MIGRATIONS IN AMERICAN THEATER AND DRAMA: GEOGRAPHICAL, PHYSICAL, RELIGIOUS, MUSICAL, AND AESTHETIC MIGRATIONS

Editorial Universidad de Sevilla

MIGRATIONS IN AMERICAN THEATER AND DRAMA: GEOGRAPHICAL, PHYSICAL, RELIGIOUS, MUSICAL, AND AESTHETIC MIGRATIONS

Josefa Fernández Martín (ed.)

LITERATURA
EDITORIAL UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA

Sevilla 2023

LITERATURA

Nº 169

EDITORIAL UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA

Primera edición: 2023

c/ Porvenir, 27 41013 Sevilla

https://editorial.us.es // info-eus@us.es

DL: SE-SE 1130-2023

isbn: 978-84-472-2427-2

Motivo de cubierta: stereogram created by Josefa Fernández Martín

Impreso en papel ecológico.

Maquetación: Referencias Cruzadas

Impresión: Masquelibros

INDEX

III. MUSICAL MIGRATIONS

IV. GENRE AND STYLISTIC MIGRATIONS

INDEX OF ILLUSTRATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history, human beings have been driven by the impulse to cross physical, social or cultural borders, in a permanent search for new horizons. Sometimes, this impulse has been motivated by economic, political, religious, or even personal conflicts, but always, behind them, one can find the unstoppable desire for self-improvement and the pursuit of happiness. However, escaping from one's homeland, in the literal or figurative sense, does not always guarantee success. Often, migration becomes an experience of pain and trauma, of rejection and alienation; on other occasions, it culminates in acceptance by the receiving societies, producing an enriching hybridization. In this context, there is no better breeding ground for investigating the migratory phenomenon, at an artistic and cultural level and, particularly in the theatrical field, than the United States of America, since its origins linked to emigrants. The evolution of American theater from its origins to the present day, conceived as a melting pot of ideas, styles, trends, and even genres, could not be understood otherwise.

Thus, this volume is intended to offer a survey of the latest research on the field of American drama and theater from a kaleidoscopic point of view. Springing up from a common trunk, migrations, every single contribution can be taken as a leafy green stem in the bare-boned branches that eventually will shape a multicolored tree canopy of

insightful thoughts onto such a prevailing topic. This collection of essays explores the many ways that migrations have been and are still today an active factor modeling the culture and, more specifically, theater and drama in their multifaceted forms. Having American drama as the focal point, these illuminating essays address questions such as geographical, physical, religious, musical, aesthetic, or stylistic migrations, providing insights into the wide range of topics and authors being discussed and analyzed, from such classics as Arthur Miller or Eugene O'Neill, to Tony Kushner, Lynn Nottage, and Sarah Ruhl, notwithstanding questions such as the migration of aesthetic movements and styles. It is intended to create a compendium of intergenerational and intergeneric references that may contribute for the most part to add layers of meaning to the discussions undertaken in it.

Although studies on migration and American theater have been published, most focus on the phenomenon of migration as a purely physical process.

In this volume, the authors address themes ranging from migration and reception of texts from one side of the Atlantic to the other, to cultural, musical, theatrical, and even religious migrations, often portraying migrants or migrations as subversions of social, literary, stylistic, cultural, racial, or ethic boundaries and norms. Despite the heterogeneous nature of the different essays, the volume has been organized around four sections, each one comprising two essays that bring together analyses with similar thematic or stylistic approaches.

The first section entitled "Transatlantic Migrations" is dedicated to the analysis of plays by such emblematic authors as Arthur Miller and Tennessee Williams and the migration of their works from the United States of America to the United Kingdom, focusing on the perception and reception of their dramaturgy in Europe. The first essay, "Two Nations Divided by a Common Man: The Migration of Arthur Miller's Drama to the United Kingdom and Back" by Sue Abbotson, centers on the three greatest hits of Arthur Miller, *All My Sons*, *Death of a Salesman*, and *The Crucible*, all of them written in just a decade. However, Miller's popularity in the United States of America declined soon after, while it increased considerably in the United Kingdom, for reasons that the

author of this essay admirably describes in detail. It is precisely this latter fact that contributed to the revival of Miller's fame in the United States of America at the beginning of the twentieth century. This essay then contributes to unraveling the ways of these "double" migrations, with a thorough discussion of the productions of the plays in the United Kingdom and their subsequent impact on the reception of both authors later in the United States of America. The second essay, "Transcultural Opportunities and Restrictions: Rewriting the American Script in Nineteen-Fifties Europe" is an insightful discussion by Michael S. D. Hooper, masterfully addressing the question of censorship in Arthur Miller's and Tennessee Williams's works in the United Kingdom. He provides the reader with a thorough analysis of the circumstances that made these authors and their plays, particularly *A View from the Bridge* and *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*, so "refreshing and controversial" for the contemporary British audience, and how much of it could be attributed to the producers of the plays, Peter Brook for *A View from the Bridge*, and Peter Hall for *Cat on a Hot Tin Roof*.

The two essays assembled in the section entitled "Human and Religious Migrations" focus on the analysis of twenty-first century plays related to the migration of people from social, cultural, ethnic and even religious points of view. The first contribution to this section, "The Avatars of Migration in Sarah Ruhl's *The Clean House* and Lynn Nottage's *By the Way, Meet Vera Stark*" by Ludmila Martanovschi, investigates acts of migration across boundaries of class, race, and ethnicity in these plays by two of the most popular and acclaimed playwrights of the moment. Martanovschi argues in this essay that the two works are comparable on the basis that they both represent the ability of two powerful protagonists to migrate to new identities, an idea, according to Martanoschi, further enhanced with the playwrights' indications for different roles to be performed by the same person, thus taking the issue of "migrations" to a further layer of meaning. In the second essay of this section "Girlhood and Religious Migration: *Gracie* by Joan MacLeod," Shelley Scott examines a rather astonishing case of migration, that related to the forced migration of women from the United States of America to Canada, motivated by religious questions.

This critical and insightful study delves into the role of women and girls, victims trapped in religious sects that violate their essential rights even today, in supposedly democratic western societies.

The contributions included in the section under the title "Musical Migrations" mark a thematic shift and take the reader into the field of musical migrations, with two outstanding essays. In both, the city of New York becomes the epicenter of the migration phenomenon in the United States of America, providing the opportunity to be a catalyst of very diverse traditions, now in connection with music. In "Sounds of the City: Musical Migration in *A Glance at New York*," Brian Valencia scrutinizes the history and impact of nineteenth-century Benjamin Baker's play, *A Glance at New York* (1848), with its celebrated "folk hero," Mose the Bowery b'hoy, "a virile embodiment of the spirit of the age," to delve deeper into the details, in a forensic manner, of this musical farce and to rescue and reconstruct the long lost music of this text for its main seven songs and their "migratory" origins. The next essay, "*BUSTED!* in the Bronx: Bambaataa, Kafka, and Keaton, and the Sampled Realities of the Underclasses in Vaudeville and Hip-Hop," Rick DesRochers explores and retells in a remarkable manner, the production of the devised multimedia performance *Busted!* at Lehman College, New York. The production uses and combines the "migrated" works of Franz Kafka's *The Trial* (1915), through the French adaptation by Jean-Louis Barrault and Andre Gide, and one of Buster Keaton's early silent short films, *Cops* (1922). Through the precise and well-documented process that enabled this performance to take, adapt, and reinvent theatrical and artistic practices, DesRochers sheds light on a series of "unexpected connections" represented in the migration of European "high culture" literary forms that get intertwined with popular entertainments of the United States of America, in this case, with the hip-hop culture of the Bronx-based student performers.

The last section of this volume, which bears the title "Genre and Stylistic Migrations," deals with the question of the migration of dramatic formats and styles to American theater at the end of the twentieth century. The first contribution, "(Neo) Baroque as a Facet of Postmodern Drama: Genre and Stylistic Migrations in Tony Kushner's

Hydriotaphia, or The Death of Dr. Browne," by Natalia Visotska, explores the many ways in which European Baroque features can be said to have migrated to postmodern American drama, focusing the analysis on those implemented in Tony Kushner's multifaceted play. The essay concludes that the migration of such European cultural elements enriched postmodern American drama, creating links between areas temporarily and geographically remote. The volume closes with Annette Saddik's enlightening and inspirational essay "Clowning Around? Crossing Boundaries in Late 20th Century Grotesque Drama." Saddik starts with the analysis of the character of Javier, the "Sad Clown" in the Spanish film *Balada Triste de Trompeta (The Last Circus)*, released in 2010, to take the reader into the world of three plays, culturally and geographically remote, where she examines and illustrates the ambivalent figure of the clown and its grotesque dramaturgy. Griselda Gambaro's *Siamese Twins* (1965), Reza de Wet's *African Gothic* (1985), and Tennessee Williams's *The Remarkable Rooming-House of Mme. Le Monde* (1984) are the selected plays in which, despite their differences, the comic-grotesque appears as the common denominator that serves to expose the vices of contemporary society, revealing the clown as a character in "*perpetual migration*," crossing borders, and, in the plays analyzed, leaving at the end, despite the general pessimistic atmospheres, "an open space for the possibility of change."

