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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Sarah Siddons, Edmund Kean, Henry Irving and Beerbohm Tree are just a few of the actors that late eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-century Londoners regarded as great. What made these actors and actresses great in the eyes of their audiences? How did Sarah Siddons, an actress famed for her portrayal of Lady Macbeth, actually act out the character when on stage? Historians will never actually know. There are no recordings of nineteenth-century theatrical performances. While the performances themselves are lost to us, on occasion the ephemera that surrounded the performance and helped to make it possible--the financial correspondence, the playbills, the promotional engravings, even marked-up scripts--survive. Sometimes however, the way they survive, in autograph collections or in very fragile condition, means that it is hard for an archive to justify preserving them. Even processing itself presents a significant challenge. The Larson Collection recently donated to CSUS’ Special Collections and University Archives (SCUA) is one example of this sort of collection.

Background

SCUA is a hybrid archival institution located at CSUS that supports the university’s research in a number of ways. First, it serves as the main repository for historically valuable university records. Second, according to the mission statement listed in the University Policy Manual, it collects and provides access to collections of materials
related to the local area’s history and the university’s involvement in that community.\textsuperscript{1} The archive has an extensive collection of Japanese American cultural material and artifacts related to the internment of local Japanese residents. It also contains extensive records of Hispanic American art and activism as well as records related to area peace movements. One thing that it does not have is an extensive collection related to the history of the theatre. While it does contain a university record collection related specifically to theatre at the university, the archive does not touch on the history of other theatres in the area or even theatres outside of it. This is where the Larson collection comes in.

In 2010, Georgia Larson, the widow of Sacramento State professor emeritus Gerard Larson, approached SCUA about donating Gerard Larson’s collection of nineteenth-century and twentieth-century theater memorabilia to the university. The archive accepted a donation of approximately four linear feet of material, over three hundred items in all, ranging in years from c. 1717 to 1999; but the bulk of the collection is directly related to London theatre in the nineteenth-century.

Although it is largely an autograph collection, with signatures from modern theatrical greats such as Lawrence Olivier, as well as Victorian actors such as Beerbohm Tree, it incorporates other items as well. There is a sizable run of an early twentieth-century theatre journal called \textit{The Mask} as well as several theatrical playbills from London dating back to the eighteenth-century. There are also several portraits,

\textsuperscript{1} California State University, Sacramento, “University Archives and Special Collections: A Statement of Purpose and Responsibility,” in \textit{University Policy Manual} (Sacramento: California State University, Sacramento, 1999), http://www.csus.edu/umanual/govern/UMA00960.htm
engravings, watercolors and other pieces of art in this collection, including the original pieces and final artwork for a souvenir booklet that the artist Charles Cattermole made for the Lyceum Theatre. There is even a substantial collection of correspondence written to Charles Manby, who, in addition to being a prominent English engineer, helped to run the Adelphi theatre in London in the first half of the nineteenth-century.

The Problem

While on the surface, this collection has relatively little to do with SCUA’s overall collecting goals, and indeed some archival scholars have come out strongly against adding autograph collections, it is still worth adding to the archive.\(^2\) One of the major reasons for this is that as mentioned earlier, this collection has elements in it other than autographs, some of which help considerably to flesh out the story of nineteenth-century theatre in England. Furthermore, the booklets and pictorial elements in the collection are clearly related to the archive’s historic book and printing collection. However, arranging, processing and describing a collection of this sort presents definite challenges to the archive.

The first major challenge that this collection presents is that it is a particularly difficult collection to arrange. First, while this collection is only 3.7 linear feet in length, it had at least three separate contributors, who all collected slightly different things. Larson artificially assembled these collections together when he acquired them from

various locations and then he supplemented them by conducting individual material purchases. Furthermore, there was little discernible order to Larson’s collection when it arrived at the archive. At best, he divided the collection into groups by the original collector, yet sometimes Larson did not even use this method to separate the materials. These two factors combined make arrangement a particular challenge for this particular record group. Indeed, SCUA’s main processing archivist, Chris Rockwell, said he had never seen a collection of this sort before.

The second major challenge with this collection is the processing itself. Several of the items in his collection are very fragile, most notably the playbills, and require careful handling during processing. Other items require special storage considerations because their size varies so dramatically from the other items in the collection. Finally, because many of the items arrived folded, they required flattening and other conservation work.

While arrangement and processing present major challenges for this collection, perhaps the biggest challenge is the description in itself. This is largely due to the nature of SCUA as an institution. Because it is attached to a larger research institution it behooves SCUA not only to create standard archival records that can be displayed on web pages or searched using systems like the Online Archive of California (OAC) but also records that the larger library’s online public access catalog (OPAC) can support. Furthermore, there are currently several changes occurring in how libraries and archives catalog their material and expose it to researchers. This opens up a wide variety of choices and decisions for an archivist considering ways to describe a collection. These two factors mean that at present, describing materials for SCUA is a major challenge.
The Project

Even though this collection is of a type that many archivists would balk at adding, certain elements within it make it a reasonable contribution to the archive and its overall mission. Furthermore, the complications associated with arranging, processing and finally describing this collection make it a valuable learning experience. In completing this project, the candidate was able to not only employ the abilities she learned in her classes but also to stretch those abilities, developing a unique arrangement structure and analyzing which method of description would work best for bringing information about the collection to the public.

The following pages not only document this process, they also explore in greater depth why this particular collection represents a contribution to the archive. Chapter two underscores the importance of documenting the era of British theatre history this collection focuses on by discussing the many changes that occurred in London theatre during the nineteenth-century. Chapter three addresses the many serious concerns associated with accessioning an autograph collection like the Larson collection, including issues of context and the overall informational value of the materials. Finally, chapter four discusses the project itself, the decisions that the intern made during arrangement and processing as well as an analysis of why the intern chose the methods of description that she did. Not only should this collection help researchers interested in either theatre or printing history develop a more comprehensive understanding of that past, by processing this collection the intern gained a great deal of experience that will be helpful in the future.
In 1853, Joshua Silsbee, a minor theatre functionary, wrote a letter to the management at the Adelphi Theatre, a minor theatre in London, demanding his back pay. In 1888, a minor painter called Charles Cattermole, drew and painted several vignettes of the latest production put on by Henry Irving, one of the most prominent Shakespearean actors of the late nineteenth-century. On the surface these two separate incidents, recorded in items from the Larson Collection, have relatively little importance. However, these fragments of stories are very important in what they reveal about theatrical life in nineteenth-century London. The letter clearly shows how uncertain wages were for any member of a theatre, while the drawings show the involvement of other professionals outside of actors in theatrical productions. What is more, both of these pieces are from a period of enormous flux in English theatrical history. Not only did the rules governing who could perform drama change, so did the acting, the method of production, the way that theatre managers designed sets and costumes, the overall safety of actors and even their social status. During the nineteenth-century, just about everything that could change in a production did.

**Governance**

In 1832, David Morris, a theatre-manager, testified at a special hearing before the Parliamentary Select Committee on Dramatic Literature regarding the famous actor
Edmund Kean’s wages at the Haymarket, one of the most prominent theatres in London.\textsuperscript{3}

Why was Parliament interested in the wages of an actor? It was part of a controversy regarding not only who performed plays in London but also how they performed them. Prior to 1843 the three theatres who could legally put on plays in London, called patent theatres, were locked in a losing battle for audiences with other, less legitimate venues called licensed theatres. These venues, in turn, were attempting to attract audiences by showing plays that the patent theatres reserved for themselves. This battle changed the structure of performances in the nineteenth-century.

The patent theatre system emerged in 1660 when King Charles II granted two courtiers exclusive rights to perform plays in the London area.\textsuperscript{4} By the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-centuries, this system designation of legitimate theatres was not only still functional, it was causing all sorts of problems. One major issue was that there were no mechanisms to allow the number of patents to expand. Indeed in the 183 years in which the patent system was in effect, the crown granted only one more theatre a patent and that was a demonstrably exceptional case. However, London itself quickly outstripped these venues’ ability to entertain all of its potential patrons. The final problem with the patenting system is that it was only one type of license. There were other ways

that less official playhouses and even brothels could gain theatrical rights. This last problem gave rise to the conflict that necessitated parliamentary hearings in 1833.5

While the patented theatres were the only venues permitted to play legitimate drama, this did not stop other venues from showing other types of performances or even working around the rules on the staging of legitimate drama. Throughout the eighteenth-century, numerous theatres sprang up to provide performances to individuals who were either too poor, too far away, or simply too uninterested in the performances put on by the patent theatres. Theatrical venues such as Astleys put on all manner of shows such as circuses and variety acts. While the existence of such places was in itself unfortunate news for the patentee theatre owners, for them, the real concern was the way in which the licensed theatres were exploiting loopholes in the definition of legitimate drama, creating new forms that could be performed without violating the laws regarding legitimate drama. One example of this was burletta, which differed only slightly from a standard play in that it had musical interludes.6 Over time, this music became more and more perfunctory until George Colman, a dramatist and theatre manager, was able to discuss the music as consisting of just a single note or two during a long dialogue.7 Indeed the definitions of what a burletta truly was were so fuzzy that neither actors nor the chamberlain’s office was able to differentiate between this form and a regular drama.8

