is necessary to pass through three distinct, but interrelated, stages. The subject requires first a considerable historical search, to establish what managers did, and what were the legal, social, educational and artistic pressures upon them which influenced decision-taking. Second, and inseparable from such a search in practice,are analyses of the rhythms of management ; inevitably these are often recorded as figures, and research in this field will at times disarmingly veer from social comment to minute analysis of

accounts. Third, in order to establish the nature of the work of the managers, it is necessary to make direct or implied comparison with alternatives, which either theory, or subsequent practice in theatre administration, have taught us to regard as possibilities.

The three stages are inevitably intermingled. It would not have been possible to make any kind of detailed historical research without concentrating upon areas, such as the moderation of weekly income, or the general budgeting of a future production, which are known to be key practices in theatre management. Had one simply been led to make analyses from the total of primary sources, one would have been inclined to paint a picture of many of the managers in the period as being wholly and spiritually concerned with notions of the higher art, and unconnected with raising capital, with the strains of correcting cash flow or with publicising new work. One has to view the sources with the benefit of one general hypothesis - that in a capitalist society a theatre manager has a (limited) number of ways he can run each part of his enterprise, and although he and his supporters may make a great variety of claims for the critical importance or the social significance of their work, a sympathetic analysis of the way business practices and policy statements combined will reveal its real nature. That sympathy is crucial ; it involves a wide-ranging and demanding attempt at comprehending matters as various as the nightly return sheets, and the arguments about the possible need for state support. If the researcher is less than sympathetic to the essence of Victorian theatre - if in other words his primary tool of analysis is some straightforward categorisation used in business or financial studies, he is likely to cut through the edge of the complicated and mobile theatre world under study, and to reveal nothing more than that the managers seemed perversely inefficient or that their world was so far removed from modern practice as to be beyond precise research.

The precision in this study must derive not from the relentless application of one research tool, but from the delicate use of a range of analyses (and the illuminating use of others' conclusions which, though they have been produced for other purposes, aid the exposition). It is a matter of the finest judgement to decide how a known practice, or how particular figures, may develop and enrich the overall argument, and the claim of the study to notice must rest upon the acceptance of that degree of discrimination. The three interlocking stages described above finally amount to a thesis which is descriptive, but the processes

described are accumulating evidence of the central argument. It follows that, disturbing though it may sometimes be to the reader, that the exposition has in its various stages to be accommodated in different kinds of language, for the records of the accounts, the legal documents, the advertising material and the contents of letters and informal books of reminiscence – which must all play a part in establishing what management was at core – cannot truthfully be recorded and accounted for in one precise common language. The best and most precise tone in which the various aspects of theatre management can however be <u>linked</u> together is one in which theatre managers themselves talk ; the assumption is therefore made that the reader is familiar with common theatre terminology, and that if one nuance of the general argument is true – the assertion that much modern theatre lore and practice derives not from the inexorable law of business necessity but from the decisions taken in our period of study – then it is important, and significant, that the argument should be perfectly comprehensible to anyone interested in modern theatre practice. It must be assumed too that the reader has a broad knowledge of the history of Victorian London, but at each point that some aspect of that history impinges on the study then reference is made to the appropriate histories.

The source materials for the study provide particular difficulties for the researcher. About the period there exist numerous studies, and although some are useful, the majority are over-general, rely on disarmingly simple generalisation, and at worst seek to put a roseate glow on the leisure-habits of the period.(45) There exists no general analysis of the methods of the managers of Victorian entertainments which is inward with the particular nature of that kind of management, and although books about the various managers exist in profusion, they are often of dubious accuracy, or are concerned to tell stories of 'human interest' rather than to examine the nature of the management itself ; we thus know more about the sex lives of the managers than about the ways they established financial control of their enterprises.(46) Although the nature of a theatrical performance – a meeting of many minds with quite different intentions, and perceptions about the event, and a meeting which is inevitably ephemeral, and which cannot be recorded with the precision of musical notation nor left, as a picture is left, on permanent record – may seem to mean that the essence of theatre management is virtually impossible to record, it is more probable that the nineteenth century separation of 'art' from more mundane human activity, leads to the willed separation of

theatre art from theatre business. The note is always that of the astute entrepreneur Bancroft, who nonchalently referred to the accounts which he supervised so meticulously and which afforded him such a luxurious living as 'those dreadful things'. (47) The attitude assuredly makes the record hard truthfully to discover , for combined with the public disdain for business was a meticulous secrecy about its details, a widespread habit that led Pinero to write ruefully to Archer in 1898, 'I think that Andree went up in his balloon not to discover the North Pole, but to obtain an accurate survey of the Actor Manager '. (48)

That discovery is no easier eighty years later. The great majority of the records of nineteenth century managements have been destroyed, or are kept inaccessible to researchers as part of the records of families still concerned with the theatre ; some West End management has also been concerned with business freemasonry and any records which may exist in those areas are obviously unobtainable. (49) Nevertheless enough records of agreements, of employment and of legal cases exist for us - knowing the theatre practices from other sources - to construct a reliable description of management. To find and use such materials has however proved a long and tedious business, as there is no central collection, no one museum, nor any consistent method of cataloguing materials connected with theatre management.

Of those letters, agreements and ledgers listed as primary source material at the conclusion of the book, the majority of key documents may eventually be located in the manuscript section of the British Museum, or in the Enthoven collection which is housed at the time of writing in the Victoria and Albert Museum building, although it is not accessible to the general public . The beginnings of the search in these and other libraries was dogged by the fact that even librarians may not recognise material which is pertinent to theatre management study, and thus it was common to find that after denials that anything existed in a collection of interest a thorough search would reveal material of some potential interest. It may well be that other material exists - Mander and Mitchenson, for example, were adamant that they have no material of interest to such searches, but it may well be that in their private collection there is pertinent material in programmes, bills or contracts which have more obvious value to other theatre researchers. (50)

The present cataloguing situation is dauntingly bad. The cataloguing of the manuscript collections in the British museum is of course well out-of-date, and as the majority of materials are in any case entered under the central figure in a chain of correspondence or the chief agent in a legal case, there is no alternative to long (and often fruitless) searches through those parts of the collection concerned with key figures of London

society of the period. Thus letters to William Peel, for example, contain a long and passionate plea on behalf of Sheridan Knowles by the Dramatic Authors Society (1:c above), which includes an interesting early statement of the aspirations to high rank of the fledgling theatre profession, but which is hidden in a collection of more than a hundred letters concerned with young mothers, the safety of the streets, prison reform and the habits of sailors on shore leave. The Enthoven collection is presently housed in cramped and inadequate quarters and is either uncatalogued, or has been catalogued in a variety of ways by different employees. Of private collections , such as that held by the British Music Hall Society,[51] the same general comments may be made ; they are either uncatalogued, which leaves the researcher making random searches through material, or are catalogued in a way which accords with the interests of the owners - by artist, for example - but which gives no indication whether the material has any interest for a particular search. Even in well catalogued public collections, such as those at Oxford or in the Stratford Library, the emphasis, naturally, is upon cataloguing material in a way which will be helpful to the literary critic, the historian of acting method, or the researcher in stage technology. If the proposed Theatre Museum is established [52] it seems improbable that it will be able to gather all materials into one central source,[53] but it should be possible to develop a simple method of cataloguing theatre management material in a way helpful to specialist researchers without disturbing the overall museum categories. It would be sensible for this task to be undertaken in cooperation with Arts Administration Studies staff members at the City University, and for the method to be widely disseminated so other smaller collections could, without undue difficulty, adopt its practices.[54]

Of a second kind of primary source material, memoirs, reminiscences and diaries written by those involved in the London theatre between 1843 and 1899, there is no lack. The London collections - and where they have failed, searches by the specialist bookshops - have yielded copies of several hundred books written in or about the period by those who were alive in it. Reading them is a wearisome business, partly because the all-round Victorian was expected to interest his readers by general books which covered aspects of a cultivated gentleman's life as various as big game hunting and party tricks, and partly because of the relentless heavy-handed tact of such books which means that where true valour exists it is well covered by discretion. Nevertheless

it has been found important to read every available publication, whether written by a theatre personality or by some other kind of London-based raconteur, because illuminating anecdote can quite often be found in chapters apparently devoted to the pleasures of dining out, or to conversations at the horse racing. The list at the conclusion of the study lists those publications that have at least some material pertinent to understanding management in the period.

Of course such books, even when written contemporaneously, further inaccuracies by retelling old stories with different principals, or passing on myths with only the slightest disclaimer about their absolute truth. In general I have tried to make reference only to anecdotes and information from reasonably reliable sources, and where there is a degree of certainty, through cross-checking, that the material is to be trusted. I have sometimes used material of which, in a precise sense, I am rather less sure, but which is mildly useful as corroborative material, without insisting that any point of the exposition depends upon its acceptance. Such colour can sometimes be useful ; thus the exact source (for example) of those anecdotes in which other managers inveigh about the prodigal expenditure of Irving may be uncertain, but the anecdotes are repeated so often they may have some small value nevertheless in establishing the prevailing wisdom about investing in new productions in the 80s and 90s.

Claims which I believe should be made for the importance of the subject may seem ambitious, but I believe that the establishment of the 'proper' way to build, staff, publicise and run theatres in London's West End in the second half of the nineteenth century has had widespread effects both in detail – the Bolshoi theatre in Moscow for example had adopted the same system of 'returns' as the Lyceum by 1896 (55) – and in the general philosophies of management which now support theatre as a force for art in Western Europe in the twentieth century. The arguments of the last twenty years are, to an astonishing degree, concerned with whether or not we should attempt to go back upon the principles of managing the theatre as an agent in our society which the managers in this study collectively established. The descendants of the 'popular' entertainments of the music hall, and the non-establishment descendants of the minor theatres are still vainly trying to establish themselves with the London critical elite that Irving and his colleagues successfully penetrated, are still excluded from the financial support given to the 'high' arts as the nineteenth century so meticulously defined them. It is still the case that in spite of ritual protestations about their belief in re-establishing a popular theatre, the housing, advertising, pricing, timing and above all manner and style of

presenting the plays by our modern managers seems to some observers both to encourage the continuing attendance by a small, well-educated (and well-mannered) minority that so thoroughly understands the social and artistic conventions, and is so comfortable with them, that changes in managerial style are clearly unwelcome. (56)

A number of ways of presenting the material were considered and rejected. A purely chronological survey would for example seem attractive but would be difficult to sustain – as theatre practices plainly varied between theatres and did not grow at a regular pace. Rather it has been found sensible at several points to offer a broad survey of the chronological development of certain aspects of management such as seat pricing, distribution of theatre programmes, or newspaper advertising, and to sustain the argument in different categories. Consideration was given to the creation and description of one single 'model' of Victorian theatre management, but that was rejected as the amount of qualification needed at each point would be enormous, and a single model could not take account of the nature of the changes made over time. It was also at first an attractive notion to present simply a fully annotated reproduction of the various source materials, but this in turn was rejected because it does not approach the material as evidence of the workings of theatre art in society, but must misleadingly be presented in such a case as if it <u>is</u> the central art. Moreover, as with the other rejected modes, such an approach would not allow us to consider at key points the alternatives that the managers did not choose, and which are often of great significance.

It seemed that the best way of presenting the material was first to work within the broad parameters of theatre management practice and to consider i) Income, ii) Expenditure, and iii) Cash Control and Accounting. In each case the practices are put in their social and financial context, are described in some detail and their implications discussed ; the threads of the argument leading to the conclusions of the last chapter, which are illuminated and placed in context by the arguments raging over the 'National' theatre and a form of state subsidy.
The material is presented in a way which attempts to show, and to explain, that financial practices both are symptoms of social and ethical beliefs and in turn form them ; consideration of alternatives shows at important points in the exposition that critical values cannot be detached from the social workings of theatre, its financial practices and the ethics of the managers. The theatre is an entirity, and to understand the detail it is necessary always to place it within the social, critical and ethical worlds

that sustain its acceptance and its practices.

Those practices were not, in this period, sharply distorted by major war, sudden inflation or domestic revolution. The Crimea affected some theatre programmes , as did the Indian mutinies, only in the sense that managers from time to time presented highly coloured patriotic pieces with those wars as background, but neither affected managerial business so sharply as did the collapse of Barings in 1890. (57) Nor were there, during the 56 years, any inflationary spurts of the order to which we have become accustomed during the 1960s and 1970s. As we shall observe, the basic price of admission in the minor theatres and the cheap portions of many West End theatres rose hardly at all during the period, and was as relatively static as the price of beer. (58) The growth in admission prices to the other portions of the house is characterised by being i) gradual, ii) taken at a pace of the management's choosing rather than in response to economic necessity (although as we shall see in our analysis of Bancroft's Haymarket stalls in the next chapter, managers occasionally affected to believe they were responding to extreme financial pressures in raising prices), iii) a price for an environment and a dramatic entertainment which was in essence qualitatively different from the theatre in the forties and fifties. The steady rise in the prices for the seats occupied by the middle classes is not properly viewed as an inflationary trend, but as a part of an act of social (and artistic) policy, which encouraged the muted and educated responses of an increasingly wealthy class to expensive and 'artistic' productions. There is no predetermined law which says what form of drama is appropriate to an age ; each generation may be offered and may accept a range of dramatic styles, from a single voice speaking in the dark (as radio listeners came to accept forty years later) to sumptuously staged and spectacularly detailed entertainments. It is important to note as we begin a more detailed analysis of income and expenditure therefore that neither rose because of some uncontrollable inflation (although wages and stage costs for the kinds of productions the managers presented did of course rise, as we shall see in 3 below) but, in part, because of the kind of theatre the managers sought, which was expensively mounted for a kind of audience that was willing to pay.

ONE

NOTES

(1) In the foreword to Rees, T. (1978). Theatre Lighting in the Age of Gas. (London : Society for Theatre Research).

(2) The note of random opportunism many histories convey can be illustrated by a reference such as this ; the Bancrofts 'appealed directly to the intelligence of their audience ; and they also reduced the bill to a single piece, with perhaps a curtain raiser, cutting out the more debased forms of entertainment which for so long had satisfied the depraved taste of the hoi polloi , and thus inaugurating a new era of respectability in the theatre'.

Margetson, S. (1971). Leisure and Pleasure in the 19th. Century . (Newton Abbot : The Victorian Book Club). p.200

(3) Donaldson, F. (1970). The Actor Managers. (Chicago : Henry Regnery).p.115ff.

(4) For a description of the changes in management state support brought after 1945 see Linklater, N.V., 'The Achievement in Drama' in Pick, J.M. (Ed.) (1980). The State and the Arts. (London : City Arts).

(5) Pick, J.M. (1980). Arts Administration. (London : E.and F.N.Spon). pp. 1 - 36.

(6) Rowell, G. (1967). The Victorian Theatre (Oxford : Clarendon Press). Prefaratory note.

(7) See the short introduction in Delgado, A.(1971). Victorian Entertainment (Newton Abbot ; David and Charles) pp.29-42. A fuller account incl. the simple dramas is in Wroth, W.(1907). Cremorne and the Later London Gardens (London).

(8) Hollingshead, J. (1880) 'Is the Pit an Institution or an Excrescence?'. The Theatre Third Series - No.3 p.133

(9) See Murray, C. (1975). Robert William Elliston, Manager (London: Society for Theatre Research). pp. 139 - 140.

(10) Brandon. (Circa 1825) The Treasury of Covent Garden Theatre in Reply to Kemble, C. (Printed document in the Enthoven Collection).

(11) Trewin, J. (Ed.) (1967). The Journal of William Charles Macready 1832-1851 (London : Longmans). See particularly pp. 6 - 86.

(12) Allen, S. (1971) Samuel Phelps and Sadler's Wells Theatre (Wesleyan University). p.155.

(13) Bancroft, S. and Bancroft, M. (1911). The Bancrofts; Recollections of Sixty Years (London ; Nelson) p. 280.

(14) Johnson Collection, Bodleian Library, Oxford. Notebook B. (1959) W/17/(c).

(15) Trewin, J. (ed.) (1967). op cit p.

(16) Urwin, G.G. (1964) 'Alfred Bunn 1796 - 1860 ; A Revaluation' in Theatre Notebook Vol II pp. 96 - 102.

(17) Williams, R. (1958). Culture and Society 1780 - 1950 (London : Chatto and Windus). p.15. The argument is concentrated in Chapters 2 and 11.

(18) This key phrase (1878) 'Stage Abuses' in The Theatre New Series - No.4 p.265, occurs within an article which perfectly exhibits the aspirations of the managers.

(19) Stoker, B. (1907). Personal Reminiscences of Henry Irving (London : Heinemann) p. 203. The most striking illustration of the distance between the manager and his employees was that following his death instructions were given that the actors may not view his body. Sir John Martin Harvey,(1933). Autobiography.(London ; Sampson Low). p.53.

(20) Irving, L. (1961) Henry Irving, The Actor and his World (London : Faber and Faber). p. 317

(21) Martin Harvey, J. (1933). op cit. p. 91

(22) Shaw G.B. (1898). 'The Drama in Hoxton' in The Saturday Review (9th. April)

(23) It was not always clear that the entire profession desired the comfort and decorum brought by the new social tenor of the London Theatre. There is an anxious hectoring tone about much of the writing about the necessity for unified dignity. See 'Social Responsibilities of the Actor' in (1879). The Theatre. New Series - No. 7. pp.8 - 11.

(24) Fitzgerald, P. (1882). A New History of the English Stage (London) pp. 439 - 440.

(25) Stoker, B. (1907). op cit. p. 425.

(26) The exception, Bertram Mills' Circus, was the only one of the larger circuses not administered by an old showbusiness family but by a family of businessmen. (Cyril Mills' account of his administration is a P.E.P.E. Videotape, Resources Centre, Centre for Arts, City University).

(27) See Arundell, D. (1965). The Story of Sadler's Wells 1863 - 1964 (London ; Hamish Hamilton) p. 170 ff.

(28) Briggs, A. (1960). 'The Language of Class in Early Nineteenth Century England' in Essays in Labour History in Memory of G.D.H. Cole. (London)

(29) Watson, G. (1973). The English Ideology : Studies in the Language of Victorian Politics. (London) p.176 ff.

(30) The strike of Music Hall artistes against the managers finally occured in 1906.

(31) Letter to Sir Robert Peel. (1843). From Dramatic Authors' Society. In Manuscript Collection, British Museum.

(32) See Stoker, B. (1907). op cit. p. 389. 'It really seemed as if the whole world rejoiced in the honour to Irving.'

(33) Bottomore, T. (1964) Elites and Society (London : C.A.Watts). pp 69 - 92

(34) Ibid. The analysis is primarily concerned with societies in the post industrial phase.

(35) Few of the managers seem to have gathered about them the trappings of middle class success. Irving lived modestly in a Grafton Street apartment well below the social station to which he could have aspired, had membership of the ordinary managerial elite interested him.

(36) There is indeed often a positive fear of conventional bureaucracy. See Tree, B. (1913). 'Our Betters' in Thoughts and After Thoughts (London : Cassell)

(37) Aron, R. (1960). 'Classe Sociale, class politique, class dirigeante' in European Journal of Sociology Vol 1, No. 2. p.260 ff.

(38) Stoker came to know who could be admitted to him because of their status as artists. See Stoker, B. (1907). op cit. p.281

(39) 33 pages are devoted to Irving's relationship with Tennyson in the Reminiscences (Ibid), 18 specifically to his relationships with the four leading academicians. By contrast Bernhardt merits 4, Genevieve Ward 6, Toole (a particular favourite) 9, but a large number of actors with whom Irving was friendly - Bancroft for example - gain scant mention, and are not isolated as acquaintances worthy of separate treatment. Ellen Terry is frequently mentioned, but other leading members of the company are cursorily treated.

(40) See for example the rather absurd story of Disraeli's admiration of Irving's distinguished physiognomy. Ibid p. 269.

(41) Bingham, M. (1978). Henry Irving and the Victorian Theatre (London : Allen and Unwin).

(42) Pearson, H. (1956). Beerbohm Tree : His Life and Laughter (London : Methuen).

(43) Pinero, A. (1901). Letter to Frank Archer. In Manuscript Collection, British Museum.

(44) Ibid.

(45) For example, 'The audiences which flocked to Music Hall went there for a holiday, and got it. They got a mixed bag of talent which was most remarkable. They got an atmosphere and friendliness which engulfed them as soon as they entered its doors. They became part of a crowd of people who were happy, and what troubles they might personally have soon fell away.'

Macqueen-Pope, W. (1952). Queen of the Music Halls (London:Oldbourne) p.13.

(46) Even so meticulously researched a book as Laurence Irving's account of his grandfather's life (op cit) is seriously flawed by his unquestioning repetition of most of the banalities about the Lyceum finances, which are far less carefully worked over than are some of the personal details of the life.

(47) Bancroft,S. and Bancroft,M. (1911). op cit. p. 281.

(48) Pinero, A. (1898). Letter to Frank Archer. In Manuscript Collection, British Museum.

(49) Two sources who will not be identified have told me uncorroborated stories about the prevelance of freemasonry in the West End during the period. The only reference to entertainers freemasonry was that midget General Tom Thumb was a mason! Barton, M. and Sitwell, O. (1930) Sober Truth ; an Account of Nineteenth Century Episodes. (London ; Duckworth) p. 206.

(50) During the work on this study Mander and Mitchenson have promised to give their private collection to a public body.

(51) Like several collections, this is scattered in a number of private homes and is collated and kept somewhat according to the particular interests of the 'landlord' in each case.

(52) At the time of writing, it is expected that the Enthoven collection will open, as the British Theatre Museum, in Covent Garden in 1982.

(53) This is advocated by Howard , D. (1970) London Theatres and Music Halls 1850 - 1950 (London ; The Library Association). Ms. Howard also urges a campaign for the preservation of material which is

in serious danger of being lost.

(54) Cataloguing would need to show date, area in which the item was used, function and the theatre, artist or organisation whose property it was. The precise function is particularly important. At present almost any ledger containing figures is termed 'Account Book', which is misleading.

(55) A return, with the precise layout and division of that in use in London fifteen years earlier, and dated 1896, is in the Bolshoi Theatre Museum on the first floor of the Bolshoi Theatre.

(56) Dr. Mann's work on modern theatre audiences shows that the social composition of audiences is predominately from the middle class and the highly educated. There is no evidence that the composition of audiences has significantly changed after more than thirty years of following a policy of keeping down prices by state subsidy - a policy which has led West End managers to keep down their prices to an uneconomic level in order to compete with the subsidised theatres. (Arts Council Research Reports 1 - 9, published at 105 Piccadilly, London W.1.)

(57) Stoker, B. (1907). op. cit. p. 124. 'To my surprise I found that on each night, growing as the week went on, were quite a number of seats unoccupied. On reference to the full plan I found that most of these seats were sold to the libraries, but that a good proportion of them had been booked at our own office. Neither of us could account for such a thing in any way.' [Rumours about Baring's collapse were rife in the city and that 'obliterated social life for many people' J.P.] p. 125. 'In the Lyceum we became wide awake to the situation. In a time of panic and disaster there is no need for mimetic tragedy ; the real thing crowds it out. The very next day we arranged to change the bill on the earliest day possible.' ['Much Ado About Nothing', the brightest and cheeriest comedy in the repertoire, was substituted on Jan. 3rd. 1891.J.P.]

(58) A comparison of the price list of Scrutton and Sharpe (who supplied Sadler's Wells from the 60s.)and that of Spiers and Pond, who owned and supplied the Criterion at the end of the period shows that there was not only little change in theatre drink prices during the period, but little difference between a central and an unfashionably suburban house prices. The prices were:

Wines	6d. glass
Brandy	4d. "
Whisky	4d. "
Gin	4d. "
Ale	3d. "

Ale and Stout in bottle 6d.
Lemonade and other minerals in bottle 4d.

Two further indications of stability were that the laquered stovepipe advertisements fixed to public buildings were designed with prices permanently a part of the design, and that so confident were the builders of the new theatres that prices in the cheaper seats would never rise that the price was often included in the tile pattern. This was so at Wyndham's and at the Hoxton Hall, and seems to have been regular practice in many theatres built during the second part of the century. (See 2 below).

TWO

INCOME.

Between 1843 and 1899 theatre income grew substantially , although growth was irregular. During the period the nightly receipt from any one theatre doubled, in simple terms, and, as we shall describe below in detail, the numbers of West End theatres grew. That growth of audience can be ascribed to the growing wealth and available leisure of larger sections of Victorian Society, but among the contributory factors which concern this study directly are i) the growth of a large catchment area for West End audiences served by new road and rail links, ii) the building of a network of smaller theatres which enabled longer runs to be housed more cheaply, and iii) the development of more sophisticated booking techniques which enabled an audience to be sought and accommodated over a longer period and with less risk of sudden failure than when managerial success depended in large measure upon 'passing trade'.

We shall point to a number of key factors in the way that income was sought, which indicate that the managers sought to impose social habits upon their audiences rather than merely to respond to them. In 1877 Henry James asserted that the very method of purchasing theatre tickets was both symptom and cause of the fact that the drama was 'not a popular amusement.' (1) To buy a ticket you must go to an agency 'in an expensive street out of Piccadilly'. For eleven shillings - the ticket price plus booking fee - you receive your ticket from a 'smooth sleek bottle nosed clerk'. Then inside the theatre when the 'white cravatted young man ' has inducted you into your stall, and has taken your sixpenny tip which has 'seemed a mockery of his grandeur', you find yourself in a tight middle class milieu in which the 'number of old ladies one has to squeeze past is very striking'. Thus the familiar objection to modern West End audiences, that they are 'largely middle class and largely women', seems already to be true in the middle of our period.

There are indications that in certain ways poorer folk and humbler souls generally, were actually discouraged from attending West End theatres. That some agencies did not deal with folk who were not comfortably able to afford expensive seats is remarked upon by Leverton, whose long and notorious tenure of the Haymarket Box Office began during the

management of the Bancrofts and who describes the habits of the agency (termed a 'Library' then, as today) Lacon and Ollier's, off Bond Street:

> 'When I first went to the Haymarket, the head of the firm was a stately old gentleman named Charles Ollier. Lacon's had a very distinguished clientele, and Charles Ollier would not sell or allow to be sold in his office any other seats than the highest priced ones – orchestra stalls or private boxes. If a stranger entered, and dared to ask for dress circle or – worse still – upper circle tickets, the venerable Mr Ollier would lead him courteously to the door, hold it wide open for his exit, and say, with infinite suavity:
>
> 'You will be able to buy <u>that</u> class of ticket opposite, at Messrs Blanks.'
>
> And the delicate emphasis with which he stressed the words '<u>that</u> class of ticket' would reduce the vulgar stranger to perspiring shame.' (2)

At the outset therefore we need to remind ourselves that the managers working in the latter part of our period were not concerned simply to maximise income ; there were ways in which no income was plainly preferable to income from the wrong sort and class of person.

A close examination of the practices of booking seats and entering the West End theatres does not readily support the view that the working classes left as audiences in general 'became more discriminating'. Yet such a view is a common one. It receives its clearest statement from Dr. Rowell:

> 'In particular the evolution of the Music Hall at this time began to draw off the violent element in the audience. By its transformation from the semi-secret haunt of the raffish man-about-town into the popular resort of the working man, providing both drink and entertainment, the Music Hall took over one of the chief functions of the mid Victorian theatre. The way was thus cleared ...for a smaller, more discriminating audience..' (3)

We must at least entertain the view that the great changes in style and presentation were not the result of the 'vulgar' having departed for the Music Halls, but were decided upon in part as a means of precipitating that departure. The loss of the pit, the loss of the 'half price' after nine o' clock and the single performance which began before many working men could possibly present themselves at the theatre, the demands made upon the booker's time, social poise and literacy (to say nothing of his pocket) were all

decisions about method and style of attracting an audience taken not in response to demand, but in advance of it. Each was the subject of protest, and we shall scrutinise the nature of the protests below.

A brief indication of the attitude of some, if not all, of the managers in the seventies and eighties is the timetable of theatre opening, with regard to its various class of customers. Most box offices opened for booking at ten in the morning, and closed at four or five in the afternoon; Leverton tells us that he always left early in order that an assistant finished off the booking and he could thus have time to change to evening dress and return to the box office to deal with the evening's audience and to 'cash up.' (4) For people at leisure there were thus some six hours each day to book stalls and the dearer seats. The Gallery however, and where it still existed, the Pit, could not be booked, and it is interesting to see how very little time that part of the audience was given to buy ticket, or token, at the pay box and to mount or descend steps into the auditorium before the show began. In May 1880, for instance, the Lyceum's The Merchant of Venice began at eight; the doors opened at 7 O'Clock. The St. James, which was presenting Still Waters Run Deep under the management of Hare and Kendal, preceded by Old Cronies at eight, opened its doors at 7.30, and thus gave its patrons thirty minutes to queue, and to enter the auditorium and settle themselves. Unbooked customers had even less time at the Prince of Wales's, where the original comedietta A Happy Pair was given at 7.40, and the doors opened at 7.30, ten minutes only in advance. (5)

It is necessary now to examine in some detail the various elements which bore upon the managers' income from each production. The elements were i) the size of the theatre, and its location, ii) the apportionment within the theatre of the various sections of the auditorium - the pit, stalls, circles, boxes and gallery, iii) the prices of admission, and the way each price ticket was sold, iv) the length of the run, and v) the income deriving from subscriptions, benefits, foyer sales and sources other than ticket sales. Factors mitigating against simple consideration of these five elements include the way the 'free list' was administered, the systems of giving 'orders', and inefficiency or dishonesty on the part of the theatre staff.

2:a Size and locations of theatres.

Before the 1878 Metropolis Management and Building Acts Amendment Act (41 and 42 Vict. c 32), control of the capacity of houses of public entertainment was slight, and notional capacity figures of theatres need to be treated with considerable caution. Although the boxes, galleries and pit would have a notional figure ascribed to them, managers would exceed that figure upon occasion. Thus Elliston, playing in Rochester during his management of the Olympic

sets the tone of the century by announcing to an overfull pit that he has 'had £100 more in that pit than there is at the present moment'. (6) The majority of the audience were a mob to the managers. Even on the occasion of the Queen's visit to see Macready at Covent Garden in 1837, the pit was overcrowded and Bartley gave back 'the price of admission' to those who were listing over the boxes 'in a fainting and exhausted state'. (7) Clearly when the opportunity arose managers extracted income from every inch of the auditorium. The practice continues into our period, with the pit at Sadler's Wells under Phelps frequently being overfull. (8)

The lack of a standard 'maximum capacity', and the managers' not unnatural desire to profit from gala evenings means that it is extremely unwise to be overcertain about capacities of London theatres. In the earlier part of our period the pit was the hardest to calculate. At Sadler's Wells for example Arundell estimates that during Phelps' time the capacity of the pit was between 1,100 and 1,200. (9) Professor Allen however, in discussing the same period ackowledges the huge pit to be the dominant characteristic of the Wells but adds that 'the thousand (sic) occupants of its benches determined the character of its audience.' (10)

The difficulty is compounded by the managers' desire to use figures from receipts (and figures of expenditure) for publicity purposes. It was the custom for the managers to 'summarise a season', and to have that summary reported in the newspapers and the theatrical press, and to include in it figures for expenditure and receipts. It is not unreasonable to suppose that expenditure was inflated and the income minimised in those speeches. Later in this chapter (2:b below) analysis indicates that the Bancrofts were overly discreet about the actual revenue they received from the Haymarket management. Earlier in the period Kean exhibits the same tendency, to present himself oversimply as a disinterested artist with no financial acumen. A speech which he gave from the stage on the last night of his successful management of the Princess's Theatre in 1859 gives clear indication:

> 'I may state that in this little theatre, where £200 is considered a large receipt , and £250 an extraordinary one, I expended in one season alone , a sum little short of £50,000.'
>
> (11)

in this instance he was not conveying the essence of his budget as accurately as he might have done. Had the sum of £50,000 which he spent 'in one season alone' been a typical sum for each of the nine seasons, he would have expended £450,000. In fact the financial summary shows he spent some £244,000,[12] an average of £27,111 per season. Moreover the house, with its four tiers of boxes, actually grossed £309.[13] On the management as a whole Kean made a profit of around £2,000.

With such cautions in mind we can look at the capacities of the London theatres in the period, and it is convenient to divide them into three categories. First, the large houses that were in existence at the time of the 1843 act - the two 'patent' houses having capacities of around 3,000, and the other West End theatres being also big ; the Sadler's Wells theatre, to which Phelps went to commence his management, housed at least 2,500 and was termed small. Second, from 1865 onwards there was a movement to build smaller theatres, and to modify those existing to more limited dimensions; thus the Haymarket was reconstructed in 1879 (to capacity circa 1150), St. James in the same year (to capacity circa 1,200) ,and the Princess's both in 1869 and 1880, when capacity was dropped to circa 1750. The 1878 Act (above) played a part in the widespread reconstruction of theatre buildings in the late '70s, but was not its sole cause.[14]

There was a discernible third boom in theatre building around the turn of the century, when a further fifteen West End theatres were constructed. Some were on the sites of former theatres, and some in the fashionable tourist parts of the West End. As we shall observe theatre entrepreneurs seemed to feel that the advantage generally lay in being near other theatres, rather than, for example, close to railway terminals, docks or 'exclusive' shopping areas.

The Bancrofts make major claims for their part in the second 'wave' of theatre building. The beginning of Bancroft management of the small theatre, which Marie Bancroft caused to be renamed the Prince of Wales's, in 1865, is of significance, not least because of the clear desire to attract a middle class audience to an hitherto unfashionable theatre, and because the venture was at once profitable, enabling Marie Bancroft to pay back in weekly instalments of £10 the £1,000 she had borrowed to finance her first venture into management.[15] However they imply that they inaugurated a movement :

> 'It is worth noting that for twenty three years before the opening of the old Prince of Wales not a single new theatre had been

built in the West End of London. In 1866, the year after the success of Society, the Holborn theatre was opened ; in 1867, the old Queen's in Long Acre ; in 1868, the Globe and the Gaiety ; in 1869, the Charing Cross, afterwards called Toole's theatre ; in 1870, the Vaudeville and the Opera Comique ; in 1871, the old Court Theatre; in 1874, the Criterion ; in 1878, the Imperial ; in 1881, the Savoy and the Comedy ; in 1882, the Avenue (now the Playhouse) and the Novelty (now the Kingsway) ; and in 1883 the Prince's (now the Prince of Wales's in Coventry Street).' (16)

All 15 theatres were indeed built, but there are three errors in Bancroft's dating. The Holborn theatre opened not in 1866, but on 25th. May 1867. The Court theatre opened not in 1871, but on 16th. April 1870. The Imperial opened on 15th. April 1876, not in 1878.

We cannot however attribute this boom in theatre solely to the Bancrofts' successes. It occured because conditions were right. Improved communications systems increasingly brought the suburbs and the 'dormitory' towns within reach of the theatre, and a rapidly growing press system conveyed advertising and theatre notices cheaply into an unprecedented number of middle class homes. It was, further, a propitious time for building in the West End; the sixties and seventies were markedly prosperous, while land and building materials remained cheap.(17)

Michael Booth's statement that the 'fact that provincials could come up to town easily was due to improvements in railway transportation' (18) requires brief elaboration. Before the 1866 Select Committee on Theatrical Licences and Regulations John Hollingshead testified that the growing audience was composed in part of 'the provincial people' who 'come up to town... every night'. (19) Certainly the network of suburban railways was by then well established, but throughout the sixties and seventies it was the combination of rail and road services that made the growth of the evening audiences possible. A further factor was the tolerance shown by the authorities to the 'parked' carriages, and the building of carriage parks close by a number of theatres. (20)

The railway companies had not been able to push their main lines further into the heart of the West End, and from the principal stations it was a considerable distance to the major theatres. If we take Covent Garden, the Haymarket and the Gaiety (in the Strand) as houses occupying three key positions in the West End, then it is interesting to note how far it would have been for the suburban theatre-goer to walk from the principal stations. The

distances are given in the London Dictionary and Guide Book, 1879:

	Covent Garden	Haymarket	Gaiety
Charing Cross (S.E.R.)	946	655	754
Euston (L.and N.W.R.)	2562	3261	2925
Kings Cross (G.N.R.)	2766	3652	3084
Liverpool Street (G.E.R.)	3732	4533	3391
London Bridge (B. and S.C.)	3603	4369	3291
Paddington (G.W.R.)	4762	4283	5125
St. Pancras (M.R.)	2506	3392	2824
Victoria (B.and S.C.R.)	3382	2301	3246
Waterloo (L.and S.W.R.)	1296	2267	984

Distances measured in yards.

(21)

It makes little sense to talk of an average distance from a station to a West End theatre, but it is the case that if 9 people arrived at each theatre above, having each walked from a different station, the distance walked to and from the theatre would average 3 miles 640 yards. Plainly the suburban theatre-goers relied upon cabs, and the omnibus service. The underground system consisted only of that track which we now call the Circle, and did not therefore provide access for arrivals at the main line stations to the majority of the theatres ; indeed when there existed a link it was an exceedingly circuitous route.

Cabs were available at the stations and it is likely that the journey each way, excluding tip, would have cost one shilling.[22] An omnibus would have been less expensive. There were 99 omnibuses still working in London after 11p.m.,[23] apart from those who in 1879 were, as small private proprietors, running their vehicles 'more or less at discretion'.[24] The charge would normally have been in the region of 4d. each way ; the shortest distances were 1d.and to go 'all the way' on a longer trip, from Kew Bridge to Fleet Street, for example, was 1/-. The majority of theatre-goers would probably be catching the last omnibus to their stations. More than half of those whose destination was a main line station began their last journey at 10.40 p.m.

or at 10.50 [25] So although the links existed we should note that the railways did not quite make it all as easy for the suburban theatre-goer as some historians have asserted ; there was additional expense, some likely discomfort and even some anxiety about whether the last train home could be caught.

The suburbanite was certainly better informed than he had ever been about the attractions of theatre. The 'taxes on knowledge' were lifted by the passing of the Newspaper Duties Bill on June 30th. 1855, and by the freeing of the duty on paper on 1st. October 1861. Thus newspapers were much cheaper. A London Evening News was established as a penny newspaper on August 14th. 1855, but did not last long ; the second penny paper however did. In September of that year the Daily Telegraph came out at a penny, and soon had a circulation of 27,000. As the railways charged only a ½d. to carry a newspaper, there was a big drive to increase suburban and country sales, and this was increased when, in 1870, Parliament established a ½d. rate for the postage of all newspapers. [26] By 1870 there were 99 dailies - as against 14 in 1846 - and 626 magazines. The growing theatre played a central role in them through advertisement, gossip, and critiques which now appeared the morning after a 'first night'. It was not surprising that in 1871 Thomas Purnell was able to say that the chief supporters of the theatre were country people, 'incited (sic) by the advertisements and criticism that they have seen in the London papers.' [27]

Conditions were therefore ripe for theatrical speculation, and the 15 theatres Bancroft mentioned all enjoyed some successes. The average capacity of the theatres named was 973, and the largest of them, the Playhouse, accommodated only 1,500. [28] That they were much smaller is not due to blind emulation of the Bancrofts' work at the Prince of Wales's, but derives rather from a wish to build a theatre in which both backstage and front of house working costs, which had soared in London, and which had been one factor in Phelps' retirement from Sadler's Wells in 1862, could be kept low. [29] It derives too from a wish to avoid 'papering the house' as managers had frequently been forced to do in the cavernous patent houses, and from a wish to extend runs of productions so that increasingly scattered potential audience members could register the production's excellence and book in advance for it. The smaller theatre seemed to offer therefore a degree of increased stability and lower expenditure to the managers, and to these topics we return below (2:d).

Success was by no means automatic however, and although there was a further spate of theatre building around the turn of the century, there were failures, as Bancroft acknowledges:

'Of those fifteen seven have now ceased to exist ; but their places have been more than filled. In 1887, Edward Terry opened his theatre in the Strand, and subsequent years have seen the building of no less than fifteen others ; the new Court, the Shaftsbury, the Lyric, the Garrick, Daly's, the Duke of York's (originally called the Trafalgar Square Theatre), the Apollo, His Majesty's, Wyndham's, the New Theatre, the Scala, the Aldwych, the Waldorf, Hick's, and the Queen's.' (30)

In fact there were eight, not seven, 'failures' from Bancroft's original list before the date of that assessment's publication. At one end of the spectrum were the clear speculations, buildings put up cheaply to take a quick profit ; at the other end were buildings genuinely trapped by London County Council's rebuilding schemes, or built to mistaken size or dimensions. Sherson, whose work predates Mander and Mitchenson's considerably and informs it , concludes clearly that 'there does not seem to be much doubt' that the projectors of the Opera Comique (closed 1899) and the Globe (closed 1902) ran up the buildings 'as cheaply as possible' knowing in advance of the Aldwych development, and the likely profits to be made 'when the time should come for an order for their destruction'.(31) Of the others the Court (1887), the Imperial (1907) and Toole's (1895) were demolished more or less by unlucky chance to make way for rebuilding of wider roads or, in the case of the last-named, for a hospital extension. The Gaiety (1903) was demolished by the Council as a part of the building of the Aldwych, but was at once rebuilt close by, and with a more brazen and showy exterior.(32) The Imperial (1907) suffered the curious fate of being sold by Mrs Langtry to Wesleyan methodists who sold it in turn to a dockside company who re-erected it in Canning Town as the 'Music Hall of Dockland'.(33)

Bancroft mentions fifteen 'replacement' theatres, and seven of them were built during the period of this study. They were Terry's (built 1887), the new Court (1888), the Shaftsbury (1888), the Lyric (1888), the Garrick (1889),Daly's (1893) and Wyndhams (1899).The average seating capacity was 931. This means that the average seating capacity in theatres built between 1867 and 1899 in the centre of London is _circa_ 950.