What all the essays collected in this volume have in common is the fact that they represent a kaleidoscopic approach to the vital and current phenomenon of migration and how it manifests itself, in this particular case, in the field of the performing arts. It is thus a valuable contribution to the field of contemporary American theater research and we sincerely hope the reader may find the essays collected here truly rewarding.

Josefa Fernández Martín
University of Seville

I. TRANSATLANTIC MIGRATIONS

1
TWO NATIONS DIVIDED BY A COMMON MAN: THE MIGRATION OF ARTHUR MILLER'S DRAMA TO THE UNITED KINGDOM AND BACK

Sue Abbotson
Rhode Island College

Miller's best-known plays *All My Sons* (1947), *Death of a Salesman* (1949), and *The Crucible* (1953) were all written in less than a decade. It was a period during which, despite the evident criticisms the plays contained of Miller's homeland —and some picketing against them from such patriotic organizations as The American Legion— still won him laurels in the United States of America as one of America's greatest playwrights. Miller was at the top of his game, the spokesperson for the American conscience, or as Philip Gelb asserted in 1958, a prophet who "warns us of the possible bitter harvest that may be reaped from our present limited way; he calls attention to the moral and ethical decisions that must be made; and he dramatizes the

problem and the need for individuality and will. These may well prove to be the ultimate meanings of hope" (Roudané 27). And Miller took on this mantle willingly, viewing the dramatist as "a sort of prophet... the leading edge of the audience," with a vision he needs to relate to that audience (Martine 177). But the unfortunate thing with prophets is that they usually end up being reviled. People also expect their moralists to be squeaky-clean idealists rather than actually human. In other words, such grandiose expectations were surely foreshadowing an inevitable fall.

Despite the output of his drama in later years being greater than that of the earlier, Miller began to be viewed by American critics as an important playwright of the forties and fifties, indeed, it was not uncommon in the early 1990s when I worked on a doctoral thesis that considered Miller's later plays alongside those of August Wilson, to hear people express surprise that Miller was even alive, let alone still producing new plays. The plays of the 1970s through to the end of his career were slighted or given little attention in his home country, even while many of them were being successfully produced and predominantly extolled in the United Kingdom. Miller continued to write through to his death in 2005, but in his homeland, he became increasingly the pariah, his work more and more scorned, and the bright lights of Broadway swiftly receded into the distance (except for the occasional revival of one of the big three). However, in that same period, his reputation in the United Kingdom continued to grow, critical responses shone, his plays began appearing on school curricula, and productions were mounted at such leading institutes as the National Theater and the Royal Shakespeare Company, aside from countless other major theaters.

That for several decades Miller was virtually ignored in his homeland, even while lionized abroad, is a fascinating aspect of the career of this very American writer, who more than ten years after his death is being viewed by many as the most important of American dramatists (based on the seriousness of his themes, the evident timelessness of his work, and the growing volume of productions of his plays that has begun to outstrip that of such worthy notables as Eugene O'Neill, Tennessee

Williams, and Edward Albee, despite them all having won far more prizes). Even before his death in 2005 the tide began to turn as the wave of British adulation finally reflected back onto American shores, due to a number of factors that include, perhaps, the mere passage of time, but also the insistent promotion of his worth by the scholars of the Arthur Miller Society, formed in Millersville, Pennsylvania, in 1995; there were also several notable and innovative productions of his plays (albeit often by European directors, such as Ivo Van Hove, David Thacker, Nicholas Hytner, Dominic Cooke, or Richard Eyre); and of course there is also the fact that his plays have not become irrelevant or merely speak to some historical interest—but remain painfully current. They continue to speak to the times—though the recent US Depression may have helped Americans to better see this. Nowadays, *Death of a Salesman* is often listed as the best play in US lists, though that would have been a much harder sell back in the 1960s when Miller seemed to have become irrelevant to American critics.

So, why did Miller first become so popular?

After all, each of those early plays offered a pretty dour picture of America, with its war profiteers, callous industrialization, growing materialism, and harmful scapegoating. But they also offered American theater a new socially responsible and potentially hopeful vision that suited the period. Miller always insisted that tragedy "implies more optimism in its author than does comedy, and that its final result ought to be the reinforcement of the onlooker's brightest opinions of the human animal" (*Collected Essays* 10). What Miller offered the American public was a new kind of drama, filled with authentic, ordinary Americans with pretensions to the extraordinary, depicted in solid productions, and which very much spoke to the zeitgeist of the times.

All My Sons opened in 1947 and ran for 328 performances on Broadway, winning the New York Drama Critics' Circle Award, and the Donaldson Award, with the then little-known Ed Begley playing Joe. Brooks Atkinson of the *New York Times* announced that with *All*

My Sons "the theatre has acquired a genuine new talent... something fresh and exciting" ("Genuine Talent" 21). He declared the play to be "a piece of expert dramatic construction," lauding its "pithy yet unselfconscious dialogue" and vivid characters who felt plucked "out of the run of American society" but were presented "as individuals with hearts and minds of their own" ("Genuine Talent" 21).

In the United Kingdom the following year *All My Sons* opened at the Lyric in Hammersmith then transferred to The Globe Theatre for a respectable but less impressive run of 148. The *New York Times* reported that W. A. Darlington had declared it to be "the best serious play that America has sent us for some time" with the critic from *The Times* admiring its "dark beauty and psychological tautness" ("*All My Sons*" 33). *The Daily Mail,* however, was less impressed, and felt the play "too long" and laborious ("*All My Sons*" 33), and while *Spectator*'s Peter Fleming found it "sincere" and "deft," he also felt that it was only "at times distinguished" (612). Joseph Calleia played Joe, and that same year a movie version starring Edward G. Robinson was also made: interesting that these two actors chosen to play Joe were ones best known for playing villains and gangsters. This speaks to how the audience was meant to react toward Joe so shortly after the war; a man whose desire to keep the family business going led to the deaths of 21 pilots. In more recent years Joe has been successfully played very differently—by John Lithgow, David Suchet or Don Warrington–and often far more sympathetically, which offers testament to the complexity of the original written character. This also suggests another reason why the play continues to be produced: its inherent mutability allowing it to evolve to suit different times and audiences, which appears to be the case with most of Miller's work.

In 1949, *Death of a Salesman* ran for 742 performances on Broadway (eating through a series of different Willys, beginning with Lee J. Cobb), becoming the first play to win all three of the major awards: the Pulitzer Prize, the New York Drama Critics' Circle Award, and the Antoinette Perry (Tony) Award, as well as winning the Donaldson Award, and the Theater Club Award, among many others. At this Atkinson insisted, "What Mr. Miller has achieved somehow seems

to belong to everybody. For he is writing as an American with an affectionate understanding of American family people and their family problems; and everybody recognizes in his tragic play things that they know are poignantly true" (Centola 27). Howard Barnes declared the play to have "majesty, sweep and dramatic impact" (14).

Elia Kazan directed this and the subsequent British premier at the Phoenix Theatre in London, which ran for just 204 performances. Paul Muni played Willy, and was resistant to Kazan's direction, and Miller was unhappy with the portrayal, later telling Ronald Hayman, "He didn't do it right" and his "style was too studied, too technical. There was too little real inner life in his performance" (Roudané 187). *The Times* liked the production but referred to it as a "massive and relentless play" ("*Death*" 9), J. C Trewin called it "needlessly portentous" with nothing "very exciting to say" ("Good" 320), while T. C. Worsley objected to what he felt was the "self-importance" permeating the play's atmosphere, noting that "The little theme is made to take itself much too seriously" (146). As Brenda Murphy points out, "Disapproval of Willy Loman as an exemplar of the defects of the American way of life pervaded the critics' response, even while they recognized the play's merit" (*Miller* 74). Peter Fleming asserted he "could not help wishing that Mr. Miller had used satire and not sentiment in his approach to a way of life whose standards and atmosphere are really—to those at any rate who are not yet in danger of having to live that way—a matter for laughter rather than for tears" (173). Murphy points to another British critic who noted "that perhaps the British audience had not responded as emotionally to the play as the American because 'we're suspicious of popularity hunters' and 'the British are likely to despise Loman for an outlook on life (smiles into diamonds) which other nations regard as quite natural.' One of several letter-writers," Murphy continues, "expressed agreement that Britons could not find Willy 'worth the tears' because he was 'a cad and a mental bounder, apart from his business life'" (*Miller* 74). But these were early days, and the more reserved British had yet to be won over.