6 Ibid., 387.
From there, the minor theatres developed the melodrama, first introduced in 1802 that was equally difficult to define as truly separate from regular dramas.\(^9\)

In response, the patent theatres employed several strategies in order to maintain their monopoly. One common method they used was to bribe the comptroller’s office in order to restrict the issuing of licenses, while also maintaining their status as a patented theatre. Called honorariums, these payments were subjected to much scrutiny by the select committee during the hearings of 1832.\(^10\) Another method of competing with the licensed theatres was through lawsuits. On at least one occasion a patented theatre sued a popular licensed theatre for violation of its rights to certain types of performances. Yet another common technique used by the patenpees to cripple their competition was to recruit the best actors possible and lock them into working at their theatre only, even if the theatre had no use for them during certain times of the year.\(^11\) Indeed, this was the subject of much discussion of the committee hearing where Collier suggested that breaking the patent holders’ monopoly would improve the overall quality of acting.\(^12\)

Finally, the patenpees would often compete directly with the licensed theatres, showing

---


\(^12\) Ibid., 33-24.
the same types of performances so common in the licensed theatres, competing directly with the licensed theatres.\textsuperscript{13}

The legitimate theatres’ concerns about the licensed theatres eventually came to a head in 1833, when the House of Commons called a select committee to discuss the decline in theatre. The committee chose not to deregulate theatres at the time, but stakeholders continued to debate the issue until finally in 1843, Parliament repealed the theatre act, allowing all theatres to play whatever type of performance they wished.\textsuperscript{14} This had profound effects on drama from that point on. All of the sudden, it was possible for theatres of all sizes to play Shakespeare, a playwright who managers saw as increasingly profitable.\textsuperscript{15} By the end of the century, a historically unpatented theatre known as the Lyceum was able to show Macbeth without legal challenge and to a great deal of public acclaim.\textsuperscript{16} Even the types of drama changed so that where in 1816 Covent Garden produced \textit{The Slave}, a straightforward morality play, in 1889, Archer produced Ibsen’s play \textit{A Doll’s House}, which was a focused commentary on women’s circumstances.\textsuperscript{17} Eventually theatre developed beyond the forms that helped the licensed theatres break the patent theatres’ monopoly. While still popular at the end of the century,

\textsuperscript{14} Ganzel, “Patent Wrongs,” 388.
\textsuperscript{17} Ahlquist, “Masculinity and Legitimacy,” 3-5; Katherine Kelly, “Pandemic and Performance: Ibsen and the Outbreak of Modernism” \textit{South Central Review} 25, no. 1, (2008), 13-17.
melodramas were coming under increasing criticism for their straightforward characterizations of good and evil.  

While the battle over play production rights was over prior to even the halfway mark of the nineteenth-century, it had a profound effect on the types of plays performed. Thanks to the legal restrictions on dramas, licensed theatres developed new play forms such as melodramas and burlettas. While these forms eventually became less popular towards the end of the century, the ability to perform Shakespeare regardless of location opened a world of possibilities to theatre managers who were beginning to see this playwright as a financially viable offering again. This change may have been partly driven by the public’s new insistence on education and realism in the theatre.

**Realism**

In his memoirs, James Planche, a costumer for a major theatre in London, announced in self-congratulatory tones that he had been singularly responsible for “the complete reformation of dramatic costume” in England. Indeed, throughout the nineteenth-century, it became more and more important to the public that stage managers portray scenes with as much verisimilitude as possible. By the late nineteenth-century, this was so important that the actor-manager Beerbohm Tree needed to apologize for the historical inaccuracies his portrayal of Julius Caesar. This increased emphasis on

---

realism, which was largely in response to public demand, in turn led to a number of theatrical innovations in set design, costuming and even in technology.

Early on in the century, play props and backgrounds were simple affairs that did little to create a sense of realism. One performer, Alexander Ducrow, complained in the early portion of the century that one theatre he performed at did not even have props, and that the scenery provided was thoroughly unsuitable to his performance. 21 This unconcern with authenticity extended to costuming as well. Planche, in his complaints about early costuming, pointed out how highly unlikely it was that thirteenth-century soldiers dressed as fifteenth-century ones. 22 However, this state of affairs changed rapidly. As early as 1823, actor-managers began paying closer attention to the historic and geographic period in which their plays were set, with widespread public approval. 23

This change was largely due to a change in the public’s view of the theatre’s purpose; more and more individuals expected the theatre to be educational in addition to being entertaining. Indeed, one author who was actively searching for educational activities to recommend to the public, in keeping with the new emphasis on theatres using their actors and acts to educate the public in science and other disciplines, visited Mr. Carter’s exhibition of his giant horse and encouraged his readers to attend it for self-improvement purposes. 24 Meanwhile, theatre critics praised the Princess’ 1883

21 Alexander Ducrow, “Incompetence at Drury Lane, 1838” in Jackson, Victorian Theatre, 166.
23 Ibid., 164.
production of the play *Claudian* for its potential to educate the public on Byzantine history.\(^{25}\) Alfred Trumble also weighed in on this, stating that by the 1880’s the public so greatly desired accurate staging that they would judge a play less harshly than it deserved if the staging were somewhat correct.\(^{26}\) Even the penny theatres aimed at working-class populations often worked to educate the public, keeping their a relatively illiterate audience up to date on the latest news by using thinly veiled summaries of the latest public events as the basis for plays and acts.\(^{27}\)

Because so much of what theatres put on could be construed as educational, this allowed actors to push the bounds of public decency in their costuming with relative ease. Women began appearing in much more revealing outfits that managers and actors argued were necessary for accuracy’s sake in so-called “Toga plays.”\(^{28}\) Audiences in turn bought into this argument and even rated a performance based on its adherence to the norms portrayed in classical art.\(^{29}\) However, even accuracy could not excuse full nudity. This was where costume innovation came into play. For scenes that required an actor or actress to appear nude, costume designers used fleshings, full body stockings that allowed the actors to appear nude while actually being dressed.\(^{30}\) Provided neither the actors nor

\(^{25}\) Barrow, “Toga Plays,” 214-216.
\(^{29}\) Barrow, “Toga Plays,” 214.
\(^{30}\) Ibid., 221.
actresses pushed the line too far through unusual gestures or positions, the audiences accepted their apparent nudity. \( ^{31} \)

Not only did the insistence on accuracy lead to more revealing costumes, it also may have contributed to a shift in who paid for the outfits. \( ^{32} \) While actors were traditionally responsible for providing their own costumes when the play called for standard clothing, theatre managers were responsible for providing costumes that actors could not legitimately wear on the street. \( ^{33} \) Indeed, by the mid-century, Charles Kean, a prominent actor and theatre manager, referred to several costumes that did not belong to individual actors but to the theatre. \( ^{34} \)

Likewise, in keeping with the spirit of providing an educational performance, actor-managers invested a great deal more care into set design and props than their counterparts in previous centuries had. Properties grew more elaborate, with a typical scene requiring the properties manager to make as many as sixty-nine separate elements. \( ^{35} \) By the 1880’s it was not unheard of to use taxonomy animals on the stage to approximate the real thing, especially horses. \( ^{36} \) Not only did the props change, so did the sets themselves. Henry Irving, the Shakespearean actor and manager of the Lyceum theatre went so far as to interview a priest when designing the altar for *Much Ado About

---

32 Ibid., 122-125.
Nothing and hire a fine artist to paint his backdrops for the stage.\textsuperscript{37} Indeed, the emphasis on realism was so strong in theatre that at the end of the century Bram Stoker, the author and theatre aficionado, could compare theatre sets favorably to portraiture from earlier portions of the century.\textsuperscript{38}

Even the technology used in plays developed in response to increasing pressure from the public for greater overall accuracy not to mention a better artistic effect. Some of the earliest uses of electricity on the stage were to create special effects such as lighting up the swords during a fight in the Lyceum’s 1886-1887 performance of \textit{Faust}.\textsuperscript{39} Likewise, lighting changed to show the new sets, not to mention the actors, to better effect. While electric lights remained uncommon through the end of the century because they tended to reveal the unrealistic elements of sets too much, theatres did develop advanced forms of limelight and managers learned how to color and focus it better.\textsuperscript{40} Even trap and pulley systems grew more elaborate, so much so that theatres had to hold technical rehearsals to get the timing right on the use of these devices.\textsuperscript{41}

While this increase in realism did generally result in more favorable reviews and even a chance to increase the overall appeal of theatre with more revealing costumes, it came at a price. The first price was monetary; the new sets and costumes were simply more expensive and harder to store than the earlier ones. Where Charles Kean could

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 1:71-105.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 2:66.
\item \textsuperscript{39} Ibid., 1:176.
\item \textsuperscript{41} Feraldt, “The Hive of Pantomine, 1880,” in Jackson, \textit{Victorian Theatre}, 200.
\end{itemize}
speak easily about destroying various sets in order to make space for new ones in the midcentury, for Irving, the loss of his sets and costumes in an 1898 fire was a major fiscal and artistic disaster from which he never recovered. Furthermore, these newer, more elaborate sets with their moving parts were subject to breakdown more rapidly, as Bram Stoker pointed out. Another major drawback to the increase in realism was the risk that the managers ran of overwhelming the story with the overall spectacle of the performance. This problem created another theatrical change during the nineteenth-century, a change in acting style.