If the first significant feature of this building boom is the relative agreement over the correct size for a modern theatre, the second is the agreement over the right place to build them. Entrepreneurs had no doubt that the West End was the correct location, and there were four reasons for this. i) The popular press invested the area with a self-propagating glamour ; once sited there, a theatre was automatically invested with an

aura to which its own existence automatically contributed, ii) the transport system was increasingly centered, in the evenings, upon that central area ; theatre proprietors were like other London businessmen well aware of plans to extend the underground, although in fact Piccadilly, Leicester Square and Trafalgar Square Stations did not finally open until 1906, iii) as business, particularly shoppers, concentrated upon the West End so managers recognised the importance of the 'passing trade', particularly as booking facilities could be extended in tandem with the lengthening runs; gas-lit illuminated lettering made its appearance, and Dr. Rees has found that in 1870 single-lined letters could as example be bought for such a purpose for 11s. each: (34) Theatre fronts, built in approved Grecian or Empire style, became aesthetically disfigured by lurid banners, illuminated signs and hanging boards, trying to attract the 'flocks' of people whom Leverton noticed were drifting around 'trying to get in anywhere', (35) iv) finally, there were professional merits in the managers and leading actors gathering together to ply their trade in one area, for broadly the same reasons that other professions found it advantageous to club together in other areas of London - ease of communication, easy access to basic materials, and a greater ease in making common cause either to oppose unwelcome legislation or to attract more attention or trade.

The West End clubs themselves play a significant part in the growth of the West End ; their centrality helps to explain the relative secrecy surrounding many of the business deals (a gentleman will give his word in his club, and it is his bond, but he will write nothing down) and is probably a factor in the virtual exclusion of women from the higher reaches of theatre management in the period (see 1 above). The clubs with large theatre managements recur in the books of reminiscence, and no manager seems to have stood totally apart from them. It is one sign both of the growing status of the profession, and of its increasing affluence, that managers played such a part. With the Beefsteak we deal later (2:e below) but a remarkable feature of the other frequently mentioned 'theatre' clubs is their relatively high cost to members. The Garrick had an annual subscription of £8.8s. and a 'variable' joining fee. The Arts had an entrance fee of £10.10s., and an annual subscription of £6.6s.. The Green Room Club had an annual subscription of £3.3s. ; the Savage had one of £3.3s. also, but an entrance fee of £5.5s., as did the Hogarth. In each case the subscription was larger than the weekly wage of most younger actors. They were however open to Hollingshead, Bancroft, Kendal, Hare, Edwardes and Alexander, and important deals were carried through in them. Irving, whose restoration of the old Beefsteak created an inner cabal of theatre

management, and Tree provide further powerful examples of the West End's dependance upon male clubs.

If the Haymarket may be taken as the 'typical' West End theatre at the beginning of our period, then the theatre built and opened right at its termination, Wyndham's, may be taken as the archetypal West End theatre at the turn of the century. Its capacity was actually reduced during planning and building. When it opened, in November 1899, the Era of the 18th. November 1899 remarked upon its relative compactness, and safety:

> 'The house is not very large, being built on a site of only 7,000 square feet. The reserved portion includes twelve private boxes, 157 stalls, 180 dress circle and 180 family circle seats. The pit is small, but particularly good, and the gallery is large and admirably planned. The theatre being isolated, the exits from the various parts of the house are many and direct.'

This last theatre built in our period is noteworthy in other ways i) it underlines a shift in the focus of the West End from the Strand over to Shaftsbury Avenue, and ii) it stands as a further symbol of the growing status of the theatrical manager, for the Prime Minister had only agreed to a building of a theatre on so important a site if the manager Charles Wyndham were entrusted with its operation. No such high-level confidence in the powers of a theatrical manager would have been found in the 1840s.

2:b The apportionment of the auditorium

In World Theatre Bamber Gascoigne gives a useful, though brief, summary of the modifications to the theatre auditorium in the nineteenth century:

> 'In London the march of respectability went roughly as follows: in the late 1820s a few rows of more comfortable seats appeared in front of the ordinary benches of the pit and were called stalls ; at much the same time a system of reserved seats was introduced, which would lead to a far more organised arrangement of the auditorium instead of the old system by which a spectator battled for any space he could secure on unnumbered benches ; also around this time the galleries with their open boxes began to split into two very distinct areas. Closed boxes near the stage for those who wanted privacy and a more convenient open gallery for the rest ; the term 'dress circle' was first used in 1822. By about 1880 the stalls reached the back of the more important theatres.' (36)

The difficulty with this description is that it perforce describes a 'march' which is in one direction. It was not so. First, because the apportionment was fluid. Until the demise of the Benefit system (2:e below), it remained common to 'lay the pit into the boxes' on those occasions. On other occasions the seating could continue to be altered ; for example, on the last night of their Haymarket management the Bancrofts removed the stall and balcony armchairs and put smaller ones in their places. It was the case that theatres in any case marched at radically different speeds and no generalisation will satisfactorily contain them all in this respect ; in some theatres a good 'run', or other unusual circumstance certainly accelerated that march. Thus, well before 1880 the Lyceum had stall seats reaching the back of the theatre ; in 1856, when the theatre was showing the work of Madame Ristori's Italian company, so experienced a playgoer as Henry Crabb Robinson was astonished to find how far the expensive stall seats had spread through the theatre:

> 'accompanied Leach then to the Lyceum - not knowing that the <u>Pit</u> begins only under the front boxes - All the rest being filled with chairs at 20/- I sat in a 5/- chair behind in the dark - I could hear nothing - And I had no pleasure.' (37)

It is noteworthy that in the same year the Lyceum divided the gallery and, following the precedent set by Covent Garden, introduced amphitheatre stalls.

Some theatres marched in the opposite direction entirely. Following the 'abandonment of the pit' at the Haymarket in 1880 - with which we deal below - four theatres were in fact built <u>with</u> a pit during the next twenty years. They were the Royal Court (opened 1888, with a Pit holding 611), the Shaftsbury (opened 1888, with a Pit of 278), Lyric (1888, Pit 180) and Wyndham's (1899, Pit 120) In those four theatres, the stalls respectively numbered 148, 177, 178 and 157, and were an average of 21.3% of seated capacity, scarcely different from the average of 19 per cent of stall seats in all London theatres registered more than twenty years before in the <u>Report of the Select Committee on Theatrical Licences and Regulations : 1866</u> (38)

The variation in the ways managers chose to divide auditoriums is a clear indication that there were many other factors involved than the purely economic. Nevertheless in announcing the banishment of the pit and its replacement by stalls for the opening of the Haymarket management on January 31st. 1880, Bancroft claimed it was a simple economic necessity:

> 'As some disappointment may be felt at the abolition of the pit, Mr and Mrs Bancroft deem it necessary to explain the alteration. With the present expense of a first-class theatre it is impossible to give

up the floor of the house - its most remunerative portion - to low-priced seats, and the management, being unwilling to place any part of the audience in close and confined space under the balcony, the only alternative was to allot the frequenters of the pit the tier usually devoted to the upper boxes, and now called the second circle. In carrying out the structural alterations of the theatre Mr. and Mrs. Bancroft have, they hope, especially attended to the comfort of visitors to these seats,by raising the ceiling, building a new stone staircase, a refreshment room, and by removing all obstacles to a clear view of the stage.' (39)

Arguably the intention of the Bancrofts was to <u>make</u> the floor of the house extremely renumerative, and we might notice that even in that carefully worded announcement there is something of an air of social reform about it , for the 'frequenters of the pit' become the 'visitors to these seats' when they ascend their new stone staircase; but is it true that it would have been 'impossible' to finance their seasons in any other way?

As a part of his bargain with J.S.Clarke and the proprietors, Bancroft had agreed to spend 'not less than' £10,000 on the theatre exterior, and in fact he finally spent £20,000. The rent was fixed at an annual sum slightly below £5,000. (40) He took the lease for the remainder of Clarke's time but had an extra ten years added, and so plainly was expecting a long management. If we assume that he made rough calculations over a five year period, and if we assume the Bancrofts' figures of the nightly expenses are broadly correct (41), then we can calculate a notional income that he might have considered necessary;

	Figures for one year.
Annual rental (say)	£5,000
Capital cost of conversion spread equally over 5 years	£4,000
'Nightly expenses' at average £110, 6 performances a week on average for,say, 40 weeks	£26,400
Notional profit margin,say	£5,000
Total	£40,400

In crude terms therefore the new managers might have been looking for an average weekly income of £1,010. The capacity of the reconstructed Haymarket was 1,159. If for the moment we exclude the income from the 'floor of the house' and apply to the other portions of the theatre the prevailing West End prices, the income would have been derived from the following:

Area, in adapted Haymarket, 1879	West End Price in Similar Theatre	Maximum Income £	s	d
Balcony (172 places)	5s.	43	0	0
1st. Circle (187 places)	6s.	56	2	0
2nd. Circle (174 places)	3s.	26	2	0
Gallery (244 places)	1s.	12	4	0
Boxes (Assumed 14 for 6 persons at the higher price, and 12 for 4 at the lower - 132 places)	£2.2s £3.3s	69	6	0
		206	14	0

In order to reach the required weekly sum, the average receipt at each performance would have to be $\frac{£1010}{6}$ = £168.6s.8d. If we then make the assumption that before embarking upon their management in a much larger theatre and recognising the formidable opposition from Hare and Kendal at the nearby St. James's Theatre in King Street, and from the less stable offerings of Her Majesty's opposite, the Bancrofts were not sure of the extent of their support (certainly Bancroft saw the relationship with Hare and Kendal in competitive terms [42]), we might assume that they considered what the financial position would be if they averaged as low as 60% of capacity over their five seasons. If we then work out the income that would have to be taken daily from the 'floor', the calculation is as follows (x = Income to be derived from the 'floor'):

$$£168.6s.8d. = \frac{60 \times £206.14s.0d.}{100} + x$$

$$\therefore x = £168.6s.8d. - £124.0s.6d.$$

$$\therefore x = \underline{£44.6s.2d}.$$

If some such calculation were made by the Bancrofts then it is clear that there is no imperative to derive a high income from new stalls. The actual stall capacity of the adapted Haymarket was 249. If we assume that the same space under the old pit conditions would have accommodated twice as many people, and that the admission were 3s., then a 60% capacity house would have yielded £44.16s.5d. at each performance, enough to balance the budget. A 60% capacity of the 249 stall seats at 10s. on the other hand yields £74.14s. 0d. at each performance. [43] Over a season this would add to the notional profit of £5,000 (that we allowed for) a further £7,294.

Such calculations are speculative, but give an indication that on financial grounds there was no imperative to create the exclusive stalls. Indeed in the event, in spite of the 'much harder work' the shorter runs were claimed to need – although the programme was largely revivals – the Bancrofts had made at the end of six months £5,000 profit on the revival of Robertson's School and £10,000 on Bulwer-Lytton's Money. They were indeed, 5 years later able to retire early from management, having made £180,000 net profit over twenty years' management. (44)

The extent of their profits from the Haymarket seems to have genuinely surprised the Bancrofts, and it cannot be assumed that their alterations to the theatre were wrought with substantial profit solely in view. The other reasons were i) artistic, ii) social and iii) concerned with their own status. Artistically, they had presented work from the first to a middle class audience, and it was that audience they expected to attract to the Haymarket, and which would decidedly be the best and most sympathetic one for their plays ; the behaviour of the pit (as the commotion on the opening night showed) was not always decorous, and their tolerance of the genteel qualities of the 'cup and saucer comedy' was likely to be lower than that of the occupants of the new stalls. Intermingled with that artistic decision is however the clear desire to make the Haymarket the most fashionable theatre in London. In turn , although Bancroft characterises his relationships with Hare as 'amicable emulation' (45) this led to a degree of conscious rivalry with other theatres considering themselves more or less fashionable than the Haymarket ; plainly the Bancrofts were concerned that their status should be pre-eminent.

That mixture of reasons for the pit's abolition was clearly understood by the profession. In its issue of March 1st. 1880 The Theatre carries (pp.129–142) a lengthy symposium with the title Is the Pit an Institution or an Excrescence?, in which the financial, social and cultural aspects of the pit's 'abolition' are thoroughly discussed. Although the contributors discuss the proposition in general terms, the reviewer of Money in the same edition (pp.175–179) personalises his dislike of the decision, and is dubious of Bancroft's public reason: 'I don't myself look upon the matter solely as one of financial policy, but of art interest'. The reviewer was in fact the Editor (below).

Frank Marshall, the first contributor, remarks acidly that 'until the other day' he had not known that the ground floor 'was supposed to be the most renumerative or expensive part of a house.' His argument is that art is lost in the intensified social activity of expensive stalls:

> 'The cheaper price is paid by those who come solely to enjoy the entertainment, and therefore devote their whole attention to

> what is being said or done on the stage, and not, as their more fashionable rivals, to what is being done or said around them'. (p.130)

He doubts whether Bancroft's financial argument holds water, pointing out that a judicious mixture of stalls and pit could yield more, but his opposition rests upon the passivity of the stalls audience:

> 'Granted that the ten-shilling audience will pay as much attention to the acting as they will to the dresses and stage decorations, their inability to express the enthusiasm which,doubtless, they feel at the artistic representation set before them, paralyses the artists' energies and inclines them insensibly to exaggeration when they wish to produce an extraordinary effect ; for too little applause is just as hurtful as too much.' (p.131)

Interestingly the second contributor is John Hollingshead, whose management of the Gaiety (1868-1886) is one to which we pay attention below. His piece is an exposition of the heavy expenses of management, and is badly informed about the Bancrofts' actual position, saying that his 'friend, Mr Bancroft, takes the Haymarket Theatre at a very heavy rental, on a not very long lease, and thoroughly rebuilds it at a 'cost which will probably represent a charge of ten pounds a night as long as he remains in possession'.' (As we have seen above, the rental was below £5000. He had a lease of more than ten years. Ten pounds a night , distributed through the lease Bancroft had in fact negotiated, would have meant that the rebuilding had cost in excess of £30,000. In fact it finally totalled £20,000).

Hollingshead's views become clearer later when, after admitting that the pit at the Haymarket had been a good vantage point, he asserts that:

> 'The pit visitors enjoyed this place for fifty years at a too moderate price, while their wretched superiors (sic) were ricking their necks in the dress circle, or cramping their legs in the private boxes. Now the turn of the superiors has come, but who has any right to grumble?' (p.133)

H.J.Byron, who had himself been the manager of a theatre without a pit, prophecies failure for the 'experiment', pointing out that the 'stall audience' is for the most part away during the hot months of the year and that such an innovation would therefore tell against managers hoping to keep their theatres

open throughout the year. Ernest Bendall then (p.136) implies that the notion of a 'critical pit' is a romantic one and that, 'If Hazlitt and Charles Lamb were going to the play now, they would, I am convinced, not be found in the pit'.

The longest contribution, by the Editor of the journal, is the most sophisticated, and the most damning of the move. He quotes at length from his own 1874 article, A Plea for the Pit, in which he argues that 'the ten shilling stalls are the falsest of all false economies', and brings the argument up to date:

> 'If this were only a commercial question and nothing else, as some people imagine it is, there would be really nothing more to say about it. The management at the Haymarket can do what it likes with its own property, can paint its walls sky-blue or pea-green, or turn it topsy turvy if it chooses - no one doubts it ; but I must protest against the assertion that it is only to be argued by those who loll in the new stalls and not by those who are excluded from the old pit. As to Mr Bancroft's figures, I have nothing to do with them except to doubt them. 'When has the theatre ever paid?' he asked. I am informed by the very best authority that it has paid over and over again with a pit, when the plays and the acting have been of the first class.....Mr and Mrs Bancroft ought to be at the head of the first company of comedians in the country, and by that I mean a company acceptable to the public at large and not only to the upholders of a fashionable and fastidious exclusiveness.'
>
> (pp.139,140)

Scott, the Editor, is clear that he supports Marshall's view that the art will suffer; 'In proportion as applause has diminished in theatres, the art has become weaker and flabbier'. He concludes by saying that:

> 'No one can possibly believe that Mr and Mrs Bancroft had any other object than the advancement of art and the comfort of their patrons in instituting a reform that is of far deeper moment than is generally believed to be the case. That they were perfectly correct in their commercial estimate is shown by the crowded houses that have been seen at the Haymarket ever since the doors were opened.'
>
> (p.142)

If there was not at least a partial intention to make high profits, it may finally be asked why Bancroft did not at this stage, when Money was well

set upon its successful run, modify the lofty position he had taken. In fact he chose to remain silent; 'The large profits made by us at the Haymarket were, I think, as little suspected as known.' (46) However at the time of the symposium he was making an average net profit of £138.17s.9d. on each performance,(47) and it may be thought that his defenders who were stressing the high cost of theatre management should have been aware of this.

The argument about income from the 'floor' must not obscure the fact that in one sense Bancroft's change had been logical. By consent, the floor gave the best view at the Haymarket, and it might therefore be simply thought that this should therefore cost most, and, in succession, the less satisfactory views should cost less. Unfortunately for logic, the names of the parts of West End theatre carried with them associations of gentility, or of critical wisdom which overrode such simple ideas. For a mixture of social and sentimental reasons groups of the audience became attached to various parts of the theatre auditorium, although the reasons were incomprehensible to an outsider. Thus when Max Beerbohm paid his first, unsatisfactory, visit to a pit he found it hard to understand why all his life he had been reading proud letters to the press signed 'An Old Pittite' as he couldn't hear and could hardly see.(48) Yet the people were 'really glad to be there'. Similarly Stoker remarks that the pit crowd, on the occasion of the opening of Irving's Richard III on December 19th. 1896 at the Lyceum, contained many who were able to pay for 'better' seats:

> 'Many of those who waited at the pit door on first nights were young ladies and gentlemen and of course quite able to provide for themselves. But nothing would induce them to have a cup of tea until it was sent out to them by the management. That came to be a part of their cherished remembrance of such occasions, and was not to be foregone.' (49)

Whatever the mixture of motives may have been for Bancroft's decision, the resultant argument showed that sentimental attachment to one portion of the house overrode in many purchasers' minds consideration of simple 'value' in terms of sitting comfortably, and hearing and seeing clearly.

2:c Prices of admission

In the twenty years following the 1843 Act there was remarkable stability in admission prices. Before that there had been a 'general-downward trend' (50) Thus Phelps at Sadler's Wells, for instance, maintained his

charges from 1846 to the end of his management:

Dress Circle	3s.
Second Circle	2s.
Gallery	6d.
Pit	1s.
Boxes	£1.11s.6d.

He maintained throughout a policy of giving no free seats (except to the Press), and of charging all children in the pit. He did not admit children under three. (51)

In the sixties there is a divergance between managers on pricing policy. Theatre prices became more fluid, and although he did not raise them at the Wells, Phelps recognised later that it may be necessary, as a letter to his wife written in Bradford in 1869 shows:

> 'These small towns are worth nothing. Even with raising the prices (sic) £35, or at the utmost £40 is a great house. On Saturday, at Huddersfield, we turned them away, and yet, with 4s. boxes,etc., it did not quite reach £40, and Friday the same.' (52)

In London, prices moved in the sixties according to the class and volume of audience the managers hoped to attract. Thus Miss Marriott and Robert Edgar, competing for custom in an area which had more Music Halls than any other area of like size in London, reduced prices at the Wells in 1863. They produced 3s. stalls in front of the pit, and reduced the dress circle to 2s.6d. With fluctuating audiences they tried in 1865 raising the circle prices once more to 3s. and reducing the stalls to 2s. In 1866, a year after the beginning of the Bancroft's successes at the Prince of Wales's, manager W.H.C.Nation introduced stalls with sprung stuffed seats and cushioned backs, and raised their price to 4s. (53)

Where the class of audience could be confidently predicted pricing was less erratic. At the Prince of Wales's, where clearly the intention was to attract a new audience, all of theprices rose steadily. 'It was not long,' writes Bancroft, 'before we found it inevitable that prices should be raised throughout the theatre. Modest advances were made at first.' In practice, the Bancrofts teased prices up gradually throughout their management, always using the stalls as the touchstone of acceptability:

> 'The charge for admission to the stalls was first raised from six to seven shillings ; but it was on the occasion of the costly

production of The School for Scandal in 1874, that the boldest step throughout our management was taken in my resolve to raise the price of the stalls to ten shillings, and the charges to other parts accordingly.' (54)

Conveying that his decision was 'bold' and courageous, Bancroft asserts that his decision was soon followed by nearly every other manager in London:

> 'When our decision was conveyed by my business manager to Bond Street, one of the principal librarians remarked, 'Of course Mr Bancroft means for the first night only?' When informed that the alteration was 'for the future,' the answer was, 'Oh let Mr Bancroft have his way ; he will change his mind in a week!' Such however was not the case. The bold example was soon followed by the Gaiety Theatre , then by the Lyceum, and afterwards by nearly every manager in London.' (55)

Five years later a majority of West End managers had followed the practice. Some however had not, and some had exceeded the 10s. slightly. This move finally marked off West End pricing policies decisively from the minor theatres, as is shown by this table:

Prices of stall seats 1879

West End theatres	
Adelphi	10s.6d.
Alhambra	6s.0d.
Court	10s.0d.
Criterion	7s.6d. and 10s.
Folly	10s.6d.
Gaiety	10s.0d.
Globe	10s.6d.
Haymarket	10s.0d.
Lyceum	10s.0d.
Olympic	7s.6d.
Opera Comique	10s.0d.
Prince of Wales's	10s.0d.
Princess's	7s.0d.

Other Theatres	
Brittania, Hoxton	1s.
East London, Whitechapel	1s.
Elephant and Castle, New Kent Rd.	2s.
Grecian, City Rd.	3s.
Park, Camden Town	4s.
Pavilion, Whitechapel Rd.	1s.
Philharmonic, Islington	3s.
Standard, High S.. E.	4s.
Victoria, New Cut	1s.

In the late seventies there was serious concern that by regarding the stalls slavishly as the touchstone of what price was acceptable to the privileged and raising the rest of the house accordingly was driving out not only the poor, but the lower middle class, the suburbanite young-marrieds and the very groups the theatre should seek to attract. In The Theatre of September 1878 an editorial piece expresses cautious alarm about the upward spiral of West End theatre prices. (pp.99-103). It is acknowledged that costs are also rising, but 'with all this he has at hand singularly ready means of meeting his growing expenses, as may be judged by the fact that the recent addition made at many houses to the price of their stalls implies in some instances an increased profit of nearly £100 a week.' A married man with an income of 'something under four hundred a year', should he wish to take his wife to the theatre, faces the cost of two seats in the dress circle at a 'cost of ten or perhaps twelve shillings', with in most instances 'an extra shilling for booking', a further sixpence for the programme, sixpence each in the cloakroom, and when travel and refreshment are added, 'we shall find the night's amusement leaves very little change out of a sovereign.' This class of person, the writer argues, is precisely the kind the theatre needs to attract:

> 'The class of playgoers kept away by the considerations which we have named is, we contend, the very one which in the long run will most certainly and most seriously be missed. It includes the backbone of the educated and taste-possessing people for whose return to the play-house we have for so long been hoping against hope. It includes professional men, and artists, and authors, and students of every kind except the small minority which has made out of art, or science, or study, an income equal to that of the uncultured tradesman.'
> (p.102)

The writer does not offer radical solutions, but offers the following suggestions (p.102) ; i) that a proportion of the pit should be reserved, at an increased price, ii) the price of the dress circle be reduced, iii) that programmes be given free, iv) that theatres universally adopt the practice of adding no charge for booking services, v) that there should be no tipping, vi) that refreshment saloons should lower their prices.

No suggestion was made of anything as radical as a single pricing policy - unthinkable in a society so layered in classes - but it is interesting to note nevertheless how in the seventies some theatres kept a wide 'spread' of prices, while others bunched prices together across a

smaller range. The following table expresses the range between the cheapest seat price (expressed as a factor of 1) and the most expensive in the theatres we took earlier as representative. Again the difference between the West End and Minor theatres is significant. West End managers mark out their higher-spending patrons more decisively:

Price Ranges in London theatres, 1879

West End Theatres		Other Theatres	
Adelphi	1 - 21	Brittania	1 - 4
Alhambra	1 - 12	East London	1 - 4
Court	1 - 10	Elephant and Castle	1 - 8
Criterion	1 - 10	Grecian	1 - 12
Folly	1 - 10.5	Park	1 - 8
Gaiety	1 - 20	Pavilion	1 - 4
Globe	1 - 10.5	Philharmonic	1 - 6
Haymarket	1 - 10	Standard	1 - 8
Lyceum	1 - 10	Victoria	1 - 1
Olympic	1 - 7.5		
Opera Comique	1 - 10		
Prince of Wales's	1 - 10		
Princess's	1 - 14		

The Victoria Theatre's standard admission charge of 1s. and the reasoning surrounding it interestingly foreshadows one strand of reasoning in the discussions about state subsidy for the theatre. It was in 1879 that Emma Cons took over the 'reformed music hall' (she opened it on Boxing Day, 1880, as the Royal Victoria Hall). One single low price is thus early associated with philanthropy. It was known to be uneconomic, but appropriate to a house open to all kinds of people, and with educational aims, and goals of social improvement. John Hollingshead, then successful manager of the Gaiety, was also involved in the idea, but as he was running a successful commercial house, felt it prudent to withdraw. 'My connection with the Gaiety Theatre,' he wrote (56), 'was not considered a good and safe qualification for me to take a leading part in carrying out my idea.' We can thus see foreshadowed the division between 'commercial' and 'subsidised' philosophies, and theatre 'pricing axioms'.

Stoker and Irving did not, in the eighties, either follow the Bancrofts' lead in abolishing the pit, nor did they dramatically raise any of the Lyceum prices. The prices for the expensive production of

Faust, which opened on December 19th., 1885, offer an interesting comparison with those of Phelps almost forty years before. Where direct comparisons can be made the seats are twice as expensive. (The Sadler's Wells prices of the forties are given in brackets as a reminder):

Seat Prices

	Lyceum 1885	Sadler's Wells 1840s
Dress Circle	6s. 6d.	(3s.0d.)
Upper Circle	4s. 0d.	(2s.0d.)
Gallery	1s. 0d.	(6d.)
Pit	2s. 0d.	(1s.0d.)
Boxes	£2.2s to £4.4s.	(£1.11.6d.)
Stalls	10s.6d.	Nil.
Amphitheatre	2s. 0d.	Nil.

In the broadest terms such a comparison indicates the essential transformation in seat pricing. For the similar parts of the auditorium prices more or less doubled in the West End ; they then crept up very slightly (in some theatres not at all) by the turn of the century. The new areas, particularly the stalls, were generally expensive. Theatres overall were usually worth rather more than twice their receipt of the forties and fifties by 1899. (57)

It is interesting to note that it was not only in the widely differing price ranges that the West End marked itself out from the minor theatres. It could be said to resent the low prices in two ways. First, because the low prices were an economic threat (as early as 1846 even the manager of the Surrey had asked the Lord Chamberlain to intervene to prevent low pricing by smaller venues). (58) Second, because pricing was, if too low, too like vulgar 'trade', and the flaunting of low prices had the wrong associations ; accordingly, by the 1890s not one 'straight' West End theatre advertised its prices in its newspaper advertisements. (59) Instead, like the superior stores of central London, they advertised the name of their (box office) managers. Thus the names of Mr. Turner (Her Majesty's), Mr.Abbott (The Garrick), Mr. Scarlsbrick (The Lyceum), Hr Holmes (Globe) and Mr Ayrson (The Strand) were better known to their middle class patrons than were such vulgar matters as the precise cost of a stall seat. (60)

Throughout the period the tendency is to i) shorten the programme, and ii) first cut down, and then eliminate the policy of allowing 'half price after nine o' clock'. Both moves seem on the surface to be removing potential sources of income by both cutting the extra admission money from the latecomers, and cutting possible income from sale of interval refreshments. As so often the Bancrofts are clear that they inaugurated the era of the 'single'play;'it was also one of our innovations,' as Bancroft writes, 'to allow a single play to form the entire programme - a thing unknown before.' The significance of the move however lies in whether it can be seen as a case of social cachet taking precedence over possible additional income.

It is significant that in The Bancrofts ; Recollections of Sixty Years, the remark about the single play is given (p. 91) in the context of a description of the 'radical' improvement of raising seat prices, which led (p.92) to a 'house thronged with intellectual and cultured adherents, many of whom were by no means theatre-goers as a general rule.' It is therefore interesting that a careful perusal of the programmes for Phelps' Sadler's Wells management, when the 'half price' was still in vogue, shows that the lighter pieces were more usually given first - one must presume to the intellectual and cultured - and that the more serious pieces were played later when the audience presumably included the working class theatregoers freed from the daily shift. The indication is therefore that the North Londoners had not, prior to the sixties, proved that it was necessary to shorten the programme and exclude the half-price audience in order to raise standards. Rather does it seem to have been necessary to do that, and to permit the loss of some extra income from interval sales, to create the kind of salon atmosphere that the Bancrofts, and their various followers, required. In the same section of their book (p.92) is the revealing description of what they meant by one of their true principles of management, respect for the audience. Their audience were visitors whose 'good-will it was sought to conciliate'. Important was the fact that they were not 'the prey' of people wishing to sell them more inside the auditorium, and also that they were not 'packed and squeezed into seats'. The higher prices, single programme and the removal of the 'half price' together therefore bring i) a more elegant and less mercenary notion of service, and ii) exclusivity. Not only the timing of the start of the single play programme, but the manner of its presentation made it more difficult for the factory worker to afford the time, money and the stress upon his social graces, that visiting the theatre now demanded.

2:d The length of the run

Michael Booth points out that as the potential audience grew so long runs became commoner:

> 'In the 1850s only 15 productions of all kinds ran for 100 consecutive nights or more ; in the 1860s. there were 45 and in the 1870s 107. The longest run of the fifties was 150 nights for A Midsummer Night's Dream : in the sixties The Ticket of Leave Man ran for 407 performances, Our Boys in the seventies for 1,362.'
>
> (61)

The point is taken, although later research modifies the figures:

1840s *	5
1850s	16
1860s	52
1870s	107
1880s	157
1890s	169

*All after 1843. (62)

The general impression of growth requires further qualification. To choose only the longest running may be misleading, for Our Boys was for example quite exceptional, having almost twice as many performances as the next longest running show, H.M.S.Pinafore, which had 700. In the 1880s the longest run was a mere 931 performances, but this by no means indicates that runs in general were getting shorter. It is more helpful to notice that the trend to longer runs is a general one, and there is increase in shows running more than 200 performances, and more than 300:

	Over 200 Perfs.	Over 300 Perfs.
1840s	1	0
1850s	0	0
1860s	11	6
1870s	25	9
1880s	46	22
1890s	58	24

The slight 'levelling off' in the nineties is explained by the fact that

the building 'boom' did not get under way until the second half of the decade and when the Garrick, Duke of York's, Daly's and Wyndham's had once again raised the number then long runs increased proportionately as this table indicates:

Number of runs of more than 100perfs in the 90s.

1890	15
1891	14
1892	16
1893	16
1894	16
1895	20
1896	22
1897	14
1898	16
1899	20

It is of greater significance to look at the sizes of the venues in which long runs were commonest. If Bancroft is right to say playing in the Haymarket, a large theatre, automatically implies shorter runs then we should expect the longer runs in each decade to be in the smaller theatres. Or if the profession learned its lesson truly from Bancroft then at least we should expect a correlation between long runs and small theatres in the latter decades. In fact the opposite is true, as this summary of all runs of more than 100 performances in all London theatres shows. The 'top six' are:

Runs of more than 100 performances

	Lowest capacity in period.	1840s	1850s	1860s	1870s	1880s	1890s	Total
1. Adelphi	1,500	1	2	6	6	7	11	33
2. Drury Lane	3,000	0	0	2	1	12	15	30
3. Lyceum	2,000	2	2	5	7	11	3	30
4. Strand	1,500	0	1	6	11	5	6	29
5. Haymarket	1,159	0	0	3	6	6	11	26
6. Vaudeville	1,000	0	0	0	9	11	5	25

This is no more than an indication because i) not all theatres operated throughout the period, ii) 100 is an arbitrary number - a run of 99 performances in bad

weather may count for more than one of 101 in good, iii) it penalises the very long run by only counting it once. Nevertheless with that proviso in mind the link would seem to be between long runs and larger houses. The general 'successes' of each decade are given in another table overleaf, and from that it may be seen that although the Prince of Wales's does indeed score highly in the 60s and 70s, it thereafter is not successful, and inaugurates no trend. We may assume that it is the lower running costs of smaller theatres., their appropriateness for the new styles of realism, and the fact that they better accorded with the new buildings legislation that attracted entrepreneurs to the idea of small houses ; the theory about long runs probably did not. As we shall see (in 4, below) all managers did not place much reliance upon the value of long runs in spreading production costs, and although they developed some notion of a delayed 'break even' point, they considered their budgets differently. It would not have been a current premise in arguments about the 'ideal' size of a theatre.

The managers in the 80s and 90s came however to believe in the 'knock on' effect, came to believe that there was more merit in staying close together than in spreading their attractions and that one success, far from emptying neighbouring theatres, helped create others in them. Certainly too much can be made of the nineteenth century manager's wish to operate his theatre in and around the West End because it was 'refined'. So were many of the suburbs refined; whereas the area around Drury Lane for example was among the least salubrious parts of London. Nearly all new theatres were built either around the Strand or, later, around Shaftsbury Avenue, and the long runs are predominately where the theatres are most thickly clustered. Thus in the 80s the most popular theatres are all within walking distance of each other – Drury Lane, the Lyceum, Vaudeville, Toole's and the Savoy were in fact so arranged that one could walk round them always seeing the advertisements of the next theatre as you leave the box office of the former. That clustering for the most part still existed in the 90s, although now there is a second grouping – the Comedy and Lyric joining the Haymarket and St. James to create an elegant new grouping around the (then fashionable) Piccadilly Circus. There were of course a group of 'midway' theatres which could benefit from the prosperity of either group – the Garrick, Wyndhams and Daly's.

Interestingly the theatre that most seemed to benefit was the bijou theatre which the 'electric light comedian' Wyndham ran, the

Most runs over 100 perfs. in each Decade

1840s		1850s		1860s		1870s		1880s		1890s		
Lyceum	2	Astley's	4	Royalty	9	Prince of Wls.	13	Drury Lane	12	Drury Lane	15	1
Astley's	2	Olympic	3	Adelphi	6	Strand	11	Lyceum	11	Savoy	12	2
Adelphi	1	Lyceum	2	Lyceum	5	Vaudeville	11	Vaudeville	11	Haymarket	11	3
		Adelphi	2	Princess's	4	Toole's	9	Toole's	9	Adelphi	11	4
		Princess's	2	Haymarket	3	Savoy	9	Savoy	9	Comedy	9	5
				Drury Lane	2	Criterion	9	Criterion	9	Lyric	9	6
				Olympic	2	Comedy	9	Comedy	9	St. James's	7	7
						Princess's	9	Princess's	9	Court	7	8
								Adelphi	7	Criterion	6	9
								St. James's	7	Strand	6	10
										Vaudeville	5	11
										Toole's	4	12

Criterion, which had 15 runs of more than 100 performances in the last 20 years of the century.

Plainly no advantage in siting could overcome the disadvantage of a bad production. There is however some reason to doubt whether some good productions could overcome the disadvantages of playing in badly-sited and unfashionable theatres. If we look for the characteristics of long-running pieces we shall find in general that long runs were achieved by known quantities (the period is punctuated by successful revivals, and with revivals of revivals), by patriotic pieces well spiced with comedy, with light musical shows and with pantomime. Appendix 3 to the study lists all long-running productions for the period, and from that it is possible to assemble some of the major long runs, adding together performances at various revivals. It is not always likely to encourage the view that the better-behaved audiences were becoming more discriminating. The longest running shows include Our Boys (totalling 1,742 performances), Charley's Aunt (with its one phenomenal run of 1,466), The Mikado (some 1,146 in straightforward runs), H.M.S.Pinafore (a total of 994 performances in long runs) and the pantomimes, particularly Cinderella, Dick Whittington and Robinson Crusoe. In order to keep the growing West End in perspective it is important to remember that The Geisha at Daly's played in 1896 more than twice as many performances as Irving played in London of The Bells in his entire career. (The Geisha ran for 760 performances ; Irving's total London performances of The Bells was 319). It is salutary too to notice that the universally admired productions of Samuel Phelps at the Wells could rarely be sustained for more than a few performances (in his opening season for example , the longest running plays were Lady of Lyons, 32 performances, The Bridal,30, Hamlet, 28, and Richard the Third,24). Excellence did not compensate for being outside the charmed circle.

Finally, the attraction of the actor-managers themselves was the major factor in a long run. An'unknown'piece such as Faust can be exceptionally popular with Irving in it (performed in London 577 times in total) but when,after a highly successful first night of Richard III Irving slipped and injured a leg, the piece was immediately withdrawn by the management, notwithstanding attractions of theatre, author and other leading players.(63) We do not know whether the 'star' attraction of leading actor managers could have regularly drawn audiences to theatres outside the West End, as is the case today, because in our period, although they toured the provinces, they were careful not to leave the area which Punch referred to whimsically as 'London's Theatreland' , to play with their companies in other parts of the capital.

2:e Income from sources other than tickets

The various 'additions' to the price of the ticket complained of in The Theatre of September 1878 (2:c above) were all potential sources of income for the management. A 'booking charge' was common at the time of the 1843 Act and continued to be practised by some theatres, as well as the libraries, until the end of our period - although some theatres in the sixties and a majority by the late seventies were proclaiming that they charged 'No Fees of any Kind'.

Charges for the playbills - later the programmes - were, and continue to be, a source of argument amongst managers. The playbill which was printed each day, and dated, served also as a 'programme' of the play for theatregoers in addition to its appearance for advertising purposes.(64) In the first fifteen years of our period two factors combine to make it large and unwieldy. i) The development of plate glass, and the large areas of boarding for billposters left by the developers of central London in the 40s and 50s as they contained their numerous building sites, both called for larger bills - to be seen distantly in the newer shop windows and across streets in and around the West End. ii) The information contained on the bills became more wordy. Scene painters' names were included, together with ambitious descriptions of scenic effects. Some managers wrote about their productions at length, notably Charles Kean, whose playbills measured 30" x 20" and were folded in three within the Princess's theatre. There were various attempts to serve playgoers with something less bulky, The Tatler for example contained the casts for each evening and was for a time sold (for 2d.) at London theatres, and was with its criticism and general articles the forerunner of the magazine programme which followed in the 70s.(65) Finally the Olympic began, about 1850, the practice of selling a separately printed folded sheet containing, in less bold type, essentially the same information that was to be found on the bills outside. The St. James's Theatre issued the first proper magazine programme in 1869, which contained material advertising refreshments, speciality shops and omnibus routes.