In 1953, *The Crucible* was not the biggest success on Broadway when it first opened, largely due to its potentially dangerous subject

matter while the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) was still in full flow, but also a static and rather tedious production from its director, Jed Harris. However, it would go on to become Miller's most produced play, with the 1958 Word Baker Off-Broadway production proving its chops, and running for nearly three times as long. In 1954, the European premier of the play at Bristol Old Vic, with Rosemary Harris as Elizabeth, garnered much acclaim. Nigel Farndale suggested its impact on British audiences was partly because it "stood out from the bedroom farces and tepid whodunnits popular at the time (Farndale). Rosemary Harris later recalled:

> All the London critics, including Kenneth Tynan and Harold Hobson, came down to Bristol to see *The Crucible* .... It was a profoundly moving production and I felt it affected people a lot, but it didn't go to London because it was considered too strong meat. Arthur Miller wasn't that accepted at the time, and people hadn't liked *Death of a Salesman* all that much. This was before the Angry Young Men, and British audiences were more staid in their tastes. They still wore dinner jackets to the theatre and preferred drawing room comedies. The critics were blown away by our production. Apparently, they talked about it on the train all the way back to Paddington. (Farndale)

One British critic, P. Hope-Wallace complained: "Arthur Miller of course is preaching a topical sermon—about McCarthyism; the impact of the play must have been great in New York. But there are plenty of other pogroms—nearer home. No, if it makes less impact than it should, it is because all witch hunts are the same in the long run... This was only melodramatically 'moving'" ("Theatre" 1544).

When *The Crucible* was finally produced in London two years later by the English Stage Company at the Royal Court Theatre, *Spectator*'s Anthony Hartley reported it "fundamentally poetic without the self-conscious striving after artificiality which is the bore of the West End stage" (547), and *The Times* declared it a fine piece of writing "generating... a genuine dramatic force" ("London Critics" 28). *The Daily Express* said that the "play sizzled with high indignation and

glowed with splendid words" ("London Critics" 28). But by then British opinions about Miller were changing, as fast as they would change back in his homeland.

In 1959, Raymond Williams avowed Miller to be "clearly a central figure in the drama and consciousness of our time" (Centola 44). The Edenic backyard of the Kellers in *All My Sons*, replete with its own totemic apple tree offered post-war Americans a vision of their own dreams and expectations, coupled with a stern warning that the serpent is ever there to tempt. Joe is that tempter, but even his neighbors admire the fact that he got away with something, but Miller's first play was called *No Villain*, and his work tended to adhere to that directive. Miller will later present Lucifer himself in the biblically inspired *The Creation of the World and Other Business*, as a guy who means well but goes the wrong way about doing things, and Joe ends by accepting responsibility and atoning for his crimes through suicide. American audiences were no doubt thrilled by the optimism of Chris (just add the "T" to work out *his* role in the play) when he asserts to his parents: "You can be better" (Miller *Collected Plays* 157), which provides the play with its central message (and warning).

The late 1940s and 1950s were periods in which the United States of America was highly aware of her own potential, as she began to flex her international muscles, and play up that sense of manifest destiny on which she had been founded. As Chris Keller had told them, "You can be better" (Miller *Collected Plays* 157), and even if you are a beat up old salesman, you *need* not give up that dream, even while Miller is warning you of its potential pitfalls. When John Proctor insists on keeping his name, regardless of his past mistakes, he is claiming his humanity against forces that are threatening to erase it entirely, and in this he is standing up for the rights of all Americans. When Eddie demands his name two years later in *A View from the Bridge*, however, conditions have become a little stickier. Eddie is not standing up to a totalitarian regime, but scrabbling to save his dignity after betraying his own family. America's dream playwright is starting to become a little harder to swallow. And isn't he being targeted by HUAC as someone engaged in Un-American activities?

A View from the Bridge first appeared in a double-bill with *A Memory of Two Mondays* in 1955. The plays were thought by some to be interesting, but Atkinson called them a "disappointment" ("Theatre" 21) as well as "flat and diffuse" ("*View*" 1), and John McClain declared, "Maybe it's my fault, but I'm getting bored by these terribly significant plays about dreary people" ("Hail" 274). The period for socialist sympathies was clearly over, and Miller was, as his 1956 appearance before HUAC insisted, a die-hard communist and American tolerance for his brand of socialism was clearly waning. As Chris Bigsby explained years later to Charlotte Higgins, "Miller's reputation in the United States of America had been damaged because the American public 'never forgot and never forgave his Marxism. Here in Britain, by contrast, we are hardly taken aback by the fact that we have a lot of socialist playwrights and that they write "state of Britain" plays.'" He concludes, "Miller's UK reputation had... always prospered by comparison with the US" (Higgins). And it does seem that here is one sure point of divide. As Harold Pinter stated on hearing the news of Miller's demise: "In the United States, they didn't like him very much because he was too outspoken and too critical of the way of life in the United States and certain assumptions that were made over there" (BBC). He left "those assumptions" undefined, but they did have to do with more than politics.

Meantime, at the urging of British director, Peter Brook, in 1956, while Miller was in England accompanying his new wife, Marilyn Monroe, Comedy Theatre mounted an expanded two-act version of *A View from the Bridge,* which is the one we better know today (and so much for the urban myth that Miller did not write anything while with Monroe). This ran for 220 performances and was a resounding success. Philip Hope-Wallace described, "the feeling in it is unusually strong and deep, with slowly built, unvarying and intense acting-situations which in Peter Brooks' superb production pack a tremendous punch" ("*View*" 1267). Other critics called it "A powerful and important play" (Findlater 62), and "an economically-wrought play that drives straight to its point" (Trewin "Quick" 720). This two-act version, however, was not seen on Broadway until 1983, when Long Wharf transferred its

successful production to the Ambassador Theatre (though it did have an Off-Broadway showing in 1965 to mixed reviews).

Interestingly, a French-Italian film version, adapted by Miller's college friend Norman Rosten, and directed by Sidney Lumet with Raf Vallone playing Eddie, was produced in 1962 in both French and English. It was mostly filmed in Paris, though its outdoor sequences were shot on location on the waterfront of Brooklyn. It was the first time that a kiss between men had been shown on screen in America (Russo 138), and unsurprisingly it garnered generally negative reviews in the United States of America when shown in the cinema, and was never released to video or DVD. In *Film Quarterly*, Pauline Kael called it "not so much a drama as a sentence that's been passed on the audience. What looks like and, for some people, passes for tragic inevitability is just poor playwriting" (29). Stanley Kauffmann's review was titled "The Unadaptable Adapted" and he declared it to be uninteresting and unoriginal (26). Even Bosley Crowther, although rather liking it, still rejected the play's putative tragic hero, Eddie, as "seamy and ignoble" (1).

So why else did Miller lose so much favor in the United States of America?

It was certainly more than just his politics, though they certainly had influence over the remainder of his career. As Higgins points out, even when "Miller died in 2005, the *Wall Street Journal* obituary was headlined 'The Great Pretender: Arthur Miller wasn't well liked – and with good reason.' *New Criterion* magazine was blunter, running with 'Communist stooge'" (Higgins). In that same article Bigsby suggests another possibility that put Miller at odds with his countrymen, in his "feeling for history" which "caused Americans bewilderment" (Higgins). Bigsby goes on to insightfully describe America as "an immigrant country to do with transcending the past, with wiping the ground behind you because you are leaning into the future. What Miller found in America" he suggests, "is a country that has a disregard for history except as myth" (Higgins). Miller, on the other hand, he

explains "understood that 'the past is not dead, we carry the past with us. We are the past'" (Higgins). It is something Miller learned from studying European writers such as Ibsen and Dostoyevsky, and many of his plays do hinge on characters struggling to understand and come to terms with their past. He even reintroduced Americans to the Salem Witch Trials to try and show them their historical inclination toward demonizing the Other. Several American critics responded to *The Crucible* rather disingenuously by declaring that there were no witches but they *are* communists, which seems to rather miss the point.