Acting Changes

Bram Stoker, in his discussion of Irving’s direction of plays in the Lyceum, pointed out that he frequently coached his actors to subordinate their acting to the overall picture that he was trying to paint on the stage. By contrast, early on in the century actors frequently acted out their own vision of how their parts should be played, often with relatively little group rehearsals prior to the performance. This change was partly due to rising audience expectations and partly due to changes in staging.

Staging changes dramatically changed the way in which actors performed. As actors worked to become more historically accurate, they relied more and more on images from the past, particularly painted ones and often imitated the gestures seen in

44 Ibid., 2:15.
famous paintings. This was not the only way in which actors changed their profession in response to the new emphasis on realism. Previously actors tended to exaggerate their gestures and intonations. However, in an effort to create plays that were more historically accurate, many nineteenth-century actors spent a great deal of time and study not only on the characters they were portraying but also on how those characters were likely to react in certain situations. Stoker reported that gradually gestures and expressions of emotion became more multi-valent in order to express the full range of emotions required in a character better. While demands for historical accuracy staging may have increased the demand for more naturalistic acting, what made it possible for actors to pull it off was a corresponding change in the audience. Where early in the century, audiences frequently talked through performances, by the mid-century this was starting to change. Indeed, it had changed so much that Samuel Phelps, the tragic actor and manager of Sadler’s Wells Theatre, felt comfortable throwing out a heckler when performing in the mid-century. The reduction in ambient noise, in turn, meant that actors could realistically lower their overall volume and act more naturally without worrying that audiences would be unable to follow the plot.

These changes necessarily altered the length of a play’s rehearsal time. At the beginning of the century, rehearsal times were often short and instead of worrying about closely personifying a particular type of character, actors often developed a repertoire of

46 Stoker, Personal Reminiscences, 1: 21; Stoker, Personal Reminiscences, 2:5.
stock characters.\textsuperscript{50} One actor might specialize in the first heavy roles while an actress might specialize in the ingénue. Within their specializations, the players would often memorize a number of roles that they could perform at a moment’s notice. However, these characterizations might not actually work together within the play, not that this mattered much to the players. Edmund Kean once told his fellow actors to “stand upstage of me and do your worst,” presumably after someone asked him how he wanted the other characters portrayed.\textsuperscript{51} By the end of the century however, this had changed dramatically. Ellen Terry, the leading lady at the Lyceum, reported that while her theatre manager, Irving, did not necessarily take the time to allow his leading figures to practice, he drilled the rest of the company ceaselessly.\textsuperscript{52}

This increased rehearsal time was part of a larger change in how actors were trained. Early in the century, actors commonly received their training by joining a provincial theatre circuit and developing a repertoire of characters that they could play at a moment’s notice.\textsuperscript{53} They worked for sixteen hours a day memorizing lines, rehearsing and otherwise performing theatre duties.\textsuperscript{54} This served as an advantage for several reasons; it meant that the players could perform a stock play at literally a moment’s notice, and it meant that when they moved to a new troop, they were essentially taking

\begin{itemize}
 \item Russell Jackson, “Management,” in Jackson, \textit{Victorian Theatre}, 239.
 \item Russell Jackson, “Management,” in Jackson, \textit{Victorian Theatre}, 239.
 \item Leman Rede, “General Regulations of the Principal Provincial Theatres, 1827,” in Jackson, \textit{Victorian Theatre}, 86.
\end{itemize}
their characterizations with them. Even in the 1880’s this old practice was still paying dividends. When Irving could not perform in *King Lear* due to an illness, an older actor used to short rehearsal times was able to step in and perform the role.\(^{55}\) However, this system also had its drawbacks. For example, it could lead to competition between actors who both knew the same part and wanted to play it.\(^{56}\) While the hours remained long later on in the century, what they learned changed. It was no longer enough to develop a repertoire of characters; actors had to learn to interact with the other players on the stage in order to create an overall vision. They also often received some form of formal instruction on the mechanics of acting. Ellen Terry reported that the theatre-manager’s wife, Mrs. Kean, and the theatre Dance Master, Mr. Byrn, took a great deal of care to teach her not only how to play her character Mamilius for the Keans’ performance of *The Winter’s Tale* but also how to act. She reported that she learned how to move on the stage, how to speak and a myriad of other skills that she needed as an actor in both that role and in her future ones from these individuals.\(^{57}\)

While the training of actors shifted to long rehearsal periods rather than rapid-fire performances, the overall skills required of an actor remained constant. Terry at the end of the century reported that elocution was still an important skill for a young actress to have in her arsenal. Indeed, she grumbled at the lack of discipline displayed by younger actresses in their development of this skill.\(^{58}\) She even credited her own success to the

\(^{58}\) George Bernard Shaw to Ellen Terry, 20 July 1897, in St. John, *Ellen Terry and Bernard Shaw*, 171.
training in elocution she received from her parents.\textsuperscript{59} Another major actress, Genevieve Ward likewise trained traditionally even though she lived late in the century and Stoker credited part of her success to her elocution training.\textsuperscript{60} This was the same in the early portion of the century. In the 1830’s lessons in elocution were necessary for new actors.\textsuperscript{61}

From changes in gestures, to changes in training, to increased rehearsal times that produced a more unified portrayal of the story, it is clear that acting changed in the nineteenth-century. Furthermore, it is also clear that these changes were necessitated at least in part by changing audience demands for accuracy. Yet it was another change in play productions that emerged at the same time, which, in many ways enabled this switch, the rise of the actor manager.

**Promoters to Actor-Managers**

In the Larson collection, there is a relic of a form of direction almost completely lost to the theatre today, a promptbook. What was this book and who used it? Early in the nineteenth-century, the individual responsible for interpreting and staging a play was not the director, but a man who also managed the technology and blocking, the prompter. However, over the course of the century, the central role that the prompter had in producing plays was largely supplanted by another figure that changed how plays were prepared, the actor-manager.
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One major change in the theatre during the nineteenth-century was the manner in which plays came together. Early in the century, actors, stage managers and indeed the public relied on a professional called the prompter to stage plays. This figure’s central role in producing plays was largely due to economics; the price of books was such that the prompter was often the only individual in the theatre who had a complete copy of the script.⁶² Due to this, the prompter was the only one aware of every character’s entrances and exits, where the lights ought to shine and the myriad of other details that were necessary to put on the show. This figure was in charge of nearly every aspect of the play. It was the prompter who determined the blocking of the actors. He was the one who managed the properties and allowed actors to use them. The prompter was the man who decided what sort of music to play during the interludes. He was even in charge of planning the sets.⁶³ Indeed, the one thing that the prompter was not in charge of, in the play, was each actor’s delivery of his or her role. James Davies, a musical theatre historian, noted that by convention the prompter left how the actor went about his stage business entirely up to the actor.⁶⁴

This last point was where the actor-manager differed from the prompter. Starting in the late eighteenth-century, more and more star actors decided to purchase their own theaters and run performances in the manner that they wanted.⁶⁵ Called actor-managers these individuals would not only manage the theatres they had purchased, they would
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also act in the plays that the theatre put on. As actors with specific visions of how plays should be performed, not to mention the owners of the theatre, actor-managers not only took on the normal responsibilities of the prompter such as determining the blocking for the actors, managing the lighting, and determining the set design, but working with actors on their characterizations. 66 This may have been due to economics. Actor-managers were individuals with star status and often the public came specifically to see them in performance. Given that this was the case, these stars could not afford to have their fellow actors in any way impede that performance. Similarly, the increased demands for theatrical realism discussed in the previous section also ruled out haphazard methods of determining characterizations, due to concerns about realistic portrayals of the play. Bernard Shaw, a leading playwright, had a more cynical explanation for this development; he maintained that jealousy and egotism led some actor-managers to cripple their employees’ performances so that their own seemed that much better. 67

Whether or not Shaw was right in his assessment of why actor-managers controlled the performances and blocking of their employees, the fact that they did was a contributing factor to the longer rehearsal times mentioned in the previous section. No longer could an actor simply act his role in the way that he had always done, instead, he had to adhere to the actor-manager’s overall vision for the play, including how he acted. This meant that he had to rehearse more with the overall company, giving rise to the

66 Ellen Terry to George Bernard Shaw, 24 September 1896, in St. John, Ellen Terry and Bernard Shaw, 60. 67 George Bernard Shaw to Ellen Terry, 3 February 1898, in St. John, Ellen Terry and Bernard Shaw, 217.
endless Irving drills, about which Terry grumbled. This change also had positive economic consequences for actor-managers. Alfred Trumble, a writer for *Decorator and Furnisher*, reported that the public tended to prefer the visually uniform performances that came from extra rehearsals, meaning that more tickets sold. Furthermore, extra rehearsals were cost neutral to managers, because actors did not get paid for rehearsals, this change was essentially free to the manager. This meant that the decision to extend rehearsal times was highly profitable to actor-managers.