The advertisements enabled managers to 'give' the programmes away, for printing costs were (presumably ; very little evidence remains) met by the advertisers. Thus John Hollingshead's Gaiety Theatre programmes have five full pages of advertisements, but were given free in the auditorium. On occasion too an outside concern, even a purely commercial organisation, would undertake the printing of the programme in return for advertising. Thus 'Eugene Rimmel, Perfumiers of London and Paris' printed many perfumed programmes for West End theatres in the 1860s and 1870s. 'Gala' programmes to celebrate a special

performance were often subsidised in this way, and publications such as the Tatler and Art Review brought out 'special editions'.[66]

In general however the programme is not in itself a reliable source of income for the West End manager. i) As the length of the run and the degree of support is unknown it is difficult to have the right number printed at any time and not be left with a useless stock, or caught without any for sale. ii) There are obvious stock control problems ; 'used' programmes can be re-sold (in the early years of this century managers 'closed' them with a small seal which had to be unbroken at sale, as a means of combatting this).iii) The income is in any event small, and taken by too many people at various doors for there to be easy effective control. Therefore it is manifestly easier for managers to gather income from selling advertising space and then give the programmes away. Social considerations still overrode such a system on occasion however. Between 1886 and 1896 the Haymarket, partly under Tree's management, provided 'free' cardboard programmes for stalls and dress circle and 'free' paper ones for the pit.[67]

Throughout the period the audiences grew to expect more and more complicated refreshment in and around the theatre they were visiting. All theatres had bars - with the obvious exception of the Royal Victoria - and in general these 'saloons' were situated on each level of the building, and were often rented out to a catering firm or brewery.[68] The sums of the subletting varied according to the size and location of the theatre ; the Actors' Cooperative that briefly ran Sadlers Wells from July to September 1889 sublet all saloons for £24 a month.[69] Stoker rented out the Lyceum saloons for £33.6s.8d.[70] Later the monthly rental for a West End theatre saloon complex seems to have risen to around £60. Not all managers however simply sublet ; some saw the catering, after our modern manner, as an integral part of the managerial style, and wished to retain complete control over it. On 22nd. December 1862 Boucicault opened a remodelled Astley's, as the Theatre Royal, Westminster, and it is interesting to see how catering was integrated in his planning:

> 'He converted the old 'ring' into an elaborate arrangement of stalls and pit ; the bygone Adelphi system of intermediate 'pit stalls' he also introduced. The immense size of the salle admitting of greater alterations, Mr. Boucicault placed between the stalls proper and the orchestra a sort of miniature garden of shrubs, flowers, and fountains, the effect of which in the hot weather was extremely pleasant. Adjoining the theatre, and on the site of what was known as 'Astley's Cottage,' Mr Boucicault had projected a vast café, which

was to be constructed of iron and glass with foyers for promenaders between the acts, and an open-air restaurant on the flat Moorish roof commanding a view of the river.' (71)

Lawsuits prevented this latter scheme from being fulfilled, but other London theatres had excellent restaurants on their premises. A good example was the first Gaiety theatre, which had the Gaiety restaurant (also open to the general public) on its premises.(72) The arrangement here was that it was managed by Spiers and Pond, who also ran the theatre's other bars.(73) It was in the sixties and seventies the fashion to eat dinner early, before the show - Frank Burnand recalls for example that 'Lincoln's Inn dinners were early - at five, I think, - and so it was quite easy for us 'students' to whom 'the play was the thing' for recreation, to be in the theatre for the commencement at seven'-(74) and numerous 'theatre restaurants' were opened in the growing West End offering a theatre meal at six o' clock. Among those commended by Charles Dickens Jnr. are the 'Albion', Great Russell Street, where 'during the season an excellent haunch of venison is served every Tuesday and Thursday at six O' clock', the 'Horseshoe', Tottenham Court Road, the 'Globe' in Coventry Street, and 'Bertolini's' in St. Martin's Street. The prices to the public varied from 2s.6d. to 4s. (75) A more exclusive class of restaurant numbered both theatregoers and the actor managers amongst its clientèle. Best known was Romano's Vaudeville Restaurant at 399, the Strand. An indication that the restaurant proprietors and managers recognised that they were good for each other's businesses is given by the fact that the managers often ate there for nothing, or had their 'slates' cancelled. (76) Other forms of public catering which developed around the West End were the chop and steak house grills in the late seventies, and the supper clubs, of which Evans's in the Strand was the best-known. There was late night entertainment in them for people who had visited or worked in the theatre, and Archer speaks with equal warmth of the madrigals and the potatoes 'in their jackets'.(77)

Primarily therefore theatregoers simply took drinks or ice cream in the somewhat stuffy interiors of the West End theatres and did not follow the audience at some Minor theatres in eating in the auditorium, but it is a mistake to think that until the end of the century there was nothing sold except alcohol - Dr. Rowell's assertion that Wyndham was the first London manager to offer his audience coffee in the intervals as well as strong liquor (78) is to take Wyndham's own boast a little too unquestioningly - for the Lyceum was offering ice cream and water ices as an attraction as early as

1835.[79] The Bancrofts are supposed to have 'introduced' coffee , and Lynton Hudson makes a partial claim for John Hare:

> 'It was significant that in 1878 at the Court Theatre, of which John Hare had become the lessee in 1875, bringing with him the genteel traditions of the Prince of Wales's, for the first time (sic) ices and coffee were handed around the pit in the intervals instead of the customary oranges and ginger beer.' (80)

It seems reasonable that by 1880 soft drinks, coffee and ices had been tried out in a number of establishments and (partly because of the growing number of women attending theatres) there were a variety of ways to drink, and to eat, in theatre catering. The major London firm of Spiers and Pond who had plainly done excellent business at the Gaiety, opened a 'Criterion Annexe' in that year. According to a contemporary advertisement it had a Cafe with American Bar and Beer Cellar, a Hall for Weddings (sic) , the Prince and Canarvon Rooms for Masonic Meetings etc., Smoking Room, Grill Room and a special 'French' restaurant. There were private rooms 'for smaller meetings'. Some rooms were plainly designed for using by families, or by groups of women, such as the Grand Hall which served Table d'Hote meals and which was open each day for teas and dinners, including Sundays. A complex and multi-layered catering service existed thus at the end of the 70s, and it is reasonable to assume that Spiers and Pond were basing their massive new investment on known market successes other than theirs at the Gaiety.

Catering services in and around the theatres existed for two (we assume equal) purposes. First, to give services to patrons who were increasingly travelling some distance to the theatres (2:a. above), and second, to gain profits from rentals or other business arrangements with brewers and catering firms. However the managers in addition used special dinners, dining clubs, hospitality at their clubs and hospitality in their theatres for other purposes which are in tandem with the public ones. The purposes of such entertaining were i) to further the admission into the 'intellectual' ranks of London society, and in so doing ii) to end any suspicion that they are managers in 'mere trade'(see 1,above), iii) to reinforce their images as highly successful entrepreneurs, and iv) to profit by the resultant publicity which would indicate that they had the higher civilised society at heart. Irving's dinners and receptions were of course particularly lavish . Stoker notes:

'Sometimes the Beefsteak Room, which could only seat at most thirty six people, was too small ; and at such times we migrated to the stage. These occasions were interesting, sometimes even in detail. On the hundredth night of The Merchant of Venice, February 14,1880, there was a supper for three hundred and fifty guests, On March 25th, 1882, ninety-two guests sat down to supper to celebrate the hundredth night of Romeo and Juliet.'

(81)

There was a particularly sumptuous reception on the occasion of the Queen's Jubilee, and even as late as 1896, when fortune had deserted the management, the usual lavish reception followed Richard III, when as usual, invitations were entirely verbal and there were between three and six hundred people on the stage. [82]

The payment for such lavish hospitality is met from the company, but of the seemingly endless minor bills for nightly hospitality there is no record. We may assume these were met in a number of ways:

i) When appropriate, from company expenses.

ii) On occasion, from Irving's own resources. He seems to have had no particular avarice, as is witnessed by his own modest salary (£70, a week) and his ackowledged generosity to former professional colleagues and to friends. [83]

iii) By an arrangement with the caterers. Certainly the letting fee when Irving was in residence was modest (see above) but when the theatre was sublet, the rental rises sharply. In the 'interim' season from 29th.July1895 to 25th.July 1896, the Saloons were rented out, during the brief subtenancy of Forbes Robertson and Wilson Barrett, at £1,003.6.8d., more than two and a half times the standard charge. (84)

iv) From the accounts of the Beefsteak Club. Membership of this exclusive club was officially high ; the Entrance Fee was £10.10s. and the subscription £4.4s. It may be assumed that there was some merging of official club hospitality and the simple use of the room - if for no other reason than that officially the Beefsteak did not permit guests and yet Irving regularly used the premises to entertain on his own behalf. As Stoker said, 'the ordinary hospitalities of the Beefsteak Room were simply endless'. [85]

We may also assume that whereas the receptions had a secondary effect on the general publicity for the theatre, the private hospitality was often concerned with the 'high finance' of the enterprise. Junior members of the Lyceum company were excluded, and seem to have recognised that it had a high financial purpose. Martin Harvey, who was by no means contented during his time at the Lyceum, said that although he was never officially admitted to the Beefsteak rooms, and that although tantalising smells of the midnight meal cooking would drift out on to the stairways leading to the company dressing room, he 'liked to picture the great man' seated there at the head of the long table, entertaining his distinguished friends. (86) It was no doubt at those meals that the subject of the loans that we discuss (4 below) would be broached with Irving's 'good friends'.

A further addition to the cost of an evening spent in the theatre complained of in the 1878 article is the habit of tipping staff, and the reciprocal practice of staff coming to demand it. Attempts to curtail this practice were made throughout the period, but it persisted. Ben Webster, during his period of management at the Adelphi (1844 -1874);

> 'made a laudible attempt to eliminate the 'fees' which had hitherto been insinuated by front-of-house staff, and tacitly allowed by theatre managements, into the price of seat reservations, programmes, refreshments, and anything else they could think of.'
>
> (87)

Trees programmes at Her Majesty's included the notice that 'The Management does not permit fees to be received by any attendant in the theatre, and hopes that the public will assist in enforcing this rule, which has been made for their comfort.' However it was plainly difficult. Tipping was a part of the middle class milieu in the fashionable emporiums of the capital, and by attracting that audience the managers were attracting their natural habits. By the end of the century the remonstrations were more bitter. G.B.Shaw inveighed against the practice in The Saturday Review (9th. April 1898) , stressing that it was a decadent West End practice and not found in decent theatres like the one at Hoxton, where the manager, Mrs Lane, was 'capable, self contained, practical' and vigilant. The hapless actor managers meanwhile resorted to sterner and sterner notices which are clearly trying to change the customers' behaviour rather than that of the staff. Thus Hare had the following stern notice on the backs of his programmes during his period of management at the Garrick theatre,

which started in 1889 and lasted seven years:

> 'NO FEES
> The attendants have strict injunctions against receiving Gratuities : and they are liable to instant dismissal if they do so. Visitors to the theatre are earnestly begged to assist the Management in carrying out a regulation framed for their convenience.'
>
> (88)

The normal 'tip' for stall attendant, or cloakroom attendant, seems to have been sixpence. As cloakroom attendants in the modern theatre expect no more than ten new pence from those customers 'tipping', the sixpence in the nineteenth century may be seen as something of an extortionate rate.

Two other practices in the nineteenth century theatre brought in additional income. The first was fining the actors. This practice, which was common in the eighteenth century, was continued by several managements, notably Phelps, who had 29 rules, each involving a fine, regulating his actors' professional behaviour. The maximum 'fine' was one month's salary (or dismissal) for performing elsewhere without written permission. It ranged through the, somewhat severe, penalty of one week's salary for refusal to appear, or transposing or causing the cutting of a scene by missing an entrance, down to fines of 6d. for being absent from scenes at a rehearsal, or for such things as standing in the wings nearer the stage than the 'mark', or for not returning the prompt book. If the stage prompters did not report offenders to the manager, they were liable to pay the fine. (89) The practice was much less rigidly imposed later in the century, but the practice of fining is an old one and actors have stories of such fines being levied by provincial managements in the years after the second world war.

The second practice is more complicated, although at its height a more lucrative source of income. This was the Benefit. The various kinds of Benefit, their administration, and the likely financial rewards have been copiously chronicled by St. Vincent Troubridge. (90) In simple summary, these are the kinds of Benefit Troubridge analyses:

i) <u>The'guaranteed' Benefit.</u> The 'star' being given the benefit by the management paid all established charges, but had a guarantee of a minimum sum.

ii) <u>The 'clear' Benefit</u>. The 'star' or other beneficiary took the receipt entire.

iii) The 'half-clear' benefit, in which the beneficiary halved the gross receipts with the manager.

Benefits were given to leading players, to lesser luminaries, to music master, costumier or scene designer, or could be set up for a worthy outside cause. There was endless dispute over the kind of benefit to be taken, and over its administration, some managers giving a benefit but leaving the supposed beneficiary to pay for the ticket printing, advertising and to persuade the artists to work. The staff could not be relied upon to pass to the recipient all that was taken, nor could some managers be relied upon to give accurate accounts of the receipt. All was further complicated by the fact that managers themselves frequently took benefits and St. Vincent Troubridge gives detailed examples of numerous disputes. (91)

He is however wrong in saying that the practice died away in the eighties. In London's leading theatre benefits were still common. During the first two seasons at the Lyceum the only occasions the house grossed over £250 (as against its then capacity of £228) was on the occasion of Irving's benefit (sic), and in the 11th. season the account books show 5 benefits (entered as debits) as follows:

		£	s	d
31 May 1887	W.Marston	828	16	0
3 June "	Opera Comique, Paris	419	0	0
7 June "	'Amber Heart'	144	7	10
9 June "	Actors' Benvt.Fund	150	0	0
16 June "	Amy Roselle Benft.	292	12	6

The total 'debit' of £1,938.18.10d. is a considerable sum, and it is fair to speculate whether, in the case of the rounded-up figure for 'The Amber Heart' at least, the term 'benefit' may not be somewhat extended for accounting purposes (see 4 below). Ordinary benefits did however continue in London well into this century, and continue still in professional sport. (92)

2;f Factors inhibiting the maximization of income

Limitations upon maximizing income fall broadly into three categories, i) limitations imposed by the milieu in which the managers worked, ii) limitations which were self-imposed by the too-ready acceptance of theatrical custom, and iii) limitations caused by the weakness of the

theatre's systems of financial control.

A theatre manager, unlike a businessman, cannot continually increase his market. He differs from salesmen of goods in that his 'product' cannot be replicated with any precision, cannot be on sale continuously, and to be 'bought' it involves 'product' and purchasers coming together at a prearranged time and under particular conditions, in which the 'product' has rights just as the purchaser does. Moreover he differs from salesmen of benefits in that the theatre does not, in spite of its apologists' claims, answer a 'need' in the way that a drug answers a 'need' to stop a tooth aching, or bread answers the pangs of hunger and the attendant 'need' for food. He has usually to stimulate desire to watch his plays, where none existed naturally, and then rather than simply selling at once to as many purchasers as possible, must regulate the would-be purchasers of tickets so they attend in groups at pre-selected times for the play. In a West End promotion a manager is aware that his income is crucially affected by two limiting factors, i) his theatre is of finite size, and his 'product' can only be on sale each week a limited number of times, yet ii) there is a point at which it becomes less appealing and at which purchasers who would happily have attended a first night or early in the run find it stale, or prefer the attraction of a newer piece.

Given the obvious restrictions, nineteenth century managers were yet remarkably unadventurous in finding ways of reconciling the apparent conflicts. Pricing was inflexible ; rarely were prices lowered as a run stretched out. There were no repertoire systems, except in the crudest sense that a production was perceived to have a 'natural' life and would be allowed one good run, then brought back for a second if there were still 'life' in it. [93] Except for the D'Oyly Carte companies, there were few attempts at 'doubling up' the work of the leading companies and sending out a second Lyceum, Garrick or Haymarket company to play a different London venue while the first presented new work at the parent theatre, in the manner the National and R.S.C. companies do today. [94]

Managers did not see the advantages of long-term booking - the 'advance man' did not appear in the theatre until the 1920s - which procedure has the following advantages, i) money is banked early, easing cash availability problems before opening or in the early,expensive, days of the run, ii) author and cast are more secure and can concentrate their energies upon the creation of a good durable production, iii) advance publicity need not be so random, but can concentrate particularly upon purposeful 'selling', iv) a regulated flow of customers over a longer

period means that box office and management services can be less harrassed and hence better. In the period however the extension of the 'advance booking' period came slowly, and never extended beyond six weeks,[95] and pit, gallery, amphitheatre and sometimes upper circle were left unbookable. (In one case at least this was not the fault of management ; Irving made an early attempt to book the pit,[96] which the habitues resisted). This meant that a miscalculation about likely demand - such as the expectation that the crowds for the 1851 Great Exhibition would wish to visit the theatres in the evening - could leave audiences wretchedly depleted, and lose funds committed upon guesswork. It also meant that bad weather was more likely to decimate paying attendance, when so much reliance was put upon the 'door'. Thus there was an evening during the bad Winter of 1885 when the fashionable Haymarket had only 7 people in the audience.[97]

It can be argued that the managers also accepted too readily the custom that major actors could only perform five or six evenings a week,[98] and it was not until the middle of the twentieth century that plays were offered 'twice nightly'. More plausibly, managers were negligent in offering a mixed programme so that major players were not overtaxed but the theatres were more fully used. In both respects the development of the 'morning performance' or matinee, is of particular relevance. The first matinees seem to have been promoted by E.T. Smith at Drury Lane in the early 1850s, a 'morning juvenile performance' on 19th. January 1853, and an adult one, Brooke in 'Othello' on September 28th. of the same year. Other managements followed, the Bancrofts having 'moderate success' with matinees of 'School' 1869-1870.[99] The two theatres with which the matinee became particularly associated were the Imperial[100] and the Gaiety, although the Bancrofts make their usual claim for having 'established' the practice[101] (during the run of '<u>Diplomacy</u>' at the Prince of Wales in 1878 -9, seven years <u>after</u> Hollingshead had in fact begun his unbroken and successful run of matinee presentations at the Gaiety in 1871).

Hollingshead's forthright reasons for starting the practice amount to an accusation of oligarchic torpor on the part of his fellow managers. He says that matinees of pantomimes and plays already established as successes were common enough, but a regular policy of matinee presentation was an innovation. He has no regard for the 'old restrictive practices (<u>sic</u>) of management'. He implies that there was an understanding that competition should not be too intensive, but, 'I

not only believed in competition, I positively revelled in it.' He had 'free trade' in his blood. (102)

That it was in general terms successful is clear ; such experimental matinees gave Londoners their first productions of The Pillars of Society (1880) and An Enemy of the People (1893), and were taken up with some enthusiasm by Beerbohm Tree. However the audiences came to be something of a literary elite. It need not have been. The increasing night shiftwork of many of the growing service industries, particularly transport, meant that there was in London a potential audience that may be reckoned at more than a hundred thousand who could not visit theatres in the evenings but could do so in the afternoons. A majority of men were frequently at leisure on Saturday afternoons, whether they worked night shifts or not, a fact which was noticed at once by the managers of professional sport.(103) Further the Bank Holiday Act 1871 had given four compulsory free weekday afternoons each year, but theatre managers were in general remarkably slow to attempt to attract this new 'family audience'.

A particular exception to this was Marie Litton, who in 1880 presented matinees at the Imperial, which she subtitled 'the Afternoon Theatre', cutting out evening performances altogether. Henry James, in reviewing her presentation of As You Like It termed the venture 'enterprising' but added that success had been 'rather coy'.(104) In spite of Hollingshead's successes the London theatre has not since Shakespeare's own co-management thought of the afternoon performance as anything but a second best.

Hollingshead had other ideas for the fuller use of his building. He set aside one day a week for the 'unknown' aspirants to play parts of their choosing, restoring in part one of the traditions of the 18th. century stage. The Era (Feb. 6th. 1871) welcomed the idea:

> 'The aspirants to histrionic honours are not amateurs in the strict sense of the term. Many of them know the boards pretty well, and have trod them, one way or another, for many years. But they have not come to the front hitherto.'

It seems more efficient business to use the theatre 'plant' more fully by matinees, by alternating a professional programme with an amateur one, or by using auditoriums for meetings, lectures and the like. Like the church however the London theatre has usually preferred to permit its buildings their one sacred use, and has not been more than

tepid in response to any suggestion that such use spreads running costs more efficiently. In a second sense too the theatre ressembles the church. Lay people – amateurs, in theatre terms – are not welcome to assist in its mysteries, and thus a closed profession ministers in closed buildings. When in 1887 a dramatic class in London offered its successful pupils the chance to play uncast parts in its next London presentation, Punch (June 4th. 1887), scenting amateurism, used a heavy administrative jest to put such notions in their proper place:

Fees for the Rocket-Stick Dramatic Class

Course of Six Lectures upon the works of TERENCE	£1	1	0
Ditto, with public performance of Third Officer in Lady of Lyons	2	15	6
The plays of SHAKESPEARE – four Adresses		10	6
Ditto, with privilege of reading to class an original one-act farce	4	10	6
A Lecture on Mimicry, as practised before the Christian Era	1	1	1
Ditto, with public performance of monkey in comic ballet d'action	5	5	5
First Lecture on 'The Art of Acting in Ten Minutes'.	1	1	1
Ditto, with privilege of playing Claudius at a real London theatre in a version of Hamlet with the title role omitted	3	3	3
Second Lecture on 'The Art of Acting in Ten Minutes'.	0	10	6
Ditto, with Lesseeship of third-rate West-End theatre with the right to play any and everything, supported by a company of fellow students, per month	2,000	0	0

N.B. All money must be paid in advance. No particular success guaranteed.

With every nuance of the term, London theatre willinglymoved to become, in spirit and fact, an increasingly 'closed shop' at the time when those aspiring to act and those aspiring to watch them were undoubtedly increasing in number.

The managers inherited a number of honoured ways of doing things in the theatre – in theatre management tradition played as large a part as in stage management (see 4 below) or acting. The managers

were remarkably slow to change the systems. One was the extraordinarily prevelant system of 'papering the house'through free seats given as of right to persons on the proprietors' free lists, or to people associated with the top management or otherwise with the current production. Intermingled with this was the system of 'orders', by which the box office keeper gave free seats to friends of the cast, the managers' friends or even to members of the profession who presented their cards. Some managers defended the practice. H.J.Byron, for example,drew a diatinction between consuming a free dinner, which could have been eaten by somebody else, and taking a theatre seat which would not otherwise be used. 'The free occupier of a seat that nobody else wants to sit in stands in a different relation to the manager of a theatre altogether.' (105) Other managers opposed it ; Stoker for example ensured that any 'orders' were 'sent out under my instruction in each individual case'. (106) Throughout the century it was a major difficulty for managers ; in 1824 Bunn had discovered that the previous management at Covent Garden had issued 11,000 orders, worth £3,851.1.0d. in a period of less than 3 months between 17th. May and 12th. July. (107)

As great a problem were the traditional methods of distributing and collecting tickets. Until the 90s some tickets were still written out in part as they were booked, a box office clerk adding date and sometimes the number of the seat to a thin card already printed with the theatre crest and the play's title. Such a system was open to abuse and Leverton tells the story of a box office chief who caused great difficulties for management by working out a grudge against them by selling seats already distributed to the Libraries. (108) However when the perforated tickets were introduced in the 90s there was some hostility to them, in spite of their greater efficiency (the stub can be checked against the returned 'half' of the ticket which is taken by the door keeper and both checked against the cash taken). Not least of the reasons was that the new tickets, necessariy flimsy, had none of the glamour of the Victorian invitation card and hence no social cachet ; Oscar Wilde for instance complained that his railway tickets were nicer than those issued by the Haymarket. (109)

Even more open to abuse was the system of admitting folk to gallery and pit by given them a metal token at the pay box which was then collected by the doorkeeper and in theory checked later against the 'take'. If pay box keeper and doorkeeper were in league the tokens could simply be returned at regular intervals to the pay box , and the

money taken for them stolen. Thus other systems should have been evolved to guard against this (see 4:b below), or the metal tokens no longer used. Kennedy Malling says that the tokens for the gallery at the old Savoy could be bunched together and slid down the hand rail, while the comedian Sandy Powell tells of a doorkeeper in league with a pay box keeper who would throw down tokens in a box in request for a cigarette and a light. (110)

The logic of the move towards presenting West End theatre to a clearly defined social group suggests that subscription selling ought, in the houses with clear policies, to have been more prevalent than it was. The fact is however that it is difficult to combine subscription selling with runs which could be extended ; it is only possible to administer it with a repertoire system. It does however make a brief appearance at the end of our period, when F,R.Benson, to whom the Lyceum had been briefly sublet, played a subscription season:

> 'Season tickets will be issued entitling holders to a reserved seat for each of the eight plays on one day a week ; and subscribers may select the Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday series as best suits their conveniences. Prices from £3.15s to £1 for the series of eight nights'
>
> (111)

The low prices - you could see Henry V, Hamlet, A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Rivals, Richard II, Twelfth Night, Anthony and Cleopatra, and The Tempest for 2/6 each in a booked seat on the night of your choice - indicates the clear populist appeal of that one season, and is a useful reminder of how far the West End, with its highflown rhetoric about its art, narrowing social conventions, long runs and inflexible pricing, had allowed itself to move in sixty years, in The Theatre's phrase 'onward and upward', for it seems strangely out of place among the discreet advertisements for the regular London companies, and strangely provincial.

The conclusion is that managers did not pursue simple mercenary goals, and attempt to raise income without other consideration. Their aspirations to the artistic elite must have led in part to the rejection of an overtly businesslike exploitation of a company with a marketable name or of actors who could have been persuaded, because of the precariousness of their position, to play more frequently. By the

1880s the managers followed a market strategy quite different from that of thirty years before, when the 'product' could be sold on few occasions to large audiences and a high profit margin budgeted for. Now long runs were common, and advance booking in West End theatres was such standard practice that Hays was able to publish a book containing house plans of all West End Theatres in 1887 ; (112) smaller profits could be taken at each performance and taken with some assurance, providing that the leisure and spending habits of the audience were known, <u>and could be counted upon</u>. In that context it was necessary to attract a middle class audience i) for stability, and ii) for the income that brought.

However the style of presentation – the highly ornate programmes, the dressing for the stalls, the lavish 'drawing room' decoration, and the 'white cravatted young men' who acted as ushers – indicates the third reason for attracting that class James so vividly describes. That all-consuming social aspiration to become artistic (in the newly developed sense of the term) led managers to exceed the decoration and order which might have been sufficient in the auditorium for their customers, and, as each managerial act has both a positive and negative side, led them to deliberately create a greater social rift between the new 'stalls' and the poorer parts of the house than was necessary. By contrast with the stalls, boxes and dress circle, visitors to the balcony and (where it remained) the pit were increasingly unwelcomed ; the shoddier programmes of the Haymarket, or the well-thumbed tokens of the Savoy that stood instead of tickets may be taken as symptoms of a social intention. For any economic argument suggests that managers should have made equal (although possibly different) attempts to make the other part of their audience as large as possible and as regular as possible, but the spartan furnishings of entrances, and of seating in the cheaper areas, the deliberately inferior service, and the lack of any compensating attraction (which the cameraderies of the old pits had been) indicates clearly that it was not seen as a wholly economic argument. As so often, what managers did not do is as significant as what they did, and a simple contrast may be made with another leisure activity, professional sport, which was determinedly seeking a large working class following. In the 1890s none of the major professional sports imposed standards of dress upon spectators ; none operated a booking system which plainly operated in favour of the metropolitan middle class ; moreover as theatres were making the matinees particularly genteel, at the same time

professional sport was drawing crowds of 30,000 and more in London to cricket and football on the newly-free Saturday afternoons. Moreover professional sport was learning how to cope with large popular followings by developing techniques of i) concessionary ticketing for large bookings, ii) linking transport with the staging of the event, so that crowds are not discomforted as the humble pantomime crowds were discomforted in London at Christmas, and iii) developing rudimentary forms of cheap mass catering.[(113] There is no evidence that theatre managers developed techniques in those areas to compete, at least in London's West End, for the growing leisured working class audience.[(114)]

NOTES

(1) James, H. (1877). 'The London Theatres', in Galaxy (London). May 1st.

(2) Leverton, W.H. (1932). Through the Box Office Window. (London : T. Werner Laurie). pp. 26-27.

(3) Rowell, G. (1955). op cit. p. 83.

(4) Leverton, W.H. (1932). op cit. pp. 115 - 118.

(5) Advertisements in The Times. May 1880.

(6) Murray, C. (1975). op cit. pp. 147 - 148.

(7) Trewin, J. (Ed.) (1967). op cit. p.109.

(8) See descriptions of the audience preserved in the Sadler's Wells collection at the Finsbury Library.

(9) Arundell, D. (1965). op cit. p.144.

(10) Allen, S. (1971). op cit. p. 80.

(11) Kean's curtain speech on the final night is quoted by Wilson, G. (1971) 'Charles Kean ; a Financial Report' in Richards, K. and Thomson, P. (Eds.) Nineteenth Century British Theatre (London ; Methuen). pp. 39 - 50.

(12) The financial summaries for the Princess's seasons are in the Folger Library, Washington.

(13) Wilson, G. (1971). op cit. p. 45.

(14) The capacities given are based on the work of Howard, D. (1970), op cit. and on Mander, R. and Mitchenson, J., (1961). The Theatres of London (London ; Hart-Davies). Wherever possible figures have been checked against the copies of plans in the Enthoven Collection, which have been obtained from the London County Council. There are also useful theatre plans and descriptions in the Westminster Central Reference Library, St. Martin's Street, W.1. The Era (complete sets of which are in the British Museum) contains fulsome, and occasionally inaccurate, descriptions of the theatres' openings, which are of modest value.

(15) Bancroft, S. and Bancroft, M. (1911). op cit. pp.72 - 74.

(16) Ibid. p.266.

(17) Metcalf, P. (1976). Victorian London (Newton Abbot ; David and Charles). Dr. Metcalf's descriptions of the London property market through the decades, based on a doctoral dissertation for the University of London, gives valuable insight into the development of central London as a business and entertainment, rather than a dwelling area.

(18) Booth, M. (1975). 'The Theatre and its Audience' in The Revels History of Drama in English. Vol. VI 1750 - 1880. p.19. Professor Booth's essays in that volume are the most lucid summary of the context of theatre management yet written, although their purposes are wider.

(19) Select Committee 1866. Report. p.191.

(20) In my paper 'Samuel Phelps and the Mass Audience', given to the Society for Theatre Research, February 1978, I argued that Phelps deliberately wooed the West End audience, and that the building of the carriage parks at Sadler's Wells was a sign that he was not primarily

interested in the local audience. (The paper is published by Centre for Arts, City University, in a short collection titled <u>Popular Arts</u> (1980).)

(21) Dickens, C. Jr. (1879), <u>A London Dictionary and Guide Book</u>. (London: Dickens and Evans). p.281 ff.

(22) <u>Ibid</u>. pp. 28 - 29.

(23) <u>Ibid</u>. pp. 167 - 189.

(24) <u>Ibid</u>. p. 167.

(25) A calculation shows that fewer than 30 omnibuses would have been available after 11 p.m. to take passengers to Main Line stations, discounting the private speculators.

(26) Herd, H. (1952). <u>The March of Journalism</u>. (London ; George Allen and Unwin). pp. 154 - 163 give a full account

(27) Purnell, T. (1871). <u>Dramatists of the Present Day</u>. (London). p.14.

(28) Compare with the vast auditoria still erected for 'popular' entertainments. The Music Hall on the site of the Surrey Zoological Gardens which ran from 1855 - 1861 housed 12,000 spectators ; the Alexandra Palace accommodated 10,000 at its mammoth entertainments, and the Dance Floor at the Cremorne Gardens held 5,000.

(29) Three new theatres, all with fewer exits and more easily staffed and smaller auditoria, were being built within a mile of Sadler's Wells Theatre at the time of Phelps' retirement.

(30) Bancroft, S. and Bancroft, M. (1911). <u>op cit</u>. p.266.

(31) Sherson, E. (1928). <u>London's Lost Theatres of the 19th. Century</u>. (London). p.237.

(32) Hyman, A. (1975). <u>The Gaiety Years</u>. (London : Cassell). p.131. The dome, ninety feet above ground level, surmounted by a golden figure of a girl blowing a trumpet, is a striking symbol of management optimism.

(33) Howard, D. (1970) <u>op cit</u>. p.120. However see Leverton, W. (1932) <u>op cit</u>. p.91.,'The ground landlord treated her badly, selling the site over her head to the Wesleyans'.

(34) Rees, T. (1978). <u>op cit</u>. p.114.

(35) Glasstone, V. (1975). <u>Victorian and Edwardian Theatres</u> (London : Cassell). The photograph No. 79, p.67, 'shows what happens to a theatre when the architects do not make provision for the advertising.' The drifting crowds are mentioned by Leverton (1932), <u>op cit</u>. p. 158.

(36) Gascoigne, B., (1968), <u>World Theatre</u>. (London ; Ebury Press). p. 257.

(37) Brown, E. (Ed.) (1966). <u>The London Theatre 1811 - 1866. The Diaries of Henry Crabb Robinson</u>. (London : The Society for Theatre Research). p. 201.

(38) p.295

(39) Maude, C. (1903). <u>The Haymarket Theatre</u>. (London : Grant Richards). p. 167.

(40) Bancroft, S. and Bancroft, M. (1911) <u>op cit</u>. P. 269.

(41) <u>Ibid</u>.p.301.

(42) <u>Ibid</u>. p. 267 ff.

(43) $\frac{249 \times 10s. \times 60}{100} = £74.14.0d.$

The profit on each performance would then be (£74.14.0d. - £44.6.2d) £30.7.10d., and 40 x £30.7.10d. x 6 = £7,294.

(44) Bancroft, S. and Bancroft, M. (1911) op cit. p.307. The figure is repeated by the meticulous Bancroft, G. (1939) Stage and Bar. (London : Faber and Faber) and is generally accepted amongst theatre historians.

(45) Bancroft, S. and Bancroft, M. (1911) op cit. p.282.

(46) Ibid. p.281

(47) Money made a net profit of £10,000, according to Bancroft, and ran for 72 performances. $\frac{£10,000}{72}$ = £138.17.9d.

(48) Beerbohm, M. (1906). The Saturday Review (12th. May).

(49) Stoker, B. (1907) op cit. p.80.

(50) Booth, M. (1975) op cit. p.9.

(51) Arundell, D. (1965) op cit. p. 144.

(52) Private Letter quoted by Newton, H.C., (1927) Cues and Curtain Calls (London ; Bodley Head). p. 92

(53) Arundell, D. (1965). op cit. p. 162 ff.

(54) Bancroft, S. and Bancroft, M. (1911) op cit. p. 91

(55) Ibid.

(56) Dent, E. (1945). A Theatre for Everybody. (London ; Boardman) p. 26. This seems a supreme example of the pointless division between 'educational' art and 'mere' entertainment - as the high-minded notions which have guided the Old Vic in its various quests to become both popular and educational could certainly have benefited from the common sense exhibited by men such as Hollingshead.

(57) Of which the overwhelming majority comes from advance booking of the more expensive seats. Analysis of the Lyceum account books in the Enthoven Collection shows that throughout the 20 years of Irving's control advance booking (including Libraries) never fell below 80% of the gross receipt.

(58) Fitzgerald, P. (1882) op cit. p.439

(59) Not even in the profession's own newspaper, The Stage, which was published from 1879.

(60) Most were also publicised on the theatre bills.

(61) Booth, M. (1975) op cit. p.19.

(62) See Appendix 3. The figures derive from Parker, J. (1977) Who's Who in the Theatre. 16th. Edition. pp.1286 - 1312. They are not wholly dependable - the figure for Gilbert and Sullivan's Iolanthe is not, for example, included - but that list is likely to remain the standard source, as the journal's future publication is in doubt.

(63) Stoker, B. (1907) op cit. p.81

(64) Oxford Companion to the Theatre. (1950) p. 620

(65) Hunt, L. (1830). 'The Play Bill' in The Tatler (London) Sept. 17th.

(66) I have a small number of these in my own collection. The Art Review's souvenir for Irving's Faust (1888) containing the

highly revealing assertion that Irving is ' a true artist who is above private interests, who does not count the cost of things, nor value his reward in money. Every argument that could be used in favour of a national subsidy for the theatre in England might be found in the history of the Lyceum.' p.16.

(67) Oxford Companion to the Theatre (1950) p.620.

(68) Or, in the case of the Criterion, it was owned by a Catering Firm.

(69) Arundell, D. (1965) op cit p. 170 ff.

(70) The weekly rent is given in the Account Books as £8.6.8d.

(71) Pascoe, C. (1880) The Dramatic List (London : Bogue) pp. 57 - 58.

(72) For a description see Bloom, U. (1956) Curtain Call for the Guv'nor. (London ; Hutchinson) p.18 ff.

(73) Dickens,C. Jr. (1879) op cit. p.224.

(74) Burnand, F. (1904) Records and Reminiscences (London : Methuen) 2 Vols. Vol. 1 p. 266

(75) Dickens, C. (Jr.) (1879) op cit. pp. 224 - 225.

(76) Hyman, A. (1975) op cit. has one such story, p. 98.

(77) Archer, F. (Undated) An Actor's Notebooks (London : Stanley Paul) p. 154.

(78) Rowell, G. in 'Charles Wyndham' in Donohue, J. (ed.) (1971) The Theatrical Manager in England and America. (Princeton University) p.202.

(79) Wilson, A. (1952). The Lyceum. (London : Theatre Book Club , Dent) p. 59.

(80) Hudson, L. (1951). The English Stage 1850 - 1950 (London ; Harrap). p.82.

(81) Stoker, B. (1907) op cit. p. 204.

(82) Ibid. pp. 438 - 439.

(83) Archer, F. (Undated) op cit. p.294.

(84) See the Accounts for the 'Interim Season' from July 1895 to July 25th. 1896 when the theatre was sublet. Forbes Robertson and Harrison paid £6,323.6.8. and Barrett £900.0.0d.

(85) Stoker, B. (1907) op cit. p.205.

(86) Martin Harvey, J. (1933) op cit. p. 92.

(87) Webster, M. (1969) The Same Only Different (London : Faber and Faber). p. 78. Strictly, she refers to playbills, not programmes in the modern sense.

(88) From a programme in my own collection.

(89) Arundell, D. (1965) op cit. p. 142 ff. The practice was elsewhere notably used by Webster and by Wilson Barrett.

(90) Troubridge, Sir St. V. (1967) The Benefit System in the British Theatre (London : Society for Theatre Research).

(91) Ibid. See particularly Chapters X - XIV.

(92) Professional sport adopted in its management many of the theatre's former methods - the private box for example - and its problems, including unruly 'audiences', in its development

in the 80s and 90s. See Petrie, C. (1960) The Victorians. (London) . In 1896 The Times commented archly that Lords 'has scarcely ever before been the scene of so much noisiness and rowdyism', when 30,000 encroached upon the pitch in the Test between England and Australia.

(93) Stoker, B. (1907) op cit. See p. 426, of the productions desroyed in the fire; 'Several of them were held over for a second run, of which good things might reasonably have been expected'.

(94) This practice is now commonly adopted by both companies ; in the last three years the National Theatre has transferred in this manner 'Bedroom Farce' and the R.S.C. 'Once in a Lifetime' and 'Piaf' to commercial West End theatres.

(95) Stoker, B. (1907) op cit. p. 122. The period was extended to 6 weeks at the Lyceum for Ravenswood. 'Our usual time was four weeks, and as a working rule it was found well to keep to this. Where booking is not under great pressure, too long a time means extra particularity in choice of seats, and a de facto curtailment of receipts. For Ravenswood we had to advance, first one week and then a second ; so that about the end of the first month we were booking six weeks ahead. I may say that we were booked that long, for as each day's advance sheet was opened it became quickly filled.'

(96) Martin Harvey, J. (1933) op cit. pp. 84 – 85.

(97) Maude, C. (1903) op cit. p.170.

(98) Booth would only play Othello three times a week at the Lyceum in 1881.

(99) Armstrong, W. 'The Nineteenth Century Matinee' in Theatre Notebook. 14. pp.56 – 59.

(100) Marie Litton was manager. See James' praise below.

(101) An interesting sidelight of this is that the cast rehearsing the Burlesque Diplunacy were enabled to watch the play at the matinees so they could parody the mannerisms of the original cast. Bancroft, S. and Bancroft, M. (1911) op cit. p. 248.

(102) Hollingshead, J. (1898) Gaiety Chronicles. (London ; Constable).

(103) Saturday soccer was established by the end of our period. The Football Association was founded in 1863, and by 1899 was supervising a major public entertainment.

(104) James, H. (1882) 'London Theatres. Part Two.', in Atlantic Monthly . August 1st.

(105) Byron, H. (1878). 'The Other Side of the Question', in The Theatre New Series – No. 2. p. 111

(106) Stoker, B. (1907) op cit. p.428.

(107) Fitzgerald, P. (1882) op cit. p. 425.

(108) Leverton, W. (1932) op cit. p.141.

(109) Ibid. p.68.

(110) Kennedy Malling, J. (1974) Theatre Ephemera (London:Shire) pp. 54 – 55.

(111) Advertisement for the Lyceum, Daily Mail, Nov. 20th. 1899.

(112) Hays, A. (1887). <u>Plans for The Principal Theatres in London.</u> (London).

(113) See for example Jackson, H. (1922). <u>The Eighteen Nineties</u> for a description of the class differences in leisure. For the marketing and managerial practices of professional sport see Mortimer, R. (1958). <u>The Jockey Club</u>, the M.C.C. <u>Centenary Test Book</u>, and Glanville, B. (1977). <u>Professional Sport</u>. (London).

THREE

EXPENDITURE

At the beginning of the period expenditure divided simply for the theatre manager into three broad areas, i) the cost of renting a theatre, ii) the costs of mounting the production, which were sometimes low, as old scenery, costumes and properties were used and any rehearsal period was very short, and iii) the running costs. Patterns of expenditure become much more complicated in the period, as rehearsal times lengthen, as productions are freshly mounted and staged with greater complexity and as extended runs and a wider catchment area for audiences considerably extends the need for advertising. Advance booking, and a growing touring system provide something of a cushion against a poor first night reception, and shows could be 'nursed'. (1)

Managers employed more people - the Lyceum employed more people to stage its productions in its own theatre than does the modern Royal Shakespeare Company in running several interlocking repertories in four or five theatres today. (2) Many of the specialist workers were well paid and, particularly in the case of the expensive artists hired to design and paint scenery, their employment may be seen in part as a public gesture designed to establish confidence in the theatre's claim to the status of high art. There were many sober assertions about the theatre's exacting demands as an employer, but nevertheless (see 3 ;e below) many employees could, by the general standards of the period, be considered underemployed.