As the "About the Author" information accompanying the DPS edition of *The Archbishop's Ceiling* states: "During the 1980s, almost all of Miller's plays were given major British revivals, and the playwright's work has been more popular in Britain than in the United States of late" (DPS). Is it that the American productions were truly bad? Were American directors and actors insufficiently respectful to give Miller his due? Or was it just that they were not given a fair chance? Miller once told Bigsby that *Death of a Salesman* was the only play he had ever written that was universally well received (*Miller and Company* 108), and he may be right. But Irving Wardle's comment, that marks *After the Fall* as a major turning point in the American public's attitude toward Miller, is one that has grown increasingly more accepted: "Almost overnight," Wardle explains, "the image of a heroic public spokesman was replaced by that of a confused private man: and thereafter Miller was punished in the only way America knows how to punish a fallen idol. *Death of a Salesman* and *The Crucible* remained great national classics, but in the work he has written since the sixties he was treated as a bankrupt trying to pick up the pieces" ("American Patron" 36). Wardle is, of course, a British critic. As is Dennis Welland, who further suggests: "People do not take kindly to the destruction of their myths, nor, indeed to the insistence that they *are* myths. Here, in their indignation, they blamed Miller for the destruction of something when he was in reality trying to show them that, if it had ever existed at all, it had in fact destroyed itself" (94). They are, of course, talking about a play whose central characters —despite Miller's own assertions that this was not the case— were evident cyphers for Miller and his three

wives, but most especially that middle one, that five foot five blonde simply known as "Marilyn."

This essay does not contain the first suggestion that the catalyst for this change of critical opinion as to Miller's worth happened in response to his relationship with Marilyn Monroe, and this obsession with Monroe's place in Miller's life has not lessened over the years. A 2018 headline in *Forward* reads: "Did Arthur Miller's Pulitzer Prize Help Him Win Over Marilyn Monroe?" (Zax). In the subsequent article, Talya Zax references "His short-lived marriage to Marilyn Monroe" (Zax), apparently unaware that of Monroe's three marriages, at four and a half years this was certainly her longest and most fulfilling, given that during most of her marriage to James Dougherty he was away serving in the navy and her one to Joe DiMaggio imploded after six months (though all obviously pale beside Miller's forty years with Inge Morath—for it was not *he* that had trouble staying faithful to a single person).

From the start, the media saw the union of Miller and Monroe as mismatched, given her star image as a sex symbol and his position as an intellectual, as demonstrated by *Variety*'s headline "Egghead Weds Hourglass" (Meyers 155). Media comments were just as disparaging on news of their divorce, one article in *Time* bore the title "Popsie and Poopsie" (61), while *Life* sententiously reported, "Marilyn's work requires her to live amid crowds while Miller needs solitude" ("End" 90).

When *After the Fall* opened in 1964 with Jason Robards as Quentin and Barbara Loden, wearing a blond wig, as Maggie—it was greeted by a torrent of disapproval. Most US critics viewed it as a ruthless, self-indulgent portrait of Miller's earlier marriage to Monroe, presented far too soon after her death in 1962. Robert Brustein's lengthy response called it "a three-and-one-half hour breach of bad taste, a confessional autobiography of embarrassing explicitness" ("Mea Culpa" 26), and other American critics insisted it was of "no consequence critically" (Cohen 289), a complete failure (Epstein 73), and felt "offended by its lack of taste" (McClain "Robards" 376).

British critics saw it somewhat differently; Welland saw it as a "mature re-examination of [the] interacting complexities" of most of the themes from Miller's earlier work (90); he admired its "grandness

of conception and boldness of design," and described the role of Quentin as "a virtuoso piece of writing" (92). Caryl Brahms, writing for *The Spectator* praised the characterization of Maggie: "To recreate a figure as innocent, as truthful, as human, as trusting, as generous, as intellectually inadequate, as striving, as shrill, as hurt, as ruined, as disintegrating, as Marilyn, is to fulfill the function of a playwright" (213). A much later revival at the National Theater, in 1990 used a black actress, Josette Simon in the role, and the director, Michael Blakemore cast Simon —with Miller's consent— in order to liberate the play from associations with Monroe and to focus audiences on what he felt were the play's intentions. Kenneth Hurren declared this production to be an "exorcism" that allowed the audience to "ponder what else is in the head of Miller's mouthpiece, the lawyer Quentin" ("*After*" 826), and Jim Hiley felt the play to be "as impressive as *The Crucible*—wise, sorrowful, heart-rending" (827). A 2004 Broadway revival still fared less well, despite having Maggie played by redhead Carla Gugino.

The way American audiences responded to Loden as Maggie/Marilyn in *After the Fall*, feels analogous to how they more recently responded to Gregg Henry's impersonation of Donald Trump as the would-be tyrant king in Public Theater's 2017 production of *Julius Caesar.* The director, Oscar Eustis, insisted that he was offering *Julius Caesar* "as a warning parable to those who try to fight for democracy by undemocratic means. To fight the tyrant does not mean imitating him" ("A Note"). However, Robert Kahn reported "it's shocking to see a band of conspirators in modern dress take turns plunging a dagger into the body of a leader so clearly modeled on America's own. At least one audience member at the performance I attended last week tossed his program into the aisle and stormed out, hissing unprintables" (Kahn). Frank Sheck for the *Hollywood Reporter* made the facetious comment: "Here's an unsolicited suggestion to artists of all genres: How about laying off mock representations of the murder of the president?" (Sheck).

The production whipped up a deal of controversy when funders pulled out over right-wing objections. "To be honest I thought it was shocking and distasteful," an audience member told reporter Aidan

McLaughlin. "If this had happened to any other president —even as recently as Barack Obama or George W. Bush— it would not have flown. People would have been horrified" (McLaughlin). She then pointed out that the play ends with Marc Anthony celebrating Brutus for his bravery, saving the Romans from Caesar's rule. "The message it sent was that if you don't support the president, it's ok to assassinate him" (McLaughlin). She obviously did not quite follow the play; eager to find fault, there seems to have been no need to find out what the play is actually about.

We again saw this connection between Julius Caesar and Trump implied in 2018 at the UK's Bridge Theatre, with David Calder in an airforce jacket and red baseball cap, backed by a campaign that is all brand and no substance. But the response from the British critics was more rational. Michael Billington called it "a visceral, politically urgent tragedy" ("*Julius*" Billington), while Henry Hitchings asserted it to be "an absorbing look into the dangers of populism." Hitchings added: "It's no surprise that there are so many bold new takes right now on *Julius Caesar*. After all, it's a play portraying the chaos that springs from political divisions. The characters' rage and resentment are matched by a fatal inability to understand the mindset of the opposition" (Hitchings). Do the British just understand Shakespeare better? After all, the play is essentially suggesting that one should *not* kill a ruler as it will only come back to bite you.

It seems that the shock over both *After the Fall* and the Public Theatre's *Julius Caesar* was misdirected, and in both cases ignored what the *play* was actually about. Miller was accused of washing dirty laundry in public and demonized by the critics—but where were they when O'Neill was depicting his mother as a drug-addicted psychiatric case, his father as a parsimonious self-concerned bastard and brother a sloppy-drunk? That was apparently true and so acceptable—so apparently Monroe was *not* a self-destructive drug, sex, and alcohol addict? A clear double standard, but why? What *is* Monroe to the American public? Her rags to riches story as the Hollywood sex symbol of the 1950s is certainly rooted in both the wealth and fame aspects of the American Dream. She was, in many ways, a

brilliant example of personal branding, and as *Newsweek* suggests, "for many men the doomed woman-child has been the subject of a thousand rescue fantasies" ("Why Monroe")—and most of her numerous biographers have been male. The persona she created was determinedly childlike and dependent, for which she was rewarded during her life, and since her death has allowed her supporters to pour derision on anyone daring to mess with that image; Marilyn became sacrosanct, despite the attempts of many (including Miller) to simply humanize her.