The rise of actor-managers dramatically changed the way in which plays were produced in the nineteenth-century. Not only did these figures take on the traditional tasks of the prompter, they went beyond the bounds of tradition and started controlling the characterizations of other actors. This in turn contributed to an increase in rehearsal-time a decision that could only benefit actor-managers and presented little to no downside. In some ways their rise reflects a similar rise in the social status of actors during this era.

**Social Status of Actors**

When a prominent engineer who moonlighted as a financial manager for the Adelphi Theatre, Charles Manby, died in the 1850s the reputation of actors was still such that the writers of his obituary felt that his continued sober living despite his association
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with actors was a major accomplishment.\textsuperscript{71} By the end of the century, Queen Victoria bestowed a knighthood on Henry Irving for his acting abilities. During the nineteenth-century, not only did performance styles change, but as manager’s changed their recruiting methods, so did actors’ status within society.

Early on in the century, theatre manages recruited actors largely from both the provinces and old acting families. By far the most common method of recruitment in the theatres was nepotism. Acting often became a multi-generational concern with the children of acting families appearing on the stage and learning their parents’ craft as young as four.\textsuperscript{72} Even in the late century Terry announced that at seven, her son “can act, or will act” and as far as she was concerned that was the end of it.\textsuperscript{73} Such children were often a sensation. In the early nineteenth-century, Master Betty, a ten-year old actor caused such a stir that the House of Commons adjourned early just so its members could go see one of his plays.\textsuperscript{74}

However, the rising popular demand meant that troupes ended up expanding their recruiting efforts to include street urchins and surprisingly, the middle-classes. Tracy Davis, a theatre historian, cited two examples of middle-class individuals joining the theatre and mentioned that there were many more.\textsuperscript{75} This group, even if they represented  
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only a small proportion of the individuals recruited to the theatre, changed actors’
dynamics both with the public and in their performances. A true middle class actor or
actress could easily portray the characters in plays set in middle class society such as
those written by Ibsen without training to imitate middle class manners.76 Furthermore,
their former friends would often come to watch them perform. This in turn slowly raised
the tone of theatre to the point that young women could attend performances
unaccompanied.77

While actors and actresses could draw from the middle classes, even in the mid-
century they still paid a steep social price for doing so. Although one contemporary felt
middle class young women were ideal new actresses because if they failed they had a
stable home-life to which they could return, the evidence suggests otherwise.78 When one
young woman announced that she wanted to become an actress, her family threw her out
of the home because they equated this with prostitution.79 Meanwhile, in 1889, one
author still felt confident enough about the generally low moral character of actors to
claim that “The actor, speaking in a general way and omitting several noteworthy
exceptions, has but two pleasures - drinking and betting.”80 One theatergoer even
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reported that the actresses he met on his backstage tour of a West End Theatre were not only far too flirtatious; they relieved him of his money.  

Part of the issue may have been the wages that actors and actresses received. While, under the office-box system devised by theatre managers, both male and female actors earned wages based on their ability to draw in a crowd, Terry noted that even a good actor who commanded a high wage could only earn about £100 a year largely due to the seasonal nature of the work. Sometimes actors did not even command their full box office rate. In early Victorian England, it was common for a manager to hire a couple at combined rates that were roughly equal to one and a half times the going wage instead of a full double salary. Not only were the wages uncertain due to the seasonality of the work, actors also frequently had to provide their own costumes. Davis points out that managers often expected women to provide their own costumes. Another theatre historian, Russell Jackson, in the meantime, reported that in the 1830’s actors had to purchase props. Even the process of obtaining work required a significant investment in an actor’s wardrobe. Actresses had to dress appropriately for auditions, which, according to Elizabeth Fagan, an actress active in the 1890’s, often meant dressing beyond their means. The pay was so bad that a C. H. Leppington, an investigative journalist for the
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National Review, reported that dancers in the off-season often worked as seamstresses.\textsuperscript{87} Even individuals like the Keans were concerned about how they would support themselves after retirement and many joined benevolent societies in hopes of staving off starvation when they could not work.\textsuperscript{88} These low wages in turn meant that not only did actors frequently belong to the lower class; but as the tendency to pick up a second job indicates, the temptations to get work in a less than legal field were strong. Indeed the robbery mentioned by the one visitor is a good indicator of this.\textsuperscript{89}

Even though the wages were low and the profession remained questionable, over the course of the century attitudes loosened enough that some actors and actresses were able to surmount the social divisions dividing them from respectable society. The late nineteenth-century actress Ellen Terry was able to retain friendships however distant with what she called “society people.”\textsuperscript{90} Henry Irving received a knighthood from the crown during the same period. By contrast, a very popular singer was largely shunned by these same groups earlier in the century until a Russian princess took her on as a kind of court jester.\textsuperscript{91} Yet even honors such as Irving’s only served to throw into stark relief how much further actors as professionals had to go to win the respect of their putative peers. As Terry wrote, Henry Irving found it odd that only he had gotten this honor and that the
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crown had not extended it to other equally worthy male actors. Terry meanwhile laughed over the lack of female parity in this issue.\textsuperscript{92} 

Overall actors ended the century roughly where they started it, as a barely respected underclass, widely derided for questionable morals and uncertain character. John Coleman in his memoirs reported that actors were as honorable as other individuals were as if protesting against a wider view.\textsuperscript{93} Yet despite all of that, views were slowly changing. Children of middle-class families were running away to join the theatre, and their peers, while distancing themselves socially, certainly came to watch their performances. Meanwhile, acting stars, while long considered pets of the nobility, were beginning to be accepted as equals as can be seen by the conferral of titles and the existence of true, albeit distant friendships. The social status of actors was slowly rising during the nineteenth-century.

**Theatre Safety**

Just as the status of actors improved a little bit over the course of the nineteenth-century but still had a long way to go, theatre safety also improved slightly but not greatly during this period. Where in the early portion of the century, some theatres voluntarily put in a few safety measures, by the latter portion, these measures were
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required by law. This change was the result of a combination of factors. Under the pressure of increasing costs, worker pressure and government regulation theatre safety improved slightly during this period.

One area where public pressure worked to improve theatre safety was in the area of fire precautions. In the late eighteenth-century, Richard Sheridan, a playwright and theatre owner, rebuilt Drury Lane, constructing a new so-called fireproof theatre in its place. This structure, in addition to being of solid brick, featured a curtain that could be pulled across the back to prevent fire from spreading in the event that a fire did break out. What is more, the ownership felt the need to advertise this at the first performance in the theatre, indicating that members of the public were concerned about the danger of fire in the theatres. Likewise, Parliament acted to regulate theatrical fire safety, and designated individuals to regularly inspect the London institutions. However, even with these improvements, theatres continued to burn with some regularity; in 1882 the Alhambra burned to the ground, while the Lyceum had two stage fires in the middle of performances.

Overall theatre safety was not the only thing improved. Due to internal pressure worker safety either improved or wages rose. For example, the children at one theatre went on strike for better wages because “their mothers won’t let them endanger their
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lives” by performing a particularly unusual flying stunt unless the management provided hazard pay. Likewise, managers installed shields on the footlights, greatly decreasing the chances of an actor accidentally catching fire. However, accidents were still relatively common on the stage; in the mid-century, Ellen Terry acted with a broken toe as a child after having an accident with one of the traps.

While having precautions in place against worker injury may have cut into theatre managers’ bottom lines, some improvements, particularly in the realm of fire safety had economic benefits for them. At the turn of the century, Sheridan was completely ruined when his theatre burned to the ground and the stakes only got worse as the century continued. The number of seats and boxes slowly increased in number while the space for the standing-room only crowd in the pit decreased throughout this period. Rising audience expectations supported this overall trend. Henry Morley, a theatre critic even discussed the need to pad the pit seats.

Seats were not the only thing to change. Theatre furnishings in general became more opulent over the course of the century. To put it simply, the cost of replacing theatre furnishings rose during the nineteenth-century. Logically, this made taking precautions against fire a sound economic decision, not only because as discussed earlier, it reassured the public but also because it reduced potential future costs.
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Three factors worked to influence managers to improve worker safety. First, the public was concerned about the hazards that fires posed to theatres, second workers pressured owners to provide better conditions. Finally, it was frequently in the owners’ economic interests to ensure at least a minimum level of overall safety. However, as can be seen by the continuance of fires and accidents, theatre safety still had a long way to go at the end of the century.