The growing ambitions of the managers led to increased expenditure in new areas, concerned with image building, and with the (genuine) new seriousness in staging. With expenditure on hospitality we have already dealt (2:e above), but there were generous donations to public causes, membership of learned societies, and gifts to individuals all as a part of the new social image. There was much expenditure on books for research, and on educational travel. (3)

In its turn the state drew increasing sums from the managers. At the very beginning of the period the licence fee was

virtually the only expenditure, but in turn income tax, costs of rebuilding and repair to accord with new fire and safety regulations, responsibility for rates, compliance with the developing legal practices of paying royalties, growing responsibility for rents and the increasing costs of insurance premiums (see 1 above) all made expenditure i) larger, and ii) less directly related to the simple staging of the production immediately to hand. The £20,000 which the state safety regulations cost Irving at the Lyceum was, for example, a greater sum than the total Macready spent on production costs during his Drury Lane management.

The managers were indeed attempting to operate within quite a new business, and two myths accordingly grew about them. The first is the myth of the feckless spendthrift, the notion that anyone could have made money by being a theatre manager and that no financial acumen was called for. An examination of the list of West End managers (Appendix 1) sufficiently disproves this ; a majority of managers make a brief appearance in the profession, and there is no record of easy profit for the chance speculator. The second myth is that the managers were by and large calculating misers, a picture painted by T.W.Robertson:

> 'The Commercial Manager is a great financial genius, and cuts down salaries and expenses to the very lowest scale. He is also fertile in expedients for stopping a night's salary from his employees, and was the original inventor and introducer of that wonderful piece of economic meanness, a Complimentary Benefit, on which occasion the actors, actresses, sceneshifters, supernumeraries all give their services gratuitously.'
>
> (4)

The study of West End managers' habits of expenditure does not support such a view, rather one that they neglected expenditure on nourishing the attendance of a popular audience while being particularly lavish with some of their own employees, if their work tended towards the attraction of an audience of distinctive rank. Although expenditures are necessarily intermingled, it is convenient to discuss the developments in each of these areas of expenditure, i) the Theatre itself, ii) Actors, iii) Authors, iv) Scenery, v) Stage Staff, vi) Publicity, and vii) Insurance and Legal Expenses.

3:a <u>Hiring a Theatre</u>

A bill of sale in the Finsbury Library collection of Sadler's Wells material gives a clear picture of the agreement held between the theatre's proprietors and Samuel Phelps, which may be taken as representative of all agreements in the earlier part of the period. It is of sufficient importance to be quoted extensively:

'The Property is held on Lease for a Term of Sixty years from Midsummer, 1851, at a ground rent of £277 per annum, the Lessees paying the Insurance and other outgoings ; and its use is granted to Mr. Samuel Phelps with such of the Properties as belong to the Proprietors, for 7 years from Lady Day, 1860, at the Yearly Sum of £1,000, payable by 10 monthly payments of £100 each, to be made in each and every month excepting July and August : the Proprietors reserving to themselves the exclusive right to the use of 2 Private Boxes, the right to introduce 20 visitors before the curtain on the night of every Performance, except on Benefit nights, and also to introduce a limited number of persons on the Free List. Mr Phelps is bound to do repairs, except to the Main Walls, Timbers and Roof. The Proprietors are under covenant to pay the Ground Rent, Insurance, Rates and Taxes...

'The net Annual Income derivable from the Property may be estimated thus:

		£	s	d	£	s	d
Rent payable by Mr. Phelps, per annum					1,000	0	0
Subject to the following outgoings, Viz							
Ground Rent	per annum	270	0	0			
Insurance	"	90	0	0			
Sewers' Rate, Taxes	"	43	6	8			
Poor's Rate		50	0	0			
Watchman (18s./week, half of which is paid by proprietors)		23	8	0			
Repairs to roof (this year)		5	8	11			
					489	3	7
					510	16	6

It will have been obvious to any budding purchaser contemplating a bid that the benefits could be higher. The benefit in kind from the 2 boxes, 20 visitors and right to put persons on the free list can, for example, be calculated nightly as:

	£	s	d
2 boxes (at £1.11.6d. each) =	3	3	0
20 Dress Circle Seats(3s each)=	3	0	0
'Free List' seats,say =	2	2	0
	8	5	0

Thus the benefit was, in a normal week of 6 performances , almost £50. In a full season of 40 weeks the benefit may be calculated at nearly £2,000. Nor will it have escaped a potential buyer's notice that repairs to the stone-built walls of the theatre were not necessarily an annual expenditure.

The arrangement follows early practice in putting the proprietors under covenant to pay Ground Rent, Rates and Taxes. As was usual as long as it remained common practice for the proprietors to retain ownership of the house store of scenery, costumes and properties, the proprietors also paid Insurance. That both hiring fee and other arrangements were flexible, and agreed at least in some cases with an eye to the realities of the theatre business, is shown by a later bill of sale for 1878, in which the same sum yields only an income of £277 from the Lessees. As they are plainly less successful than Phelps, the rent has been accordingly lowered. (6)

Not all proprietors were as accommodating. In spite of his mounting difficulties Chatterton continued to pay £6,000 a year for Drury Lane in the seventies, and when he failed, in January 1879, The Theatre commented:

> 'The only wonder to our minds is, not that Mr. Chatterton has failed, but that he had not failed long ago. The old theatre is, considering the state of its repair, let at a ridiculously high rent, and under absurd conditions.'
>
> (7)

At that time Chatterton owed £40,000, having suffered from the loneliness of all managers, and its attendant lack of disinterested financial advice ; when the collapse came, his artists refused to work for lower wages. Undoubtedly the rental was high for a West End theatre ; Webster paid £4,000 a year for the Adelphi, Kean £4,000 for the Princess's, Bancroft £5,000 for the Haymarket in the eighties.

In the latter part of our period there is a movement for successful managements to build their own theatres. Some, such as Toole's and Terry's, had comparatively brief success. The most successful was the Savoy theatre, which the successful D'Oyly Carte had built, buying the freehold of the site in 1880, sponsoring plans by C.J.Phipps and having in

built by Messrs. Patman and Fotherinham in less than five months. It was the first London theatre to be lit - except in the case of failure, when it reverted to gas - by incandescant electric light, the first to insist upon orderly queuing for pit and gallery,[8] and had a'tasteful'interior. The reason for its success however was in the established attraction of the Gilbert and Sullivan Operas, which formed virtually the exclusive programme in the period.

The rigid distinction between the proprietors, who as simple owners of the plant could be said to play an entrepreneurial role, and the managers, who were the risk takers,[9] grew less, not only because, as in the case of D'oyly Carte, they could be identical , but because, markedly with the purchase of the Lyceum company from Irving, consortiums make their appearance. Long term entrepreneurship and short-term risk-taking are then increasingly intermingled in the wider responsibilities of the controlling groups. In some cases these were families,[10] in others business groupings ; in a few cases, notably the literary theatre associated with Shaw (see 5 below),the managing group clearly comes together for a stated purpose quite other than financial management, and instructs the acting manager to devise financial routines to best attain those separate goals. Those later instances are of management structures precisely like those of modern subsidised theatre, where the administrator derives his goals from a management board, and creates financial routines accordingly.[11]

3:b <u>Hiring actors</u>.

Leading actors had been accustomed to negotiating a fee 'per performance' at the beginning of the period. Thus Macready's diaries carefully record his fee for each performance during an engagement,[12] and it is well known that Kean worked hard to establish himself as a player worth £50 a night. In the period however there are several moves away from this simple system, among them i) the giving of longer contracts, ii) rendering them exclusive in their service to one management, and iii) being somewhat less precise about the parts to be played, and frequency of performance. It is, as usual, not a simple picture ; before the start of our period Phelps was chafing at the poor parts given him by Macready at Drury Lane while he was on extended contract,[13] and as late as the 1950s at least one leading actor offered himself to repertory companies for a fee 'per performance'. [14]

Nor did it remain so unsophisticated a system that an actor's standing with the public could be judged entirely from his salary. It depended upon the management. Some, like the Bancrofts, were generous with their 'stars'. Thus John Hare, first engaged for £2 a week, was earning £20 when he left. When Caste was revived at the Haymarket George Honey was paid £60 a week to play a part which had been 'worth' £18 when he had previously played it at the Prince of Wales's. Others, like Irving, were less generous. His own London salary had shown steady growth ; his first London payment was £10 a week at the Vaudeville, but in his third year for Bateman was paid £19 a week, and when he had achieved some notoriety, £28. However upon assuming management he paid himself £70 a week, and did not vary it throughout the Lyceum tenure. His fellow players were likewise paid standard salaries, no matter how their reputations fluctuated, and it was felt that they were below the actors' market values. [15] The exception was Ellen Terry who was paid a high salary for overseas touring, an increased one for British tours, and whose London one was rather higher than other leading players in the company.[16]

The accounts of the period concentrate almost exclusively upon the salaries of the leading players, and this is misleading. The majority of working actors subsisted on much lower, much more precarious salaries. Salaries in the West End varied for such actors between £1 and £10 a week throughout the period. There is no fluctuation of salaries in this bracket, but what is remarkable is the increasing number of actors employed by managements; there were for example more than 5,000 'speaking parts' in the total Lyceum repertoire.

However it remained a buyer's market. There was no union or professional organisation to guard the rights of actors, and newcomers to the profession were exploited and were apt to consider a subsistence wage adequate in the lottery of theatre employment. So low a basic wage gave the managers power to further assume the role of benevolent squire, giving out tokens of generosity to underpaid hirelings. Revealing is Edward Gordon Craig's account of his first 1889 engagement:[17]

> 'I received a princely salary of £5 a week. On the first night Henry Irving gave me a fine malacca cane with an eighteenth century silver gilt head, and he added a gold band with an inscription and the date. I have preserved this.'

As Baker points out in his study of the Victorian actor [18] unemployment probably rose during the period. Nor had the actor any other benefit for

which, in our own time, the state, or management acting under the state's law, would have responsibility. Professor Watson mentions the lack of any sickness benefit,[19] and the lack of a pension was to become a part of the argument over state subsidy in theatre (5 below). The generosity of managers was a function of their current fortune. When Irene Vanbrugh began her career she points out that Toole ' took pleasure in making up our pay packets himself and in putting in an extra gold sovereign occasionally as a surprise.'[20] However in hard times Irving, formerly given to gifts for his fellow players, had little compunction about administering to Ellen Terry what she termed 'the dirty kick out'.[21]

Things were harder still for the lowest ranks of performers, the supernumeraries , the dancers and the children, all of whom were paid very little. The usual wage for 'supers' was 6d. a night at the start of the period, and rose to 1s. by the end.[22] They were hired by the night, usually at the stage door, and had no contractual agreement with the managers, as their work was casual. They were expected to have other jobs and Stoker is adamant that his management would not employ loafers.[23] Children were often hired for pantomimes and for special scenic effects in spectacular productions for the same sums, supported by mothers who had aspirations for them in the profession.[24] Amongst dancers the employment position was particularly harsh, and even in the halls and on variety stages their salaries were markedly lower than those of singers, comedians or 'specialities'.[25]

There is overall no evidence that actors contributed markedly to the soaring production costs that were to make theatre management less secure. In the lower depths of the profession they continued to be exploited in spite of the theatre's relative prosperity ; thus, although Irving was more generous to supernumeraries than most West End managements it is salutary to calculate that the 250 supporting 'supers' in Robespierre cost him only £18.15s. a performance (1s6d. each), a sum not markedly more than his own salary. The actors' salaries came to represent a small proportion of total expenditure in the period. In the last decades before our period the leading actor's £25 or £35 a performance probably represented some 60% of total costs ; archival records of management and backstage costs for Covent Garden at the beginning of Macready's career for example, indicates that such costs in total were around £10 - £12 a performance, when 'star' players obtained three times as much.[26] Similar sampling in the decade following our period shows that, for instance out of a total weekly expenditure for 'The Cherry Girl' at the Vaudeville in 1904 of £1,046, the total wage bill for the company is £186.4s.0d., roughly 18%. It is a remarkable difference, considering

that the box office impact of a star player was known (see returns for The Notorious Mrs Ebbsmith, 4:c below), but demonstrates clearly the real nature of the increasing costs for 'straight' theatre, with its new dependance upon elaborate and architectural setting, complicated costume design and 'artistic' lighting effects. Where these expenses were considered less essential, in the music hall and variety theatre, the performers' salaries were higher. The extant artists'book for the Alhambra for 1898 (27) shows for instance both that the leading performer was better paid than Irving, and that the average weekly salary was higher:

Alhambra Ledger. Week Ending May 9th. 1898

	Business	Agent	Salary	Termination
Cissie Loftus	Mimic	N.& S.	£85 P.W.	23rd. July
Fred Sussell	Vent.	N.& S.	£15 P.W.	2nd. July
Sisters Merkel	Contortsnt.	Ercole	£25 P.W.	4th. June
Joe Elvin	Comedian		£75 P.W.	30th. July
Dutch Daly	Comedian		£25 P.W.	21st. May
Agnes Delaporte	Vocalist		£15 P.W.	21st. May
Delami & Debrimont	Duettists	Claxton	£20 P.W.	21st. May
Musical Korries			£10 P.W.	28th. May
Martino and Mars	Duettists	N.& S.	£10 P.W.	21st. May
Marvello's Birds			£30 P.W.	21st. May
Lissie & Vinie Daly	Dancers		£15 P.W.	-
Darto Quartette	Dancers	Forbee	£40 P.W.	4th. June
The Bostons	Eccentrics		£12 P.W.	-

The average weekly salary, £29 , would have been £52. 14s had the leading performer, Molle Olero, a Spanish singer and dancer booked to appear on a weekly salary of £150, turned up. Her name is scratched out with a terse note that she did not come 'to fulfil'.

3:c Payment to authors

Before the Copyright Act of 1833 there was no legal right in a dramatic presentation,(28) and in the years following the act many loopholes were evident in it. Fees were extremely low, ranging from as little as £3.3s for a full-length script to £50. F.C.Burnand says,

'Planche, The Broughs, Dance Talfourd, Tom Taylor, Stirling Coyne, and all the dramatists of that day had a hand to mouth existence as far as the stage brought any contribution towards their income.' (29)

The marked increase in author's earnings during the period derives in part from the changing management of the theatres. In an increasingly attractive and buoyant West End a good script was in any case of higher value to management. The income that it brought was much greater as lengthier 'runs' became commoner. The development of a play-printing press serving the popular market - notably the play-publishing house of Lacy's - gave a script an enhanced literary value, and rendered it a more accessible commodity for use by other companies, professional and amateur, all of which were a source of income. Finally the growing theatrical press, to which we have made reference (2:a, above), gave the author a substantial position in society. It is an irony that authors achieved the rank the managers sought, at the same time they were complaining that they were exploited by theatre management and insufficiently powerful to defend themselves. (30)

Not surprisingly, the authors mounted a highly literate campaign to improve their financial rewards from writing for theatre, and three authors in particular had marked successes. Boucicault (who had experience of management - see Appendix 1) insisted upon a sharing agreement with Webster at the Adelphi for The Colleen Bawn ; that arrangement, by which he took half the net profits, was emulated later by other managements. (31) Second T.W.Robertson, whose earlier bitterness over managers' meannesses might have made him a difficult author with whom to deal, was fortunate in finding accommodation with the Bancrofts over terms remarkably easy, and he shared in the Bancrofts' financial successes, notably profiting from the longer runs. The fixed-sum payment per performance yielded at first £1 a night for Society and rose - if what he told Burnand was correct (32) - to £10 a night for Home at the Haymarket. Third F.C.Burnand himself took a leading part in the fight to establish authors' financial rights, having had an unfortunate early experience in selling the complete rights of plays to Lacy's, without knowing that Lacy's would then profit from fees from both professionals and amateurs, and that he had no further rights in the matter. (33)

Burnand's ignorance illustrates the modest effectiveness of the Dramatic Authors' Society, which had been founded just before the passing of the 1833 Act to safeguard the interests of authors, but in practice found itself capable of exercising only limited control over the

interests of member authors whose names appeared on its lists, and did not have the resources to publicise authors' rights in negotiating with the play publishers, or indeed with the theatres. It brought prosecutions, but had marked failures. [34] The legal enforcement of the payment of royalties came from legislation, particularly three acts, i) the Literary Copyright Act 1842 which extended the benefit of the 1833 Act to cover librettos, songs and recit, so managers could not claim a script was not covered by law as it contained music, ii) the Berne Convention on Authors' Rights 1886, which effectively prevented managers from filling a season with cheaply commissioned translations of the French drama, and iii) the Copyright Law U.S.A. 1891 which by giving British authors royalties from U.S. performances raised their expectations of the income to be derived from each written piece.

The steady establishment of the copyright law, and the increasing market value of plays led Burnand, who had earlier complained that authors lived a 'hand to mouth' existence, to imply that they were somewhat overpaid. In 1904 he writes:

> 'But to offer advice now is useless ; never have I, for the last twenty years, come across a commencing dramatist, in the very earliest stages of cutting his first drama, who was not quite prepared to propose such terms as would stagger a manager, and to accept such modifications as, if the piece were successful, would if properly invested secure him a competence for life, while subsequent successes would provide him with all the luxuries that a healthy, wealthy and wise man could desire.'
>
> (35)

It may indeed be that earlier pleas concerning the penury of authors are also somewhat over-sympathetic to the writer. Much writing was rapidly done to formula, and as turnover was rapid, a writer could expect several fees each year. Major pieces were well-rewarded ; the £600 Vestris and Matthews paid Sheridan Knowles for Love [36] is put into context by recalling that the annual wage of a skilled labourer at the same time was £65 a year. [37] There is even the intriguing assertion by Thomas Morton, in evidence to the 1831/2 Select Committee, that when no special bargain was struck, an author was in any case paid £33.6.8d. by the theatres, although there is no other evidence on this point.[38]

Beyond question established authors were well paid at the end of our period. Wilde was paid more than £7,000 in royalties for Lady Windermere's Fan alone ; W.S.Gilbert was a rich man;[39] James rejected

Alexander's offer of an effective payment of £2,000 for Guy Domville, evidently feeling it was an offer well below a reasonable current fee for a full-length play in the West End in the 90s. (40)

The managements expenditure on scripts did not however simply mean an increasing sum spent on royalties. At the beginning of the period managers either i) bought script and 'rights' together in one fee, ii) purchased the sole copyright of a play, or iii) bought the rights to present the play in London within a particular period, and it tended to be a 'once for all' payment. By the end of the period expenditure was higher, and accounting expenditure on scripts more complicated for these reasons, i) Higher royalties were paid to dramatic authors, composers of songs and composers, ii) scripts were purchased 'in advance' for later production, or to prevent them from falling into the hands of a rival, iii) much time and money was spent reading both solicited and unsolicited scripts ; as Stoker says, 'To Irving were sent plays from every phase and condition of life ...Every play that was sent was read.' (41) The expense cannot be calculated, but it must have been large. iv) greater concern with realism and historical accuracy meant that a script under serious consideration generated many further book purchases. Thus, when Irving was preparing for Faust he seems to have spent £210 on books associated with the research. (42)

Thus expenditure grew, and its accounting became more complicated, costs for scripts and exploration of possibilities for other productions could not be set simply against the production costs of the piece occupying the stage. Such 'company costs' became large, and had inevitably to be met in the early years of a management when the repertoire was being built ; thus Irving seems to have paid fees or options on some 27 plays that he did not produce, the average sum expended on each being around £400;(43) this seems to point to an 'unproductive' expenditure of some £10,800. There is every reason to suppose however that no other management spent so lavishly on this item, although all managers were bound to spend something in this way.

3:d Scenery

In the period it became standard practice to design fresh settings for each production, and not to take sets from stock. As the trend in settings was towards the twin goals of i) complexity, and ii) three dimensional realism, expenditure on scenery was first a new item and later a rapidly growing one. It was a part of the managers' aspiration to

high rank that Fellows of the Royal Academy of Arts , which had been founded in 1786, were hired and paid, expensively, as the new scenic artists. As Professor Moelwyn Merchant's interesting analysis of the milieu in which a scenic artist such as E.W.Godwin worked shows, [44] Kean would be meeting costs in the 1850s for a considerable period as each production was researched (books and travel) discussed (costs of preparing papers), planned (ground plans and models), built (basic and individually made rostra and pieces) and painted. Lengthening runs meant that sets were better made and would not fall apart, as did Bateman's old sets for The Bells ,[45] which in turn meant higher expense in the last phases, as the wings, cut outs and backcloths were built to higher specifications and painted to last for many years.

Both the drive towards realism - the three-dimensional box set had probably reached an elaborate degree of refinement in Vestris' management at the Olympic,[46] . reached its zenith with the Bancrofts' Prince of Wales's management, and its final philosophical support from the writings of Antoine and his supporters associated with the Theatre Libre in Paris in 1887 (a school which had considerable impact on discussions in London) - and, second, the drive towards rich architectural complexity - whi reaches its highest point with the work of Hawes Craven at the Lyceum - spawned many other costs than the artist's fee and the cost of construction.

First was the cost of storage. The storing of the Lyceum settings - 44 productions were stored at the time of the 1898 fire - was 'a very serious matter'. It occupied a space as large as the Lyceum itself ; cloths were 42 feet long when rolled around their battens, and the framed cloths 30 feet high and 6 feet wide. It was extremely difficult to find a space, and when one was found, it had to be insured, rent paid, and expensive maintainance attended to.[47] A second cost was transport to and from the theatre - in the case of the Lyceum company for more than two thousand pieces of scenery and 'bulky properties without end'. [48] A third cost was for stage labour - not just in the employment of master carpenters (or machinists)[49] but in the considerable and expensive employment of stage hands (see 3;e below) to erect and change settings, to operate the various mechanical contrivances, and to guard actors in an increasingly perilous area of multi-layered settings containing complicated machinery and in which brilliant light and pitch darkness alternated. [50] In general terms running costs have risen by the end of the period so they are roughly three times the costs

of management and front. (51)

3:e Stage Staff

In the earlier part of the period , under the control of the stage manager would be carpenters, property department, wardrobe department and gas men. There would in addition be a number of 'hands' or 'boys' carrying out general tasks, assisting in each area or responsible directly to the stage manager, and some semi-skilled hands such as the 'fly men'. As the vogue for complicated settings grew each department expanded. The coming of electricity added the 'electric' department. The establishing of longer runs increased the numbers employed on ordinary maintainance while increasing backstage decorum brought dressers, chaperones and custodians for children. (52) Thus in the latter part of our period, West End theatres are employing in excess of 100 people 'backstage'.

Such a growth might be thought remarkable in view of the fact that it coincides with an age of technical innovation, in which lighting, transport, movement of weighty objects and rapid erection of stage constructions all in theory were tasks which needed fewer operatives, and tasks made easier by technical advance. There was a suspicion of overmanning, put strongly by Boucicault quite early in the period:

> 'In 1859 I built in New York the Winter Garden Theatre, capable of containing 2,500 persons, being very little less than the capacity of the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane. With the same entertainments as at the Adelphi Theatre, the Winter Garden consumed 20,000 feet of gas per week ; the Adelphi consumes 100,000. The number of carpenters required to work the stage in London varies from 20 to 30 ; in New York the same work is done by six. Here we employ five or six gasmen ; there the same work is performed by a man and a boy. While in management at the Adelphi theatre I saw three men endeavouring to move a piece of scenery ; I caused a simple contrivance to be attached to it, and a child was then able to move it readily with his forefinger. One might suppose that such an economy of labour would have been generally adopted, but our English nature is suspicious of improvement and jealous of reform.'
>
> (53)

Later Stoker , discussing why backstage staff were seen to be idle <u>inter se</u>,

explained that backstage manning and duties were governed by traditional 'rights' and 'customs':

> 'There is the Master Machinist - commonly called Master Carpenter - the Property Master, the Gas Engineer, the Electric Engineer, the Limelight Master. In certain ways the work of these departments impinge on each other in a way to puzzle an outsider. Thus, when a stage has to be covered it is the work of one set of men or the other, but not of both. Anything in the nature of a painted cloth, such as tassellated flooring, is scenery, and therefore the work of the carpenters ; but a carpet is a'property' and as such to be laid down by the property staff. A gas light or an electric light is to be arranged by the engineer of that cult, whilst an oil lamp or candle belongs to properties. The traditional laws which govern these things are deep seated in trades rights and customs, and are grave matters to interfere with.'
>
> (54)

Elsewhere Stoker lays stress upon the Lyceum management's care for efficiency, and for innovation in method when it is more efficient ; it may be taken that he has found 'tradition' amongst backstage workers too strong for drastic alterations as technical invention made it possible. The new charter of rights the Trade Unions received in the legislation of 1871 - 5 had more effect upon the worker solidarity of the stage crews than any other branch of the theatre workforce. Actors were not effectively unionised until the establishment of Equity in 1929 (the Actors' Association of 1891 did not gather a substantial and effective membership), and Managers (and Administrators) have still no effective union, or professional body.

The pay of the backstage staff varied from £30 - £40 week for the experienced Stage Managers in influential West End theatres to £1 for the casual labourers backstage in the slightly less fashionable houses. That however was a basic wage ; for the assistants and 'hands' overtime was an important factor. The Ten Hour Act 1847 both created a defined working day and created a new commodity, leisure - which meant that overtime rates had to be made attractive to persuade the worker to cut into his leisure time. By the 80s stage hands in London worked an 8 hour day; in overtime the next 4 hours counted as a second full day, and thereafter a further 2 hours counted as a third day. (55) Overtime was necessary ; stage workers were in general not only expected to work on the current production from 6.30 to 11.30 each evening, but were required to build and paint new scenery,

create models, prepare rehearsal spaces, maintain settings currently in use, light rehearsals with the tended Tee Piece,[56] and launder costumes and clean properties throughout the day. At a time of a new production, when a manager such as Irving would sometimes have three long dress rehearsals,[57] it must have been the case that a stage hand could well double his weekly income by working 14 hours on three successive days. At the beginning of the Lyceum management the Stage costs (weekly) are as follows:

Week ending 3rd. January 1879

Stage Costs : The Lyceum

	£	s	d
Salaries	282	4	0
Supers	6	6	4
Stage Expenses	106	9	2
Gas	46	7	6
Lime Light	7	10	0
Author's Fees	.	.	.
Orchestra	78	3	11
	527	0	11

This amounts to roughly 50% of the expenditure for the week (£1,004.8.3d.), and is representative of the early years. However by the end of the period salaries and expenses have soared ; there is marked inflation of both in the period 1880 - 1885 when 'the production account doubled...limelight bills quadrupled. More significantly, the net increases in both salaries and stage expenses was greater.' [58] By the mid 1890s the Lyceum account books show that salaries and stage expenses combined were in general more than 50% of the total outlay each week, as against 25 - 30% at the beginning of the period. At least in part such an increase must point to an acceptance of traditional methods of manning the stage, an acceptance of traditional work loads and demarcations, and a degree of over-indulgence in the scenic art. In spite of the grand effects of Beerbohm Tree the end of our period exhibits in West End theatre a new preference for domestic drama of less elaborate effect, and a movement towards a literary theatre which emphasised more the sense of the spoken word than the expensive sense to be derived from spectacular settings.

3:f Publicity

Publicising theatres became more complicated because i) the potential audience was larger, more scattered, and hence more expensive and complicated to reach, and ii) the means of reaching them became more various. In the early part of our period the short run, the immediacy of London productions, meant that a relatively small potential audience had to be reached quickly, but that no advertising was needed to 'remind' potential customers as runs simply did not in general extend for long enough for the first advertisement to need follow-up. The most effective advertisement was to plaster the town with advertisements, and to have two or three display vehicles on the central London streets, such as E.T.Smith's Advertising Cart (59) for Astley's. Occasional 'mailing campaigns' were necessary at the opening of the management or at the start of a season ; Phelps opened his Sadler's Wells management with one. (60) Both the 'mail shots' and posters were fairly verbose, and were designed in forties and fifties to be read at ease by relatively unhurried citizens. (61)

By the early sixties the railways had extended the potential audience to the 'provincial people' (2:a above), and the boom in magazines and newspapers had begun, hence advertising became a bigger charge. An indication of its scope in 1862 is given by Webster, defending himself against an action brought by the proprietor of The Era before the Queen's Bench, who stated that at that time there were four kinds of advertisements, 1) advertisements in newspapers, ii) placarded posters, now simplified in content, (62) iii) board bill or shop bill, of which 700 were distributed to shopkeepers for a Webster production, and iv) the playbill within the theatre itself. To this list must be added in the 70s and 80s v) advertising on omnibuses and railway carriages, vi) permanent signs and hoardings at stations and on shop walls, vii) extensive magazine advertising, and viii) illuminated gas and (later) electric signs in public places and on theatre 'fronts' in London.

The preservation of a bill for advertising in one week of newspapers sent by James Willing Jr. to Bram Stoker in 1904 (63), gives an indication of the scope of newspaper advertising the managers thought necessary. It is sent from the 'Advertising Offices' at 125 Strand, and reads:

	£	s	d
Times	1	10	0
Telegraph	1	8	0
Era		5	0

Referee		4	0
Stage		3	2
	3	10	2

Assuming that advertising rates did not vary drastically between the late 90s and 1904 then the number of insertions the Lyceum management took must have been very high. The advertising bills for the seasons 18-21 were respectively £1,489 . 7. 8d., £3,660. 15. 6d., £4,533. 8. 2d. and £3,933 . 16. 2d. As it is separate from printing and bill posting costs it may reasonably be assumed to represent expenditure on magazine and newspaper advertising. From the bill above we might say that an average cost/insertion is 4s 8d, and can make a rough calculation of both the likely quantity of newspaper and magazine advertising and its relation to actual box office income, as follows:

Newspaper Advertising ; Lyceum 1893-8

Season ending.	Estimated Number insertions.	Revenue £s	Ratio Insertions/seats sold**
21.7.94	6,383	24,899	1 : 10
27.7.95	15,689	50,504	1 : 9.6
23.7.97	19,429	39,638*	1 : 6.1
1.7.98	16,859	38,515	1 : 6.8

* Excluding the revenue from the sale of the Lyceum Company.

** A rough calculation, making the assumption that £1 revenue equals the sale of three seats.

It is possible to do not more than speculate, but there seems no reason to suppose that there was any marked rise in ticket sales as a result of greatly increased newspaper advertising and that this considerable expense (for all managements in the 90s ; a random search through all daily and weekly publications reveals very few not carrying advertisements for the Lyceum, Drury Lane, Her Majesty's, Globe, Prince of Wales's, Duke of York's, Court, Shaftsbury, Adelphi, Savoy, Haymarket, Criterion, Wyndham's, Gaiety, Garrick, Vaudeville and Princess's) may have been allowed to grow as custom, as an indication of and reminder of status, rather than as an effective means of advertising. This point is underlined by the fact that those publications not carrying West End advertising are the magazines such as Police Gazette, plainly intended for an unsophisticated readership.

The managers of the period seemed to understand well the

distinction between publicity and mere advertising, and they feature in numerous press stories which are plainly deliberately 'leaked' or written out press releases directly copied. The stories are in general of the kinds Mr Puff so memorably propounds in <u>The Critic</u> (64); stories of the rumoured excellence of new pieces in rehearsal, sumptuous alterations to the theatre itself, anecdotes of the players in which the present production is obliquely mentioned and even the apparent attack cleverly disguising the puff. A book by Shaw relates in detail the techniques of this,(65) but the essential point for our purposes is that it was free.

Equally free was the way in which the majority of the managers generated interest and excitement by the pointing up of their own personalities. In our modern terminology we should describe the way Phelps presented himself as raising the educational tone of Islington, or the way the meticulous Madame Vestris permitted (and, one suspects, encouraged) rather salacious publications about her to be openly sold (66) as 'marketing an image'. Irving's melancholic/scholarly presence at dignified occasions, the studied public flamboyance of Tree in London Society or the polished society elegance of Alexander are equally deliberate, having immediate impact and generating those oft-printed stories which were both valuable publicity, and valuable means of projecting the stage's new cultivated rank.

It remains true until the end of the period that expenditure on advertising followed custom, and the demands of the new publications boom, and was not informed by any precise knowledge about its own effectiveness. The managers carried out no audience researches, but rather having selected the preferred element they wished to make up the West End audiences modified practices to reach them, through the appropriate journals, and in the appropriate language. There is no compelling evidence of West End managers seriously trying to reach a large plebian audience through any particular publicity campaign, and their public 'images', so far as they may be taken to give public representation to the developing theatre world, suggested the manners, dress, cultivation and habits of the affluent upper middle class Londoner. In it some managers, like Alexander, may have seemed to move as of right, while others, like George Edwardes, seemed <u>nouveau riche</u> , but none made any serious attempt to publicly identify with any other type than the well-to-do Londoner. Used to the simple language, insistent welcoming phrases and (often) the 'wet' ticket money of the music hall and minor theatre advertisements(67) an East Ender could only read the advertising stance of the West End as deliberate disincentive.

3:g Insurance and Legal Costs.

As we noted (1:b above) the 1845 Act limited speculative insurance businesses, and was effective in weeding out some feckless operators. Costs of premiums rose. They rose further following the passing of the Life Assurance Companies Act 1870 ; an act deriving in large measure from the spectacular business failures of the 1860s in the City of London. (68) This created two new legal requirements, i) all insurance companies had to deposit £20,000 with the High Court before they were permitted to trade, and ii) they were forced to publicise their complete audited accounts. This led to a further increase of insurance costs. The bills of sale for the Sadler's Wells theatre show that costs of insurance during Phelps' management were £90 per annum. During Irving's Lyceum management the annual insurance costs had risen to an average of £330 per annum.

In addition to the general rise in insurance costs, which the new enforced stability of the companies generated, two factors combined to make costs higher. The first was that the theatre was notoriously a high risk business ; fires and accidents were still frequent in the nineteenth century. (69) Second was that more premiums had to be paid, as the vast stocks carried by leading theatres had to be housed in separately housed scenery stores, costume stores and general stores. It is a cruel irony of the 1898 fire which destroyed so much of the Lyceum stock that it did not take place in the theatre, but in a storage which Irving considered so safe that the cover was reduced from £10,000 to £6,000 immediately before the fire. (70)

In general legal costs grew in number and in size. They were of four kinds, i) necessary costs of licensing, extracted by the London County Council, ii) legal advice over agreements and contracts, iii) litigation, and iv) audit, a legal necessity for a company, and itself a considerable cost ; it was an average cost of £150 a year for the Lyceum company. (71)

The costs of taking legal advice over agreements and contracts, and the costs of litigation, inevitably are aspects of the same managerial problem. In the period the state was gradually becoming involved in relationships between employer and employee,(72) and was thus absolving the manager from a need to establish a reputation for honour within the profession. More important was a reputation for fidelity to the state's laws and restrictions. 'Honour' is a word much used by Macready , and a

word used of Phelps' associates when, for instance, he gave the actor Dickinson a full year's contract before he had been 'blooded' by the Sadler's Wells audience. (73) By contrast Irving, though totally law-abiding and meticulous over the state's returns, was thought dishonourable by Ellen Terry over his treatment of her, and the publicity did not harm his reputation. 'Honour' was now demonstrated by more public acts of generosity; Wilson Barratt for example was admired for his 'constant benevolence and unfailing sympathy with the poor and the distressed.' (74) But the managers were more publicly vulnerable, less able to demonstrate their virtue by idiosyncratic acts of generosity within their companies, and constricted by increasing social legislation. Legal advice was necessary to cope with the state, and legal aid necessary for the defence of their lofty positions.

In practical terms the period shows managers developing routines of cash control to try to cope with the strains of longer runs, of larger and more complicated companies, and of the raised level of necessary expenditure. That it was so raised, particularly in the realms of scenery and costume, was due to a conscious and expressed emulation of the success the painters had found in forming their own 'artistic' elite, and finding themselves accepted as men of the highest rank for it. That expenditure on the auditoriums was raised was due in part to a real desire to improve conditions but also (as 'improvements' were not universal) a desire to attract and retain the attention of the vocal and understood body of middle class support that read the new Art and Science journals and patronised the stylish galleries and restaurants of central London. Intermingled with this is a curiously supine acceptance of tradition ; the new technology, as Boucicault angrily pointed out , was not accepted and made surprisingly little difference to much stage practice. Sometimes, as with Irving's dislike of electric light, it is simply an artistic pattern that is hard to break, but it also may be seen as further evidence that the theatre economy was operating in a context quite unlike an ordinary industrial one. Tradition could overcome efficiency ; and a working mystique could remain unbroken. A theatre was more like the country house of one of the gentry than a business community in its relationships, and in its beliefs about 'efficiency' and 'inefficiency'.

THREE

NOTES

(1) The story of the Gaiety burlesque Frankenstein in 1887 provides illustration. The pittites created a great disturbance when they discovered the pit, formerly 2s., had been converted into stalls and now cost 7s. 6d. . The piece was in any case disliked. However instead of the 'failure' which would have been inevitable twenty years before, it was turned into a'success' by using the period already covered by advance booking to rewrite the show, and thus 'nursing' it in a manner adopted by the 'play doctors' of the twentieth century.

(2) Irving employed more than 600 people, including actors, at the height of the company's successes. The R.S.C. employs between 500 and 550 people.

(3) Irving's travels played an important part in his visualising Lyceum productions. His visits prior to the production of Faust for example informed the stage pictures, and he 'did not think of playing The Merchant of Venice until he had been to the Levant' Stoker,B. (1907) op cit. p.53.

(4) Robertson, T.W. (1864). 'Theatrical Types' in Illustrated Times (London) January 9th.

(5) The collected is not catalogued in detail but kept in safe boxes by year, and category.

(6) Sold on July 30th. 1878 by Frederick Galsworthy of Chinnock, Galsworthy and Chinnock, 11 Waterloo Place, Pall Mall, London S.W.

(7) The Theatre

(8) Mander,J. and Mitchenson, J. (1961) The Theatres of London (London: Hart-Davis) p. 176

(9) See 1, above. It must be said that the temptation to minimise risks by identifying a reasonably well-to-so audience (articulate enough to make its expectations clear and hence for them to be satisfactorily met) was a very large one.

(10) The family traditions of West End management are very strong. As Dr. Rowell points out, the Wyndham/Albery family have run the Criterion for a century. Rowell (1971) op cit. pp189 - 213.

(11) If his theatre is state subsidised, there is little room for individuality in the financial routines themselves, as the Arts Council returns, which must be made regularly, are of a standard form.

(12) Trewin (Ed.) (1967) op cit. Or see Pollock, Sir F. (Ed.)(1875) Macready's Reminiscences and Selections from His Diaries and His Letters. (London)

(13) Allen, S. (1971) op cit. pp. 30 - 76

(14) Viz , Lupino Lane. The manager of the Chesterfield Civic Theatre (1952) told me proudly that he had got him cheaper because they weren't doing matinees, and that he always suggested a fee per performance.

(15) See the analysis given by Stoker and quoted in 5 below, in which he suggests what the 'real' Lyceum bill would have been if the actors had paid proper salaries to leading players. That Irving was curiously mean to his players in this regard was told me by Mr Clifford Mellison, whose father was a leading player in Irving's company, and who remembers Irving clearly.

(16) She was paid £400 a week on overseas tours. She was also expensive in other ways. In New York she had a bunch of fresh roses every night, in 1888, when the blooms were 5 dollars each. Stoker (1907) op cit. p.365.

(17) Craig, E.G. (1957) Index to the Story of my Days (London : Hulton) p. 97.

(18) Baker, M. (1978) The Rise of the Victorian Actor (London : Croom Helm).

(19) Watson, E.A. (1926). Drama from Sheridan to Robertson (Oxford) p.434.

(20) Vanbrugh, I. (1928). To Tell My Story (London : Hutchinson) p.21.

(21) Craig, E. and St. John,C. (Eds.) (1933) op cit. p. 272.

(22) There were many variations. In 1881 Irving was paying 1s3d. for 'supers' and 2s 9d. for the 'Master Super'. Disher, M. (1936) The Last Romantic (London : Hutchinson) p. 91.

(23) Stoker, B. (1907) op.cit. p.102. 'If a man only worked as a super, we took it for granted that he was in reality a loafer, and did not keep him.'

(24) One of the reasons for the increase of backstage staff was the necessity of looking after the children. It was the duty of the wardrobe mistress at the Lyceum to inspect the children's hands to check they were not wearing rings. At Her Majesty's Theatre children were supervised by the formidable Mrs Evans.

(25) Dance was at a low ebb at the turn of the century; the only ballet to be seen in London was in the form of 'interludes' at the Alhambra. Throughout 1898 for example at the Alhambra, no dancer was paid more than £9 per week. Music Hall performers were paid between £10 and £150 in the same theatre. It is noteworthy also that no dancer had, or could afford, an agent, with the exception of the highest-paid, Ian Colquhoun.

(26) See the Covent Garden archive. See also Brandon (circa 1825) op cit. (Star plays were circa £35 - £40. Production costs £10-£12.)

(27) Enthoven Collection.