Newsweek points out, "No one ever asks, Marilyn who?" ("Why Monroe"), and asserts that it is evident that "Death has enhanced her memory." Describing her as "a platinum archetype, a legend feeding upon her life beyond the camera" the article points out how, "When Margaret Parton, one of the few women journalists to cover Marilyn during her life, did a profile for the *Ladies' Home Journal*, it was killed for being too favorable" ("Why Monroe"). When alive, women apparently saw her as a threat, but in a more feminist age, it became easier for women to respond with sympathy to the way Monroe was treated. "Years later," *Newsweek* reports, "when *Ms.* magazine ran a cover story on Monroe called 'The Woman Who Died Too Soon,' it became one of the magazine's best-selling issues. 'I want to be an actress,' [Monroe once] said, 'not a celluloid aphrodisiac'" ("Why Monroe"). But it was a vain ambition. The public gets what the public wants. And it will defend its decision to the hilt.

The post Marilyn turnabout in Miller's career was evident even in responses to a more traditional Miller play like *The Price,* which ran in the United States of America in 1968 for 425 performances in a beleaguered production directed by Ulu Grosbard. While it garnered some respectful reviews, with Clive Barnes declaring that it was "one of Miller's two or three best plays" (39), it also had critics such as Brustein taking potshots at its "poor writing" and calling it "an empty grave" that "is virtually divorced from concerns that any modern audience can recognize as its own... The play as a whole gives us merely the appearance of significance, behind which nothing meaningful is happening" ("Unseriousness" 38-41). Meanwhile, Miller

himself directed the United Kingdom premier the following year at Duke of York's Theatre in London, which ran for 51 weeks —a record for that theatre— and to unadulterated acclaim. The *New York Times* reported Philip Hope-Wallace calling it a "strongly fashioned drama... which should make a very wide appeal to playgoers tired of satire and salacity" ("Miller's *Price"* 36), while others declared it "finely written, brilliantly acted... a well-made problem play which commands intelligent attention. There is no other on in London"; "Mr. Miller at his best"; "easily Miller's best play since *The Crucible"*; "a marvelous evening in the theatre"; and as Peter Lewis opined: "It is thrilling to welcome a play which is thumping proof that the drama, as Ibsen and Chekhov understood it, can still be written and still knock an audience for six" ("Miller's *Price"* 36). *The New York Times* had to explain the cricketing reference to their readership.

So Miller's politics and insistence on the primary importance of the past were certainly both marks against him in the general American mind, and so was his dalliance with "Marilyn," but there was *also* the matter of his later plays being different from his earlier ones. The case seems to be, as playwright David Rabe pointed out in Bigsby's *Arthur Miller and Company* in 1990: "People act like his early plays are the only ones he wrote... the critics have praised him for a certain kind of play and dramaturgy of moral ideas and then they have maligned him for not growing when in fact what has happened is that they have refused to admit he has grown." Rabe concludes: "What is really insane is not to recognise the value of the later plays, the development of the writer, the evolving struggle of his relationship to the idea of a moral position" (144-146). Seven years earlier, Welland suggested:

> Miller's plays since *The Price* have been his least successful in the theatre, but they are not for that reason his least interesting and it would be premature to imply an end to his career. He might have remained more in the public eye by repeating some of the formulae of his earlier success, but that has never been his way. Without capitulating facilely to new and perhaps ephemeral trends, he has still tried to break new ground with each successive play. (125)

At that same time in the United States of America, we have critics, even such as Robert Corrigan, a strong supporter of Miller's earlier works, dismissing Miller, calling his plays since the 1970s "abortive failures" that are unable "to give expression to the conflicts of contemporary experience" (155). In 1991, Brustein declared Miller's sensibility to be so outdated that it is related to "the eighteenth century, which is the age of Newton, rather than to the twentieth, the age of Einstein" (*Reimagining* 24). No wonder Miller chose to premier his next play in the United Kingdom. He was excluded from late twentieth century surveys of contemporary American dramatists (though this has gladly been rectified by more recent publications—such as his inclusion in 2014's *Contemporary American Dramatists* (edited by Martin Middeke et al). Though Ruby Cohn called Miller one of the "durable giants of American drama" (9), she did not see *any* of his plays as relevant to her 1960-1990 survey of American drama, and while William Herman defined contemporary American drama in 1987 through Sam Shepard, David Mamet, David Rabe, Ed Bullins and Lanford Wilson, he considered Miller as "un-American" in the forms he employed and, thereby, not worthy of consideration.

Possibly because his works are so rooted in "real life" social issues, Miller is often described as a realist rather than expressionist, and what is more, subsequently denigrated for being so. Casually dismissed and pigeon-holed by American critics of the late twentieth century as a simple realist pandering to an easy morality, Michael Vanden Heuvel's 1991 survey of Alternative Theater dismisses Miller's plays as "bourgeois realism" which are "inadequate for addressing the immediate pressures and concerns" and incapable of taking "an active role in effecting change" (27-28). But as Bigsby, insists, the opposite is in fact true; Miller "has experimented with form, disassembled character, compressed and distended language" (*Modern* 117) throughout his career. Miller always disliked definitions of his writing as realistic, because he saw himself as one who was not attempting to create reality, but rather interpret it. Constantly trying out new techniques, Miller always created works whose artistic form is part of their message. Murphy rightly suggests that Miller's whole

career since *Death of a Salesman* has been a continual experimentation with realistic *and* expressionistic forms to uncover an effective means of conveying the bifurcation of a human experience which he saw as split between a concern for the self and a concern for society as a whole (*Realism* 189-191). Miller's later works are as perceptive, critical commentaries on *their* contemporary society, as his earlier works were, and they are written in a style that reflects the confused and fragmentary nature of that society. He is as Bigsby asserts, "a writer whose plays have proved... responsive to the shifting pressure of the social world" (*Modern* 125).

So, Miller's later plays do matter. In *The Creation of the World and Other Business's* retelling of Genesis, the playwright had been seeking answers to the world's growing depravities in a decade defined by greed and senseless conflict. His conclusion was that what mankind needs most is faith, or a god, to help them to keep good alive. Without faith, or God, morality becomes meaningless—His/Her presence gives people "the obligation to make choices against evildoing, which is what helps keep the good alive" (*Timebends* 559). The idea he asserts is that since good and evil exist in everything, we must choose to look for the good. Miller ensures we do not fall into the trap of forgetting we have the important and self-affirming capacity to choose. His protagonists may at times make the wrong choices, but they are always offered a choice of some kind. Sometimes these choices are psychological —admitting one's own complicity yet refusing to wallow in guilt (as depicted in "Clara," *After the Fall*, or *Playing for Time*)— at other times they are more physical—such as staying against leaving (see *The Archbishop's Ceiling, The American Clock,* or *Mr. Peters' Connections*).

Miller insists that whatever the state of the world, we still have free will and it is our responsibility to create the society in which we would live. He recognizes that aspects of our lives, such as capitalism, patriarchy, and liberal humanism, are in fact cultural creations that did not exist until we made them; therefore, it is in our power to reject, embrace, or change them, if necessary. Miller has spoken of one of the Nazis' greatest evils as being the way they obstructed "the individual's capacity for choosing" and eroded completely an individual's "autonomous

personality." While the Nazis carried this to extremes, Miller felt that contemporary society was "struggling with the same incubus" (Wager 13). These are the central dilemmas he confronts in his later drama, and they are dilemmas that continue to be relevant.

However, production reviews of Miller's later plays by US critics reveal that the prevalent perception of Miller in 1970s through 1990s America was that of a playwright in decline. 1972's *Creation of the World* was deemed by one critic as a "foolish project" containing a "coy, fake, fatuous Biblicism laced with night school wisdom" (Gottfried 153), and a "feeble, pointless play" by another (Kalem 122). In 1977, *The Archbishop's Ceiling*'s New York production was canceled after a disastrous try-out in Washington DC, and Richard Coe declared this to be "good news both for New York and Miller" (B7). Douglas Watt refers to 1980's *American Clock* as "bloodless" and 1987's *Danger: Memory!* "as comfortable, and as yawn-inducing as a sprung old couch" (344-345), whereas Alain Piette saw 1982's *Two-Way Mirror* as unsatisfactory, lacking in credibility and thematic substance, and related how "spectators leave the theatre with a bitter feeling of disappointment" (554). Be it the gentler dismissal of 1991's *The Ride Down Mt. Morgan* by Richard Christiansen as "riddled with problems... an artistically unresolved play in a profoundly unsettled production" (C24) or John Simon's excoriation that same year of *The Last Yankee* as a "one-acter that did not know where to go or how to stop" ("Coming" 24), it is clear that Miller's work was not attaining general critical acceptance among US critics.