**Conclusion**

In nineteenth-century London, almost every element of theatre changed in some way. Staging grew more realistic in response to popular demand, which in turn changed the costuming and technology used. In response to this, acting changed as well when, enabled by the rise of a new theatrical organizer, the actor-manager, actors began concentrating on creating an overall picture rather than their individual performances. Likewise, the social position of actors marginally improved over this century so that by the 1890’s the crown knighted some elite actors for their performances. Even theatre safety measures were in flux. This makes theatre, according to Nora Devlin’s article on archival collecting, a prime subject that needs documenting by archives, since periods of change or tension have a unique way of highlighting subaltern groups.\(^\text{107}\) However, even collections that cover this period must still undergo archival appraisal to determine whether the collection is appropriate for archival housing.

Chapter 3

COLLECTION ARCHIVAL VALUE

Gregory Hunter, a certified archivist and professor at Long Island University, in his book on archives states, “selection and appraisal are at the heart of archival work.”\textsuperscript{108} This is supported by the extensive studies done by archival appraisal specialists such as Frank Boles on the value that archivists place on certain factors such as scarcity and context during this process.\textsuperscript{109} These factors weigh as strongly into questions of whether to accession autograph collections, such as the Larson Collection as they do other collections. Indeed, autograph collections present a number of evaluative challenges when it comes to the question of whether archives should accession and process them. These challenges include concerns about the collection’s overall research value as well as prosaic worries about things like the collection’s fragility. While the Larson Collection is particularly fraught with issues of this sort, it was still worth accessioning and processing.

Scarcity

One thing that archivists consider when contemplating accessioning a collection is the materials' overall research value. This question of research value has a number of contributing factors but one important one for any collection is scarcity.\textsuperscript{110} As an
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autograph collection, this collection is high on the scarcity scale, which weighs heavily in
its favor on a decision to accession it.

One element that makes an archival collection worth adding and processing is the
overall scarcity of the records. In this respect, the Larson collection more than meets
the criteria listed for accessioning. Many of the items are so unique and so important to
the field of theatre history that an appraiser valued the overall collection as worth over
$38,000. Indeed, according to Christie Brown, a writer for Forbes Magazine, autograph
values have soared due to widespread public interest in them and are artificially high.

Furthermore, the autographs are not the only items in the collection that are
scarce. Promptbooks and staging notes such as the two examples included in this
collection are some of these items. Unlike playbills, which only record the promises of
what the theater intended to produce which could be changed at a moment's notice
depending on the theatre's needs and the audience, promptbooks and blocking notes serve
as records of not only what the actors intended to produce but how they intended to
produce it. These items show not only the locations where various actors were
supposed to stand when reciting their lines but also which lines of the play were to be
recited and which were left out of the play completely. Furthermore, because the staging
was, more often than not, unique to the performing company each promptbook or set of
staging notes is a unique record of a single show. It is from sources such as this that
historians know how thoroughly star actor-managers redacted the roles of other
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characters to more thoroughly highlight their own roles. It is also from sources such as these that theatre historians are able to track changes such as technology and acting changes affected staging.

From items like promptbooks to staging notes used by a single company, many of the items in this collection are unique. This rarity affects the monetary value of these items, as can be seen by their overall monetary value. As a collection with a number of unique items in it, this collection certainly meets this particular evaluative criterion used by archivists. Indeed, some of these items are simply irreplaceable.

**Context**

While this collection contains many items that are very scarce, this is not the only factor that archivists need to account for where evaluating collections. Another factor is the completeness of the record context. In this respect, the Larson Collection leaves much to be desired, although it has enough context to pass this criterion.

One of the factors that favors against accessioning the Larson collection is the lack of original context for most of its documents. As a collection of autographs, many of which are separated from the original body of correspondence and even from the original letters they belonged to, this collection is vulnerable to criticism about the relative virtue of adding it to the archive. Indeed Edward Kemp, a university archives specialist, suggests that archivists show autograph donors the door as quickly and politely as possible.
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This is as true for this collection as for other autograph collections. If a researcher or archivist were to attempt to view the whole collection as telling a story about the overall history of London theatre in the nineteenth-century, he or she would be sorely disappointed. However, the nature of context can be tricky. Indeed, depending on the type of context a researcher is looking for, it could be said that this collection does have enough context to merit inclusion in the archive.

One method of looking at context that works in favor of the Larson collection is viewing it in terms of the overall collection. Do these particular materials contribute to the overall collection make-up? This was a point brought up by Boles who points out that if the collection fills out the archives’ overall collection, it is more valuable to the archive than if it is merely rare. What is more this is a fairly common method of interpreting the context rule. In this respect, the Larson collection actually does contribute something to the archive. While, SCUA has relatively little material on nineteenth-century theatre in England, (indeed this is a little outside of its collection development plan which relates directly to the university’s history) the archive has been building a collection of rare books, and items that somehow portray the history of the book. In this respect, the Larson Collection, is context rich.

In the Larson Collection, there are several series that shed light on some highly unusual aspects of printing and binding in the nineteenth-and early twentieth-century.
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One good example of this is the souvenir booklets from the Lyceum theatre. Souvenir booklets such as the major one in this collection, the *Macbeth* booklet, were commonly distributed to theatergoers at special performances and sometimes kept as mementos. What is most interesting about these pieces, however, is what they reveal about the use of printing and binding in advertising, as the degree to which both actors and fine artists were involved in the creation of this unique form of print culture. These pieces not only show the original processes used by the artists Charles Cattermole and Bernard Partridge through details such as false starts on the reverse side of the original art pieces but also how the original art eventually translated to and was combined with text in the final booklet. As a relatively ephemeral publication, these booklets provide a valuable peek into the variety of publication types and processes available in the late nineteenth-century.

Not only does the collection contribute a great deal to the archive’s overall collection, it fits in well with the overall context of archival collections in the Sacramento area, a fact that could do a great deal to attract researchers. The Center for Sacramento History contains a sizable theatre collection donated by Eleanor McClatchy. The combination of these two collections in the same area would make a trip to research both collections quite worthwhile for the determined researcher, if the Interim Head of Exhibits in Special Collections at the University of Nevada Library, Peter Michel’s
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statements regarding the way that comprehensive archives draw researchers are applicable to a larger geographic area.  

This collection clearly contributes information to SCUA’s collection when fit into the larger context of book history. Likewise, it fits in well with the area’s current assortment of collections dedicated to theatre history. It is clear that viewed through the lens of institutional context, this collection is worth accessioning.

However, institutional context is not the only way in which to analyze the usefulness of this collection. Another way of viewing this collection and its context is as a reflection of its creator, Gerard Larson. Once again, using this method, this collection is context-rich.

According to Lori Nordland, an archivist at McGill University, each owner adds his or her own layers of interpretation to an item.  

Terry Eastwood, a retired archival studies professor from the University of British Columbia, makes a similar point when he talks about the structure of such collections.  

As such, even though this collection’s material focuses on theatre history, the items collected and the way they were organized reflect on Gerard Larson. For example, why were items like The Mask so important to Larson that he felt the need to acquire them? This is an important point for SCUA because, according to the collection guidelines, one goal of the archive is to collect items
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created by faculty members. Given this goal, accessioning a collection assembled by a faculty member like this one, suddenly seems like a very reasonable plan, even if the collection does not directly relate to his teaching career or his academic research.

There is another reason for evaluating a collection based on the context created by its owner however, and that is that it provides an important glimpse into the milieu in which they were collecting. Helene Weinberg, a curator at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, drew conclusions about the motivation of a collector based on the structure and content of one autograph collection. If she could do this, it seems plausible that other archivists and researchers could also at least speculate on collector motivations in general based on what they chose to collect. Furthermore, if what archives collect changes with the seasons, then it stands to reason that it is likely for other collectors to change their collecting paradigms to reflect overall trends. This means that not only is the Larson collection a snapshot of Larson, it is also, in some ways, a sample of a 1970’s private theatre collection, showing what individuals of this era valued in their collecting. This could potentially fit under SCUA’s collection development guidelines as documentation of a post-war cultural movement in the Sacramento area.

By examining context through the lens of the collector, it is clear that this collection provides a fair amount of information through context on the collector. However, that is not all it provides, it also through its structure, reveals something about
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collecting in general from the period between 1970 and 1990. As such, it fulfills this interpretation of context.

Finally, a researcher can of course examine the Larson collection in the context of nineteenth-century theatre. It is here that the collection fails to stand up to scrutiny. Although there are punctuated instances where this collection is able to provide a great deal of context to individual artifacts, on the whole there is not enough information to provide a continuous narrative on any one subject in nineteenth-century theatre.

The area where this collection is truly weak on context is in its overall coverage of theatre during the period from which its artifacts come. Instead of providing an overall picture of theatre in London or even an overall picture of a specific aspect of theatre during this period, the best it does is provide brief glimpses into random aspects of theatre history. However, these glimpses do in themselves have substantial context.