(28) McFarlane, G. (1980) Copyright : the Development and Exercise of the Performing Right. (London : City Arts). p. 39 ff.

(29) Burnand, F.C. (1904) op cit. p.119, '...dramatic authorship was, at best, a poor game'.

(30) Authors were clear about their appropriate high rank throughout the period. In their letter to Sir Robert Peel (24th. Jan. 1843) the Dramatic Authors Society makes much of the fact that Knowles' income has been only £260 a year throughout his lifetime as a dramatist. (Manuscript Room, British Museum). This was almost five times as much as the annual income of a skilled labourer.

(31) Fawkes, R. (1979) Dion Boucicault (London ; Quartet) pp. 126 - 127.

(32) Burnand, F.C. (1904) op.cit.Vol. 2.p.21 ff.

(33) Ibid Vol 1. p. 367 ff.

(34) McFarlane, G. (1979) op cit. p. 66.

(35) Burnand, F.C. (1904) op.cit. Vol. 1. pp. 373 - 374.

(36) Booth, M. (1975) op.cit. p.48.

(37) For other interesting comparisons see Nicholson, W. (1966). The Struggle for a Free Stage in London (New York).

(38) McFarlane,G. (1979) op.cit. p.43. Dr. McFarlane quotes from Reports, Committees 1831/2 Vol.7. p.142. It was the case that a common agreement was that authors were paid £33.6.8d. on the first nine nights of a run, £100 on the 20th. night, and a further £100 on the 40th. - but there is no other evidence that in default of any other agreement this was accepted practice on all nights.

(39) Gilbert and Sullivan each earned £10,000 a year.

(40) Donaldson, F. (1970). op.cit. p.115. The terms finally agreed between Alexander and James are not known.

(41) Stoker, B. (1907). op.cit. p.325.

(42) Irving, L. (1951). op.cit. p. 460. The sum may well be larger, for Laurence Irving cites only the expenditure in that year.

(43) Stoker, B. (1907). op.cit. p.326 and p. 329.

(44) Merchant, M. (1971) 'On Looking at The Merchant of Venice ' in Richards, K. and Thomson, P. Nineteenth Century British Theatre (London: Methuen). p.171 ff. The argument receives further illustration in the same author's Shakespeare and the Artist (Oxford University Press).

(45) Stoker, B. (1907) op.cit. p.92. 'Under the modern conditions of Metropolitan theatres it is hard to imagine what satisfied up to the 'seventies'.'

(46) Waitzkin, L. (1933) The Witch of Wych Street (Yale University pamphlet).

(47) Stoker, B. (1907) op.cit. p.423 ff.

(48) Ibid. p.425

(49) Machinists was the former name for Master Carpenter, although, as always, there is no clear division between the two uses.

(50) See for example Stoker,B. (1907) op.cit.pp.421-422. 'I have seen Irving J.P. thrown into the 'cut' in the stage.....on another occasion the whole scene fell about the stage...During Faust the great platforms which made the sloping stage on which some hundreds of people were dancing wildly ...had to be suspended over the acting portion of the stage. The slightest thing going wrong would have meant death to all underneath.'

(51) A difference must be noted however between the spectacular productions of Irving and Tree and the simpler productions of,say, Alexander. The attendants at the St. James seem to have been dressed, if Henry James' account is to be believed, as expensively as the cast.

(52) The decorum backstage at the St. James was the most striking. Separate passageways on to the stage for ladies and gentlemen, chaperones and maids employed to dust the property tables.

(53) Fawkes, (1979). op.cit. p. 137 ff.

(54) Stoker, B. (1907) op.cit. pp.114 - 115. '...prolonged rehearsals mean a fearful addition to expense'.

(55) Stoker, B. (1907). op.cit. pp. 114 – 115.

(56) Rees, T. (1978). Theatre Lighting in the Age of Gas. (London : Society for Theatre Research) p.114 ff.

(57) Terry E. (1933) op. cit. p. 268. 'He always believes in'2 or 3 dress rehearsals.' Clever.'

(58) Hughes, A. (1973). 'Henry Irving's Finances : The Lyceum Accounts 1878 – 1899' in Nineteenth Century Theatre Research Vol. 1. No. 2. p. 80.

(59) See Sherson, E. (1925). London's Lost Theatres of the Nineteenth Century. The cart is described in the entry for Astley's.

(60) The 'educated ' nature of the audience desired is clear from the wording, which was wordy and ingratiating, but asserted quite clearly that Phelps, Greenwood and Mrs Warner felt 'assured that such an endeavour is not unworthy of the kind encouragement of the more highly educated and influential classes.'

(61) There are 539 words in Phelps' distributed manifesto, and a rough cross check of posters for Drury Lane, Covent Garden and Sadler's Wells reveals an average of more than 200 words on each. Conventional advertising wisdom is that for a poster to be read rapidly by a passer-by it should contain no more than 22 words.

(62) They must have been simplified as the court case makes it clear that they did not contain the libel.

(63) Johnson Collection, Bodleian Library, Oxford.

(64) The majority are the 'Puff direct' however. Sheridan (1779), The Critic, Act. 1.

(65) Shaw, G.B. (1894 – 1928) Advice to a Young Critic (London : Peter Owen. Published 1955)

(66) See for example Memoirs of the Life, Public and Private . . Adventures of Madame Vestris (London ; privately printed ; 1839). This extraordinary publication, which Madame Vestris appears to have tolerated, describes her sex life in lurid but unlikely detail. There were also bawdy songs about her, sold in the Toy Theatre shop in Wych Street, close to the Olympic theatre.

(67) Morton for example charged 6d. for admission to his Music Halls, and the ticket entitled the purchaser to 3d. worth of refreshment in the auditorium.

(68) Hansell, D. (1974). Elements of Insurance. (London : M and E Handbooks.). p.260 ff.

(69) See Sachs. O. (1897). Fires and Public Entertainments. (London: Layton).

(70) Stoker, B. (1907) op. cit. p. 425.

(71) In the article discussed in 5 below, Stoker gives the total (20 yr.) amount spent on audit for the company as £3,000. $\frac{£3,000}{20} = £150.$

(72) Trevelyan, G. (1934). British History in the Nineteenth Century (London : Longmans Green and Co.). See particularly Chapter XXV.

(73) Arundell, D. (1965) op. cit. p. 145 ff.

(74) H. Chance Newton, (1927). Cues and Curtain Calls. (London: Bodley Head). p. 155 ff.

FOUR

CASH CONTROL AND ACCOUNTING

Particular attention must now be paid to the methods adopted by the Irving management at the Lyceum, 1879 - 1899, as it can be taken as representative of the best practices of the period. All the Lyceum account books are preserved in the Enthoven collection, and there is additional material in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (John Johnson collections), and in the Stoker Collection, Shakespeare Birthplace Centre, Stratford-upon-Avon. All other books and materials are referred to with footnotes in the usual way.

4:a Budgeting

Dr. Hughes has demonstrated that the method of accounting each season separately at the Lyceum has allowed us a false notion of actual production costs. (1) It also has given a false idea of the basis used in budgeting new productions. Hughes has added together all production costs throughout the years leading up to new productions and has totalled them with production costs of the first two years of the production's life. (Thereafter such costs may fairly be called maintainance). His work shows a sharp difference between the production costs authorities have hitherto accepted, and the actual costs arrived at by his more sophisticated method:

Year	Production	Usual figure			Actual figure		
		£	s	d	£	s	d
1878	Hamlet	1,100	0	0	1,100	0	0
1879	Merchant of Venice	2,061	0	9	2,163	10	9
1880	Corsican Brothers	3,934	12	5	5,086	18	9
1882	Romeo and Juliet	7,468	7	7	9,554	9	0
1885	Faust	11,074	19	8	15,402	14	3
1888	Macbeth	6,660	19	1	9,354	12	6
1889	The Dead Heart	6,035	9	11	7,100	13	11
1892	Henry VIII	11,879	1	0	16,543	15	2
1895	King Arthur	4,501	2	3	9,613	17	2
1897	Madame Sans Gêne	3,587	3	6	6,375	12	6

When considering a new production the usual budget would note the likely production costs, running costs and ordinary 'house' costs (that is, the costs the Lyceum management had to meet irrespective of what was playing) and would balance them against the estimated receipt. This latter was remarkably steady. What a seasonal account does not however show, and what, in the absence of all bank accounts the members of the management kept, can never finally be known, is the amount of money that had to be borrowed in order to float some of the new productions. There are clear indications from Stoker of 'friends' who helped Irving out, and it has been generally assumed that these were in the later stages of his career. (2) There is good reason to suppose that they helped much earlier, once we examine the company's position over several seasons, and that the 'hidden' costs of the interest came to be a factor in decisions about which plays to present, and the manner of their staging.

Irving began management with a negotiated overdraft of £12,000 (3) and Mrs Hannah Brown loaned him a further £1,500.(4) If we make the assumption that Mrs Brown's loan was interest free, but that the bank charged a virtually unknown speculator 1% (5) then Irving had to repay £13,620 at the end of his first year of management or after. As the figures show on the summary accounts for the first season, he had taken £23,584.8.1d. and had spent £9,369.12.10d. before the season began which totalled, with the addition of all expenses during the season, £31,804.16.6d. His 'loss' was therefore £8,220.8.5d., and he owed more than £13,000. (See summary of first season overleaf).

It is not the case, as Dr. Hughes asserts, that Irving was able to enter the second season 'on a paid-up, year-to-year basis'.(6) Even if we accept Dr. Hughes renumbering of the seasons, and accept his interpretation of the bequest (with which we deal below), it is plain that his management did not have a good financial base at the start. Indeed there is clear evidence that his running deficit caused conflict between business and critical instincts. He decided he could not then produce Tennyson's Thomas à Becket. According to the poet's son, Tennyson said at the time, 'Irving won't answer letters....I gave him my Thomas à Becket ; he said it was magnificent, but it would cost him £3,000 to mount it ; he couldn't afford the risk. If well put upon the stage, it would act for a time, and it would bring me credit (he said), but it wouldn't pay.' (7)

The second season (if we adopt Stoker's own numbering) was short, and ended on 26th. July 1879. Receipts were £9,902.15.11d. and expenditure £8,076.9.5d, giving a profit of £1,826.15.11d. The total 'loss'

1978/9

Irving's First Season summary accounts.

	Week ending	Receipts	Carried Forward	Expenditure	Carried Forward
	Jan 3rd.	£1,031.9.2d.	£1,031.9.2d.	£1,004.8.3d.	£10,374.1.1d.
	Jan 10th.	£1,416.19.3d.	£2,448.8.5d.	£851.2.3d.	£11,225.3.4d.
	Jan 17th.	£1,442.7.5d.	£3,890.15.10d.	£1,084.19.1d.	£12,310.2.5d.
	Jan 24th.	£1,429.14.0d.	£5,320.9.10d.	£907.8.2d.	£13,217.10.7d.
	Jan 31st.	£1,325.0.8d.	£6,645.10.6d.	£1,351.7.10d.	£14,568.18.5d.
	Feb 7th.	£1,243.6.8d.	£7,888.17.2d.	£830.18.9d.	£15,399.17.2d.
	Feb 14th.	£1,246.16.0d.	£9,135.13.2d.	£804.11.9d.	£16,204.8.11d.
	Feb 21st.	£1,210.0.1d.	£10,345.13.3d.	£832,16.9d.	£17,037.5.8d.
	Feb 28th.	£1,031.11.3d.	£11,377.4.6d.	£971.6.0d.	£18,008.11.8d.
	March 7th.	£1,010.2.9d.	£12,387.7.3d.	£965.10.4d.	£18,974.2.0d.
	March 14th.	£808.18.0d.	£13,196.5.3d.	£771.9.10d.	£19,745.11.10d.
	March 21st.	£783.14.5d.	£13,979.19.8d.	£738.9.7d.	£20,484.1.5d.
*	March 28th.	£586.8.5d.	£14,566.8.1d.	£1,146.16.7d.	£21,630.18.0d.
	April 4th.	£700.6.5d.	£15,266.14.6d.	£739.8.2d.	£22,370.6.2d.
	April 18th.	£1,061.17.7d.	£16,475.10.11d.	£861.0.5d.	£23,600.9.10d.
**	April 25th.	£1,161.6.8d.	£17,636.17.7d.	£1,281.16.11d.	£24,882.6.9d.
	May 2nd.	£1,105.7.3d.	£18,742.4.10d.	£927.10.0d.	£25,809.16.9d.
	May 9th.	£1,193.12.5d.	£19,935.17.3d.	£1,014.10.2d.	£26,824.6.11d.
	May 16th.	£1,199.2.1d.	£21,134.19.4d.	£1,008.4.3d.	£27,832.11.2d.
	May 23rd.	£1,089.15.7d.	£22,224.14.11d.	£1,126.9.4d.	£28,959.0.6d.
	May 30th.	£1,061.19.5d.	£23,286.14.4d.	£1,396.16.1d.	£30,355.16.7d.
***	May 31st.	£297.13.9d.	£23,584.8.1d.	£1,448.19.11d.	£31,804.16.6d.

* Irving briefly out of the bill with a heavy cold.

** The theatre was closed during Passion Week, ending April 11th.

*** Last 'week' consisting of a matinee and evening performance only.

therefore in that first year, the combined first and second seasons, was £6,394.1.11d. If all money had been kept in a single account, that account would in broad terms have showed at the end of the first full year:

	Credit				Debit		
	£	s	d		£	s	d
Bank Loan	12,000	0	0	Charges	120	0	0
Private Loan	1,500	0	0				
				Season 1 (Loss)	8,220	8	5
Season 2 (Profits)	1,826	15	11				

Account in Credit : £6,986.7.6d.

Plainly without the bequest of £5,000, which was given to Irving that summer, he could not possibly have repaid the £13,620 which we assume he owed. Even with it, he could not quite have done so, and even if he delayed repayment of Mrs Brown's loan, he still has not quite enough to pay the £12,000(and interest accruing)back to his bankers.(8)

Did he in fact pay it into the company? There are grounds at least for supposition that he did not. Stoker, who loses no opportunity to ennoble the ethics of his chief, is somewhat evasive on the point, saying only that it was the only money that Irving received (sic) in his lifetime for which he did not work.(9) He goes on to say that there were no other similar payments, but as he acknowledges elsewhere that there were times when the enterprise was aided by loans, he may conceivably mean that there were no other occasions when Irving received monetary gifts personally.

Whether he put the money into his company or not the Lyceum management was on shaky foundation in its early days, running on borrowed capital with a house that yielded too little revenue for its overall size. Stoker was by his own admission totally new to theatrical management, but one may assume that he was anxious about the position. Yet at such a time Irving determined to present the costly Corsican Brothers. The production costs, which began to accumulate early, were to total in excess of £5,000 (see above) and to the eyes of a conventional Victorian businessman such as Stoker the costs would have seemed irresponsibly high , the desired income unlikely, and it would have seemed there were in the coffers insufficient funds, without other realisable assets, to sustain its early

performances.

In fact it highlights for us an important distinction in the ways a theatre company can budget for its work. In our own time a 'straight' London production will assemble all its likely costs, production costs, house costs and running costs, and will then speculate on whether its funds are adequate to sustain the company in business during the run until the 'break even' point. As the production will be running on borrowed money (probably) for some part of the time, interest charges are taken into account and various 'scenarios' worked out to accommodate the possibility that it may not run, or that business may be slow for a period, or that it may do much better than expected. During 1879-80 any usual budget would have showed that The Corsican Brothers was - by 'straight' theatre notions, an insecure promotion. A notional budget would have shown that with likely production costs of £5,000, and running costs of more than £100 a night, in a theatre likely to take at that time only £220 a night (in fact the average for the 1880/81 season was £214 a night) it would, to put it mildly, be a great risk. It is possible to speculate upon the contents of a conventional budget, for as the 1879-80 season drew to a close the management would know the house costs for the first season of the management. These were:

House Costs 1879 - 80

	£	s	d
Rent	3,834	17	4
Taxes	551	12	0
Insurances	221	13	4
House Staff	1,551	5	4
House Expenses	1,662	17	7
Sundries	1,262	4	6
Total	9,083	10	1

Divided between the 31 weeks the company had operated in total this gives a weekly house cost of £293.3.4d, which may be reckoned as a House Cost per performance of £48.17.3d. Therefore a conventional budget for the proposed Corsican Brothers might have read:

		£	£
Expected production costs		5,000	
Capacity of good av. 'House'			220
Less av. House Costs	£50		
av. Running "	£120		
Costs			170
'Profit'			50

Therefore it was reasonable to estimate that it would be 100 performances, at good average business, before the 'break even' point was reached. However, as we have seen, throughout the decade of the 70s, only 107 productions of all kinds in London had exceeded 100 performances (2:d above). It would therefore seem extremely risky to invest in the first major non-Shakespearean production by the new company with good chances of profit.(Eventually it did run, in conjunction with The Cup, for 192 performances during that season).

However it would be wrong to consider the management decision overly risky or the actual outcome in the 1880-81 season fortunate, for it is clear that Irving did not budget in the way modern 'straight' London shows now usually do.

Rather did he notionally regard the production as a permanent asset, a source of touring income, a source of income at revivals, and an asset that could be profitably resold when the time came. In other words Irving carried a notional budget unlike 'straight' London drama of the present day, but exactly like the way producers of modern pantomimes budget. A 'Cinderella' may not break even during its first run, but it is an asset which is toured as an entity and at the right time sold as an entity. The scenery is not, unlike that of a 'straight' play, broken up, and storage costs are included in overall 'running' costs during the life of the production. Irving was enabled to work in this way because,unlike Macready or Kean, he owned his own stock, had indeed in part purchased it from the Batemans [10] and could therefore consider it a long-term realisable asset. Obviously Stoker thought more conventionally and was worried over high production costs, [11] but by the 1890s had plainly come to understand Irving's mind, and after the fire makes an attempt to explain this in his own writing. 'In fact, to a theatrical manager his productions form the major part of his stock-in-trade.... As to Irving (sic) it was checkmate to the repertoire side of his management. Given a theatre equipped with such productions, the plays to which they belong being already studied and rehearsed, it is easy to put on any of them for a few nights. There is only the cost of carting and hanging the scenes...Several of them were held over for a second run, of which good things might have been fairly expected....Had it not occured he could have gone on playing his repertoire for many years, and would never have had to produce a new play.' [12] As Stoker rightly remarks the real cost of the fire was not the £11,000 that it cost to replace the seven key productions, but the loss of the source of realisable income through occasional revival, and through sales of

scenery of the others.That the final 'selling up' of a production was then a part of the manager's asset, and no longer a traditional part of the proprietors', is indicated by the large number of productions for sale in The Stage, the newspaper for the emergent profession which began publication as The Corsican Brothers was produced. (13)

It is clear from the weekly accounts of the first season that there was never a point at which the bank balance can have moved into credit, Similar examination of seasons 3,4,and 5 (the complete summary of all Irving's London seasons is given overleaf) shows us that by the 11th. week of the 3rd. season (assuming that he had not repaid Mrs Brown's executors the £1,500 , and assuming that the £5,000 legacy had been simply ploughed into the company) he had passed a 'break even'point. Matters then become more complicated, as provincial tours and lucrative U.S. tours intervene, but a thorough examination reveals that it is likely that in the autumn of 1881 Irving had to borrow money to sustain the investment in his company. This is at least ten years earlier than has been accepted by commentators. (14)

By that autumn Irving was undertaking his first major provincial tour with his own company. The account books show a weekly summary of receipts and expenditure in each venue, which is as follows:

Venue	Wk.ending	Receipts			Expenditure		
		£	s	d	£	s	d
Grand Theatre,Leeds	10.9.81	1,538	18	0	1,107	4	6
Alexandra, Liverpool	17.9.81	1,418	1	0	1,135	6	10
"	24.9.81	1,539	11	0	1,101	8	4
"	1.10.81	1,283	5	0	1,006	2	2
Gaiety Theatre, Dublin	8.10.81	1,285	11	6	1,024	19	10
"	15.10.81	1,362	12	0	1,012	12	9
Ulster Hall, Belfast	22.10.81	949	4	0	916	11	2
Royalty Theatre, Glasgow	29.10.81	1,923	15	6	1,249	19	11
"	5.11.81	2,089	1	6	1,376	19	1
Theatre Royal,Edinburgh	12.11.81	1,945	0	6	1,236	16	7
"	19.11.81	2,314	8	6	1,479	7	10
Prince's, Manchester	26.11.81	1,654	8	6	1,141	18	5
"	3.12.81	1,559	19	6	1,101	3	4
P.of Wales's, Birmingham	10.12.81	1,594	19	0	1,178	10	1
Prince's Theatre, Bristol	17.12.81	1,207	10	0	1,052	7	11

Irving reopened at the Lyceum, with The Captain of the Watch, on Monday 26th. December. At first sight it seems that he must have made a handsome profit from the tour ; receipts in these summaries exceed expenditure in total by £6,544.16.9d. However, it was Stoker's practice

Synopsis of Lyceum Accounts 1878 - 1899

Season	Ending	Total Receipts £	s	d	Total Expenditure £	s	d	'Break Even'
1	31st. May 1879	23,594	8	1	31,804	16	6	Nil.
2	26th. Jul.1879	9,902	15	11	8,076	9	5	Week 1.
3	31st. Jul.1880	58,906	13	6	49,254	11	5	Week 10.
4	9th.April.1881	43,434	8	7	34,918	6	5	Week 3.
5	23rd.Jul. 1881	21,206	16	2	19,231	17	6	Week 2.
6	29th.Jul. 1882	47,912	14	9	51,883	5	10	Briefly Weeks3 and 19, then loss.
7	28th.Jul. 1883	89,081	15	4	72,836	12	6	Week 7
8	5th.Sept. 1884	17,262	12	1	18,982	10	4	Nil.
9	30th.Jul. 1885	21,042	13	8	22,419	17	10	Week 9.
10	31st.Jul. 1886	88,117	11	5	76,101	5	3	Week 29.
11	16th.Jul. 1887	75,375	14	0	63,757	19	3	Week 2.
12	7th.July 1888	16,583	3	8	18,718	0	9	Briefly Week 3 then loss.
13	29th. Jun.1889	50,482	11	6	45,021	7	10	Week 10.
14	31st.May. 1890	53,794	8	2	49,699	5	11	Week 8.
15	25th.Jul. 1891	70,670	18	0	66,570	14	10	Week 7.
16	20th. Jul.1892	58,639	10	0	63,214	16	2	Nil.
17	22nd.Jul. 1893	75,372	14	9	79,267	14	1	Briefly Week 31 then loss
18	21st.Jul. 1894	24,898	13	1	27,679	0	8	Briefly Week 8, then loss.
19	27th.Jul. 1895	50,504	4	1	50,652	9	2	Briefly Week 4, then loss.
20	23rd. Jul.1897	66,137	15	0	76,065	19	10	Nil.
21	1st.July 1898	38,514	17	4	41,769	18	11	Briefly Weeks 10-16 then loss.
22 (Interim)	31st. Mar.1899	32,867	2	10*	16,822	6	5	-

*includes money for sale of company.

not to put the sum given to managers of the theatre venues in the summary, although they clearly appear in the expenditure list of the individual weekly summaries. Thus the touring book for the week ending 5th. November 1881, at the Royalty Theatre Glasgow, reads

	£	s	d
Salaries	498	6	0
Hotel			
Postage and Newspapers			
Telegrams and Cables			
Banking			
Petty Cash			
Sundries	58	13	1
Gratuities			
Share	696	7	2
Printing	17	2	0
Advertising	93	4	10
Travelling			
Railway			
Haulage			
Stage			
Extras			
Supers	13	6	0
Chorus			
Stage Hands			
Property Bill			
Wardrobe Bill			
Dressers			
Gas			
Limelights			
Band			
	1,376	19	1

In other words the Irving management had already adopted what was to become standard practice. They supplied the production entire (with the small exception that they were still apparently recruiting and, presumably, training supers in each city), paid the costs for printing and advertising (including bill posting) in situ, and in return the resident manager took one third of the total 'take'.

This means that the actual receipts which were banked by the Lyceum company were a third less than the total given in the summary accounts, $\frac{£23,666 \times 2}{3}$ = £15,777.10.4d. The total expenditure for the tour amounts to £17,121.8.9d. Therefore the management overall in fact showed a loss of £1,343.18.5d, on this venture.

While Irving was on tour the Lyceum itself had been expensively redecorated. Stoker tells us that the cost was in excess of

£12,000.[15] This sum does not appear in the accounts as pre-season expenditure, nor during the entire Lyceum management does the money spent on the rebuilding and redecoration of the house appear, for the 'house expenses' do not approach the total Stoker gives.[16] We therefore assume that major rebuilding , which was marked in 1879, 1881,[17] 1885 and 1893, was paid for directly from bank account and does not figure in the seasonal accounts, wherein house expenses may be assumed to be minor repairs, minor works and general maintainance ; that total for the entire length of the management was £60,000 and we return to it below. There are other payments between 1879 and 1881. As Mrs Brown had died and as Stoker expressly says the executor was repaid 'in due season'[18] we may assume that Irving repaid the money in the year following her death. Finally we must put a sum upon the management expenses in entertaining which (2:e above) were considerable, and in the following suggestion for the 'bank account' it has been suggested that they were £750 a year, including the receptions and personal entertainments in toto which were presumably paid on many occasions directly from the account. With these points in mind, we can construct a 'bank account' as follows:

Credit	£	s	d	Debit	£	s	d
Seasons 1 & 2	6,985	18	11				
3 (profit)	9,652	2	3				
4 (profit)	8,516	2	2				
5 (profit)	1,974	18	8				
				Prov. Tour (loss)	1,343	18	5
				Repayment of Bank Loan	12,120	0	0
				Repayment of Mrs Brown's Loan	1,500	0	0
				Refurbishing of Lyceum (say)	12,200	0	0
				Entertainment (say)	1,500	0	0

Debit £ 1,531 16 5d

The question of whether he ploughed back his bequest into the Company

remains important. If he did not then the company probably had a debit balance until the Spring of 1882. The 6th. season was closely balanced between expenditure and income. The account book for the season shows that within its own terms the season reached 'break even' in the 3rd. week, but slipped back almost at once into loss, and did not go back into credit until the 19th. week, finally making a small overall 'profit' of £3,970.11.1d. A loan of some £1,000 (if Irving did pay in the bequest) or of £6,000 (if he did not) would have been necessary to sustain the company and enable it to meet the bills it did pay.

That Stoker delayed paying bills as long as was possible is indicated by scrutiny of the first year's accounts. The last week shows that although there were only two performances in it, expenditure on house was £404.6.3d and the production account was £815.4.4d., plainly bills left until the season's end.

4:b Financial systems.

Macready's account book for 1843 (19) is a remarkably simple document compared with accounts written later in the period. Advance booking, selling more tickets through Libraries and having different ticketing systems for bookable and unbookable portions of the house meant records inevitably became more complicated. By the 1880s a return sheet at the Lyceum theatre took this form:

ROYAL LYCEUM THEATRE

Sole Lessee and Manager Mr Henry Irving

...day,.....day of....................... 188..

Half Past Nine O Clock

	£ s d	£ s d
ADVANCE BOOKING (incl. Libraries)		
CASH RECEIPTS		
Box Office		
Pit		
Gallery		
TOTAL £		

There are however two distinguishing features additionally on the Lyceum sheets. The first is that there were two returns each evening, one half an hour after curtain up and the second at 9-30 p.m. The second is that the returns were also kept for other recording purposes, as in the bottom left hand corner there was also a space to record the weather.

The building reforms which followed the 1878 Act (1, above) seem to have created at least one further administrative problem. As numerous exits from each portion of the house were now insisted upon, it was no longer possible to rely simply upon the pay box keeper recording the number of people passing through as paid customers. It became possible in many theatres for people to arrive in the gallery from several entrances or to change their seat once within the theatre. Managements seem to have had two responses to this. The first was to introduce a 'transfer charge' from one portion of the house to another, and for each doorkeeper to have a copy of a long and complicated receipt on which each 'cross' could be recorded. One of these, for the Vaudeville Theatre, exists in the Enthoven collection. [20] The second was to inaugurate a system of double checking on doorkeepers' returns by other members of the management staff.

This was the route taken at the Lyceum, where there were nightly 'ushers' returns' These were then summarised on a nightly sheet, in the following form:

ROYAL LYCEUM THEATRE

Sole Lessee and Manager Mr Henry Irving

SUMMARY OF USHERS' RETURNS.

....day, ...day of............. 188..

Private Boxes	Persons
1 : 20	
Total	
Stalls Dress Circle Upper Circle Amphitheatre	

It is noticeable that the management did not have such a double check on gallery or pit, leaving the possibility open of the token system being abused (2:f above)

In spite of Stoker's 'strict reticence' [21] we can reconstruct the Lyceum system. The box office keeper (later termed manager) would supervise the sale of tickets , checking them against a booking sheet (a plan). In the late afternoon he would take back from the Libraries unsold seats – in the years before a telephone, this duty was carried out by an assistant – and would receive their account of sales. As soon as the curtain went up he would complete a 'return' , but would not know the cash receipts at pit or gallery. A summary ' return' would then be completed in the managers office, which Irving, Stoker and Loveday shared [22] from the addition of the three sources, the box office, and the pay boxes at gallery and pit. The money was, presumably, kept in the 'great safe' [23] overnight, and in the morning the treasurer banked the money given him by Stoker. [24]

The treasurer was kept curiously ignorant of the 'high finance' of the undertaking. He paid into the account only what he was given. He does not appear to have been privy to the books or to have carried a cheque book for the company. [25] He seems to have been a cipher; paying the accounts each Tuesday as instructed, some in cash given him by Stoker, and some according to a list given him by Stoker by cheques given him by Stoker. [26] Stoker chose to carry singular financial responsibility, and in other organisations the power of the Acting Manager was usually rather less. [27] Stoker even paid the larger trade accounts. [28]

The Heads of Departments kept minor books of the expenditure within their own departments, and each week brought them to be 'thoroughly checked' in the office before they received the money they required. (Presumably each had a 'float' to accommodate minor expenditures although there is no record of this ; most purchases were billed and paid for after the event it seems). When the money was distributed to their assistants they returned receipted accounts with vouchers. [29] There is no record of any general meeting concerned with finance, only of company meetings or social gatherings at Christmas and the like, [30] and so it is unlikely that they were aware of each other's expenditures. As it was also the case that no-one in the company both received and paid out money, [31] it was

a system – in broad outline remarkably like that followed in twentieth century theatres – which enabled the top management at the Lyceum to keep their business to themselves. Stoker alone had the key of the 'great safe', and although Irving could have examined the books at any time he chose, in the ordinary way he saw them after audit. ... independant audit was carried out by Chartered Accountants' clerks monthly, and after the annual audit by the Accountants themselves the books were returned directly to Irving in sealed envelopes.[32]

The criticism of such a routine must be that it places overmuch responsibility upon one man (it is hard to imagine what would have happened in the event of Stoker being incapacitated for any length of time). Martin-Harvey, who irreverently terms Irving, Loveday and Stoker 'the Holy Trinity', makes it clear that Stoker was disliked by the company, and that he sought to put a considerable distance between them and the management. Nor is it clear that the secrecy had the desired effect of dampening the wrong kind of speculation about the Lyceum's finances.[33] Already in 1880, when the company's finances were far from secure, Henry James was speculating that the Lyceum was an 'immense financial success', adding that 'startling stories' were being told of 'the great sums of money' coming in to 'the happy lessee of the theatre'.[34] There is no evidence of unscrupulous bargains being struck to the detriment of the company by traders intoxicated by rumours of the sudden weath of the Lyceum, but it might be considered that such 'startling stories' were undesirable at the least. Finally it should be pointed out that a modern management would be unhappy that so much crucial information was kept, apparently without copy, in small books of jotter size which are small enough to allow all twenty three to be easily kept within a shoebox.[35]

4:c Accounting

Following the problems of the first three years the Lyceum management had a decade of profit. In the nineties however their financial position gradually declined, and in 1899 Irving, despite protest from Stoker,[36] sold out to the parent Company of the Lyceum, who paid him £26,500 in cash, and £12,500 in shares. He was to play 500 performances at the Lyceum over 5 years at reduced terms, paying all production expenses in the first year and 60% of them thereafter. He was moreover to pay all stage expenses, half the advertising cost, and was to

guarantee the parent company a minimum £100 from each London performance. Stoker, who was hostile to the scheme, offers a hostile analysis of its results in his writings. (37)

It is reasonable to assume that a tired Irving, having lost his productions in the fire, recognised that his only asset was his acting ability and that it would be best to conserve this by shedding some (though in practice remarkably few) of the duties of management. Certainly he was not destitute, but he might have calculated that he could have become so had he continued to operate in the same way. His financial position in 1899 I do not think as healthy as does Dr. Hughes (38) but it was by no means hopeless. He retained capital enough to refurbish some productions. Broadly his 'bank account' would in 1899 have had this outline:

Credit	£	s	d	Debit	£	s	d
Insurance payment	6,000	0	0	Improvements to Lyceum	60,000	0	0
Profit U.S. tours	66,500	0	0	Hospitality(20 times £750)	15,000	0	0
Profit, provincial tours	25,000	0	0				
Profit, Lyceum seasons	36,000	0	0 *				

*(This figure is arrived at by finding the net 'profit' from all London seasons and subtracting the loans, discussed above, as appropriate)

Account in credit £58,500

However, meticulously though the accounts had been kept, the management had suffered from its own secrecy, and from forgetting the account second function; they are not merely i) a means of recording the accuracy with which financial procedures have been carried out, but more importantly, ii) a means of informing parties of the precise situation of a business. The Irving management took great pride in its probity, but read too little into the accounts of the last years at the Lyceum. Expenses had overtaken income, and it was possible to make certain economies. But detailed accounts had they been scrutinised by others (in the way a modern Theatre Board scrutinises accounts and figures presented by an administrator) would have shown that there were certain disturbing characteristics in the growth of expenditure and

in the comparative slide in income. The two most salient features are the theatre advertising, and the audience composition.

In 1878, at the very beginning of management and in order to advertise an entirely new venture, the following were the sums expended:

	£	s	d
Printing	56	17	0
Advertising	286	10	6
Bill Posting	39	2	6

In the last four seasons (of very different lengths) the sums for an established company are by contrast high:

	18th. Season			19th. Season			20th.season			21st. season		
	£	s	d	£	s	d	£	s	d	£	s	d
Printing	467	9	1	828	5	2	653	14	0	253	9	0
Advertising	1,489	7	8	3,660	15	6	4,533	8	2	3,933	16	2
Bill Posting	525	9	1	787	18	6	1,361	3	4	1,105	1	7

There is no proportionate increase in audience size, and in marketing terms, an outsider would suggest that the 'packaging' was wrong, that the haughty educational tone of the Lyceum's advertising was faintly inappropriate in a city which could legitimately point to a variety of reasons for attending the theatre, other than 'improvement'. Certainly there is too much outlay on advertising for too little impact - yet the management continued to spend it until the end. (39)

More importantly, an outsider commenting on the detailed accounts of income would have seen evidence that the accumulated measures which clearly had made the educated middle class the target audience for serious theatre were now working too well ; the target was defined too accurately. The following table of a series of representative seasons shows what any representative cross section of like weeks also shows the disinterested observer - that the fluctuations, and finally the falling away of support, tend to occur at the extremes. It is boxes and pit which show less substantial return. In the table the percentage figures are rounded up in order to give a broad comparison:

Percentage Income from portions of the Lyceum (in 4 year samples from 1881)

	Season 3	Season 7	Season 11	Season 15	Season 19.	
Private Boxes	10.2 (£6,023)	8.4 (£7,258)	3.6 (£2,694)	3.1 (£2,234)	2.8 (£1,387)	%
Stalls	32.4 (£19,053)	30.3 (£30,341)	31.2 (£23,444)	33.6 (£24,235)	31.3 (£17,938)	%
Dress Circle	20.2 (£11,934)	19.7 (£17,055)	22.8 (£17,140)	25.7 (£18,476)	23.1 (£11,423)	%
Amphitheatre	2.5 (£1,473)	4.6 (£4,014)	6.3 (£4,652)	5.1 (£3,715)	5.5 (£2,672)	%
Pit	19.1 (£11,281)	15.9 (£13,811)	16.6 (£12,430)	13.7 (£9,886)	12.2 (£6,020)	%
Gallery	4.8 (£2,881)	3.7 (£3,209)	4.3 (£3,168)	3.6 (£2,564)	4.8 (£2,356)	%
Upper Circle	10.8 (£6,389)	12.9 (£11,516)	15.2 (£11,411)	15.2 (£11,067)	15.1 (£7,031)	%

Although theatre managers hanker after such axiomatic certainties when budgeting, it is not possible to derive absolutely from accounts the guaranteed future 'take' of a particular play, or the certain attraction of a particular player or a presentation in a particular theatre. It is however possible to discern trends.

From accounts at the Garrick theatre at the same time as Irving's 'decline' at the Lyceum, we can deduce more. In the accounts (given in full overleaf) for the production of <u>The Notorious Mrs Ebbsmith</u> by the Hare management we can see quite clearly a marked change in the house takings on and after May 15th. 1892. The first 58 performances (including matinees) yield a total of £14,168.11.0d., and the next 28 (also including matinees) a further £3,477.10.6d. The average receipt per performance for the first 58 performances is £244.5.0d., and the average for the second 28 is £124.4.0d. In the second part of the run there is only one matinee, yielding £119.18.0d., but in the first part the seven matinees yield on average £213.8.6d. The reason is simple. On May 15th. Mrs Patrick Campbell left the cast, and was replaced by the less popular Miss Nethersole. (40) A popular performer thus meant, even allowing for the fact that she appeared during the fresh part of the run, a clear difference in receipt of more than £600 a week.

Had any independant body had sight of accounts for the Garrick and the Lyceum for 1892 they must have recognised that the loss for the 1891/2 season at the Lyceum of £4,575.6.2d. would have been wiped out in 8 weeks had the Lyceum had a star performer with such novel drawing power. They might indeed, viewing the two accounts, have reflected that Irving's box office power was now less than other performers in the West End, and advised him that in attempting to fill the house by his own drawing power, certainly in the later pieces such as <u>Robespierre</u> (which Ellen Terry described explicitly as 'A one-man piece. Henry, and over 250 supers' (41)) he was mistaken. However no such body existed. Then as now the individual managements guarded their accounts carefully, and permitted rumour to flourish when it flattered, and thus permitted the theatre business to plan upon a questionable accumulation of theatre lore, and an incomplete knowledge of the existing market.(42)

The fact that by the end of the period of this study there was already a business specialising in publishing account books used by theatres - Henry Good and Son of 12 Moorgate Street, London - is indication that the procedures we have described were generally accepted. However the account books are simple, and contain no space for checking actual income and expenditure against budget.

'The Notorious Mrs Ebbsmith.' Garrick Theatre 1892

No.	Date.		£	s	d	
1	March	13	191	9	0	
2	"	14	210	17	0	
3	"	15	223	19	6	
4	"	16	280	12	6	
5	"	18	238	11	6	
6	"	19	253	12	0	
7	"	20	264	18	6	
8	"	21	260	8	6	
9	"	22	260	13	0	
10	"	23	221	9	0	m.
11	"	23	279	14	0	
12	"	25	259	8	0	
13	"	26	266	12	0	
14	"	27	270	12	0	
15	"	28	267	10	6	
16	"	29	258	14	0	
17	"	30	253	16	0	m.
18	"	30	284	3	6	
19	April	1	257	15	0	
20	"	2	265	11	6	
21	"	3	270	0	0	
22	"	4	270	2	0	
23	"	5	261	12	0	
24	"	6	251	16	0	m.
25	"	6	265	11	6	
26	"	8	257	6	0	
27	"	9	262	9	6	
28	"	10	257	18	0	
29	"	13	258	13	0	
30	"	15	157	9	6	m.
31	"	15	213	13	0	
32	"	16	201	1	6	
33	"	17	218	17	0	
34	"	18	211	15	6	
35	"	19	225	14	0	
36	"	20	199	1	0	m.
37	"	20	260	11	0	
38	"	22	214	5	0	
39	"	23	229	13	6	
40	"	24	235	0	6	
41	"	25	248	13	6	
42	"	26	255	4	6	
43	"	27	214	14	6	m.
44	"	27	262	5	0	
45	"	29	215	14	0	
46	"	30	242	19	0	
47	May	1	251	15	0	
48	"	2	247	1	6	
49	"	3	245	8	0	
50	"	4	195	13	6	m.
51	"	4	257	17	6	
52	"	6	235	0	0	

No.	Date.		£	s	d	
53	May	7	244	8	0	
54	"	8	241	9	0	
55	"	9	248	13	6	
56	"	10	270	9	6	
57	"	11	223	2	6	
58	"	11	262	3	0	
59	"	15	170	17	6	
60	"	16	192	0	0	
61	"	17	172	2	0	
62	"	18	119	18	0	m.
63	"	18	217	6	0	
64	"	20	142	10	6	
65	"	21	152	19	0	
66	"	22	157	3	6	
67	"	23	174	12	6	
68	"	24	159	2	0	
69	"	25	142	17	0	
70	"	27	121	5	6	
71	"	28	124	12	6	
72	"	29	111	2	0	
73	"	30	90	10	6	
74	"	31	94	10	0	
75	June	1	74	13	0	
76	"	3	65	11	6	
77	"	4	70	14	0	
78	"	5	88	12	0	
79	"	6	84	6	0	
80	"	7	108	3	0	
81	"	8	63	18	0	
82	"	10	96	15	6	
83	"	11	110	4	0	
84	"	12	125	3	6	
85	"	13	115	19	0	
86	"	14	130	14	0	

M. - matinee.

This fact, coupled with the secrecy with which managers sought to surround their budgets and their accounts, meant that theatre was still a highly speculative business. The managers had no market research, and were not impelled in any sophisticated way to check income and expenditure regularly against budget, and were hence less knowledgable about their own functions than are some of their modern counterparts. Moreover they had no more official professional meeting place than the London clubs, and so the lore on which judgements were made was suspect, shared not on a common professional basis, but on rumour and gossip. (Some indication of this can be found in the hack life stories which followed the deaths of leading managers and actors and in which financial details were almost always lurid and inaccurate).