But at the same time he was being acclaimed in the United Kingdom, and clearly revered by theater directors who were eager to give his plays worthy productions. From 1984 to 1993 David Thacker was the Artistic Director of the Young Vic and in 2005 he claimed: "One reason why Miller's plays are regularly performed in Britain is that they are so easily accessible. At the Young Vic we tried to attract an audience that did not usually visit the theatre. We put on one Miller play each season on average" (Thacker). His parting gift when he moved onto the RSC in 1993, was to produce Miller's *The Last Yankee*, because, "'To my mind he is the greatest living playwright" (Hemming). This

production –which British critics, such as Stefan Tai, called a "comic but deeply moving and poignant play" (148), Sheridan Morley, "a thoughtful, resonant production" ("Yankee"), and Helen McNeil, "the most moving of all the recent lessons by the master" (17)– extended its run by transferring to the Duke of York. This is the same play that Simon described as a "one-acter that did not know where to go or how to stop" ("Coming" 24).

The Archbishop's Ceiling, which flopped at the Kennedy Center in 1977 and never reached Broadway, was produced by the Bristol Old Vic in 1985 and by the RSC in 1986 to an, at times, mixed, but far more welcoming response, for as Jonathan Licht suggested, "even an Arthur Miller 'failure' is worth one evening of any questioning human being's time" (1197). Still, in reference to the Old Vic production, in the *Mail on Sunday*, Hurren described the writing as "taut and muscular" ("*Ceiling*" 375), and John Peter's *Sunday Times* review admired it as being "full of a giant and warm humanity" and called it a "gripping, thrilling play" (41), while Michael Billington praised it in *The Guardian* as "a complex, gritty, intellectually teasing play" ("Ceiling" 1985 375) and viewed the RSC production as giving "you the sense of a major writer wrestling with the problem of how one preserves personal integrity in a corrupt world" ("Ceiling" 1986 1199). For *Time Out*, Jane Edwardes called the latter "a powerful exploration of a world in which morality no longer appears to provide any easy answers" (1194); this seems hardly outdated or lacking expression of contemporary experience.

The American Clock, which shut down after only 20 performances in New York, was presented by Peter Wood at the National Theater in London in 1986, causing the *Financial Times'* Michael Coveney to propose that it reaffirms "Miller's reputation at a stroke" and "suggests we may have to look at all his plays of the last decade or so... much more carefully" (838). And so the British did. For *Punch*, Morley viewed *Clock* as having "considerable emotional and documentary power" (837), and for *The Spectator*, Christopher Edwards described it as "impressive... brilliantly staged... a touching, amusing and cleverly wrought piece of theatre" ("*Clock*" 837), Hurren called it "brilliant" ("*Clock*" 832) and as Francis King pointed out for the *Sunday Telegraph*: "Since good

writing usually brings out good acting, the members of this family are all portrayed with skill" (832). So much for "bloodless."

The two double-bills of shorter plays were also praised by British critics, Billington lauded *Two-Way Mirror* for its elegant design and economy of language, saying "Miller has lost none of his gift for the resonant phrase" (46), others declared "a very interesting and dramatically accomplished evening" (Edwards "*Two-Way*" 65), and, "These are haunting, poetic plays, and the director, David Thacker, must be congratulated on his handsome, respectful production" (Jones 66). Of *Danger Memory!* William Henry III insisted "their contemplative voice is well worth hearing" (88), Hurren suggested, "Like everything else Miller writes, it is illuminated by an implacable liberalism underpinned with innate compassion" ("*Two-Way*" 431), and Blake Morrison announced, "two complex realist dramas which show his creative powers, at 73, still in full spate" (431). Measure that against John Simon's vitriol on the same plays: "so flaccid and lackluster that one questions whether they are about anything beyond Miller's desire to maintain his undeserved reputation as a dramatist" ("*Danger*" 128).

Meantime, in 1989, another British critic, Morley, is declaring Miller to be "the greatest living American dramatist" ("*Two-Way*" 64), the University of East Anglia names its Centre for American Studies after Miller, and in 1995 he is given an honorary doctoral degree from no less than Oxford University. On hearing of his death Thacker declared, "if you put Shakespeare to one side, Arthur Miller stands comparison with any playwright writing in the English language for his contribution to our culture and our understanding of what it is to be human. He uniquely captured the pain and the anguish, the hopes and aspirations of human beings in the modern world. And perhaps most importantly, he understood how human beings are connected to events in the greater world" (Thacker).

As mentioned before, it seems hardly surprising that in 1991, The *Ride Down Mt. Morgan* had its world premiere in London rather than New York, where Billington declared it a "fierce critique" on contemporary values, with "plenty of shrewd and pungent things to say about our sanctification about the self" (1351). It did not reach New

York for another seven years, and then it closed after 40 performances. While *Broken Glass* premiered in both the United Kingdom and the United States of America in 1994, in the United Kingdom it won the Olivier Award for Best Play, and was turned into a TV movie. In the United States of America, Howard Kissel bemoaned that it "seems more like the outline for a play than the finished product" (131), and Simon called Miller "the world's most overrated playwright" and his latest play "gives the epithet *shattering* a theatrically new, and wholly undesirable, meaning" (81).

Miller's popularity in the United Kingdom has continued to grow over the past six decades, evidenced by his regular inclusion on exam syllabi since at least the 1980s (at least until the recent purge of several American texts from the English A-levels), but also by productions of his work by the nation's most prestigious theater companies—the National Theatre has mounted *The American Clock* (1986), *A View from the Bridge* (with Michael Gambon 1987), *Death of a Salesman* twice (with Warren Mitchell in 1979, and Alun Armstrong in 1996), *After the Fall* (1990), and *The Crucible* 1990; the Royal Shakespeare Company, aside from *The Archbishop's Ceiling* in 1986, and who for a long time rarely performed any modern plays on their main stage, has offered *The Crucible* there twice with Alun Armstrong in 1984, and again in 2006 with Iain Glenn, as well as more recently *Death of a Salesman* with Sir Antony Sher (2015). Indeed, after Shakespeare, Miller is the one of the most produced playwrights at the RSC *and* The National, and this seems like testament to the quality of his work. Like Shakespeare, his plays thrive because they contain so many layers and so much humanistic insight, that they can successfully bear all kinds of interpretation and experimentation. As well as all-importantly, they apparently sell tickets!

Miller's Return to Fame in the United States of America

How did Miller become re-embraced by his homeland—was it simply respect for his sheer longevity, surviving until almost his 90th birthday? His death in 2005 certainly boosted his reputation in some quarters, as

a famous person's demise so often does, with a series of memorials and productions, as also occurred in the year of his centennial, 2015. But Miller's reputation had begun to be reconsidered in the United States of America even before he died. Tributes to the playwright on the occasion of his eightieth birthday in 1995 were held in both England and America, and that same year he received the William Inge Festival Award for distinguished achievement in American theater. The following year he was given the Edward Albee Last Frontier Playwright Award, and in 1998, New York's Signature Theatre dedicated their complete season to Miller's work, for which he gave them a new play *Mr. Peters' Connections*. He also began raking in awards from a bunch of other countries. In 2000, major 85th birthday celebrations for Miller were again held at University of Michigan (his alma mater) and at the Arthur Miller Center at UEA.

In a 2002 review of Mel Gussow's *Conversations* (interviews with Miller) and Miller's second collection of essays, *Echoes Down the Corridor*, Brustein, a long-time critic of Miller's work actually admitted (albeit, perhaps, sardonically): "Miller's reputation, for years in eclipse in America, has always been solid in London, where virtually every work, new and revived, is greeted with the kind of enthusiasm usually reserved for coronations and royal weddings" ("Outlived"). It seems that several landmark productions helped remind the American public of the strength of Miller's early plays, since the 1999 Goodman Theatre 50th anniversary production of *Salesman* that successfully transferred to Broadway, directed by Robert Falls, with Brian Dennehy, which won Tony for Best Revival of a Play, through Liam Neeson and Laura Linney's high profile *The Crucible* (2002), to Ivo van Hove's amazing reconstructions of both *A View from the Bridge* and *The Crucible*.