Part of the problem with looking for overall context in this collection is that because Larson purchased the material in groups, it actually consists of several sub-collections. Because these sub-collections came from different eras, and focused on different aspects of theatre, the overall effect is spotty coverage. However, his evaluation discounts the amount of context within each sub-collection.

A good example of a sub-collection with a high level of context is the Manby letter collection. This small subset of correspondence contains letters to and from Charles Manby, the financial manager of the Adelphi theatre during the midcentury. Edward Kemp reports that correspondence like this is often invaluable to researchers and
biographers.\textsuperscript{127} Indeed the inclusion of several notes regarding the internal workings of the theater supports this view.

The presence of sub-collections with this level of context raises uncomfortable questions about the nature of this evaluative mechanism. After all, if these items were donated as collections in themselves they would be evaluated as having more than enough of this element. Is the influence of this context actually diluted within the larger collection? How does an archive determine how much context is necessary for a collection? For SCUA, its collection development guidelines specifically excludes this particular analysis of the records’ context. The guidelines state that SCUA collects information on local events, university records and anything that contributes to a deeper understanding of printing history.\textsuperscript{128} Given this, the context that these records provide or fail to provide regarding nineteenth-and early twentieth-century theatre history is irrelevant.

Although irrelevant to SCUA, given the way its collection guidelines are phrased, this collection provides relatively little overall context for its records of nineteenth-century theatre. Indeed, what context exists is for specific sub-collections. In another set of circumstances, this apportionment of context could raise questions regarding both the role and value of this particular evaluative mechanism in considering artificially assembled autograph collections.
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Although as an autograph collection, the Larson materials lack the context an archivist would usually expect to find within a collection dealing with nineteenth-century theatre, that does not mean that the collection lacks context altogether. Indeed, when a researcher views this collection in the context of the archive’s larger rare book collection or its owner's interests, it becomes clear that the collection does in fact have context, albeit not of the usual type. In the same way, while this collection contains information, the emphasis on autographs can sometimes hide this factor.

**Information**

Even with materials scarcity on this collection’s side and, depending on the interpretation, a relatively high level of context, there are other criteria that this collection must fulfill for an archivist to accession and process it. One of these is the overall informational value of the collection. In this respect, this collection, as is true with many autograph collections, does contain enough information although in a more fragmentary manner than would be the case with other record types.

While context is very important to decisions to accession a collection, what a collection contains is also important. As Frank Boles points out, context is not important without content.\(^{129}\) Indeed, Boles and Greene rank the value of information higher than the value of context in their discussion of archival appraisal.\(^{130}\) Yet do autographs actually contain a high enough informational value devoid of their context to merit their
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inclusion in the archive? This depends largely on the note or letter accompanying the autograph if there is one. Edward Kemp states that autograph letters have little value in that they actually contain little information.\footnote{Kemp, \textit{Manuscript Solicitation for Libraries}, 26.} However, as Weinberg points out, autographs frequently contain information however fragmented.\footnote{Weinberg, “Archives' Autograph Collections,” 2-3.}

One example of how much informational value autographs can provide is the Willett rejection binder. This booklet in many ways serves as a chronicle of Ernest Willett’s attempts to get his work shown in theatres. It includes advice from actors regarding the changes he could make to his plays in order to make them more appealing to a broader audience as well as offers to put him in contact with other directors and managers. Notes of this sort serve as powerful documentation of the very common challenges associated with producing plays. George Bernard Shaw for example, had trouble getting his plays on the market, if his conflict with Henry Irving and his subsequent decision to publish rather than perform his plays is anything to go by.\footnote{George Bernard Shaw to Ellen Terry, 4 May 1897, in St. John, \textit{Ellen Terry and Bernard Shaw}, 143-144.} Even Alfred Tennyson, a particularly famous author and playwright, apparently encountered difficulties. He was so untrusting of actors that he demanded his original copy and the proofs used for creating scripts back after selling performance rights for his plays.\footnote{Stoker, \textit{Personal Reminiscences}, 1:203.} Indeed, records of the sort left by Willett are in many ways more powerful than other forms of testimony, as they are third party testimonies to the difficulties associated with publishing.
For all of the informational value that full letters with a signature can provide, there are other autograph forms that are less than useful. One common one is the random scrap of paper with a signature attached. This form unfortunately occurs even within relatively information-rich collections such as the Larson one. For example, within the Willett rejection booklet, there are instances where Willett, apparently valuing the signature more than the note, cut off the response and only included the signature. These scraps of paper are far less useful to the researcher than the full letters and in many ways justify Kemp’s complaints about autographs. The question then becomes whether the overall collection has enough information to justify housing and processing even the parts that have less informational value. In the case of the Larson collection, enough of the signatures are attached to full letters, engravings or other pieces in themselves containing significant informational value to justify the inclusion of the other documents. Even in the Willett booklet, the area where most of the isolated signatures occur, less than fifty percent of the collection consists of signatures alone, and as already demonstrated, the remainder of the autographed notes provide significant information about the challenges associated with publishing plays.

In a way both Kemp and Weinberg were right. Where an autograph or an autograph letter contains little to no accompanying content it is very difficult for a researcher to use. However, when an autograph comes with an appropriate level of information to serve as context, it can be quite valuable as the Willett book suggests. The

The real question is how much of the collection consists of useful autograph forms and how much of it is just signatures. In the Larson collection, most of the materials consist of the former useful form meaning that in this case, Weinberg’s argument is more applicable than Kemp’s and the materials have enough information to justify including the collection in the archive.

**Likely Use**

The collection's fragility, however, makes the question of whether or not to accession and process records like this particularly fraught. While the overall context of theatre collections in the area and in the archive ensures that it is likely that local researchers will access the collection, this means little if the records are so fragile that the archive will not permit the public to handle them. Indeed Gregory Hunter, the director of the archival studies program at Long Island University, suggests that archivists restrict access to such materials and provide access to reasonable facsimiles instead.\(^{136}\) This lack of likely use is a major count against adding the Larson collection, but the archive can employ workarounds to mitigate the negative impacts that restricting the handling of the original documents can cause.

The Larson collection, as a group of items ranging in age from the early eighteenth-century to the mid-twentieth century with a concentration in the nineteenth-century, is a particularly fragile collection. Some of the pieces are on paper so thin and so

\(^{136}\) Hunter, *Developing and Maintaining*, 215.
acidic that they are almost completely translucent and crumble at the slightest touch. Even the pieces made on relatively high quality paper, such as the Carter Posters, show definite signs of decay, with several tears along fold lines, water damage and other issues. This does not even take into account the decay caused by the newspaper clippings interspersed throughout the collection. Given the state of these documents the archivist could easily justify significantly curtailing public access to these documents by refusing to bring the originals out for researchers to use. However, given that nearly the entire collection has preservation problems, this would mean restricting access to most of the materials. This raises questions as to whether it is worth spending the time and money needed to stabilize a collection that the archivist will largely block researchers from accessing. However, there are ways to mitigate this lack of access which would go a long ways towards reducing such concerns.

One way to mitigate the access problem is to put on an archival exhibit. Martin Kalfatovic, the associate director of the Smithsonian Institution Libraries, in his book on digital exhibitions reports that this is one way archives can both advertise their collections and ensure public viewing of the rarer items in the collection.\(^{137}\) However, this solution can be problematic. One major problem with this solution is that it necessarily imposes a layer of selection and interpretation between the researcher and the original documents. Furthermore, such a display can negatively affect the materials. As Barry Lord and Gail Lord, the co-presidents of Lord Cultural Resources, an exhibit and

---

historical project company, point out, exhibits can also damage artifacts due to prolonged exposure to light and the stress that display positions can put on them. However, for an archive that has a particularly fragile or overly valuable collection, and for whom digitization is not an option, this solution can at least ensure that the public is aware of the collection and that they have an opportunity to see it.

A second way to mitigate the access problem is through digitization. In many ways, this solution is the archival exhibit on a broader scale. Indeed, Kalfatovic reports that digitizing his exhibition extended its lifespan. However, this too presents some problems. Chief amongst these is the question of copyright. Should the image be of high enough quality that a patron can truly view every element of the item? This is risking that users will pirate the photo. However, if the institution chooses to scan the images at a lower quality, it would reduce the access researchers truly have to the image. Furthermore with either solution there is the problem that the image that researchers see will necessarily be at the same angle clarity and distance as what the photographer shot or scanned, making the idea of total access through the digital medium somewhat illusory.

Of these two possible solutions, digitization is a better option for an archive than creating a temporary exhibit. There are a couple of reasons for this; first, it presents relatively low possibilities regarding document damage. Second, it is longer term than a...
display of fragile documents. Lord and Lord point out that putting an artifact on display always risks damaging the artifact in some way.\textsuperscript{142} Third, it allows for wider access than an exhibit. In the survey of archives conducted by Donnelly Walton, the interim head archivist of the University of Alabama, the archivists contacted point out that more users access materials through online services.\textsuperscript{143} Finally, although it does add a layer of interpretation because the photographer or scanner is creating an image, this layer is less intrusive than the layer of careful selection and explanation that often goes into exhibits.