The determined, and tightly controlled, financial systems which Stoker and his contemporaries ran must excite our admiration, for they were developed without advice, and to meet the demands of a newly grown enterprise. Nevertheless we also notice that the large numbers of people employed front of house, and the complicated paperwork that derives from a complicated pricing system, means that change was difficult. Concessions, for example, which an observer might have thought a sensible way of enticing new groups into the theatres, could hardly be accommodated in the returns (3 above), unless they had been redesigned, and further checks made upon the staff in the pay boxes and at various doors. Nor is variation per performance easy, and it is not surprising that Stoker did not learn the benefits of variable pricing attracting a variable audience, even though he noticed that when Booth was in the company and stall seats were raised from 10s. to £1.1s, the demand for the 'off' night, when prices were lower was not affected. (43) More radical modern solutions, which make staff costs lighting and cash control easier - such as limiting the numbers of entrances, and standardising admission charges - were impossible within the social framework the theatre chose to work, but that underlines only the fact that as so often it is what the managers did <u>not</u> advocate that is of equal significance with what they did.

FOUR

NOTES

(1) Hughes,A. (1973). 'Henry Irving's Finances : The Lyceum Accounts 1878 - 1899' in Nineteenth Century Theatre Research Vol 1 No 2 pp. 79 - 87.

(2) Stoker, B. (1907) op cit. p.433 '..he had occasionally to get an advance. Fortunately there were friends who were proud and happy to aid him.'

(3) Ibid. p.429

(4) Ibid.

(5) The Bankers were London and County Bank. It has not proved possible to uncover any accounts that may still exist.

(6) Hughes,A. (1973) op cit. p.83

(7) Archer, F. (undated) op cit. p256.

(8) If the bequest were added the 'account' would total £11,986.7.6d. Throughout the assumption is made that before the season began the profits from the tour with which Irving preceded London management were swallowed up in the initial costs of 'beautifying' the Lyceum. Stoker indicates these were at least £5,000, which must account for the tour profits (Stoker,B. (1907) op cit p.39).

(9) Ibid. p.431

(10) Letter from Bateman to Irving. (Enthoven Collection).

(11) As example, Stoker hoped when he heard Irving read Edgar and Lucy on November 25th. 1889 that it could 'be accomplished at little cost'. 'As I was chancellor of the exchequer I was greatly delighted to see a chance of great success combined with a reasonable cost.' In the event, in spite of there being no author's fee, the production account was just under £5,000. Stoker,B. (1907) op cit. pp.121,122.

(12) Ibid. p. 426.

(13) See the complete sequence of issues of The Stage , on microfilm, in the Skinners' Library, City University.

(14) See Dr. Hughes, 'nightly receipts increased continuously from 1878 until about 1895, but they failed to keep pace with costs, which finally and irrevocably overtook receipts in 1892'. Hughes,A. (1973) op cit. p.82.

(15) Stoker, B. (1907) op cit. p. 431.

(16) The total, £60,000 , is given in Stoker,B. (1907) op cit. p. 432. In the totals he gave later (see 5:a below)it may be presumed that costs on the renovation of the building are excluded, and that hospitality costs are also.

(17) Wrongly, Diane Howard gives a date of 1882 for major redecoration, perhaps misled by the dating of the account in the Builder Jan 14th., 1882. p.56. That however is a description of the redecoration and alterations of the previous year, prior to the opening in December of the 6th. season.

(18) Stoker, B. (1907) op cit. p. 429

(19) Account Book for Drury Lane(Dec. 1841 – June 1843)is in the Enthoven Collection.

(20) Daily Returns, Alhambra Theatre, in the Enthoven Collection.

(21) Stoker, B. (1907) op cit. p. 427.

(22) Ibid. p. 428.

(23) Ibid.

(24) Ibid. p.427.

(25) Ibid.

(26) Ibid.

(27) 'It is not an uncommon thing for members of a company to dislike the business manager...We did feel that Stoker strongly fortified the barriers that kept us away from our Gov'nor.' Martin Harvey, J. (1933) pp.63,64.

(28) Stoker, B. (1907) op cit p. 427.

(29) Ibid p. 428

(30) At meetings Irving outlined production plans, or in the case of the one called following a drunken appearance in Hamlet by one of the Lyceum actors made a rousing call for company loyalty. Stoker, B. (1909) op cit. pp. 51 – 52

(31) Ibid p. 428

(32) Ibid

(33) 'Everyone wants to know all about a theatre J.P. and curiosity-mongers if they cannot discover facts, invent them.' Stoker,B. (1907) op cit. p. 427

(34) James, H. (1881) 'The London Theatres' in Scribner's Monthly. Jan. 1881.

(35) They are currently kept in such a box in the Enthoven Collection. Their importance is such that copies should be made. The same applies to the Irving notebooks which, written in pencil, are open to simple forgeries.

(36) Stoker, B. (1907) op cit p. 444.

(37) Ibid pp. 444 – 446

(38) Dr. Hughes gives his reasons for saying that we have to 'explain away' £130,000. Hughes, A. (1973) op cit.p. 85. He has a different view of the House expenses, and makes no allowance for hospitality in this sum.

(39) We examined the cost of newspaper insertions above (3:f).

(40) The scandal of the play had become closely associated with Mrs Pat. '...the play is bad. But one of its defects – to wit, the unreality of the chief female character, who is fully as artificial as Mrs Tanqueray herself – has the lucky effect of setting Mrs Patrick Campbell free to do as she pleases in it, the result being an irresistible projection of that lady's personal genius, a projection which sweeps the play aside and imperiously becomes the play itself.' Shaw, G.B. (1895).The Saturday Review.March 16th.

(41) Craig, E. and St John, C. (1933). Ellen Terry's Memoirs p. 272. There were actually 69 speaking parts, largely minute, in the piece.

(42) There is still great wariness of market research. The Albery family

have researched their own audiences and have occasionally released figures to the press. However more widespread research into West End audiences has only just begun in 1980 when the National Theatre and the Society of West End Theatre Managers have separately set up research with the City University.

(53) Stoker. (1907). op.cit. p. 57.

FIVE

STATE SUBSIDY.

Professor Stokes' analysis of the demand for a National Theatre founded on state patronage , the most recent study published of the ethics of the commercial and independant managers, [1] is too brief for our purposes. He does not make the distinction between a Shakespeare memorial, a National theatre and other forms of subvention, and his references to the development of the argument in the nineteenth century are cursory, and omit altogether the detailed papers published in The Theatre in 1878 and 1878, perhaps because Professor Stokes chooses to label the editor, Clement Scott, 'phillistine'.[2] He gives greater prominence to the work of J.T.Grein and Moore, who approached their notions of revolution from outside the professional theatre, than to the work of the practitioners, and the emphasis lies upon the politics of the 'literary theatre'.[3] Our purposes are different ; we aim to disentangle the threads of financial, critical and ethical argument for the establishment of state support and to analyse all that tells us about the state of the West End theatre in our period.

That some form of financial support from the state was necessary was argued as early as 1806 by Martin Archer Shee, who gave his opinion that 'a drop from the ocean of our expenditure' would sufficiently 'impregnate' the growth of the arts.[4] For much of the first part of the century the argument dwelt upon the state support of the visual arts, and the high purposes of the new national galleries,[5] but the argument for state support of the theatres grew afresh in the 60s and 70s. It was by no means the case that the two strains of argument were totally separate, for many 'fine art' establishments were presenting performances of various kinds, artistic venues such as the Chrystal Palace were certainly used for dramatic performances by drama companies,[6] and the discussions which Professor Altick has so thoroughly analysed in the realm of the fine arts are by no means irrelevant to a study of theatre. [7] Nevertheless specific arguments about establishing subsidy for a 'national' theatre grew afresh, and by 1878 were the subject of the first of a series of papers on the subject in The Theatre.

The argument in the first issue of the reorganised journal (Aug.1st. 1878) was that although there had been desultory discussion, the time was ripe for serious debate about a subsidised theatre for London. It should not be limited to the preservation of the works of Shakespeare, but should be concerned with a wider repertoire. It made much play of Gladstone's support [8] and stressed that the theatre would be an agent of moral good.

The central argument however purported to deal with the usual objections to state aid, firstly by stressing that as the state already had a controlling influence upon theatre in a prohibitory, negative sense, it was reasonable to permit it the same powers through more positive action. Moreover the state already looked after the Victorians' sanitary arrangements and it 'even concerns itself with our education, which it makes compulsory' [9] so why not directly aid the artistic and spiritual life of its citizens? The objections to the 'private enterprise' of the commercial managements are then listed, i) they ferment the 'long run' system, ii) they encourage the 'star' system, iii) they discourage young playwrights and actors, iv) have no impulse to found training schools or to encourage training. State aid, in the opinion of the anonymous author (conceivably the phillistine Scott - see above), would i) put all these things right, ii) offer a stimulating centre of prestige at the heart of the profession, iii) give permanent employment to the fine actors employed therein, iv) offer those actors in-service opportunities that they conspicuously lacked for holidays and for study at leisure, and v)give long-serving actors a pension. The paper is evasive on detail, but seems to envisage that this national theatre would be controlled by a Minister for the Arts. [10]

The second contribution was in December of that year in the same journal (Dec. 1st. 1878), and was written by Charles Godwin who, Professor Stokes says,[11] 'campaigned' with J.R.Planché in the following year, 1879. (However his campaigning had begun very much earlier, for he notes that he had in fact begun campaigning seven years before , in 1871).

It is a curiously emotional paper, brushing aside the achievements of the Bancrofts, and Kean, and Phelps and Webster with the contemptuous remark that they will only offer programmes 'most likely to bring money',[12] and launching into a dark attack upon an unnamed lady actress, also commercial, who displays the 'charms of her person' lavishly to her adoring public, but who is 'known' to influence the management of 'a certain theatre'. His remedy does not seem to be direct state aid as a means of covering the lady's charms, but a theatre run by a list of public-spirited guarantors, where the educated audience (sic) could find delight.

The second part of the paper, little concerned with the first, consists of a long direct quotation from Irving, whose views had been sought by Godwin. (13) Irving is cautious, confining himself only to generalities, and he repeats some of the points made by the author of the previous paper, but his general description of the parameters of a national theatre is (in parts) interestingly like the way our modern state-aided theatres are run, particularly in the first point. His major arguments are:

i) It should be run by a corporation, and state subsidy should not be given until the corporation was established, and was seen to be promoting work 'a little beyond' average taste.

ii) It should be big enough to absorb losses and big enough for it to work in 'every branch' of the histrionic art.

iii) The corporate body must be elastic as to its size. Talent is not a 'fixed commodity'.

iv) It should be independent of direct government control (we should say 'at arm's length' from government), and controlled from within by confluent opinion.

v) It would give theatre in general a 'local habitation and a name' - official recognition and political significance.

vi) It would give pensions and divest old age for the actor of 'the terrors of want'.

The careful thought Irving had given to the question is of particular significance in view of the journal's attitude towards state subsidy the following November. (14)

In February 1879 The Theatre published Henry Peat's paper on 'Objections to State Aid'. The paper takes the general premises of the previous arguments, indeed he accepts without challenge the view that state aid must take the form of aiding a single London theatre, (15) and his objection is largely that it would not work in practice. The government would almost certainly appoint the 'wrong' manager, and it would be staffed by actors well past their prime playing to a well-heeled audience too polite to recognise the 'senile incapacity' of the players. He would have his readers look to France not for the example of the Theatre Francais, but at the warning given by the other subsidised house, the Odeon, where runs are as long and as dull as in the West End of London. (16)

On 4th. March 1879 a public meeting was held at Covent Garden at which the Marquis Townshend was elected chairman, and a committee/working party was set up to investigate all possibilities ; Baillie Cochrane had his proposal for a second 'follow up' meeting at Willis's Rooms accepted. The Theatre on 1st. April 1879 published a lukewarm review of the meeting, pointing out that the Marquis was scarcely the right chairman, that the committee/working party needed to be weeded of its 'numerous nonentities' and that for the movement to stand a chance it must have the suppport of the leading London actors and managers. Even less enthusiastic was the leader -in November of the same year[17] which took up the novel notion which Hermann Vezin had proposed at that year's Social ScienceCongress,[18] that the interests of art and commerce could be identical. The journal now saw no need for state subsidy, the idea stood 'less secure' because Irving had begun to show at the Lyceum that private enterprise could achieve everything desired in the earlier (Aug 1st.,1878) piece.

The argument however did not die down, in spite of James' sly assertion that since the repeal of the monopoly powers of the patent theatres, London theatre had moved away from state control rather than towards it.[19] The strongest argument for state control of this kind was put forward by Matthew Arnold, in August 1879.[20] He followed the stages that Irving had suggested:

> 'Form a company (sic) out of the materials ready to hand in your many good actors and actresses of promise. Give them Drury Lane theatre. Let them have a grant from your Science and Art department.' (21)

The direct link through Education Funding is interesting in view of the subsequent history of state aid.[22] It accords with Arnold's view of the right of the state to make education compulsory and to educate against the lower instincts:

> 'We gladly took refuge in our favourite doctrines of the mischief of state interference, of the blessedness of having every man free to do as he likes, of the impertinence of presuming to check any man's natural taste for the bathos and to press him to relish the sublime.'

Interestingly he too offers a small defence of the old patent theatres although acknowledging that 'the system had its faults.'

For the next fifteen years the argument continued much along these various lines. Proposers argued that commerce and art were irreconcilable and that only some more disinterested funding would ensure that the art of the theatre found a home. However there was much doubt about the wisdom of state interference, and it was generally felt that a consortium of rich and cultured men should fund such a theatre. The alternative was a company. As Trevelyan says, 'Many an old family firm was replaced by a limited liability company with a bureaucracy of salaried managers.' (23) But such proposals in general found no favour within the profession's leadership, because as we have seen (1:c above), they did not aspire to be a part of the managing elite, but of a branch of the intellectual.

By 1891 Tree seemed almost bored with the subject (although his interventions were strong and decisive when they came). In a lecture to the Playgoers' Club he said:

> 'It sometimes happens that, in his attempt to evade the quicksands of the Bankruptcy Court, the manager perishes in the stagnant waters of commercialism. It is obvious that it is desirable that a manager should be freed from these sordid considerations, and I believe that in almost every country but England the theatres are State-subventioned. It is an open question,however,in a country in which individualism in all departments has taken strong root, and where State encouragement or interference is looked upon askance – whether a national or subsidised theatre would be for the ultimate benefit of the community.'
>
> (24)

Although Tree marginally was inclined to support the idea his doubts lay with the conservatism of national institutions. For Tree the 'Great Perhaps' that Archer had spoken of nine years earlier, of an Endowed Theatre, (25) was not necessarily desirable. 'Other countries' he said, 'do not tend to show that the State-subsidised theatres are in touch with the age.' (26)

As we know that the movement did not achieve its results within the lifetime of these advocates, their arguments take on a different importance. From them we can gather much about the limitations of the commercial managements and the nature of their aspirations.

5:a <u>The financial arguments</u>

The first serious discussion of the money which would be necessary to subsidise the theatre came in 1879, the year Arnold suggested a grant from the Science and Art Department (above). Clement Scott, in his paper in The Theatre said it would be a matter of 'a few thousand' and later specifically mentioned a 'guarantee fund' of £29,000. Later contributions to the debate implied some kind of government funding of this order, but the scepticism which such low estimates provoked within the profession did not find public statement until May 1908, when Stoker analysed the likely costs of a subsidised National theatre in the light of his overall experience in the 1878-99 management of the Lyceum. (27) The paper is important both for its sober judgements upon the vaunted state subsidy, but also for the retrospective view of the Lyceum management.

He begins by insisting that ordinarily speaking , a theatre 'is supported by its own efforts' while acknowledging that, 'Some capital, or credit which can take the place of capital - may be required at first ; but in the long run it must stand or fall by its own work'.(28) A national theatre must be an exception to this:

> 'This being a national matter must naturally be placed in the national capital - in this case, London....It should serve as an accredited model for all lesser and local enterprises dedicated to workings of a similar kind, with regard to safety, hygiene, resources, convenience, ease, comfort, elegance and good taste - in all ways a model and an exemplar of what should be and what is capable of achievement....It must be large.'
>
> (29)

He stresses the space such a new building must occupy - the larger stage and storage spaces required for a theatre housing a national repertory, and the larger and more costly auditorium fitments taking more ground space than that occupied by present West End theatres. He calculates that at turn of the century prices the ground occupied by the old Lyceum would have cost between £250,000 and £300,000. That space however would be not 'nearly large enough', and so a reasonable calculation of the sum required to start building is £500,000.

He then summarises the total costs of the twenty years of Irving's management (see 4:a and 4:c above) as follows:

Stage expenses.	£
Salaries	280,000

Stage Expenses (contd.)	£
Supers	16,000
Stage Staff and Expenses	100,000
Lighting (Gas, Electric and limelight)	32,000
Orchestra	47,000
Cost of producing plays	153,000
Front of House	
General Staff of Theatre	30,000
Expenses of working	56,000
Sundries	12,000
Other categories	
Law and audit	3,000
Insurance	7,000
Upkeep of the house	48,000
Other 'working expenses'	
Printing	13,000
Newspaper Advertising	57,000
Bill-posting	15,000
Purchase of plays and authors' fees	13,000

These figures, it should be noted, are given under slightly different titles from those used elsewhere by Stoker, but they justify our earlier suppositions (4:a above) above the Lyceum expenses, [30] and are used tellingly here by Stoker to explain that the cost of a National Theatre would be very much higher than lay arguments supposed. At the outset he stresses however that they are misleading in one important respect ; if Irving and Ellen Terry (in her London seasons) were paid salaries according to their status the actual salary costs would have been £750,000

From this and from the likely figures arrived at for acquiring site and building, Stoker estimates annual running costs to be £75,000. Based on knowledge of the London audience, and the probable size of the theatre, he

asserts it is reasonable to say that such a theatre would draw £1,000 a week, that is in a 50 week season (allowing two weeks for cleaning and maintainance) the annual income would be £50,000, leaving a shortfall of £25,000. (31)

The most interesting part of Stoker's argument however is that he vehemently objects to the very way in which state subsidy was ultimately to work, by annual grant offered to offset calculated loss. 'It does not do to calculate by subsidy fixed per annum, or varying as required.' (32) He insists, perhaps bearing in mind the way his own chief considered production budgeting (4:a above) that it must be theoretically capitalised before the matter could be fairly considered. He gives an indication of what this might mean. In order to provide for the initial investment of £500,000 as required, and for the annual payment of £25,000 shortfall he estimates that a sum of £1,700,000 (for Bonds then at 88% rate, yielding 2½ % per annum) would be required from government. He does not consider that the same effect could have been achieved by an initial grant of £500,000 and either an annual £25,000 grant or a further grant of £1,100,000 to capitalise the project in the way he suggests, both of which might have been more attractive prospects.

The scale of the figures was much larger than any given previously, and the general reaction to them was summarised by Pinero later that year, when he moved a motion at another public meeting called to consider the National theatre question (10th. June 1908). He said that he found the figures very high, and repeated the old rumour about Irving that 'a more recklessly extravagent manager never signed cheques in the office of a theatre', adding 'I can see no earthly reason why [a National theatre J.P.] should not be done on a fairly remunerative basis'. (33) Such figures plainly alarmed a profession used to thinking of itself as a collection of small productive units rather than one whole.

5:b The arguments over critical standards

In the same speech (above) Pinero took exception to the often repeated view that subsidy was necessary because, for commercial reasons, serious works would not otherwise be presented. He listed the work of the actor managers in presenting Shakespeare, and in promoting contemporary British drama and came firmly to the conclusion that without subsidy both were in good health. (34) He felt that arguments over critical standards were better conducted in the sphere of revivals.

Unlike British managements, foreign ones 'preserve' great productions. 'They do not allow it, when it has been seen and admired to be neglected, forgotten.' (35) He felt Britain should emulate these unnamed foreigners in this respect, and also such a theatre would, when a play had failed, form ' a court of appeal'.

It is a curiously unworldly argument from a man so versed in the practicalities of theatre ; there is no discussion of who acts as judge in such a theatrical court or, more to the point, by what process are plays that have 'failed' given such a re-trial. Yet it illustrates the difficulty of conducting the argument about state aid in terms of critical standards. If it is true (which no contemporary writers seem to have contested) that the major West End ensembles did achieve a corporate ability which yielded productions as good as anything that could be imagined as coming through further aid, then the only obvious use for subsidy are either i) to reward those involved by giving them security of tenure, state pensions and the like, or - a point which raises more serious difficulties - ii) subsidy should be used to distort the ordinary functioning of theatre audiences' tastes by 'preserving' great productions beyond a time when paying audiences will naturally support them, or by offering again plays which have 'failed' but which other (literary?) critics insist are better than the audiences thought at first.

It will be seen how such abstract arguments become confused with the objections to the 'commercial managers' which had generated the argument about state aid in the first place. One of the objections was to long runs, but the extra 'preservation' of great productions would make them even longer. Another objection was to the over-security the star system afforded leading players - but security of tenure, a guaranteed pension and the environment of an even more prestigious house would arguably make them even more settled and secure. Nor - to take a thread from other arguments on the topic (36) - is it clear how high standards are going to radiate out from the one London theatre when by definition that theatre recruits the best players and administrators from the others by offering better conditions of service.

The argument , from our point of view, turns upon whether any managerial function - of choosing, staging and attracting audiences to the nineteenth century drama - was distorted by the existing system, and could have been better performed with state advice, and with state finances.With the benefit of historical analysis we can see that a tendency of the late nineteenth century was for the leading houses to adopt a special strain of the drama, to suit their acting style to it, and to

attract to itself the audience for that kind of work. Leverton, particularly conscious of the character of audiences, says of Terriss at the Adelphi, the Bancrofts at the Haymarket, Hare and Kendal at the St, James's, Wyndham at the Criterion, Tree at His Majesty's and Irving at the Lyceum that they had 'A more or less fixed policy. The playgoer knew the sort of fare that would be provided for him, and sought it where it was provided.' (37) He regretted the decline of this habit. 'Today, the old personal management with the fixed policy hardly exists. Nearly every theatre changes its menu haphazardly from farce to tragedy, from musical comedy or revue to talkies or thrillers, and is controlled by a central office, run by a syndicate.' (38)

However the 'fixed policy', by cultivating one kind of audience and by meticulously satisfying its needs plainly i) limits the potential audience that it can address, and ii) affects the writing of the drama by effectively announcing in advance what idiom will be acceptable to the management. It may cultivate high technical standards in the playing of farce, or high tragedy, but if the cultivation of standards involves some notion of responsibility to the widest possible theatre audience, and the widest possible number of means of theatrical expression, then its 'standards' are too limited, its parameters too narrowly drawn, and it is a critical judgement to say (as Irving said, above) that state aid would, by being on a grander scale, permit of the technically able production of many kinds of drama. It is a critical limitation upon the work of the managers in our study that many of them were caught to a degree in the vicious circle of producing work to meet the narrowing expectations of a particular audience that is already loyal to one kind of drama, <u>to the exclusion of other forms</u>.

As might be expected, only Arnold perceived the importance of this element in the discussion. His recognition of the West End theatre's inbred and divisive role in feeding the myths and prejudices of a series of interlocking middle class London audiences is contained in his argument for a National theatre. He would see it not merely as a subsidised London establishment among many, but as a large organisation with (in Arnold's sense of the term) wide cultural ambitions, and informed by the most comprehensive critical judgement. His judgement upon the ultimate form of the West End theatre is devastating, and deserving of full quotation:

'We have a drama of the last century, and of the

latter part of the century preceding, a drama which may be called our drama of the town. When the town was an entity powerful enough, because homogeneous enough, to evoke a drama embodying its notions of life. But we have no modern drama, our vast society is not homogeneous enough for this, not sufficiently united, even any large portion of it, in a common view of life, a common ideal, capable of serving as a basis for a modern English drama.'

(39)

Arnold's critique is of great significance, for he clearly sees a series of managerial decisions as creating the necessary conditions for less localised and more ambitious work to be attempted, and for that work to play its part in generating and defining a new sense of what it is to be British. Nowhere else is there so clear an indictment of the taut and particular groups the West End theatres were usually seeming to serve, while talking of their educational and moral significance to the nation as a whole. [40]

5:c State Support and Professional Ethics.

As we have seen, there was by the end of the period no general feeling that writers, actors or technicians were misused by the managers, nor was there any feeling that the state needed to impose a code of conduct, or otherwise to standardise relationships between managers, or between managers and employees. The one area in which state finances were seen to be needed was in welfare, in the provision of sickness benefits and pensions, but in that respect the theatre was included in general social arguments, and in concerns shared with most emergent professions.

The significant point is that when state aid was finally agreed, by all major political parties, to be desirable, it was agreed to be so on grounds of the widest social needs. The ethics of C.E.M.A., and the early Arts Councils [41] – as against their moral concerns with the improving nature of art itself – were all concerned with spreading the lyric arts in two ways, by making them i) available, and ii) accessible. The imperative lay therefore precisely in the area which the protagonists had avoided half a century before, the relation with the audience.

It was G.B.Shaw who in a significant article written upon the opening of Her Majesty's Theatre in 1897 (42) analysed the attitudes the new theatre displayed in its architecture and furnishing towards the various classes of would-be patrons. First, because of their spartan grandeur the big old theatres are to be preferred to the theatres of the Robertsonian era 'with their first class carriage idealism'. The plushness of the velvet covered stalls is both unnecessary and uncomfortable, and can only be there because of the then convention. Most importantly, he objects to the use of the gallery:

> 'This gallery will not, I understand, be always used ; but it seems to me it would be better, instead of wasting it on ordinary occasions, to set it apart at a charge of sixpence or even less for such faithful supporters of high art as the working-man with a taste for serious drama - especially Shakespeare - and the impecunious student, male and female, who will go to the stalls and balcony later in life. These people would not, like the shilling god, expect the drama to be written down to them ; and once they had found their way to the gallery it would never be empty. For the working-man connoisseurs, though they represent a very small percentage of their class, yet belong to an enormously large class, and so are absolutely more numerous than might be expected from their relative scarcity.'
>
> (43)

The attitudes displayed are intelligent, but entirely constricted by the notions of public provision of the period. In his appraisal of the 'working man' lies the assumption that there must always be a 'very small percentage' of 'connoisseurs'. In his appraisal of the theatre manager's duty, it is implied that he must recognise and encourage this - but largely because sooner or later the recipients of such favour will later in life go to balcony and stalls. There is no question but that a theatre must continue to be socially stratified, and no higher ethical obligation for managers than to find a way of accommodating those 'connoisseurs' who have sprung unaided from the ranks of working men, but cannot yet afford the better parts of the house.

In view of the kinds of discussion we now commonly have about the ethical responsibilities of the providers of the lyric arts within a democracy, such a statement - revolutionary by the standards of the 90s - seems thin and meek. One is bound to register astonishment that , except obliquely, no voice linked the new state education system and the argument about state support for theatre in any wide-ranging and detailed way. If the

same vision had been brought to bear upon state support for the theatre that had been brought to bear upon state support for education, one might have expected to hear i) some challenge of the automatic assumption that any support for theatre must be for London theatre, ii) some suggestion that in part state subvention could aid audiences, as well as actors, playwrights and managers, to come together for their art, iii) that state education might be interlinked with the creation of good new audiences. Instead the arguments were (in general) limited to the best way of providing for one privileged West End house. The wider notions of social and ethical responsibility were not considered in public, and the theatre was assumed 'naturally' to be the genteel and mannered social activity that it was, and to which state it had arrived after the 'onward and upward' march of the previous fifty years.

Ethical questions are decided, often, by agreement upon a proper order of duties and responsibilities. It was not assumed that state intervention could aid the theatre in any grand design because it was assumed that its proper responsibilities were being met. As the movement away from the rough minor theatres, and as the separation from the popular music halls were now complete, and as both (deliberate) social movements were assumed to be a part of the trend to improvement - educational and artistic improvement - it would have been more than perverse even for so revolutionary a spirit as G.B.Shaw to suggest by way of improvement for theatre managers anything more far - ranging, in hard business terms, than that the gallery at Her Majesty's should be permanently open.

Yet it was those business terms imposed by the managers which had both put into practice their own ethical principles and had created a model of the functioning of high theatre so rigid that it seemed beyond question. So decisive had the voices of the West End managers been that no influential voice suggested that state aid could directly benefit theatre provision outside London, or that it could aid the creation of a single price policy under which the working man connoisseur would not have to 'find his way' necessarily to a distant gallery, but could join the old ladies past whom Henry James was struggling in the stalls. It was assumed state aid could assist the established practices of theatre management, and not in any significant way change them. There is no clearer indication that the managers effectively had joined the elite to which they aspired, and that they had taken their theatres with them.

Shaw's failure to bring the same cauterising intelligence to the management of theatres that he brought to the writing of plays for them may be typical of the period, but it is a limitation. Had the literary theatre genuinely sought a popular audience, or had it genuinely sought through different managerial practices and through new links with education the gradual creation of a popular audience the development of theatre in the twentieth century may have been very different. However he did not. There was no shaping intelligence in theatre management more far-seeing than Irving or Tree, and it is their limitations (and of course their visions) which are bequeathed to us as guides to conventional promotion and management of theatre.

5:d Conclusions

In its most primitive forms, drama may be said to answer at least one species of need ; in its first stages [44] it may be said to aim 'to make profitable terms with the alien powers surrounding man'. [45] No such cosmic claims could be made for the nineteenth century theatre, but rather it could be said that in the period of the study the theatre moved from being a rough, raw and yet immediate activity, in which the literary and moral sentiment was coarsely presented, to being a more predictable, more social activity presented on a smaller scale but to a large and identifiable middle class audience and in which feelings and sentiment were expressed with greater refinement. The acting, which exhibits most obviously the nature of the experience, moved from being coarse but highly charged to being naturalistic and deft. [46]

This development took place in a period when the profession of theatre management formed itself, and when its critical standards and ethical notions took firm root. The growing body of managers, as we have seen , aided the generation of 'theatrical refinement' by attracting a less widely cosmopolitan audience to the more highly priced seats in the smaller West End theatres. They effectively contracted with the audience to offer smaller scale and more sophisticated presentations in return for less unruly behaviour and a more mannered response ; theatres and their audiences contracted in their behaviour to turn theatres into salons for the intellectual elite. A large number of managerial decisions contributed to this ; the manipulation of the publicity so the 'refined' only were attracted, increasing prices, the abolition of the 'half price after nine o' clock', the replacing of the pit by stall seats, the 'single programme', the encouragement of formal dress, the social milieu of the carriage park, the

grand entrance and the high class saloons, and the growth of booking through libraries situated in high-class districts are contributory factors.

The aspirations of the managers – which we have argued showed a shortcoming in ethical understanding – led them to spend money, reliant on increased prices, upon lavish settings, upon hospitality, and upon the persual of a lifestyle appropriate to a new rank both on and off stage. The increasing sums paid to the linked artistic professions of writer and artist, in addition to the considerable but less heady sums spent upon hiring the new technicians to work the stage machinery and to operate the gas and the new electricity, made the theatre big business. As its social targets narrowed, so its financial scale increased ; the increasing tendency in many West End theatres was to concentrate upon a narrow range of 'product' for a vocal but comparatively well-to-do audience. Expenses rose as ticket prices rose ; the theatre was caught in the business trap of being over-dependant upon selling one expensive kind of product to a limited market.

This narrowing was coincidental with the growth of a newly educated mass audience, created by the Education Act 1870 , by the new cities formed by the industrial revolution, and by the new leisure time they gave their inhabitants. For the first time in history a majority of our citizens could have visited the theatre ; for they could read the advertisements, they had the free time, had the necessary money and lived within possible distance of the theatres in our towns and cities. In Shakespeare's day the London theatres drew a weekly attendance of 13% of London's population in spite of the fact that over two thirds of the population never attended.(47) At the conclusion of our period, an attendance of that order would, given the relative ease of access created by the new rail and omnibus services, have meant that 800,000 people would have been visiting the theatre each week, and that a further 35 theatres at least would have been necessary to accommodate them. Plainly although a new potential audience seems to exist, the proportion of London's citizens attending the 'straight' theatre seems lower than in Shakespeare's day. If the 'out of town' attenders are as numerous as some commentators suggested, the drop in support by Londoners themselves is even more striking. (48)

Coincidental with this relative narrowing of support for 'straight' theatre is a vast increase in audiences for the more raffish pleasures in the popular entertainments, ranging from music hall to the rapidly growing areas of professionally organised sport. Not all pastimes

with growing followings were however passive. A noteworthy, though largely ignored, growth at the turn of the century was that of amateur dramatics, and amateur operatics. The National Operatic and Dramatic Association which, amongst other functions, disseminated managerial information amongst its members, was formed in February 1899. A part at least of the population preferred to create its own theatre than to trek onward and upward with the West End and its imitators.

The practices of management, which we have in detail described, were subject to two pressures. One was towards simple efficiency ; a desire that can be discerned in Boucicault's wish to instal less expensive and more labour-saving stage machinery, or in Stoker's wish that Edgar and Lucy could be cheaply staged. The other pressure was towards acceptance by the intellectual elite as belonging to the rank of artist ; a desire than can be discerned in turn in Alexander's elaborate stage dressing, or in Tree's hospitality. At the beginning of our period the two desires can be accommodated in managerial practice, because London society expected no more of Webster, or Buckstone than that they were amusing theatrical types. By the time of Irving's management the ambition was higher ; Irving desired to be accepted as intellectual and artist, and the relentless socialising was necessary to establish the role. By the end of the century it is a disabling conflict. 'The modern actor's life is, I believe, all wrong,' wrote Barnes early in the new century.(49) Looking back over his long career he glumly highlights the result of this tension:

> 'In recent years I have rehearsed in a theatre all day - and sometimes nearly all night - where the manager and leading actor would be called away from rehearsal almost every hour to attend to social matters, or meet private friends....'
>
> (50)

The social ambition both shapes and destroys the artistic ambition. It informs the nature of 'the theatre business' but narrows wider vision, compromises ethical judgement and mitigates against efficiency in managerial affairs. Worse, because our theatre springs not from primitive need but from established custom and practice, it bequeaths a notion of what theatre is, and what theatre management is, that we find difficulty in redefining. Much that was shabby and crude was purged by the managers of the period, and we owe a debt for that. Sadly their movement onward and upward however in the managerial practices of theatre did not

establish the best London theatre as the moral and educational force that the managers of the period professed it to be. Its new refinement became a pleasure for a limited group of people, and the details of management practice which we inherited contribute still to many of the best things in drama being ignored by 95% of the population, and seen by the minority in theatres and surrounded by social practices that would have been entirely appropriate to the 'intellectual and cultured' folk the Bancroft management attracted to the old Prince of Wales.

It is of course wrong to pursue the argument too far or to draw conclusions that are over-simple. The managers in our study had none of the accumulated wisdom about leisure habits which media research, social research and arts administration studies have given modern theatre administrators. Managers as varied as Boucicault and Edwardes took risks that were not merely financial speculations, taken within a comfortingly defined area of doubt, but their entrepreneurship took major risks in other areas . They knew very little about leisure habits, because in large measure those leisure habits had not been formed. So the remodelled Astley's, or the Gaiety, were speculations about social habit, as well as monetary risks. The patent theatre managers had known something of the taste of 'the town', but the new managers of the Court, or Terry's, or the remodelled Haymarket,had to find a new audience and understand it. They must not be too much blamed for the focus upon the solid middle class, nor upon the way they sometimes talked of critical standards unconvincingly as they presented more and more revivals or 'formula plays'. They had no promise of grant aid to cushion the consequences of unsuccessful experiment, or of enticing patrons with lowered prices.

Yet it remains an important way of learning that we understand and evaluate the present by understanding and evaluating our past. The description of the practices of West End theatre managers between 1843 and 1899 enables us to come, sympathetically, to an evaluation. Significantly, we have come to use the term 'administration' in the arts to describe what is ostensibly the same function undertaken formerly as 'management'. It could be held that this is because the large involvement of state aid has forced us to recognise the social responsibility of the role, and that 'administration' is now the preferred word because its older meaning is of a functionary holding a post of (social or legal) responsibility, whereas in most senses of the word a 'manager' is merely a manipulator, a moderator or

negotiator. With hindsight therefore we can say that the onward and upward movement of the theatre managers in the study demonstrates considerable skill in adapting financial practice in many areas of management to new and unknown circumstances. We can however not feel totally at ease with the way that growth was so frequently described as being of itself a cultural 'improvement' as well as a business one, nor can we overlook the fact that a number of key financial decisions, though publicly presented as necessities to the public, were in part at least socially restrictive in intention, and certainly so in effect. Any evaluation of the general ethics of the managers had to point to the greatest failure of responsibility in that role. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to construct an argument showing that the art of playwrighting or acting were better served in 1899 than it had been three hundred years before, and difficult to isolate any managerial decision that was clearly and without doubt intended to bring about a finer context for artists and art. More dauntingly, it could be said that it is beyond doubt that the percentage of Londoners enjoying the theatre had, as we have seen, actually diminished in those three centuries. There is therefore a certain irony in the fact that in the period of the study managers habitually used such grandiose language about their social aims, and indulged in so much serious discussion about a 'national' theatre ; one of the less happy bequests from the Victorian theatre is its obfuscating language of self-justification.

For all that it is the twentieth century which must stand equally indicted. In a long and comfortable period of a half century and more we have challenged too few of the practices. We carried a stratified pricing structure, habits of publicity, an unwelcoming staff manner, a clumsy and time-consuming booking system and the unquestioned performance timings of the nineteenth century middle class into our own times, unquestioned, and we have continued to repel very many of our own citizens by those practices as did the later Victorians. (51) Because we can trace our own current failings to the last century does not mean we can pass the blame to them ; we have had many opportunities to alter our managerial practices in our own century, and we are responsible in large measure for our own difficulties. A measure of those difficulties is that this description of the aspirations and practices of West End managers seems at many points to be contemporary with us, although much of it is more than a century old.

FIVE.

NOTES.

(1) Stokes, R. (1972). Resistible Theatre. (London
Professor Stokes aims to describe the milieu in which the 'literary theatre' challenged the prevailing commercial one.

(2) Ibid. p.7

(3) The movement, known as the 'independant theatre', was literary at core ; it was founded in 1891, and lasted until 1898. Its moving spirits were J.T.Grein, George Moore and G.B.Shaw ; its interests included the removal of the censor and the spread of Ibsenism.

(4) Shee, M.Archer. (1809). Rhymes on Art. (London: William Miller).

(5) In this movement the support of Prince Albert was particularly noteworthy. It is significant that the Consort's support of the visual arts and music yielded practical results in the shape of buildings and civic support in a way that Victoria's earlier support of the theatre (particularly the Princess's in the time of Kean's management)had not done. The Prince was of course from a Germanic tradition of active financial and managerial support by the State for the arts.

(6) Archer, F. (1912). op. cit. p.145 contains a description of a performance of Hamlet at the Chrystal Palace. Irving suggested that it would be a good venue for the Oberammergau Passion Play. Stoker, B. (1907). op. cit. p. 397.

(7) Altick, A. (1978) The Picture Shows of London. (Harvard ; Harvard University Press)

(8) Given in a letter to the journal in the previous year.

(9) It must be remembered that the legislation was only 8 years old, and that opposition to it remained strong.

(10) The term actually used is 'Minister for Fine Arts'. 'Fine Arts' is another term which came into use in the nineteenth century, and by 1899 the division already seems clear between 'Crafts' and 'Fine Arts'. It would have seemed absurd to speak in such terms a century before.

(11) Stokes, R. (1972). op. cit. p.5 footnote.

(12) p. 347.

(13) Irving's part in the paper is actually longer than the named author's.

(14) Article, in The Theatre, Nov. 1st. 1879.

(15) Except for Arnold, every participant in the debate took as axiomatic the fact that 'the best' must be exhibited in one London house.

(16) It is noticeable that greater familiarity with the realities of Continental City Life had dimmed the unbridled enthusiasm with which the Contintental way of doing things had invariably been greeted. This was so in a range of articles in The Stage, the Era and the Theatre, in the 1880s.