Through such productions is has become clear that Miller's plays have not become irrelevant or merely speak to some historical interest—but remain painfully current. They continue to speak to the times. These days, *Salesman* is often listed by Americans as the best play in best US play lists, and Miller is increasingly being referred to as America's greatest playwright. Despite being the only American dramatist to win the Nobel Prize, Eugene O'Neill does not get

nearly the number of productions a year as Miller. Indeed, far more productions of Miller are annually mounted than those of his equally famous contemporaries from the peak of his fame, Tennessee Williams and William Inge. Inge, who was selling more tickets than either Miller or Williams in the 1950s, has been almost forgotten. There also appears to be tremendous interest both home and abroad in Miller scholarship —assisted and promoted by both the Arthur Miller Society and the *Arthur Miller Journal*— and evidenced by a rising number of dissertations on Miller, worldwide.

Yet the United States of America is, in my opinion, still far too strongly focused on those earlier successful plays to the detriment of his other works. The 2006 Robert Altman *Resurrection Blues* in London was the kind of calamity one can only achieve when you ask a film director with hardly any theatrical background to direct a stage play, and this very funny satire needs to be produced with the right comedic touch. There was originally a reading that Jerry Zaks directed so that Miller could see what he had. The cast included Nathan Lane as Felix, Bill Murray as Skip, and Julia-Louis Dreyfuss as Emily, and that seems to be the kind of cast this play needs. More recent productions, such as ones by the Canadian Fancy Bred Theatre (2009), and Chicago's Eclipse Theatre Company (2010) that have taken this comedic route, though smaller in scale, have been better received.

The United Kingdom, on the other hand, also continues to better explore Miller's oeuvre, not only mounting major productions of his newer works—Phil Willmott (who has successfully mounted a number of lesser-produced Miller plays (including *The American Clock* and *Incident at Vichy*), presented the British premier of Miller's last play *Finishing the Picture* in June 2018, at the Finborough Theatre in London. In the United States of America this was given a single production in Chicago, and then vanished. But the Brits are also good at discovering new, never before seen pieces: it was in the United Kingdom, under the guidance of Bigsby, who first persuaded the BBC to produce a play Miller had written around 1940 prior to hitting Broadway; *The Golden Years* was aired as a radio play in 1987. It was Bristol Old Vic who first revived Miller's 1944 flop, *The Man Who*

Had All the Luck, in 1990, in a successful production with Iain Glen that transferred to the Young Vic in London (US didn't get around to this until 2002 when the Williamstown Theatre Festival production with Chris O'Donnell successfully transferred to Broadway). And in 2015, Miller's centennial year, while there were plenty of celebrations around America, including many productions of his established works, it was in the United Kingdom where they celebrated by producing *new* works, including stage productions of *No Villain*, Miller's first ever play written as a student at the University of Michigan, *The Hook*, based on an unproduced 1951 screenplay, and then in 2018 in Ireland, the first ever stage production of Miller's 1961 film, *The Misfits*. So while Miller is at last getting more of his due on home territory, there remain plenty of hurdles yet to navigate.

WORKS CITED

"*All My Sons* a Hit." *New York Times,* (12 May 1948): 33.
Atkinson, Brooks. "Arthur Miller's *All My Sons* Brings Genuine Talent into the Coronet Theatre with Expert Cast of Actors." *New York Times,* (30 Jan. 1947): 21.
Atkinson, Brooks. "Theatre: *A View from the Bridge*." *New York Times,* (30 Sept. 1955): 21.
Atkinson, Brooks. "*A View from the Bridge*." *New York Times*, (9 Oct. 1955): sec. 2, 1.
Barnes, Clive. "Reappraisal of *The Price*." *New York Times,* (30 Oct. 1968): 39.
Barnes, Howard. "A Great Play is Born." *New York Herald Tribune,* (11 Feb. 1979): 14.
Bigsby, Christopher, editor. *Arthur Miller and Company*. London: Methuen, 1990.
Bigsby, Christopher, editor. *Modern American Drama 1945-2000.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.
Billington, Michael. "*The Archbishop's Ceiling*." *London Theatre Record*, 5.8 (1985): 375.
Billington, Michael. "*The Archbishop's Ceiling*." *London Theatre Record*, 6.22 (1986): 1199.

Billington, Michael. "The Contours of Passion." *The Guardian*, (25 Jan. 1989): 46.

Billington, Michael. "*Julius Caesar* Review-Hytner Delivers a Visceral, Politically Urgent Tragedy." *The Guardian*, (30 Jan. 2018). www.theguardian.com/stage/2018/jan/30/julius-caesar-review-bridge-theatre-nicholas-hytner-ben-whishaw-david-morrissey . Accessed 25 Mar. 2018.

Billington, Michael. "*The Ride Down Mount Morgan*." *London Theatre Record*, 11.22 (1991): 1351.

Brahms, Caryl. "Marilyn, Dolly, and Dylan." *The Spectator*, (14 Feb. 1964): 213.

Brustein, Robert. "Arthur Miller Outlived His Critics." *New Republic*, (14 Oct. 2002). https://newrepublic.com/article/115211/arthur-miller-87. Accessed 25 Mar. 2018.

Brustein, Robert. "Arthur Miller's Mea Culpa." *New Republic*, (8 Feb. 1964): 26-30.

Brustein, Robert. *Reimagining American Theatre*. New York: Hill, 1991.

Brustein, Robert. "The Unseriousness of Arthur Miller." *New Republic,* (24 Feb. 1968): 38-41.

Centola, Steven, and Michelle Cirulli, editors. *The Critical Response to Arthur Miller*. Westport, Conn: Praeger, 2006.

Christiansen, Richard. "Arthur Miller Opens New Play in London for Good Reason." *Chicago Tribune,* (13 Nov. 1991): sec. 1, 24.

Coe, Richard. "Arthur Miller's *Ceiling*." *Washington Post*, (2 May 1977): B1, B7.

Cohen, Nathan. "Hollow Heart of a Hollow Drama." *National Review,* (7 Apr. 1964): 289-90.

Cohn, Ruby. *New American Dramatists 1960-1990*. New York: St. Martins, 1991.

Corrigan, Robert. "The Search for New Endings: The Theatre in Search of a Fix, Part III." *Theatre Journal*, 36 (1984): 153-63.

Coveney, Michael. "*American Clock*." *London Theatre Record*, 6.16 (1986): 838.

Crowther, Bosley. "Questions of Choice." *New York Times*, (28 Jan. 1962): sec. 2, 1.

"*Death of a Salesman* by Arthur Miller." *The Times,*(29 July 1949): 9.

Dramatic Publishing Services (DPS). "About The Author," *Archbishop's Ceiling.* https://books.google.es/books/about/The_Archbishop_s_Ceiling.html?id=l_CeuCN9g1QC&redir_esc=y. Accessed 25 Mar. 2018.

Edwardes, Jane. "*The Archbishop's Ceiling*." *London Theatre Record*, 6.22 (1986): 1194.

Edwards, Christopher. "*The American Clock*." *London Theatre Record*, 6.16 (1986): 837.

Edwards, Christopher. "*Two-Way Mirror*." *London Theatre Record*, 9.1-2 (1989): 65.
"End of Famous Marriage" *Life*, (21 Nov. 1960): 88A-90.
Epstein, Leslie. "The Unhappiness of Arthur Miller." *Tri-Quarterly*, (Spring, 1965): 165-173.
Farndale, Nigel. "Rosemary Harris: *The Crucible* was Misery by Day and Joy by Night." *Telegraph*, (13 Oct. 2015). www.telegraph.co.uk/theatre/actors/rosemary-harris-arthur-miller-crucible-interview/. Accessed 25 Mar. 2018.
Findlater, Richard. "No Time for Tragedy?" Twentieth Century, 161 (Jan. 1957): 56-62.
Fleming, Peter. "The Theatre." *Spectator*, (21 May 1948): 612.
Fleming, Peter. "The Theatre." *Spectator*, (5 Aug. 1949): 173.
Gottfried, Martin. "*Creation of the World and Other Business*." *New York Theatre Critics' Reviews,* 33 (1972): 153.
Hartley, Anthony. "Good Melodrama." *Spectator*, (20 April 1956): 547.
Hemming, Sarah. "The Art of Persuasion: After Nine Years as Director of the Young Vic, David Thacker is Bowing Out." *Independent,* (21 Jan. 1993). www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/interview-the-art-of-persuasion-after-nine-years-as-director-of-the-young-vic-david-thacker-is-1479830.html. Accessed 25 Mar. 2018.
Henry, William A. III. "Cry from the Heart." *Time*, (9 Mar. 1987): 88.
Herman, William. *Understanding Contemporary American Drama*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1987.
Heuvel, Michael Vanden. *Performing Drama/Dramatizing Performance: Alternative Theater and the Dramatic Text*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1991.
Higgins, Charlotte. "Arthur Miller: Why America Lowered the Curtain on His Reputation." *The Guardian,* (19 Aug. 2011). www.theguardian.com/culture/2011/aug/19/arthur-miller-america-reputation. Accessed 25 Mar. 2018.
Hiley, Jim. "*After the Fall*." *London Theatre Record*, 10.13 (1990): 826-827.
Hitchings, Henry. "*Julius Caesar* Review: Join the Mob for this Absorbing Look at the Dangers of Populism." *Evening Standard*, (31 Jan, 2018). www.standard.co.uk/go/london/theatre/julius-caesar-review-join-the-mob-for-this-absorbing-look-at-the-dangers-of-populism-a3753921.html. Accessed 25 Mar. 2018.
Hope-Wallace, Philip. "Theatre." *Time and Tide*, (20 Nov. 1954): 1544.