The fragility of the materials in the Larson collection definitely brings up serious questions on whether or not to accession these materials; after all access to the collection will necessarily be very closely restricted. However, there are workarounds that the archive can employ to mitigate this problem in the form of exhibits and digitization. In the case of the Larson collection, the archivist opted to create a temporary exhibit to display the materials.

**Conclusion**

Accessioning this collection presents numerous philosophical questions for an archivist. It is a very fragile collection, with many problems regarding the relative amount of context it has and the information it can provide. The only factor that is completely in its favor is the rarity of several of the elements within it. That said, a closer examination both of the collection and the spirit behind concerns regarding collection

context and information content, reveals that this collection, however unorthodox, does have sufficient value for accessioning into the archive. The only true concern is the relative use that this collection will be to researchers given that it has so many restrictions on its use owing to the overall fragility of the materials. However, archivists can even work around this through digitization and exhibits. Overall, this collection is worth adding to the archive and taking the time to process.
Chapter 4

COLLECTION PROCESSING AND DESCRIPTION

Frank Boles, the director of the history library at Central Michigan University and former president of the Society for American Archivists, reports that when considering whether to add a collection to the archive, a responsible archivist considers whether or not the staff have the time to process and describe the materials in a timely manner. Meanwhile the archivist code of ethics strongly encourages current archivists to take the time to train and encourage new members of the profession. In this case, the head archivist at SCUA, saw a way to fulfill both of these imperatives, and assigned her intern, Elena Smith, the task of processing the Larson collection. Viewing this as a learning opportunity, Smith employed the techniques she had learned in her archival class as well as recent research on archival arrangement, processing and description to prepare these records for use.

Appraisal

To process this collection, the intern first conducted a preliminary appraisal of the collection. Although an appraisal had already been completed on this collection, the site supervisor, Sheila O’Neill, and the main processing archivist, Christopher Rockwell, felt that the appraisal was incomplete and therefore a second appraisal was in order. To conduct this appraisal, the intern followed Gregory Hunter’s guidelines on the classic

144 Boles, *Selecting and Appraising Archives*, 93.
archival appraisal technique, the Schellenberger method, in order to appraise the collection.\textsuperscript{146} She looked at the material in terms of its informational and evidentiary value. Due to the nature of this collection however, Smith put a strong emphasis on informational value as it related to uniqueness and importance since several of the pieces in the collection were short letters written and signed by famous actors or theatre ephemera of which there are either very few or no other examples in existence.\textsuperscript{147} To do this, Smith conducted a great deal of web research on several stand-out pieces in the collection that had not been mentioned in the preliminary appraisal, such as the three posters depicting Mr. Carter, the Lion King. She also spent a great deal of time deciphering the signatures, to facilitate the later development of the finding aid and therefore patron access to these scarce items. Since the original sellers already verified these, her work circulated around matching them up to the original appraisal list in order to confirm their presence and their location within the collection. While she was doing this, Smith simultaneously obtained price estimates on several of the objects in the collection to supplement the original appraisal. She did this, not because it affected whether the archive retained the items, but so that O’Neill could follow-up with the appraiser to obtain a higher value estimate for the donor’s tax write-off.

\footnote{146} Ibid., 60.  
\footnote{147} Ibid., 58-59.
Processing Planning

The next step in the processing of this collection was to create an arrangement plan. This proved to be a major challenge with this particular collection. There was very little original order to the collection. Furthermore, within the larger collection, Larson purchased several distinct sub-collections at auction. These collections varied in their materials and occasionally the material types overlapped. While it was tempting to follow the Australian series system described in Terry Eastwood, the director of the Archival Studies program at the University of British Columbia, and link a single subseries to several creating entities, this is not yet common practice. Therefore, Smith instead relied on traditional practices and isolated these individual collections within broader overarching topics. Since these sub-collections vary in terms of how thoroughly the collector had ordered them, where possible, she retained original order. Where this was not possible, in keeping with Hunter’s advice, she worked to order the materials in a manner comprehensible to a researcher.

Arrangement

After creating a processing plan, the next major challenge was execution. Since the pieces in this collection vary in size from 2’ by 3’ posters to 2” by 3” tickets, and these sizes frequently vary within each proposed folder, Smith chose to follow a storage separation schema where. She removed the larger items to flat folders and then created a
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cross-referencing system, inserting a page in the file noting where the archive was housing that item. Then, in response to common practice at SCUA, in her finding aid, she noted the removal and the item's current location. Some folders consist entirely of oversized items. In this circumstance, Smith created an oversized folder dedicated solely to these items and again made a note on her rapidly developing finding aid.

While conducting the processing, Smith undertook several simple preservation procedures. She flattened several folded documents. She also removed multiple rusted straight pins holding documents together since this was a simple, inconsequential preservation procedure. Additionally, she placed large silver-plate photographs in photographic folders, placed several documents in Mylar slipcovers, and interleaved several documents with acid-free tissue. One major challenge she dealt with was the newspaper clippings that riddled this collection. Their age and their arrangement on scrapbook pages made these documents valuable in their own right, so the usual practice of photocopying and disposing of the originals was not an option. Instead, Smith followed the preservation principal of creating a barrier between these and the other documents using acid-free paper.\textsuperscript{150} While many preservation steps still need to be undertaken, including several sizable repairs with Japanese paper on the larger posters, lifting of several documents that were either glued to each other or to backing, and an overall cleaning of most of the documents; the collection is largely stabilized. Provided

\textsuperscript{150} Nelly Balloffet and Jenny Hille, \textit{Preservation and Conservation for Libraries and Archives}, (Chicago: American Library Association, 2005), 70.
the archive maintains this material at a temperature at or below 68 degrees, it should last until the archivists can take further steps.  

**Role of Collection Size in Description**

The final step in processing the collection was to describe the collection. This was where Smith devoted the majority of her time and energy. Where in large collections it is common for archivists to take a high level approach to describing the collection, merely noting down series’ and subseries’ this is often not the case with small collections. Indeed, according to the responses to a survey conducted by two prominent members of the Society of America Archivists, Pam Hackbart-Dean and Elizabeth Slomba, there seems to be an almost inverse relationship between the size of the collection and the amount of care that goes into describing it.  

This is partly due to the lack of context in the collection. Smaller collections often need more description simply for the researcher to make sense of them.

In creating the description, Smith had several options regarding ways in which she could go about doing so. These options included not only options on what style of description to use, which would necessarily affect the level of description she could provide, but also what style of mark-up to employ, a decision which had consequences for the types of digital platforms the descriptions could be posted on.

---
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Descriptive Standards

The decision regarding the type of description to employ is one of real import for archivists. Information scientists from a spectrum of perspectives widely acknowledge that it is important for librarians and archivists to take how a patron searches for information into account when making decisions on how to present data. Indeed, these considerations have frequently altered even database design. Given this it is important to consider how historians search for data. Monica Bulger and Eric Meyer both of the Oxford Internet Institute and Ellen Collins of the Research Information Network report that although there is a beginning shift towards using data online, even there, searching remains largely hierarchical with users burrowing into the records from the top down. This also fits with the general structure of archival records. For the sake of speed, archivists generally do not describe at the item level. These two factors, the way that historians search and the way archivists structure records, are important considerations in choosing which of the three major descriptive systems, AACR2, DACS and RDA, to use to describe archival records like the Larson Collection.

The oldest of the three primary options for archival description, AACR2 is a general cataloging guide used primarily by libraries in the United States but with allowances and general instructions for archival records. There are several advantages to using AACR2 to describe materials. First, it is a widely recognized, general standard that

155 Hackbart-Dean and Slomba, *SPEC Kit 314*, 63-65.
provides instructions on how to catalog everything from books to bird nests.\textsuperscript{156} Second, as a general standard, it is widely supported and easily comprehensible by both information science professionals, and, once it has undergone markups, library users alike. Finally, in general, it is a brief record that is relatively fast to create. However, when considering archival records, there are some problems with applying this particular style of description. The main problem is that while it is highly useful for single-item descriptions and records, it does not provide easily for a full record series. Indeed the section that discusses describing archival material, still suggests looking at title pages for information, something most record groups lack.\textsuperscript{157} A second major problem is that it is not a helpful guide for cataloging items of derived or otherwise uncertain authorship and dating. For example, the section on corporate headings that catalogers use to designate authorship by multiple individuals does not even include a section on the creation of corporate headings for families.\textsuperscript{158} This is a clear problem for archival records since processors frequently need to attribute authorship to whole families. With problems such as an overdependence on publication data uncommon in archival materials and inflexibility regarding the creation of author heading, AACR2 is not a good choice for describing archival records.