(17) Presumably wriiten by the phillistine Scott.

(18) October, 1879. Congress of Social Science. Paper by Dr. Vezin.

(19) James was nevertheless in one sense broadly correct. The nature of the arguments about theatre had changed ; the Patent Theatres were discussed by the press as if state ownership conferred a state moral responsibility ; the commercial theatres were discussed in terms of moral abstraction. Thus the sense of public concern and ownership clearly evident in the articles about the patent theatres in The Times before 1843 seem to give way to a more distanced, awestruck tone in the same newspaper's approach to the 'art' houses of the West End at the end of the century.

(20) Arnold, M. in 'The Nineteenth Century'. August 1879.

(21) Ibid. p.243.

(22) Although the 1944 Education Act and the effective 1945 formation of the Arts Council of Great Britain were later to be brought to reality at the same time, by the same Government doctrines, and effectively by the same people, it is interesting to note that it was many years before the two streams of thinking were merged or before the same Minister spoke in cabinet for both. See Introduction to Pick, John(1980) The State and the Arts. (London; City Arts). Introduction.

(23) Trevelyan, (1952). English Social History 4 (London: Longmans Green). Illustrated Edition. p. 210.

(24) Published in Tree, B. (1913). Thoughts and After Thoughts. (London : Cassell). p.185.

(25) Archer, W. (1882) English Dramatists of Today. (London). p.17.

(26) Tree, B. (1913). op.cit. p. 186.

(27) Stoker, B. (1908). 'The Question of a National Theatre', in The Nineteenth Century, May 1908

(28) Ibid. p.735.

(29) Ibid. p.736.

(30) The total expenditure listed here is £882,000. However Stoker tells us the overall total was £965,000. We have presumed that the outlay on renovations of the Lyceum,and some outlay on hospitality do not appear in the expenditure. We have also assumed that some costs - donations, subscriptions etc. by Irving, are 'hidden'. If the sum for renovation (£60,000. See 4:a), is added to the total presumed spent on Hospitality (£750 x 20 = £15,000) then the remainder is 'Miscellaneous'. The sum reads:

$$\text{Miscellaneous expenditure} = £965,000 - (£882,000 + £60,000 + £15,000).$$

$$= £8,000$$

This seems a reasonable supposition for a working period of more than 20 years.

(31) Stoker, B. (1908).op. cit. p. 739.

(32) Ibid. p. 740.

(33) Notes of lecture given on 10th. June, 1908. Held in manuscript room of the British Museum, as part of collection of Pinero's Letters.

(34) *Ibid.*

(35) *Ibid.* Evidence that there was still in London literary circles a degree of naive admiration for 'the Continental way'. In general however there was much more scepticism. See Tree, B. (1913), *op. cit.* p. 161 ff. 'Fallacies of the Modern Stage', a comic and effective rebuttal of the excessive admiration that 'the Contintal way' evoked in some circles.

(36) The question of standards is dealt with in detail by N.V.Linklater, 'The achievement in Drama' in Pick, John (1980) (Ed)*The State and the Arts*. (London : City Arts).

(37) Leverton, W. (1932). *op. cit.* pp. 122- 123.

(38) *Ibid.* p. 123.

(39) Arnold, M. (1879). *op.cit.* p. 238.

(40) 'The town' shifts from being a community, homogeneous enough to be said to have a view, and taste, and becomes instead in theatrical circles a cynical term for the place. Thus all those titles such as 'On the Town', 'Out on the Town', 'Talk of the Town' etc. in mass variety shows.

(41) The earliest aims of C.E.M.A. and the Arts Council were to make the arts generally accessible. It has been axiomatic that there must be some kind of regional policy to spread the arts, and a state-supported pricing policy so that people of all incomes can enjoy the arts. Its success or otherwise is irrelevant to the question here of its stated aims.

(42) Shaw, G.B. (1897) . 'Her Majesty's' in *The Saturday Review*, May 1st. 1897.

(43) *Ibid.* Compare with Shaw's attack upon the 'Drawing room' Lyceum theatre. (See 3 above).

(44) For an excellent introduction to the subject see Styan, J.L. (1969). *The Elements of Drama* (Cambridge University Press).

(45) Wilson Knight, G. (1962). *The Golden Labyrinth*. (London : Methuen). p.3.

(46) See Pick, John. (1976). *A Study of Movement and Gesture on the Legitimate London Stage between 1843 and 1909.* M.A. Thesis, University of Birmingham.

(47) Harbage, A. (1941). *Shakespeare's Audience*. (Columbia University Press). p.44.

(48) More surprising yet in our own day. If the view of observers that 40 per cent of the audiences towards the end of our period were 'out of towners' then there were on average only some 250,000 Londoners visiting the theatre weekly. This is less than 5% of 5m. However the position is now much worse. All estimates put the 'tourists and visitors' figure between 30% and 75%, and the majority view holds it to be about 50%. (The TCU research with SWET will by 1982 have demonstrated reasons for acknowledging a more definite figure). If this is so, then around 350,000 of West End seats are being filled each week by Londoners. From a population of *circa* 11m. it gives a weekly figure of 3%.

(49) Barnes, J.H. (1908). *The Nineteenth Century*, Feb. 1908.

(50) *Ibid.*

(51) See the 1980 report to the Society of West End Theatre Managers by Vincent Burke, which proposes sweeping alterations of many of the long-established practices.

APPENDIX ONE

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF WEST END MANAGERS : 1843 - 1899

NAME	PERIOD	THEATRE
1. Alexander, G.	1891 - 1899	St. James's
2. Allcroft, F.W.	1852 - 1855	Strand
"	1855	Lyceum
3. Allerton, C.	1869 - 1870	Lyceum
4. Alport, S.	1881 - 1882	Alhambra
5. Anderson, J.	1849 - 1852	Drury Lane
"	1855 - 1856	Lyceum
6. Arthur, R.	1898 - 1899	Prince of Wales's(N)
7. Aubrey, J.	1876 - 1878	Old Vic
8. Baker, C.	1880 - 1883	Olympic
9. Balmain, R.	1892 - 1893	Princess's
10. Bancroft S.B. (with James C.J.)	1871 - 1875	Prince of Wales's(O)
"	1875 - 1880	Prince of Wales's(O)
"	1880 - 1888	Haymarket
"	1888 - 1889	Haymarket
11. Barker, R.	1876 - 1885	Opera Comique
12. Barrett, W.	1881 - 1887	Princess's
"	1887 - 1888	Globe
"	1890 - 1891	Olympic
13. Basing, S.	1891 - 1892	Princess's
14. Bateman, F.S.	1875 - 1878	Lyceum
"	1879 - 1881	Sadler's Wells
15. Bateman, H.L.	1871 - 1875	Lyceum
16. Bateman, I.	1881	Sadler's Wells
17. Batty, W.	1843 - 1853	Astley's
"	1860 - 1862	Astley's
"	1863	Astley's
18. Baum, J.	1870 - 1871	Astley's
"	1872 - 1875	Alhambra
19. Bolton, F.	1871 - 1872	Sadler's Wells

20. Bolton, G.	1846 - 1847	Sadler's Wells
"	1850	Strand
"	1852	Drury Lane
21. Boracchi, E. (with Corti, E.)	1885	Her Majesty's
22. Boucicault, D.	1862	Drury Lane
"	1862 - 1863	Astley's
23. Bradwell, E.W. (with Field, W.R.)	1869 - 1872	Toole's
24. Brickwell, H.T.	1879 - 1899	Garrick
25. Brough, W.	1860	Lyceum
26. Bruce, E.	1880 - 1882	Prince of Wales's (O)
"	1884 - 1887	Prince of Wales's (N)
27. Buckstone, J.B.	1853 - 1878	Haymarket
28. Bunn, A.	1843 - 1849	Drury Lane
29. Burke, E.	1882	Playhouse
30. Burleigh, C.T.	1873 - 1874	Old Vic
31. Burnand, F.C.	1875	Opera Comique
32. Burt, W.A.	1881	Globe
33. Byrmes, M. (with Negherson, G.)	1889	Sadler's Wells
34. Carillon, E.	1886	His Majesty's
35. Carr, J.W.C.	1893 - 1896	Comedy
36. Cartwright, C. (with Dana, H.)	1895 - 1896	Duke of York's
37. Cave, J.A.	1867 - 1871	Old Vic
"	1875 - 1876	Alhambra
" (with Henry, J. and West, A.)	1878 - 1880	Old Vic
38. Cavendish, A.	1872 - 1873	Olympic
39. Chamberlyn, A.H.	1896 - 1898	Shaftsbury
40. Chatterton, F.B. (with Falconer, E)	1863 - 1864	Drury Lane
"	1864 - 1879	Drury Lane
"	1874 - 1876	Princess's
"	1874 - 1878	Adelphi
"	1881 - 1882	Sadler's Wells
41. Chudleigh, A. (with Wood, M.C.)	1890 - 1893	Royal Court
"	1893 - 1899	Royal Court
42. Clarke, J.S.	1872 - 1873	Toole's
"	1878 - 1879	Haymarket
"	1885 - 1899	Strand
43. Coleman, S.S.	1876 - 1877	Imperial
44. Collins, A,	1879 - 1899	Drury Lane
45. Compton, E.	1891 - 1892	Opera Comique

46. Conover, A.	1883 – 1886	Olympic
47. Cons, E.	1880 – 1899	Old Vic
48. Cooke, W.	1853 – 1860	Astley's
49. Copeland, W.R.	1850 – 1852	Strand
50. Copper, F.F.	1847 – 1848	Strand
51. Corti, E. (with Boracchi, E.)	1885	Her Majesty's.
52. Costa, M.	1847 – 1848	Covent Garden
53. Crowdy, J.	1896	Princess's
54. Daly, A.	1893 – 1899	Daly's
55. Dana, H. (with Cartwright,C.)	1895 – 1896	Duke of York's
56. Davidson, W.	1846	Strand
"	1847 – 1849	Olympic
57. Deacon, J.	1886 – 1887	Sadler's Wells
58. Delatoire, R.	1871 – 1873	Old Vic
"	1872 – 1873	Sadler's Wells
59. de Pinna, D.	1886	Imperial
60. Delafield, F.	1848 – 1849	Covent Garden
61. De Vere, A.	1852	Drury Lane
62. Dillon, C.	1856 – 1857	Lyceum
63. D'Oyly Carte	1874	Opera Comique
"	1881 – 1899	Savoy
"	1891 – 1892	Palace
64. Duck, W.	1886	Opera Comique
65. Edgar, R.	1863 – 1871	Sadler's Wells
66. Edwardes, A.R.	1892 – 1893	Shaftsbury
67. Edwardes, G.	1886 – 1899	Gaiety
"	1887 – 1899	Empire
"	1891 – 1892	Shaftsbury
"	1892 – 1893	Prince of Wales's (N)
68. Elliott, C.	1859	Lyceum
"	1860 – 1861	Lyceum
69. Ellis, J.	1863 – 1864	Empire
"	1889 – 1896	Criterion
70. Emery, F.	1894	Playhouse
71. Emery, S.A.	1844	Lyceum
72. Enden, W.C. (with Robson, F.T.)	1857 – 1864	Olympic
73. Fairlie, F.C.	1874 – 1875	Globe
"	1876 – 1880	Globe
74. Falconer, E.	1858	Lyceum
"	1861 – 1863	Lyceum

No.	Name	Dates	Theatre
	Falconer, E. (with Chatterton, F.B.)	1863 – 1864	Drury Lane
	"	1870 – 1871	Lyceum
75.	Farren, W.	1849 – 1850	Strand
	"	1851 – 1853	Olympic
76.	Fechter, C.A.	1863 – 1867	Lyceum
77.	Fenton, F. (with Frampton, F.)	1862 – 1867	Old Vic
78.	Field, W.R. (with Bradwell, E.W.)	1869 – 1872	Toole's
79.	Foster, R.	1893	Shaftsbury
80.	Fowler, F.	1892 – 1893	Opera Comique
81.	Frampton, F.	1856 – 1857	Empire
	" (with Fenton, F.)	1862 – 1867	Old Vic
82.	Freeman, H.A. (with Wilmot, C.)	1890 – 1892	Sadler's Wells
	"	1892 – 1895	Sadler's Wells
	"	1896 – 1899	Sadler's Wells
83.	Frewer, W.T.	1874 – 1875	Old Vic
84.	Froleman, C.	1898 – 1899	Duke of York's
85.	Gadaver, C.	1847	Lyceum
86.	Gardener, C.	1869	Astley's
87.	Gatti, A (with Gatti, S.)	1878 – 1885	Adelphi
	"	1895 – 1896	Vaudeville
88.	Gatti, S. (with Gatti, A.)	1878 – 1885	Adelphi
	"	1885 – 1899	Adelphi
	"	1892 – 1895	Vaudeville
	"	1896 – 1899	Vaudeville
89.	Gilmer, A.A.	1893 – 1895	Alhambra
	"	1896 – 1898	Princess's
90.	Gladstone, T.	1843 – 1844	Adelphi
91.	Godbold, H.	1896 – 1899	Criterion
92.	Got, P.	1871	Opera Comique
93.	Gooch, W.	1877 – 1881	Princess's
	"	1893 – 1896	Princess's
94.	Grahame, C.	1890 – 1891	Opera Comique
95.	Greet, W.	1894 – 1896	Playhouse
	"	1896 – 1897	Criterion
	"	1896 – 1899	Lyric
	"	1898 – 1899	Comedy
96.	Gulver, J.	1873 – 1874	Princess's
97.	Gye, A. (with Gye, E.)	1850	Covent Garden
98.	Gye, E. (with Gye, A.)	1850	Covent Garden

99. Gye, F.	1850	Covent Garden
"	1852	Drury Lane
"	1856 - 1857	Lyceum
100. Hare, J. (with Kendal, W.H.)	1879 - 1888	St. James's
"	1889 - 1896	Garrick
101. Harris, A.	1859 - 1862	Princess's
"	1879 - 1897	Drury Lane
"	1888 - 1896	Covent Garden
"	1892 - 1893	Palace
102. Harris, F.J.	1885 - 1890	Opera Comique
103. Harrison, F.	1896 - 1899	Haymarket
104. Harwood, J.	1869 - 1870	Astley's
105. Hawthorne, G.	1886 - 1887	Olympic
"	1887 - 1891	Princess's
106. Hawtrey, C.	1884 - 1887	Globe
"	1885	Her Majesty's
"	1888 - 1893	Comedy
"	1896 - 1898	Comedy
"	1896 - 1899	Playhouse
107. Hayes, S.	1884	Her Majesty's
108. Henderson, A.	1876 - 1879	Toole's
"	1881 - 1888	Comedy
109. Henry, J. (with Cave, J.A. and West, A.)	1878 - 1880	Old Vic
110. Hewitt, A.	1887 - 1889	Olympic
111. Hingston, E.P.	1872 - 1874	Opera Comique
112. Hobson, A.P.	1881 - 1885	Imperial
113. Hollingshead, J.	1875	Opera Comique
"	1868 - 1886	Gaiety
114. Hodges, C.C.	1845	Strand
115. Hooper, E.	1848 - 1849	Strand
116. Howard, K.	1844 - 1846	Olympic
117. Howell, J.	1882 - 1884	Alhambra
118. Hunt, G.	1884 - 1885	Empire
119. Hurwith, B.	1846 - 1847	Strand
120. Irving, H.	1878 - 1899	Lyceum
121. James, C.J.	1843 - 1869	Prince of Wales's(O)
" (with Wilton, M.)	1869 - 1871	Prince of Wales's (O)
" (with Bancroft, S.B.)	1871 - 1875	Prince of Wales's (O)

122. James, D. (with Montague, H.J. and Thorne, T.)	1870 – 1871	Vaudeville
" (with Thorne, T.)	1871 – 1881	Vaudeville
"	1885	Opera Comique
123. Josephs, F.	1869 – 1870	Garrick
"	1879 – 1880	Olympic
124. Jullien, L.	1858	Lyceum
125. Kean, C. (with Keeley, M.A.)	1850 – 1852	Princess's
"	1852 – 1859	Princess's
126. Keeley, M.A.	1844 – 1847	Lyceum
" (with Kean, C.)	1850 – 1852	Princess's
127. Kendal, W.H. (with Hare, J.)	1879 – 1888	St. James's
128. Killingsworth, J.	1880 – 1881	Alhambra
129. Kittle, T.	1877	Alhambra
130. La Forque, F.	1884 – 1885	Her Majesty's
131. Lancaster, J.	1888	Shaftsbury
"	1890 – 1891	Shaftsbury
132. Lart, J.	1888	Globe
" (with Willard, E.)	1889 – 1890	Shaftsbury
133. Laurent, E.	1860	Lyceum
134. Lawrence, R.	1843 – 1844	Strand
135. Leader, F.C.	1876 – 1877	Alhambra
"	1883 – 1884	His Majesty's
136. Leslie, H.J. (with Steele, C. and Norton, W.)	1870 – 1871	Opera Comique
"	1889 – 1890	Her Majesty's
"	1890	Lyric
137. Levenston, M.	1896 – 1897	Duke of York's
138. Lindus, H.W.	1862 – 1863	Princess's
139. Liston, W.H.	1869 – 1872	Olympic
140. Litton, M.	1879 – 1880	Imperial
141. Lirenston, M.	1892 – 1893	Duke of York's
142. Lowenfeld, H.	1893 – 1898	Prince of Wales's (
143. Lucetts, C.	1862 – 1863	Sadler's Wells
144. Lumley, B.	1843 – 1852	Her Majesty's
"	1853 – 1860	Her Majesty's
145. Maddox, J.M.	1843 – 1850	Princess's
146. Mager, M.P.	1886 – 1887	Her Majesty's
147. Maitland, F.	1881 – 1884	Globe
148. Mansell, W.L.	1870	Lyceum

149.	Mansell, W.R.	1871	Globe
150.	Mattei, T.	1861	Lyceum
	"	1871	Lyceum
151.	Mapleson, J.H.	1867 – 1882	Her Majesty's
	"	1887	Her Majesty's
152.	Mathews, C.J.	1847 – 1855	Lyceum
153.	McCann, J.	1847	Olympic
154.	Melnotte, V.	1893 – 1894	Duke of York's
155.	" (with Wyatt, F.)	1894 – 1895	Duke of York's
155.	Michael, E.	1891 – 1893	Globe
156.	Mitchell, J.	1871	Lyceum
157.	Montagne, H.J. (with James, T. and Thorne, T.)	1870 – 1871	Vaudeville
158.	"	1871 – 1874	Globe
158.	Montelli, C.	1871 – 1872	OPera Comique
159.	Morell, H.H. (with Waller, L.)	1895 – 1896	Shaftsbury
160.	Morton, C.	1876	Opera Comique
	"	1877 – 1880	Alhambra
161.	Mowbray, T.	1885 – 1886	Imperial
162.	Musgrove, G.	1898 – 1899	Shaftsbury
163.	Nation, W.H.C.	1866 – 1899	Astley's
	"	1873 – 1876	Toole's
164.	Negherson, G. (with Byrmes, M.)	1889	Sadler's Wells
165.	Neville, W.G.	1873 – 1879	Olympic
166.	Nicolls, D.	1885 – 1887	Empire
167.	Norton, W. (with Leslie, H.J. and Steele, C.)	1870 – 1871	Opera Comique
168.	Osbaldiston, D.W.	1843 – 1851	Old Vic
169.	Owen, J.G.	1887 – 1889	His Majesty's
170.	Paget, G.	1889 – 1894	Playhouse
	"	1890 – 1891	Globe
171.	Parratt, E.	1844	Lyceum
172.	Parry, S.	1868 – 1869	Globe
173.	Paul, H.	1881	Alhambra
174.	Payne, T.	1855 – 1858	Strand
175.	Peacock, E.H.	1898 – 1899	Princess's
176.	Pearson, H.J.	1893 – 1895	Shaftsbury
177.	Penley, W.S.	1893 – 1898	Globe
178.	Phelps, S. (with Greenwood, T.L. and Warner, R.)	1845 – 1846	Strand
	" (with Greenwood, T.L.)	1846 – 1862	Sadler's Wells
179.	Philips, G.	1880 – 1881	Globe

180. Phillippe, J.	1845 - 1846	Strand
181. Pitrou, A. (with Valuay, E.)	1874	Princess's
"	1875	Opera Comique
182. Pond, C. (with Spiers, F.W.)	1874 - 1879	Criterion
183. Pott, S.	1864 - 1865	Empire
184. Powell, H.	1873 - 1879	Sadler's Wells
185. Pridmore, R.	1850 - 1855	Empire
186. Puckridge, H.	1850 - 1851	Olympic
187. Reeve, G.	1857 - 1858	Empire
188. Rendle, W.E.	1880 - 1881	Imperial
189. Robert, G.T.	1888 - 1889	Sadler's Wells
190. Roberts, H.B.	1844 - 1845	Strand
191. Robertson, W.W.	1877 - 1879	Imperial
192. Robson, F.T. (with Enden, W.C.)	1857 - 1864	Olympic
193. Robson, M.	1882 - 1885	Sadler's Wells
194. Rodford, R.	1889 - 1890	Globe
195. Rofa, W.J.	1867	Old Vic
196. Rosenfeld, T.	1899	Olympic
197. Rye, F.	1882 - 1883	Her Majesty's
198. Sanger, G. (with Sanger,J.)	1871 - 1874	Astley's
"	1885 - 1892	Astley's
199. Sanger J. (With Sanger, G.)	1871 - 1874	Astley's
"	1874 - 1885	Astley's
200. Sedger, H.	1887 - 1892	Prince of Wales's (N)
"	1890 - 1896	Lyric
201. Sheridan, A.	1874 - 1875	Opera Comique
202. Smith, E.T.	1852 - 1862	Drury Lane
"	1858 - 1861	Alhambra
"	1860 - 1861	Her Majesty's
"	1863 - 1866	Astley's
"	1867 - 1869	Lyceum
203. Smith, S.	1852	Drury Lane
204. Smith, R.C.	1889 - 1890	Sadler's Wells
205. Spiers, F.W.	1865 - 1868	Gaiety
" (with Pond, C.)	1874 - 1879	Criterion
"	1879 - 1889	Criterion
206. Steele, C. (with Leslie, H.J. and Norton, W.)	1870 - 1871	Opera Comique
207. Strange, F.	1865 - 1870	Alhambra
"	1871 - 1872	Alhambra
208. Swanborough, L.	1858 - 1861	Strand

209.	Swanborough, W.H.	1863 - 1864	Strand
	"	1875 - 1876	Old Vic
210.	Swanborough, M.A.	1864 - 1885	Strand
211.	Swanborough, V.	1861 - 1863	Strand
212.	Syers, R.	1864 - 1866	Gaiety
213.	Taylor, J.R.H.	1884	Her Majesty's
214.	Terry, E.D.	1887 - 1899	Terry's
215.	Thorne, T. (with Montague, H.J. and Jones, D.)	1870 - 1871	Vaudeville
216.	Thorne, T. (with James, D.)	1871 - 1881	Vaudeville
	"	1881 - 1892	Vaudeville
217.	Todd, A.	1889	Sadler's Wells
218.	Toole, J.L.	1879 - 1881	Toole's
	"	1882 - 1895	Toole's
219.	Towers, J.J.	1855 - 1862	Old Vic
220.	Tree, B.	1888	Haymarket
	"	1889 - 1896	Haymarket
	"	1897 - 1899	Her Majesty's
221.	Tulken, L.G.	1843 - 1844	Lyceum
222.	Valuay, E. (with Pitrou, A.)	1874	Princess's
223.	Vincent, E.	1851 - 1856	Old Vic
224.	Vining, C.J.	1863 - 1870	Princess's
225.	Walkins, H.	1887 - 1889	Playhouse
226.	Ward, J.	1885 - 1886	Sadler's Wells
227.	Watts, W.	1849 - 1850	Olympic
228.	Waller, L. (with Morell, H.H.)	1895 - 1896	Shaftsbury
229.	Webster, B.	1843 - 1853	Haymarket
	"	1844 - 1874	Adelphi
	"	1866 - 1869	Olympic
	"	1870 - 1873	Princess's
230.	Webster, G.	1858	Lyceum
231.	West, A. (with Cave, J.A. and Henry, J.)	1878 - 1880	Old Vic
232.	Wheeler, F.	1897 - 1898	Duke of York's
233.	Wigan, A.	1853 - 1857	Olympic
234.	Wigan, H.	1864 - 1866	Olympic
	"	1876	Opera Comique
	"	1876 - 1877	Princess's
235.	Wilde, W.	1861 - 1865	Alhambra
236.	Willard, E. (with Lart, J.)	1889 - 1890	Shaftsbury
237.	Williams, R.	1898 - 1899	Globe

238.	Wilkinson, J.W.	1891 - 1899	Imperial
239.	Wilmot, C.	1889 - 1890	Olympic
	" (with Freeman, H.A.)	1890 - 1892	Olympic
	"	1891 - 1896	Olympic
	"	1895 - 1896	Sadler's Wells
240.	Wilmot, Mrs.C.	1896 - 1899	Olympic
241.	Wilton, M. (with James C.J.)	1869 - 1871	Prince of Wales's (O)
242.	Winder, E.	1890 - 1892	Alhambra
243.	Wood, M.C. (with Chudleigh, A.)	1890 - 1893	Royal Court
244.	Wood, P.G.	1882 - 1887	Playhouse
245.	Woodward, H.W.	1895 - 1899	Alhambra
246.	Wyatt, F. (with Melnotte, V.)	1894 - 1895	Duke of York's
247.	Wyld, G.	1843 - 1844	Olympic
248.	Wyndham, C.	1899	Wyndham's

APPENDIX TWO

WEST END THEATRES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY.

As explained in Chapter 1 the list below is inevitably open to challenge although the reasons for the selection are given. Where a theatre changes name during the period it is referred to by its commonest name - thus Her Majesty's, Astley's and the 'Old Vic' are preferred to the alternatives. As the two Gaiety buildings were so close, and one followed the other in style and management without pause, they are referred to as one. As the two theatres known as the Prince of Wales's are different in location,size and periods of opening however they are distinguished in the appendices as Old (O) and New (N).

1. Adelphi 412 Strand.
2. Alhambra Palace 27 Leicester Square.
3. Astley's 7 Westminster Bridge Road, Lambeth.
4. Comedy Panton Street, Westminster.
5. Court Sloane Square, Chelsea.
6. Covent Garden. The Royal Opera House. Bow Street, Westminster.
7. Criterion 221 Piccadilly Circus
8. Daly's 8 Cranborne Street, Leicester Square.
9. Drury Lane, Theatre Royal Catherine Street, Westminster.
10. Duke of York's St. Martin's Lane, Westminster.
11. Empire 6 Leicester Square, Westminster.
12. Gaiety Aldwych
13. Garrick Charing Cross Road, Westminster.
14. Globe Newcastle Street, Strand.
15. Haymarket 8 Haymarket, Westminster.
16. Her Majesty's Haymarket, Westminster.
17. Imperial Tothill Street, Westminster.
18. Lyceum Wellington Street, Strand.
19. Lyric 29 Shaftsbury Avenue, Westminster.
20. 'Old Vic' The Cut, Lambeth.
21. Olympic 6-10 Wych Street, Strand.
22. Opera Comique 299 Strand.

23. Palace Cambridge Circus, Westminster.

24. Playhouse Northumberland Avenue, Westminster.

25. Prince of Wales's (Old). Charlotte Street, St Pancras.

26. Prince of Wales's (New). Coventry Street, Piccadilly.

27. Princess's 73 Oxford Street, St. Marylebone.

28. St. James's King Street, Piccadilly.

29. Sadler's Wells Rosebery Avenue, Finsbury.

30. Savoy Beaufort Buildings, Strand.

31. Shaftsbury Shaftsbury Avenue, Westminster.

32. Strand 169 Strand, Westminster.

33. Terry's 106 Strand, Westminster.

34. Toole's King William Street, Charing Cross.

35. Vaudeville 404 Strand, Westminster.

36. Wyndham's Charing Cross Road, Westminster.

Addresses of other theatre titles mentioned in the study.

1. Aquarium Tothill Street, Westminster.

   (Name of theatre built on Royal Acquarium, which operated from 1876 under a variety of names, finally becoming the Imperial).

2. Avenue Northumberland Avenue, Westminster.

   (Earlier name of the Playhouse theatre).

3. Brittania 188 High Street, Hoxton.

   (The 'Brit', of which Dickens wrote, and the theatre, run by Mrs Sara Lane, that G.B.Shaw admired).

4. Charing Cross King William Street, Charing Cross.

   (Earlier name of Toole's theatre).

5. Duke's 42, High Holborn, Holborn.

   (Also known as the Mirror Theatre. q.v.)

6. East London 237 Whitechapel Road, Stepney.

7. Elephant and Castle 24 - 28 New Kent Road, Southwark.

8. Grecian City Road, Shoreditch.

9. Holborn 242 - 245 High Holborn, Holborn.

10. Mirror 42, High Holborn, Holborn.

    (Also known as the Duke's Theatre. q.v.)

11. Park Park Street, Camden Town.

12. Pavilion 193 Whitechapel Road, Stepney.

13. Philharmonic 40 Upper Street, Islington.

(Early name of Islington Empire. Not to be confused with the Philharmonic Rooms, Newman Street, St. Marylebone.)

14. Royalty 73 Dean Street,Soho.

(Also known as New English Opera House, Royal Soho, Soho theatre, New Royalty etc.)

15. Standard 203 Shoreditch High Street, Shoreditch.

16. Trafalgar Square St. Martin's Lane, Westminster.

(Earlier theatre on site of Duke of York's)

17. Victoria The Cut, Lambeth.

(Early name of theatre which became the New Victoria Palace, and then the Royal Victoria Hall and Coffee Tavern in 1880, being popularly known as the 'Old Vic'.)

The standard listing of London theatres, titles and managers is Howard, D. (1970). London Theatres and Music Halls 1850 - 1950. (Library Association). Elaboration of some detail can be found in Mander, R. and Mitchenson, J. (1961). The Theatres of London (London: Hart-Davis).

APPENDIX THREE

LONG RUNS - LONDON THEATRES IN EACH DECADE.

In alphabetical order.

1840s

PLAY	THEATRE	DATE	No.PERFS.
The Chinese War	Astley's	1844	114
How to Settle Accounts With Your Laundress	Adelphi	1847	108
The Island of Jewels	Lyceum	1849	111
Martin Chuzzlewit	Lyceum	1844	105
The War in China	Astley's	1844	114

1850s

PLAY	THEATRE	DATE	No.PERFS.
The Battle in the Alms	Astley's	1854	126
The Battle of Waterloo	Astley's	1853	110
The Camp at Chobham	Adelphi	1851	143
Chase	Astley's	1853	104
The Court Beauties	Lyceum	1851	104
The Discreet Princess	Olympic	1855	105
Goodnight, Signor Pantalon	Adelphi	1851	132
King Charming	Lyceum	1851	109
King Henry VIII	Princess's	1855	150
Magic Toys	St. James's	1859	103
Mesaniello	Olympic	1857	105
The New Ways of Windsor	Strand	1854	105
Richard III	Astley's	1856	110
Still Waters Run Deep	Olympic	1855	134
Uncle Tom's Cabin	Victoria	1852	111
A Winter's Tale	Princess's	1856	102

1860s

PLAY	THEATRE	DATE	No.PERFS.
After Dark	Princess's	1868	153
All That Glitters is not Gold	Royalty	1866	150
Among the Breakers	Strand	1869	169
Area Belle	Adelphi	1864	128
Arrah - Na - Pogue	Princess's	1868	164
Bel Demonio	Lyceum	1863	188
La Belle Sauvage	St. James's	1869	197
Black-eyed Susan	Royalty	1866	400
Brown and the Brahmins	Globe	1869	100
Caste	Prince of Wales's (O)	1867	158

Checkmate	Royalty	1869	166
The Colleen Bawn	Adelphi	1860	165
Cyril's Succers	Globe	1868	100
Daddy Gray	Royalty	1868	139
The Duke's Motto	Lyceum	1863	174
The Field in the Cloth of Gold	Strand	1868	298
The Flying Scud	Holborn	1866	207
Formosa	Drury Lane	1869	117
The Great City	Drury Lane	1867	103
A Hero of Romance	Haymarket	1868	104
Home	Haymarket	1869	133
Its Never Too Late to Mend	Princess's	1865	140
Ixion	Royalty	1863	153
Jeanie Deans	Standard	1862	100
A Lancashire Lass	Qusens	1868	139
Leah	Adelphi	1863	215
Little Don Giovanni	Prince of Wales's (O)	1865	117
Little Em'ly	Olympic	1869	100
The Lost Child	Lyceum	1863	115
A Loving Cup	Royalty	1868	115
The Master of Ravenswood	Lyceum	1865	106
Meg's Diversion	Royalty	1866	330
Milky White	Strand	1864	125
Military Billy Taylor	Royalty	1869	134
No Thoroughfare	Adelphi	1867	151
Orpheus and Eurydice	Strand	1863	100
Our American Cousin	Haymarket	1862	314
Ours	Prince of Wales's (O)	1866	150
Peep O' Day	Lyceum	1861	346
Play	Prince of Wales's (O)	1868	106
Rip Van Winkle	Adelphi	1865	179
School	Prince of Wales's (O)	1869	381
The Sert	Olympic	1865	170
She Stoops to Conquer	St. James's	1869	159
A Shilling Day at the Exhibition	Adelphi	1862	135
Snowdrop	Royalty	1864	123
Society	Prince of Wales's (O)	1865	156
The Streets of London	Princess's	1864	209
The Ticket of Leave Man	Olympic	1863	407
The Toodles	Strand	1869	201
Uncle Dick's Darling	Gaiety	1868	100
A Widow Hunt	Strand	1868	151

1870s

All for Her	Mirror	1875	152
Babil and Bijou	Covent Garden	1872	160
La Belle Helene	Alhambra	1873	109
The Belle's Stratagem	Strand	1873	101
The Bells	Lyceum	1871	151

The Black Crook	Alhambra	1872	204
Blue Beard	Charing Cross	1874	251
The Bohemian G'yuri.	Opera Comique	1877	117
Caste	Prince of Wales's (O)	1871	195
Caste (revival).	Prince of Wales's (O)	1879	196
Charles 1st.	Lyceum	1872	180
Claucarty	Olympic	1874	164
Lady Claucarty	Olympic	1874	180
The Clocks of Coumeville	Folly	1878	705
Crutch and the Toothpick	Royalty	1879	234
Dan'l Bruce, Blacksmith	Haymarket	1876	119
Diplomacy	Prince of Wales's (O)	1878	329
Don Carlos	Vaudeville	1870	185
Don Juan	Alhambra	1873	123
Dora and Diplomacy	Strand	1878	115
Drink	Princess's	1879	229
Eileen Ogre	Princess's	1871	118
Engaged	Haymarket	1877	105
Family Ties	Strand	1877	168
La Fille de Madame Augot	Philharmonic	1873	235
A Fool and His Money	Globe	1878	126
Genevieve du Brabant	Philharmonic	1871	307
The Girls	Vaudeville	1879	121
The Great Divorce Case	Criterion	1876	182
H.M.S. Pinafore	Opera Comique	1878	700
Hamlet	Lyceum	1874	200
Hamlet	Lyceum	1878	106
The Harbour Lights	Adelphi	1873	222
The Heir at Law	Strand	1871	150
Its Never Too Late to Mend	Princess's	1878	129
Jane Shore	Princess's	1876	116
Jane Shore (revival).	Princess's	1877	162
Jo	Globe	1876	120
Joan of Arc	Strand	1871	125
The Ladies' Battle	Court	1879	113
A Lesson in Love	Strand	1875	127
The Lion's Tail	Globe	1877	117
Little Doctor Faust	Gaiety	1877	151
London Assurance	Vaudeville	1872	165
London Assurance (revival).	Prince of Wales's (O)	1877	110
Loo	Strand	1874	163
Lost in London	Princess's	1874	127
M.P.	Prince of Wales's (O)	1870	156
Madame Favart	Strand	1879	502
Man and Wife	Prince of Wales's (O)	1873	136
Married in Haste	Haymarket	1875	118
Masks and Faces	Prince of Wales's (O)	1875	130
Merchant of Venice	Lyceum	1879	250
Money	Prince of Wales's (O)	1872	205
The New Babylon	Duke's	1879	361
The New Magdalen	Olympic	1873	112

New Men and Old Acres	Court	1876	198
Nicholas Nickelby	Adelphi	1875	192
Notre Dame	Adelphi	1871	197
The Old Love and the New	Court	1879	137
Old Sailors	Strand	1874	190
Old Soldiers	Strand	1873	265
Olivia	Court	1878	138
Orphee aux Enfers	Alhambra	1877	132
Our Boys	Vaudeville	1875	1,362
Ours	Prince of Wales's (O)	1870	361
The Palace of Truth	Haymarket	1870	141
Partners for Life	Globe	1871	131
Peril	Prince of Wales's (O)	1876	156
Pickwick	Lyceum	1871	132
The Pink Dominos	Criterion	1877	555
The Prayer in the Storm	Adelphi	1874	143
Pygmalion and Galatea	Haymarket	1871	194
A Quiet Rubber	Court	1876	174
Richelieu	Lyceum	1873	114
Richelieu Redressed	Olympic	1875	110
Rip Van Winkle	Princess's	1875	154
The Rivals	Charing Cross	1872	133
The Road to Ruin	Vaudeville	1873	116
Robinson Crusoe	Folly	1876	120
Le Roi Carotte	Alhambra	1872	134
Romulus and Remus	Vaudeville	1872	188
School	Prince of Wales's (O)	1873	166
The School for Scandal	Vaudeville	1872	404
The School for Scandal	Prince of Wales's (O)	1874	110
A Scrap of Paper	Court	1876	120
The Shaughraun	Drury Lane	1875	119
She Stoops to Conquer	Aquarium	1879	133
The Sorcerer	Opera Comique	1877	176
Stolen Kisses	Globe	1877	150
Struck Oil	Adelphi	1876	101
Sweethearts	Prince of Wales'S (O)	1874	138
Trial by Jury	Royalty	1875	128
Truth	Criterion	1879	153
Twixt Axe and Crown	Queen's	1870	200
The 2 Orphans	Olympic	1874	214
The 2 Orphans (revival).	Olympic	1878	154
Two Roses	Vaudeville	1870	294
Venus	Royalty	1879	120
The Very Last Days of Pompeii	Vaudeville	1872	263
La Voyage dans la Lune	Alhambra	1876	140
The Wandering Jew	Adelphi	1873	151
Weak Woman	Strand	1875	104
The Wedding March	Court	1873	118
Whittington	Alhambra	1874	112
The Wicked World	Haymarket	1873	154
The Woman in White	Olympic	1871	119

1880s.