Hope-Wallace, Philip. "Theatre: *A View from the Bridge*." *Time and Tide*, 37 (1956): 1267.
Hurren, Kenneth. "*After the Fall*." *London Theatre Record*, 10.13 (1990): 826.
Hurren, Kenneth. "*The American Clock*." *London Theatre Record*, 6.16 (1986): 832.
Hurren, Kenneth. "*The Archbishop's Ceiling*." *London Theatre Record*, 5.8 (1985): 375.
Hurren, Kenneth. "Danger: Memory!" *London Theatre Record*, 8.7 (1988): 431.
Jones, Dan. "*Two-Way Mirror*." *London Theatre Record*, 9.1-2 (1989): 66.
Kael, Pauline. "The Innocents and What Passes for Experience." *Film Quarterly*, 15 (Summer, 1962): 27-29.
Kahn, Robert. "The Public Slays a Trump-Like Leader in *Julius Caesar*." *NBC New York*, (11 June 2017). www.nbcnewyork.com/news/local/Review-Shakespeare-Julius-Caesar-Donald-Trump-427672483.html. Accessed 25 Mar. 2018.
Kalem, T. E. "Adam and Evil." *New York Theatre Critics' Reviews,* 33 (1972): 152.
Kauffmann, Stanley. "The Unadaptable Adapted." *New Republic*, (12 Feb. 1962): 26-27.
King, Francis. "*The American Clock*." *London Theatre Record*, 6.16 (1986): 832.
Kissel, Howard. "Miller's *Broken Glass* Doesn't Crystallize." *New York Theatre Critics' Reviews*, 55 (1994): 131.
Licht, Jonathan. "*The Archbishop's Ceiling*." *London Theatre Record,* 6.22 (1986): 1196-97.
"London Critics Hail Miller's *Crucible*." *New York Times,* (11 April 1956): 28.
Martine, James, editor. *Critical Essays on Arthur Miller*. Boston: Hall, 1979.
McLain, John. "Arthur Miller's *After the Fall* Tour de Force by Robards." *New York Theatre Critics' Reviews*, 25 (1964): 376.
McLain, John. "Hail Heflin in Two Plays: Arthur Miller Dramas Show Fine Acting, but the People Are Dreary." *New York Theatre Critics' Reviews,* 16 (1955): 274.
McLaughlin, Aidan, "Senators Stab Trump to Death in Central Park Performance of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*." *Media-ite* (6 June 2017). www.mediaite.com/trump/senators-stab-trump-to-death-in-central-park-performance-of-shakespeares-julius-caesar/. Accessed 25 Mar. 2018.
McNeil. Helen. "Pictures from an Institution." *Times Literary Supplement*, (5 Feb. 1993): 17.

Meyers, Jeffrey. *The Genius and the Goddess: Arthur Miller and Marilyn Monroe. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 2009.*
Middeke, Martin, Matthew Roudané, and Peter Paul Schnierer, editors. *Contemporary American Dramatists. London:* Bloomsbury Academic, 2014.
Miller, Arthur. *Collected Essays*, edited by Susan C. W. Abbotson. New York: Penguin, 2016.
Miller, Arthur. *Collected Plays 1944–1961*, edited by Tony Kushner. New York: Library of America, 2006.
Miller, Arthur. *The Penguin Arthur Miller: Collected Plays.* New York: Penguin, 2015.
Miller, Arthur. *Timebends: A Life*. New York: Grove, 1987.
"*Miller's Price Acclaimed by Critics in London.*" *New York Times*, (6 March 1969): 36.
Morley, Sheridan. "*The American Clock*." *London Theatre Record*, 6.16 (1986): 839.
Morley, Sheridan. "In *Last Yankee* Miller is Taking American Pulse." *International Herald Tribune*, (3 Feb. 1993): n.p.
Morley, Sheridan. "*Two-Way Mirror*." *London Theatre Record*, 9.1-2 (1989): 64.
Morrison, Blake. "*Danger: Memory!*" *London Theatre Record*, 8.7 (1988): 431.
Murphy, Brenda. "Arthur Miller: Revisioning Realism." *Realism and the American Dramatic Tradition*, edited by William W. Demastes. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 1996.
Murphy, Brenda. *Miller*: Death of a Salesman. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
"A Note from Oscar Eustis." *Public Theater*, www.publictheater.org/Tickets/Calendar/PlayDetailsCollection/SITP/Julius-Caesar/?SiteTheme=Shakespeare. Accessed 14 Sept. 2018.
Peter, John. "Looking Up to Big Brother." *Sunday Times*, (21 April 1985): 41.
Piette, Alain. "*Elegy for a Lady* and *Some Kind of Love Story*." *Theatre Journal*, 35 (Dec. 1983): 554.
Pinter, Harold. "Harold Pinter: My Friend Arthur Miller." *BBC News*, (11 Feb. 2005). http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/4258707.stm . Accessed 25 Mar. 2018.
"Popsie and Poopsie." *Time*, (21 Nov. 1960): 61.
Roudané, Matthew. C., editor. *Conversations with Arthur Miller.* Jackson and London: UP of Mississippi, 1987.
Russo, Vito. *The Celluloid Closet: Homosexuality in the Movies.* New York: Harper & Row, 1986.

Sheck, Frank. "*Julius Caesar*: Theater Review" *Hollywood Reporter*, (11 June 2017). www.hollywoodreporter.com/review/julius-caesar-1012271. Accessed 25 Mar. 2018.

Simon, John. "Coming Apart Together." *New York Theatre Critics' Reviews,* 54 (1993): 24.

Simon, John. "*Danger: Memory!*" *New York*, (23 Feb. 1987): 127-28.

Simon, John. "Whose Paralysis Is It, Anyway?" *New York*, (9 May 1994): 80-81.

Thacker, David. "Arthur Miller: A Writer of Integrity," *Socialist Worker*, 1939 (19 Feb. 2005). https://socialistworker.co.uk/news/arthur-miller-a-writer-of-integrity/. Accessed 25 Mar. 2018.

Tai, Stefan. "Arthur Miller's *Last Yankee*—A Male Depressive." *Contemporary Review*, 264 (March 1994): 147-48.

Trewin, J.C. "Good King Bernard." *Illustrated London News,* 215 (27 Aug. 1949): 320.

Trewin, J.C. "Quick Change." *Illustrated London News*, (27 Oct. 1956): 720.

Wager, Walter. *The Playwrights Speak.* New York: Delacorte, 1968.

Wardle, Irving. "American Patron Saint of the English Stage: Arthur Miller." *Independent,* 28 (Jan. 1990): 36.

Watt, Douglas. "Another Round of Miller Lite." *New York Theatre Critics' Reviews,* 48 (1987): 344-45.

Welland, Dennis. *Miller: The Playwright*. 3rd. edition. London: Methuen, 1985.

"Why Monroe is Still Famous." *Newsweek Archives,* 5 (Aug. 2017). www.newsweek.com/why-marilyn-monroe-still-so-famous-64493. Accessed 14 Sept. 2018.

Worsley, T. C. "Poetry without Words." *New Statesman and Nation,* (6 Aug. 1949): 146-47.

Zax, Talya. "Did Arthur Miller's Pulitzer Prize Help Him Win Over Marilyn Monroe?" *Forward* (2 May 2018). https://forward.com/culture/theater/400244/arthur-miller-might-have-won-marilyn-monroe-with-pulitzer-prize/. Accessed 2 May 2018.