Adonis	Duke of York's	1886	105
Aladdin	Drury Lane	1885	145
About in London	Olympic	1885	107
All in a Looking Glass	Opera Comique	1887	141
As You Like It	Imperial	1880	135
Aunt Jack	Court	1889	137
The Babes	Toole's	1884	200
The Babes in the Wood	Drury Lane	1888	176
Babil and Bijou	Alhambra	1882	162
The Balloon	Strand	1889	131
The Beggar Student	Alhambra	1884	112
The Bells of Haslemere	Adelphi	1887	282
Betsy	Criterion	1888	140
Boccaccio	Comedy	1882	106
Bootle's Baby	Globe	1888	121
The Bronze Horse	Alhambra	1881	197
The Bungalow	Toole's	1889	290
The Bütler	Toole's	1886	217
Called Blank	Princes	1884	219
The Candidate	Criterion	1884	295
Captain Swift	Haymarket	1888	164
Carina	Opera Comique	1888	112
Caste	Criterion	1889	100
The Churchwarden	Olympic	1886	137
Cinderella	Drury Lane	1883	131
Claudian	Princess's	1883	248
The Colonel	Prince of Wales's (N)	1881	550
Confusion	Vaudeville	1883	587
The Corsican Brothers	Lyceum	1880	189
The Cup	Lyceum	1881	126
Dandy Dick	Court	1887	262
David Garrick	Criterion	1886	294
David Garrick (revival).	Criterion	1888	152
The Dead Heart	Lyceum	1889	189
Dick Whittington	Drury Lane	1884	130
The Doctor	Globe	1887	106
Don Juan Junior	Royalty	1880	146
Dorothy	Gaiety	1886	931
Ermine	Comedy	1885	154
Falka	Comedy	1883	157
Faust	Lyceum	1885	388
Faust up to date	Gaiety	1888	180
Fedora	Haymarket	1883	133
Forty Thieves	Gaiety	1880	232
Forty Thieves	Drury Lane	1886	155
Fourteen Days	Criterion	1882	108
Frankenstein	Gaiety	1887	110
The Glass of Fashion	Globe	1883	113
Going It	Toole's	1885	113
Golden Ladder	Globe	1887	119
Golden Ring	Alhambra	1883	105
Gondoliers	Savoy	1889	554
The Great Pink Pearl	Olympic	1885	188
The Guv'nor	Vaudeville	1880	164

H.M.S. Pinafore	Savoy	1887	120
Half Way House	Vaudeville	1881	106
Hamlet	Princess's	1884	116
Harbour Lights	Adelphi	1885	512
Helen!	Princess's	1887	159
The Hobby Horse	St. James's	1886	104
Impulse	St. James's	1882	294
In the Ranks	Adelphi	1883	457
The Invisible Foe	Savoy	1882	393
The Ironmaster	St. James's	1884	200
Jack and the Beanstalk	Drury Lane	1889	127
Jim the Penman	Haymarket	1886	200
Joseph's Sweetheart	Vaudeville	1888	261
Kenilworth	Avenue	1885	125
Khartoum	Astley's	1885	100
Lady Clancarty	St. James's	1887	160
The Lights O' London	Princess's	1881	228
Little Jack Shippard	Gaiety	1885	155
London Day by Day	Adelphi	1889	186
Loose Tiles	Vaudeville	1885	128
Macbeth	Lyceum	1888	151
The Magistrate	Court	1885	363
Marrima	Court	1888	118
A Man's Shadow	Haymarket	1889	204
Les Manteaux Noirs	Avenue	1882	190
The Man with 3 Wives	Criterion	1886	113
La Mascotte	Comedy	1881	199
Masks and Faces	Haymarket	1881	102
Master and Man	Princess's	1889	125
The Merry Duchess	Royalty	1883	177
Michael Strogoff	Adelphi	1881	100
The Middleman	Shaftsbury	1889	132
A Midsummer Night's Dream	Globe	1889	110
The Mikado	Savoy	1885	674
The Mikado (revival).	Savoy	1888	116
The Millionaire	Court	1883	131
A Mint of Money	Toole's	1884	111
Money	Vaudeville	1882	152
The Money Spinner	St. James's	1881	105
Monte Cristo Jr.	Gaiety	1886	166
Mother in Law	Opera Comique	1881	133
Much Ado About Nothing	Lyceum	1882	212
My Sweetheart	Strand	1884	162
The Mystery of a Hansom Cab	Princess's	1888	100
Nadgy	Avenue	1888	162
The Old Guard	Avenue	1887	300
Olivette	Strand	1880	466
Olivia	Lyceum	1885	135
On Change	Toole's	1885	286
Our Boys	Strand	1884	263
Our Flat	Opera Comique	1889	645
The Parvenu	Court	1882	114
Patience	Opera Comique	1881	578
Paul Jones	Prince of Wales's (N)	1889	370
Pour Claudian	Toole's	1884	140
Pepita	Toole's	1888	102
The Pink Dominoes	Comedy	1889	144

The Pirates of Penzance	Opera Comique	1880	363
Pluck	Drury Lane	1882	103
The Pointsman	Olympic	1887	105
The Pompadour	Haymarket	1888	100
The Private Secretary	Princes	1884	784
The Profligate	Garrick	1889	129
Puss in Boots	Drury Lane	1887	133
Pygmalion a Galatea	Lyceum	1883	102
The Red Hussar	Lyric	1889	175
The Red Lamp	Comedy	1887	165
Rip Van Winkle	Comedy	1882	328
The Rivals	Vaudeville	1882	227
Robinson Crusoe	Drury Lane	1881	122
Robinson Crusoe	Avenue	1886	120
Romeo and Juliet	Lyceum	1882	101
Romeo and Juliet	Lyceum	1884	101
Ruddigore	Savoy	1887	233
Ruy Bias	Gaiety	1889	282
St. Joan	Vaudeville	1884	182
A Scrap of Paper	St. James's	1883	120
Shadows of a Great City	Princess's	1885	145
Silver Guilt	Strand	1883	153
The Silver King	Princess's	1882	289
Sinbad	Drury Lane	1882	104
Sophia	Vaudeville	1886	100
Sophia (revival).	Vaudeville	1886	353
The Sorcerer	Savoy	1884	150
The Squire	St. James's	1881	170
The Still Alarm	Princess's	1888	100
Still Waters Run Deep	Criterion	1889	150
Sweet Lavender	Terry's	1888	684
Taken From Life	Adelphi	1881	150
The Doctor Cupid	Vaudeville	1889	147
Trial by Jury	Savoy	1884	150
Turned Up	Comedy	1886	159
Twins	Olympic	1884	105
Uncles and Aunts	Comedy	1888	211
The Union Jack	Adelphi	1888	121
The Upper Crusts	Folly	1880	432
The Vicar of Wide-Awake-Field	Gaiety	1885	118
La Vie	Avenue	1883	123
Where's the Cat?	Criterion	1880	149
A Winter's Tale	Lyceum	1887	166
The World	Drury Lane	1880	120
Yeomen of the Guard	Savoy	1888	423
Youth	Drury Lane	1881	114

<u>1890s</u>

The Adventures of Lady Ursula	Duke of York's	1898	262
Aladdin	Drury Lane	1896	139
All that Glitters is not Gold	Adelphi	1896	126
An Artist's Model	Daly's	1895	392
As You Like It	St. James's	1896	114

The Babes in the Wood	Drury Lane	1897	135
Beauty and the Beast	Drury Lane	1890	149
Becket	Lyceum	1893	112
The Best Man	Toole's	1894	121
Black Eyed Susan	Adelphi	1896	129
The Cabinet Minister	Court	1890	199
Captain Therese	Prince of Wales (N)	1890	104
Carmen up-to-data	Gaiety	1890	248
The Case of the Rebellious Susan	Criterion	1894	164
Charley's Aunt	Royalty	1892	1,466
Cheer! Boys, Cheer!	Drury Lane	1895	175
The Chili Widow	Royalty	1895	213
La Cigale	Lyric	1896	423
Cinderella	Lyceum	1893	126
Cinderella	Drury Lane	1895	139
Cinder-Ellen-up-too-late	Gaiety	1891	236
Circus Girl	Gaiety	1896	497
Claude Duval	Strand	1894	142
A Court Scandal	Court	1899	126
The Dancing Girl	Haymarket	1891	310
Dandy Dan the Lifeguardsman	Lyric	1897	166
Dandy Dick Whittington	Avenue	1895	124
The Degenerates	Haymarket	1899	122
The Derby Winner	Drury Lane	1894	140
Dick Whittington	Drury Lane	1894	123
Diplomacy	Garrick	1893	175
Don Juan	Gaiety	1893	221
The Dovecot	Duke of York's	1898	118
Dr. Bill	Avenue	1890	297
Dream Faces	Garrick	1890	335
The Eider Down Quilt	Terry's	1896	103
El Capitan	Lyric	1899	140
The Elder Miss James	St. James's	1898	106
L'Enfant Prodigue	Prince of Wales's (N)	1891	250
The English Rose	Adelphi	1890	238
The Fatal Card	Adelphi	1894	165
Florodora	Lyric	1899	455
A Fool's Paradise	Garrick	1892	148
Forty Thieves	Drury Lane	1898	130
A Gaiety Girl	Prince of Wales's (N)	1893	413
The Gay Lord Quex	Garrick	1899	300
The Gay Parisienne	Duke of York's	1896	369
The Geisha	Daly's	1896	760
Gentleman Joe	Prince of Wales's (N)	1895	392
The Girl I Left Behind Me	Adelphi	1895	108
Go - Bang	Trafalgar Square	1894	159
The Grand Ducchess	Savoy	1897	104
The Grand Duke	Savoy	1896	123
The Great Ruby	Drury Lane	1898	101
A Greek Slave	Daly's	1898	349
H.M.S.Pinafore	Savoy	1899	174
Haddon Hall	Savoy	1892	204
Hamlet	New	1892	115
Hansel and Gretel	Daly's	1894	161
Hearts are Trumps	Drury Lane	1899	106

His Excellency	Lyric	1894	161
How London Lives	Princess's	1897	104
Humpty Dumpty	Drury Lane	1891	144
Hypatia	Haymarket	1893	104
An Ideal Husband	Haymarket	1895	119
The Idler	St. James's	1891	176
In Town	Prince of Wales's	1892	292
Ivanhoe	Royal Opera House	1891	155
The J.P.	Strand	1898	100
Jane	Comedy	1890	196
Joan of Arc	Opera Comique	1891	235
Judah	Shaftsbury	1890	165
King Arthur	Lyceum	1895	105
King Henry VIII	Lyceum	1892	203
King John	Her Majesty's	1899	116
Lady Windermere's Fan	St. James's	1892	156
Jack and the Beanstalk	Drury Lane	1899	128
The Late Lamented	Court	1891	228
The Liars	Criterion	1897	291
Liberty Hall	St. James's	1892	163
A Life of Pleasure	Drury Lane	1893	153
The Lights of Home	Adelphi	1892	121
Little Bo Peep	Drury Lane	1892	137
Little Christopher Columbus	Lyric	1893	361
The Little Genius	Shaftsbury	1896	117
The Little Minister	Haymarket	1897	320
Little Miss Nobody	Lyric	1898	198
A Little Ray of Sunshine	Royalty	1895	195
Lord and Lady Algy	Comedy	1898	306
Mam'selle Nitouche	Trafalgar Square	1893	104
The Manoeuvres of Jane	Haymarket	1893	281
Marjorie	Prince of Wales's (N)	1890	193
A Marriage of Convenience	Haymarket	1897	113
A Message From Mars	Avenue	1899	544
The Mikado	Savoy	1895	127
The Mikado (revival).	Savoy	1896	229
A Million of Money	Drury Lane	1890	114
Miss Decima	Criterion	1891	191
Miss Hobbs	Duke of York's	1899	209
Miss Ponderbury's Past	Avenue	1895	162
Money	Garrick	1894	107
Morocco Bound	Shaftsbury	1893	295
The Mountebanks	Lyric	1892	229
The Musketeers	Her Majesty's	1898	160
My Friend the Prince	Garrick	1897	171
My Lady Frayle	Gaiety	1896	183
The Nautch Girl	Savoy	1891	200
Nerves	Comedy	189	157
Never Again	Vaudeville	1897	116
The New Barmaid	Avenue	1896	139
The New Boy	Terry's	1894	437
The New Woman	Comedy	1894	178
A Night Out	Vaudeville	1896	531
Oh! Susannah!	Royalty	1897	161
On and Off	Vaudeville	1898	226
One of the Best	Adelphi	1895	153

One Summer's Day	Comedy	1897	180
The Only Way	Lyceum	1899	107
Our Boys	Vaudeville	1892	137
Our Flat	Strand	1894	116
A Pair of Spectacles	Garrick	1890	235
A Pantomime Rehearsal	Terry's	1891	439
The Passport	Terry's	1895	119
La Poupie	Prince of Wales's (N)	1897	576
The Prisoner of Zenda	St. James's	1896	254
The Private Secretary	Comedy	1892	184
The Prodigal Daughter	Drury Lane	1892	106
The Professor's Love Story	Comedy	1894	144
The Prude's Progress	Comedy	1895	116
Robinson Crusoe	Drury Lane	1893	116
Rosemary	Criterion	1896	153
The Rose of Persia	Savoy	1899	213
A Royal Family	Court	1899	117
A Runaway Girl	Gaiety	1898	593
San Toy	Daly's	1899	768
The Second Mrs Tanqueray	St. James's	1893	225
The Sign of the Cross	Lyric	1896	435
The Sorcerer	Savoy	1898	102
The Squire of Dames	Criterion	1895	137
The Strange Adventures of Miss Brown	Vaudeville	1895	255
Sunlight and Shadow	Avenue	1890	125
Thoroughbred	Toole's	1895	117
The Three Musketeers	Globe	1898	208
The Times	Terry's	1891	155
Trelawney of the Wells	Court	1898	135
Trial by Jury	Savoy	1892	102
Trilby	Haymarket	1895	200
Trip to Chinatown	Toole's	1894	125
A triple Bill	Terry's	1891	287
The Trumpet Call	Adelphi	1891	221
Twelfth Night	Daly's	1894	112
Two Little Vagabonds	Princess's	1896	275
The Tyranny of Tears	Criterion	1899	112
Under the Red Robe	Haymarket	1896	256
Utopia Limited	Savoy	1893	243
Vanity Fair	Court	1895	122
A Village Priest	Haymarket	1890	124
Walker, London	Toole's	1892	511
What Happened to Jones	Strand	1898	383
Wheels within Wheels	Court	1899	132
A White Elephant	Comedy	1896	101
The White Silk Drey	Prince of Wales's(N)	1896	133
Why Smith Left Home	Strand	1899	109
With Flying Colours	Adelphi	1899	110
A Woman of no Importance	Haymarket	1893	113
A Woman's Revenge	Adelphi	1893	206
The Wrong Mr Wright	Strand	1899	121
The Yashmak	Shaftsbury	1897	121
Yeomen of the Guard	Savoy	1897	186

APPENDIX FOUR

PRIMARY SOURCE MATERIAL AND ITS LOCATION

Enthoven Collection. (Victoria and Albert Museum)

Lease of Box in Pit Tier to H.Vane by B.Lumley. (Feb.27th. 1846. Covent Garden)

Messrs. Coutts' Receipts (3) for Charles Kean's Salary Nov.21, Nov. 29, Dec. 28. Haymarket 1848.

Receipts for Kean's Salary at the Haymarket, Jan. 10, Jan. 12, and April 4.

Articles of Agreement by Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, to William Bennet, with some share documents. 1812 - 1866.

Copyright Agreement (James Vandenhoff) 28th. March 1866

Agreement, Globe Theatre. (Augustus Harris). June 22nd. 1883

Licence for 'Women Against Woman', granted by Pigott. Grand Theatre, Islington. Feb. 7th. 1883

Agreement, Britannia Theatre, Hoxton. (Sara Lane). 15th. Oct. 1888.

Ledger of payments to Performers, Alhambra Theatre. 1898 - 1900.

Assignment of Lease of Lyceum Theatre and Beef Steak Rooms. Letter signed by Bateman to Irving, with receipt. Dec. 23rd. 1878

Account Books. Henry Irving's Lyceum Company. (Bram Stoker).

Legal Documents relating to the ownership of Toole's. (Gurvey and Freedman). 1893 - 1894.

Other relevant material outside the period.

Brandon, On the Treasury of Covent Garden Theatre. (Document published in reply to criticism from Kemble, C.) Incl. Receipts 1809 - 1821. *circa* 1823.

Account Book, Drury Lane. (W.C.Macready). Dec 1841 - June 1843.

Accounts, Terry's Theatre,1904

Accounts, Vaudeville Theatre, 1904.

Daily Returns, Vaudeville Theatre, 1904.

Tour Accounts, 'Quality Street'. (Gatti), 1903 - 1904.

Manuscript Room, British Museum.

Theatrical Collection (Letters, programmes, notes etc.) by J.Winston. (38607)

Letters of John Hare 1844 ff. (acq. 1968. Uncat.)

List of Performances at Various London Theatres, - 1878.. (Cont. 39863, ff. 207 - 242)

Letter, C. Kean on Shakespearean Points, 1849. (41996, f.17)

Letters, S. Bancroft, to T.H.S. Escott. (E. 16926)

Letters to Sir Robert Peel, incl. letter from Dramatic Authors' Society on behalf of John Sheridan Knowles, 1843.(40523/40526)

Letters, A. Pinero. (45294). (incl. list of nightly takings for 'The Notorious Mrs Ebbsmith'). (45294. ff. 137-138)

Other relevant material outside the period.

Dialogue between a theatrical manager and a female candidate, late 18th. century. (39302 f. 205)

Department of Print and Drawings, British Museum

Architects' plans, some architects' drawings and impressionistic drawings of theatre frontages and interiors for whole period, 1843 - 1899.

Some scrapbooks and playbills, particularly of theatres in 80s and 90s. Particular scrapbook material on the St. James's, Daly's, Globe and Wyndham's.

Department of Printed Books, British Museum.

Comprehensive collection of Theatre Books, Pamphlets and monographs of the period.

Some theatre scrapbooks and playbills.

Westminster City Library.

(1st. Floor). Metropolitan Special Collection. Monographs, Bibliographies and pamphlets. A small but useful collection of Circus, Music Hall and Variety publications, late 19th. Cent.

Greater London Council's Architects' Department Collection.

Theatre Plans for the majority of West End theatres after 1878, at times of building or adaptation, or at 10-yearly reviews.

Some theatre plans prior to 1878.

Bodleian Library, Oxford. (John Johnson collection)

Lyceum Theatre Box Return. Nov. 22nd. 1882 (1970/A/132)

Henry Irving's Notebook. (1959/B. 17 (C).)

Bills for travel, advertising etc. sent to Lyceum Company. 1904.

Shakespeare Memorial Library, Stratford upon Avon.

Considerable collection of promptbooks, notes, playbills, designs, posters, programmes, drawings and photographs. Of interest to researchers into management are the collections of Stoker, and Beerbohm Tree.

University Library, Harvard

Family papers, Webster, B.

Letters, and Account Book (summary) 1841-2. (Kean).

Henry E. Huntingdon Library, San Mariad, California, U.S.

308 Letters to John Hollingshead. (NUC. MS. 62 - 449)

Folger Library, Washington US.

Charles Kean Collection.

Charles Kean Receipt Book, 1848.

Ohio State University Library, U.S.

Extensive collection of MS., Letters, Playbills of the nineteenth century London theatre.

Finsbury Library, St. John's Road, London.

Bills of sale of Sadler's Wells Theatre during Phelps' management. (2)

Actors' Fines during Phelps management.

Extensive Collection of posters and programmes for Sadler's Wells Theatre, 1843 - 1899.

Extensive (though poorly catalogued) collection of press cuttings relating to Sadler's Wells, 1843 - 1899.

Buckingham Palace Branch Road Library.

Playbills, and some prints of West End theatres, 1850 ff.

I.E. Kennedy Melling Collection. (Address private, but mentioned in Kennedy Melling, J. (1974). Discovering Theatre Ephemera. (Shire publications).

Theatre souvenirs, and special programmes.

Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Theatre Tickets.

Throwaways.

Harry Beard Theatre Collection, Little Eversdon, Cambridge.

Some material 1850 ff. including playbills and prints.

Society for Theatre Research c/o 14 Woronzow Road, London NW8 6QE.

Extensive collection of books, pamphlets, monographs, playbills etc. Housed partly in the Library of the University of London.

Mander and Mitchenson Theatre Collection, 5 Venmer Road, Sydenham.

Large collection of prints, programmes, playbills, souvenirs, letters and ephemera. The owners are to give the collection to the projected Theatre Museum.

St. Marylebone District Library, Marylebone Road, London N.W.1.

Collection of prints, plans, monographs, programmes and cuttings relating to a number of London theatres 1850 ff.

Princess's Theatre;collection of material.

Hampstead Central Library, Swiss Cottage, N.W.3.

Cuttings, bills and programmes for Scala Theatre. Some correspondence, but largely twentieth century.

Guildhall Library, Basinghall Street, London E.C.2.

Good collection of histories of London theatres, including some rarities.

Extensive, but loosely catalogued, collection of prints, scrapbooks etc.

Holborn Central Library, 32 Theobolds Road, W.C.1.

Small collection of material relating to the 'Brit' and local houses.

Shoreditch Central Library, Pitfield Street, N.1.

More material on the 'Brit' and other halls.

London Museum, Kensington Palace, W.8.

Some prints, playbills, letters and properties (etc.) used in West End productions.

The above have been sources for building the description in this study. Other sources, for further research, may be found in the Libraries and collections of the University Drama Departments and through contacts made through the British Music Hall Society, (c/o 1 King Henry Street, London N.16.), Concert Artists Association, (20 Bedford Street, Strand, London WC2), the British Theatre Association,(9 - 10 Fitzroy Square, London WIP 6AE) and the British Association of Circus Proprietors, (The Pheasantry, Longleat, Warminster, Wilts.).

With the exception of Covent Garden, no London theatre keeps an archive in a form accessible to researchers, but contacts made through the Society of West End Theatre Managers (Bedford Chambers, Covent Garden, London WC2) may be found useful by future researchers.

APPENDIX FIVE.

CONTEMPORARY PUBLISHED SOURCES

1. Newspapers, Magazines and Journals ;published in London, A Select List.

Theatrical Observer 1843 - 1899
The Athenaeum 1843 - 1899
The Era 1843 - 1899
The Theatrical Journal 1843 - 1873
London Entr'Acte 1869 - 1899
Illustrated Sporting and Dramatic News 1874 - 1899
The Theatre 1877 - 1899
The Stage 1880 - 1899
Music Hall Review 1889 - 1899

The Times 1843 - 1899
The Telegraph 1855 - 1899
Daily Mail 1896 - 1899

Punch 1843 - 1899
Chambers's Journal 1854 - 1899
Spectator 1843 - 1899
The Economist 1843 - 1899
The Leader 1850 - 1899
The Saturday Review 1855 - 1899
Academy 1869 - 1899
Illustrated London News 1843 - 1899
Cornhill Magazine 1860 - 1899
Contemporary Review 1866 - 1899
Nineteenth Century 1877 - 1899
Household Words 1850 - 1859
Public Opinion 1861 - 1877

Chelsea News 1857 - 1899
Finsbury Weekly News 1884 - 1899
Hampstead and Highgate Express 1860 - 1899
Holborn Guardian 1868 - 1899
Islington Gazette 1856 - 1899
Kensington News 1869 - 1899

Marylebone Chronicle 1843 - 1880

Paddington News 1843 - 1899

St. Pancras Chronicle 1857 - 1899

2. Accounts written by contemporaries ; Books. A Select List.

The following contains three kinds of book. First those written by or about the managers and their theatres. Second, those general surveys of theatre which include some useful material on management. Third those books on other subjects which nevertheless include some insights into the practice of theatre management 1843 - 1899.

Adams, J. (1850). On Licenses for Music and Dancing. (London: Ridgway).

Archer, F. (1912). An Actor's Notebooks. (London : Stanley Paul).

Archer, W. (1885). Henry Irving, Actor and Manager (London).

Archer, W. (1886). About the Theatre. (London).

Archer, W. (1888). Masks or Faces? (London).

Archer, W. (1923). The Old Drama and the New (London)

Bancroft, S. and Bancroft, M. (1886). Mr. and Mrs Bancroft On and Off The Stage. (London : Nelson).

Bancroft, S. and Bancroft, M. (1909). Recollections of Sixty Years. (London : Nelson)

Baker, H.B. (1904). History of the London Stage. (london).

Beckett, A. (1896). Green Room Recollections. (London).

Benson, C. (1926). Mainly Players. (London : Thornton Butterworth)

Beresford Chandler, E. (1908). Wanderings in Piccadilly, Mayfair and Pall Mall. (London).

Besant, W. (1909). London in the Nineteenth Century. (London : Black). Includes a chapter written by Hollingshead on the tribulations of management, pp. 92 - 215.

Blathwayt, R. (1898). Does The Theatre Make for Good? (1898)

Blow, S. (1958). Through Stage Doors. (London: Chambers)

Buller, H. (1853). Theatrical Directory and Dramatic Almanac. (London: Chambers. Also for 1860)

Burnand, F. (1904). Records and Reminiscences. 2 Vols. (London : Methuen)

Campbell, P. (1922). My Life and Some Letters. (London)

Charrington, F. (1885). The Battle of the Music Halls. (London: Dyer).

Cole, J.W. (1859). The Life and Theatrical Times of Charles Kean. (London).

Coleman, J. (1886). The Memoirs of Samuel Phelps. (London)

Coleman, J. (1888). Players and Playwrights I have Known. (London)

Cook, E.D. (1883). Nights at the Plays ; A View of the English Stage. 2 Vols. (London ; Chatto).

Craig, E.G. (1911). On the Art of the Theatre. (London : Heinemann)

Craig, E.G. (1957). Index to the Story of my Days. (London : Hulton).

Creswick, W. (1885). An autobiography. (London).

Dark, S. (1901). Stage Silhouettes. (London : Methuen).

Davenant, F. (1870). What shall my Son Be? (London).

Day, W. (1885). Behind the Footlights. (London).

Desmond, S. (1927). London nights long Ago. (London : Duckworth).

Donaldson, W. (1865). Recollections of an Actor. (London).

Doran, J. (1881). In and About Drury Lane. (London : Bentley).

East, J. (1967). 'Neath the Mask ; the Story of the East Family. (London : Allen and Unwin).

Eliot, W. (1925). In My Anecdotage. (London)

Escott, T.H.S. (1885). England ; its People, Policy and Pursuits. 2 Vols. (London)

Ervine, St. J. (1933). Theatre in my Time. (London :Rich).

Fagan, E. (1922). From the Wings. (London: Rainbow).

Farebrother, S. (1937). Through an Old Stage Door. (London).

Field, K. (1882). Charles A. Fechter. (London)

Fitzgerald, P. (1881). The World Behind the Scenes. (London: Chatto and Windus).

Fitzgerald, P. (1896). Music Hall Land. (London ; Chatto and Windus).

Foster, G. (1939). Spice of Life. (London; Hurst and Blackett).

Frohman, D. (with Marcossi, I.). (1916). Charles Frohman, Manager and Man. (London).

Ganthony, R. (1898). Random Recollections. (London)

Gissing, G. (1891). New Grub Street. (Reprinted 1976, London : Pelican).

Hanley, P. (1883). Random Recollections of the Stage. (London : Tinkler).

Harker, J. (1924). Studio and Stage. (London:Macmillan).

Halton, J. (1889). Reminiscences of J.L.Toole. (London).

Harvey, J.Martin. (1933). The Autobiography of John Martin Harvey. (London: Sampson Low).

Hibbert, G. (1916). A Playgoer's Memories. (London).

Hollingshead, J. (1895). My Lifetime. (London : Sampson, Low, Marston and Co.)

Hollingshead, J. (1892). The Story of Leicester Square (London : Simpkin and Marshall).

Hollingshead, J. (1898). Gaiety Chronicles. (London : Simpkin and Marshall).

Howard, J. (1938). Fifty Years A Showman. (London : Hutchinson).

Howe, J.B. (1886). A Cosmopolitan Actor. (London).

'Irvingite' (F.Marshall). (1883). Henry Irving, Actor and Manager. (London).

James, H. (1872 -1901). The Scenic Art. (Essays written by James in the period which have been gathered and published by Allan Wade, 1957, New York)

Jones, H.A. (1895). The Renascence of the English Drama. (London)

Jerome, J.K. (1885). On the Stage - and Off. (London).

Kemble, F. (1878). Records of Later Life. (London).

Kendal, D. (1890). Dramatic Opinion. (London).

Kerr, F. (1930). Recollections of a Defective Memory. (London : Thornton Butterworth).

Knight, C. (1844). London. Vol 5. 'Theatres of London' . (London : Crowley and Son).

Laceby, A. (1904). The Stage Struggles of a Bad Actor. (London).

Leverton, W.H. (1932). Through the Box Office Window. (London ; Werner Laurie

Lupino, S. (1934). From the Stocks to the Stars. (London).

Lytton, H. (1922). The Secrets of a Savoyard. (London: Macmillan).

Logan, W. (1871). The Great Social Evil. (London).

Macready, W.C. (1832 - 1851). Diaries . (Ed. Trewin, J. 1967. Longman, Green)

Maude, C. (1903). The Haymarket Theatre. (London : Grant Richards).

Mayhew H. (1861). London Labour and the London Poor. (London).

Morley, H. (1860). The Journal of a London Playgoer. (London: Routledge)

Murray, W.H. (1851). A Memoir of W.H.Murray. (London).

Newton, H.C. (1921). Cues and Curtain Calls. (London : Bodley Head).

Newton, H.C. (1920). The Old Vic. (London; Bodley Head).

Nicholson, W. (1906). The Struggle for a Free Stage in London. (London).

'Old Playgoer'. (1885). Random Recollections of the Stage. (London).

'Old Stager'. (1866). Stage Reminiscences. (London)

Paxton, S. (1917). The Ups and Downs of an Actor's Life. (London : Mills and Boon).

Pemberton, T. (1893). The Life and Writings of T.W.Robertson. (London: Bentley).

Pemberton, T. (1900). The Kendals. (London : Bentley).

Pemberton, T. (1904). Sir Charles Wyndham. (London).

Planche, J.R. (1872). Recollections and Reflections. (London : Tansley).

Pollock, F. (1875). Macready's Reminiscences. (London)

Pollock, Lady. (1884). Macready As I Knew Him. (London).

Pougin, A. (1885). Dictionnaire du Théâtre. (Paris).

Renton, E. (1918). Vaudeville Theatre , building, operation, management. (New York : Gotham Press).

Rimbault, E. (1895). Soho and its Associations. (London ; Dalan).

Ritchie, J. (1857). The Night Side of London. (London ; Tweedie)

Robertson, T.W. (1898). Trelawney of the 'Wells' (Play)

Robertson, T.W. (1889). Memoirs. (London)

Roberts, G. (1870). Behind the Curtain. (Play)

Robinson, H.C. (1811 - 1866). Journal of a London Playgoer. (Ed. Brown. The Society for Theatre Research, 1966)

Russell, W.C. (1888) Representative Actors. (London).

Scott, C. (1892). *Thirty Years at the Play.* (London).

Sherson, E. (1925). *London's Lost Theatres of the Nineteenth Century.* (London : John Lane).

Shuttleworth, H.C. (1885). *The Diary of an Actress or 'Realities of Stage Life'.* (London).

Smith, A. (1847). *The Natural History of the Ballet Girl.* (London).

Stirling, E. (1881). *Old Drury Lane.* (London).

Stoker, B. (1907). *Personal Reminiscences of Henry Irving.* (London ; Heinemann)

Taylor, T. (1871). *The Theatre in England. Some of the Shortcomings and Possibilities.* (British and Colonial Publishing Company).

Terriss, E. (1928). *Elaine Terriss, by herself.* (London)

Terry, E. (1933). *Memoirs.* (Ed. Craig, E. and St. John, C.) (London: Gollancz).

Toole, J.L. (1889). *Reminiscences.* (ed. Joseph Hatton). (London).

Tree, V. (1926). *Castles in the Air.* (London).

Vanbrugh, I. (1948). *To Tell My Story.* (London ; Hutchinson).

Vernon-Harcourt, F. (1902) *From Stage to Cross.* (London).

Walkley, A. (1892). *Playhouse Impressions.* (London)

Wallack, L. (1889). *Memories of Fifty Years* (London).

Williams, B. (1909). *An Actor's Story.* (London ; Heinemann).

Williams, M. (1883). *Some Theatres, Past and Present.* (London).

Wyndham, H.Saxe (1905). *Annals of Covent Garden Theatre.* (London).

3. Published Lectures and pamphlets. A Select List.

East, J. (1843). *The Pulpit Justified, and the Theatre Condemned.*

Godwin, G. (1878). *On the Desirability of Obtaining a National Theatre not Wholly controlled by the prevailing Popular Taste.* (Paper read to the Cheltenham Congress of Science Association).

Irving, H. (1878). *The Stage.* (paper read to the Perry Bar Institute, Birmingham).

(1881). *The Stage As It Is.* (Address given to the Philosophical Institute, Edinburgh)

(1894). *Municipal Theatres.* (Paper read to the Literary Institute , Walsall).

Kendal, Mrs. (1884). *The Drama.* (Paper given to the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, Annual Congress).

Kenney, A. (1875). *Poets and Profits at Drury Lane : A Narrative Suggested by F.B. Chatterton.*

Planche, J.R. (1879). *Suggestions for Establishing an English Art Theatre.*

Roth, W.E. (1883). *Theatre Hygiene ; A Proposal.*

Shaw, E. (1889). Fires in Theatres.

Tree, B. (1891). Some Interesting Fallacies of the Modern Stage. (Paper delivered to the Playgoers Club, London).

4. Contemporary Biographies and Works of Reference ; A Select List.

Archer, W. (1894 - 1898) The Theatrical World. (Annual).

Dickens, C. (Jr.) (1879) Guide to London.

Ledger, E. (1868 - 1899) The Era Almanack. (Annual).

Hays, A. (1887). Plans of All the Principal Theatres in London.

Little, C. (1898). London Pleasure Guide for 1898.

Matthews, C. and Hutton, L. (1886) Actors and Actresses of Great Britain and the United States from the Days of David Garrick to the Present Time.

Pascoe, C. (1879-1880) The Dramatic List.

(1879 - 1893) Dramatic Notes, A Year Book of the Stage.

Rampton Hunt (1906) The Green Room Book.

Reid, E. (1892) The Dramatic Peerage.

Scott, C. (1884 - 1886) The Theatre Annual.

Weale, J. (1851) London 1851.

(1883-1884) The Dramatic and Musical Directory of the United Kingdom.

(1850) London As It Is. (pub. Cradock and Co. Handbooks).

(1881 - 1899) The Entr'Acte Annual.

(1904) The Miscrocosm of London. (pub. Methuen.)

(1864) A Handy Book on the law of the Drama and Music.

5. General Bibliographies.

The most complete source for contemporary publications is Arnott, J.F. and Robinson, J.W. (1970). English Theatrical Literature 1559 - 1900 . A Bibliography. (London : Society for Theatre Research). Professor Arnott is working on a second edition of this book, which is scheduled to be published by the Society in 1982.

There is a thorough and carefully annotated Bibliography in Leech, C. and Craik, T.W. (1975) (eds.) The Revels History of Drama in English VI (Methuen) pp. 271 - 286. A standard, though incomplete, list of works arranged according to the subject is in Rowell, G. (1955). The Victorian Theatre (Oxford University Press) pp. 159 - 196. Eclectic lists can be found in Baker, M. (1978). The Rise of the Victorian Actor. (Croom Helm) pp. 226 - 240, and in Howard, D. (1970). London Theatres and Music Halls 1850 - 1950. (The Library Association). pp. 273 - 276. All publications listed in these four works have, with others, been searched in the compilation of this thesis.

BOOK LIST.

The following studies, and books, are a list of the basic literature existing for the researcher on this topic, and which has been used for the writing of the thesis.

Allen, S. (1971). Samuel Phelps and the Sadler's Wells Theatre. (Wesleyan University Press).

Appleton, W. (1974). Madame Vestris and the London Stage. (New York).

Armstrong, W. 'The Nineteenth Century Matinee', in Theatre Notebook, Vol II pp.96-102.

Arnold, M. (1869) Culture and Anarchy. (London). (Republished, Dover Wilson, J. (Ed.). (1960). Cambridge University Press).

Arundell, D.(1965). The Story of Sadler's Wells. (Hamish Hamilton).

Baker, M. (1978). The Rise of the Victorian Actor. (Croom Helm).

Beales, H.L.(1949). Ideals and Beliefs of the Victorians. (London).

Beerbohm, M.(1920). Henry Beerbohm Tree. (Hutchinson).

Bentley, E. (1957). Bernard Shaw, 1856 - 1950. (New York).

Booth, M. 'The Social and Literary Context', and 'Public Taste, the playwright and the law' in Revells History of Drama in English VI. (Eds. Leech, C. and Craik, T.) 1975.

Bottomore, T.B. (1964). Elites and Society. (Watts).

Briggs, A. 'The Language of Class in Early Nineteenth Century England', in Essays in Labour History in Memory of G.D.H.Cole. (Eds. Briggs, A. and Saville, J.). 1960.

Brown, E. (1966). The London Theatre 1811 - 1860. The Diaries of Henry Crabb Robinson. (Society for Theatre Research).

Chaplin, C. (1964). My Autobiography. (Bodley Head).

Clark, G.K.(1965). The Making of Victorian England. (London).

Crowther, G.(1940). An Outline of Money. (Nelson).

Darton, F.J.(1926). Vincent Crummles ; His Theatre and his Times. (London).

Dent, E. (1945). A Theatre for Everybody (Boardman and Co.)

Donaldeon, F. (1970). The Actor Managers. (Chicago).

Disher, M.W. (1957). The Personality of the Alhambra. (London).

Dobbs, B. (1972). Drury Lane. (London).

Donohue, J. (1971). The Theatrical Manager in England and America. (Princetown University Press).

Duncan, B. (1964). The St. James Theatre ; Its Strange and Complete History. (London).

Fawkes, R. (1979). Dion Boucicault. (Quartet Books).

Feasey, L. (1948). On The Playbill in Old London. (Harrap).

Fitzgerald, P. (1893). Henry Irving : A Record of 20 Years at the Lyceum. (London).

Forbes-Robertson, J. (1925). A Player Under Three Reigns. (Boston).

Fransisco, V.R. (1974). Charles Kean's Acting Career 1827 - 1867. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Indiana. U.S.

Glasstone, V. (1975). Victorian and Edwardian Theatres. (London).

Godfrey, P. (1933). Back Stage. (Harrap).

Hartnoll, P. (1952) Oxford Companion to the Theatre. (O.U.P.)

Herd, H. (1952). The March of Journalism. (Allen and Unwin).

Hibbert, H.G. (1916). Fifty Years of a Londoner's Life. (London).

Honri, P. (1974). Working the Halls. (Saxon).

Hughes, A. 'Henry Irving's Finances ; the Lyceum Accounts 1878 - 1899', in Nineteenth Century Theatre. Vol. 1. No. 2. 1973.

Hughes, A. 'The Lyceum Staff - A Victorian Theatrical Organisation', in Theatre Notebook Vol XVIII.

Hyman, A. (1975). The Gaiety Years. (Cassell).

Irving, L. (1951). Henry Irving. (Faber)

Macomber, P. (1959). The Iconography of London Theatre Auditoriums, 1660 - 1900. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Ohio. U.S.

Mander, R. and Mitchenson, J. (1961). The Theatres of London. (Rupert Hart-Davis).

Mander, R. and Mitchenson, J. (1975). The Lost Theatres of London. (Rupert Hart-Davis). 3rd. Revised Edition.

Marrus, M. (1974). The Emergence of Leisure. (Harper, New York).

Mason, A,E. (1935). Sir George Alexander and the St. James. (Macmillan).

Martin, G. (1963). The Playbill : the Development of its Typographical Style. (Chicago).

Martin Harvey, J. (1933). Autobiography. (Sampson, Low, Marston and Co.)

McFarlane, G. (1977) Copyright ; the Development and Exercise of the Performing Right. Ph.D. Thesis in the University of London. (Published, 1980, City Arts. Ed. Pick, J.)

McKechnie, S. (1930). Popular Entertainments through the Ages. (Sampson, Low and Marsten).

Minihan, J. (1977) The Nationalisation of Culture. (Hamish Hamilton).

Murray, C. (1975) Elliston, Manager. (Society for Theatre Research).

Nicoll, A. (1966). A History of the English Drama Vols IV and V. (Cambridge).

Odell, G. (1963). Shakespeare from Betterton to Irving. (New York).

Olsen, D. 'Victorian London : Specialisation, Segregation and Privacy', in Victorian Studies 17. March 1974.

Pearson, H. (1980). The Last Actor Managers. (Methuen).

Pearson, H. (1956). Beerbohm Tree : His Life and Laughter. (Methuen).

Petrie, C. (1960). The Victorians . (London).

Playfair, G. (1950). Kean. (Reinhardt and Evans).

Rees, T. (1978). Theatre Lighting in the Age of Gas. (Society for Theatre Research).

Roberts, P. (1976). The Old Vic Story. (Allen).

Richards, K. and Thomson, P. (1970). Nineteenth Century British Theatre. (Methuen).

Robertson, G. (1931). Time Was. (Hamish Hamilton).

Rowell, G. (1956). The Victorian Theatre. (O.U.P.)

Rowell, G. (1971). Victorian Dramatic Criticism. (Methuen).

St. Vincent Troubridge. 'Adelphi Advertising in 1862' in Theatre Notebook IV. p.57.

St. Vincent Troubridge. (1967). The Benefit System in the British Theatre. (Society for Theatre Research).

Saunders, A. (1928). Professions - their Organisation and Place in Society. (London).

Shaw, G.B. (1932). Our Theatres in the Nineties. (Constable).

Sherson, E. (1926). London's Lost Theatres of the Nineteenth Century. (London).

Sims, G. (1910). My Life ; Sixty Years of Bohemian London. (Heinemann).

Steen, M. (1962). A Pride of Terrys. (Longmans).

Stokes, J. (1972). Resistible Theatres. (London).

Stottlar, J. 'A Victorian Stage Censor - the Theory and Practice of William Bodham Donne ', in Victorian Studies, 8. March 1970.

Tawney, R. (1931). Equality. (Allen and Unwin).

Trevelyan, G. (1922). British History in the Nineteenth Century. (Longmans, Green and Co.).

Trevelyan, G. (1952). Illustrated English Social History IV. (Longmans, Green).

Urwin, G. 'Alfred Bunn, 1796 - 1860 : A Revaluation ',in Theatre Notebook Vol II pp.96 - 102

Watson, E.B. (1926). Drama from Sheridan to Robertson. (Cambs. Mass.)

Watson, G. (1973). The English Ideology : Studies in the Language of Victorian Politics. (London).

Webster, M. (1964). The Same Only Different. (faber).

Whitworth, G. (1951). The Making of a National Theatre. (London).

Williams, C. (1973). Madame Vestris : A Theatrical Biography. (London).

Williams, R. (1958). Culture and Society. 1780 - 1950. (Chatto and Windus).

Wilson, A.E. (1952). The Lyceum. (Yates).

Woodward, L. (1962). The Age of Reform 1815 - 1870. (London).