RDA, the more recent version of AACR2, does work to fix these problems somewhat. RDA takes a more object-oriented programming approach to cataloging than

\textsuperscript{157} Ibid., 123.
\textsuperscript{158} Ibid., 439.
AACR2. Designed to adhere to international cataloging standards, this system leverages modern computer science concepts such as entities, properties and relationships to link not just one publication, but multiple copies of the same work, or even multiple works by the same author together.\textsuperscript{159} Furthermore, it takes into account the needs of cataloging communities outside of the library. Indeed, its developers incorporated portions of the archival cataloging codes into its structure.\textsuperscript{160} For example this standard includes guidelines for procedures for the creation of author authority records for families.\textsuperscript{161} In short, RDA is a very forward-thinking cataloging standard that should encourage cross-fertilization. However, it is still in the very early stages of implementation. Indeed, at the time that Smith was processing this collection, it was still under development and not even slated for release until 2013. Given this employing this standard was still just a little too far out of reach.

With AACR2 and RDA eliminated, that leaves only one system left, DACS. DACS is a derivative of AACR2 developed specifically for archival description. It still depends on the instructions in AACR2 for the creation of name authorities; however, the instructions for the creation of titles, provenance and origins are far more detailed than they are in the AACR.\textsuperscript{162} This system also permits different levels of description depending on the needs of the archive in question, something that AACR2 allows for in

\textsuperscript{160} Ibid., 232.
\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., 236.
general but is vague about in the archives chapter. Furthermore, under DACS, there is again room for the portrayal of hierarchies that AACR2 cannot accommodate.

While AACR2 is too inflexible for an archival record, and RDA was still under development when Smith was describing the Larson Collection, DACS is a sound system of archival description that is perfect for describing multi-level records. Accordingly, Smith employed this method of description relying heavily on the DACS manual to create the records, and referring where necessary for name authority work to the copy of the AACR2 guidelines made available to the university through Cataloger’s Desktop.

Because the collection was so small she became very granular in her descriptions, often going down to the item level in the case of the autograph letters. To finish the description, she assigned Library of Congress Subject Headings in keeping with DACS and AACR2 guidelines, using the university’s copy of the LCSH subject headings manual.

**Mark-up Languages**

After creating the description, her next step was to determine the style of markup she wanted to use. For archival markups in a university archives setting there are two main options, MARC and EAD. Both of these styles are useful to have available although for dramatically different reasons.

MARC is a technology that was developed in direct response to increased demand from the public to computerize access to library materials. Although merely a mark-up and designed to be flexible, catalogers commonly use it with classic library cataloging rules such as AACR2. Even though it is classically paired with AACR2 for an archive
attached to a larger research institution such as an academic library, MARC records, serve an important function, they ensure the visibility of the material to a broader cross-section of patrons.

For several years now, there has been a problem with archive and library patrons’ abilities to access records. To put it simply there are too many venues in which a patron must search in order to find information. At present, a standard academic library has multiple silos in which a patron can search, the library catalog where books and other single items are accessible, the various databases where journal articles are accessible and occasionally a larger search such as WorldCat that allows the patron to access materials outside the libraries holdings via inter-library loan. There are several problems with this current state of affairs; however, the biggest problem is that of accessibility and usability. Because materials are scattered across multiple different platforms users must know where to look for the various materials and many times they do not. Jeff Wisnieski, a web services librarian at the University of Pittsburgh, reports that many library patrons assume that the OPAC contains all of a library’s holdings.\textsuperscript{163} Even for those who do not make this assumption, however, the fragmentation of resources can be problematic. One patron reported that if he could not find something in the library catalog in five minutes he switched to Google, something likely to limit the discovery of archival records for patrons who either do not know where to start searching for a particular item or what they

are searching for in the first place.\textsuperscript{164} Having MARC records of archival records can mitigate this problem. Instead of placing all of the item’s information in yet another separate silo that the patron needs to know about in order to search, it places at least a high-level amount of information in a place that library patrons already know to search namely the Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC).

The use of MARC as a common markup will likely also smooth out the transition to styles of systems that completely circumvent the problems of siloed library resources such as discovery layers and next generation catalogs. Roughly this technology allows users to bypass the library search system silos by allowing the user to search against a web-scale federated database that not only includes books but other library materials such as articles and archival materials.\textsuperscript{165} Furthermore, these search systems are often web-scale, meaning that depending on the libraries preference, the user is not only searching the local collection but the collections of all the libraries that are a part of the discovery system.\textsuperscript{166} In short, it is a system that exists alongside web-search engines such as Google that can access information that web-crawlers have a hard time accessing. Furthermore, it provides near immediate linkage to the data using library link resolvers, something that Google scholar often cannot do due to restricted access to certain databases. For archives and libraries to implement these types of systems, having MARC records of unique resources like archival collections, will facilitate a smooth transition to the new system.

While librarians and archivists can convert the data format, Marshall Breeding, a

\textsuperscript{164} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{166} Ibid., 5.
prominent technical services librarian who until recently, worked at Vanderbilt University, mentions that doing so is often a multi-step, labor-intensive process.¹⁶⁷

For all of its usefulness to researchers, this particular mark-up is not actually ideal for an archival finding aid. For one thing, although MARC is flexible, it is only designed to accommodate one layer of information easily, not a hierarchy.¹⁶⁸ This, although it is ideal for library style cataloging, is less helpful for archival description where it is common to describe large swathes of material in aggregate using hierarchies. Due to this limitation, it often makes sense for archives to employ EAD as a mark-up language and use MARC only when the archive has the time and the need to create a record that it can easily incorporate into a library system.

EAD is an XML-based markup language developed to address some of the shortcomings of MARC. Unlike MARC, it not only allows, it was designed to portray information hierarchies of all types. Furthermore, because it is written in an XML-based language it has a wider degree of migration capabilities than MARC, particularly on the web and programmers can easily convert it via XSLT to HTML, XHTML and other web-based languages.¹⁶⁹ As a standard for the archival community, this language forms the basis of many unified platforms used by multiple institutions such as the Online Archive of California. This in turn, has allowed for an aggregation of data specific to archives. Thanks to EAD, archival researchers can perform one-stop shopping of multiple archives

and their resources at once. Finally, it is very easy to implement The open source program, Archivist’s Toolkit, provides for a relatively simple conversion process via a Graphical User Interface.

Owing to the usefulness of both of these forms, Smith opted to use both. She created a full MARC catalog record, following the DACS, the results of which can be seen in Appendix 1. She then also created a DACS style record designed for easy conversion to EAD, a process that Christopher Rockwell intended to undertake by feeding the record into Archivist’s Toolkit after the student left the archive. This record is available in Appendix 2.

Conclusion

By appraising these records, Smith was able to potentially improve the donor’s eventual tax-write-off by drawing attention to portions of the collection that were not as thoroughly appraised. By arranging the documents in the manner that she did, Smith was able to create a structure that would be comprehensible to a researcher and preserve the integrity of the original sub-collections. Even her processing procedures and storage solutions, while necessarily conservative given the overall value of the collection, were designed to stabilize the materials as much as possible until the archive could work on it further. However, it was in creating not one but two different avenues of access through a MARC record and a finding aid designed for conversion into EAD, where Smith was able to truly reach out to the public and make them aware of the collection. By creating records that users could find on multiple different platforms, she worked to ensure that
the widest possible audience would be able to find this collection. Throughout this
process, she conducted research on the best approach to performing the steps of
appraising arranging and describing the records, often making critical decisions regarding
document arrangement and description.
Chapter 5
CONCLUSION

There is no doubt that the nineteenth-century was a period of real change for the theatre. Actor-managers emerged during this era, Parliament abolished the patent system of theatrical governance, staging and acting changed to fit new audience demands for realism, even theatre safety and the social status of actors improved slightly during this era. The many changes that theatre underwent during this period, make documentation regarding how actor-managers staged plays and even playbills, important sources of information regarding the particulars of how these changes occurred and what the overall effect was.

While it is of course important to have thorough documentation of a subject like nineteenth-century theatre, for archivists, there is always a concern about the collection’s overall quality. This is especially true when the collection offered consists largely of autographs, as is the case with the Larson collection. In cases like this, the archivist must consider the collection very carefully in terms of context, informational value and other factors. In the case of the Larson Collection, there was enough context, enough information, and enough of a research draw to the overall area for the university to justify adding and processing this collection.

It was in conducting this processing, along with the arrangement and the description that the intern was able to truly expand her horizons and grow. Not only did this collection, although small, present several arrangement and processing challenges, because the archival and library world is undergoing a significant shift in how it deals
with cataloging and description, there were more options than usual concerning the way that the intern could describe the materials. The result of this was a significant level of further research, not only into the “hows” of arrangement, processing and description, but also, particularly in the case of description, an exploration of the “whys.”

Now that this collection is fully arranged, partially processed and fully described, it should be of some value to researchers. In particular, researchers interested in the financial dealing of mid-eighteenth century theatres or individuals curious about the role of professional artists other than actors in English theatre will find this collection useful. Some other possible uses include research on the history of theatrical printing and binding, and even research on the history of mid-twentieth century autograph collecting. Overall this collection not only served as a useful learning experience for the intern, by arranging, processing and describing it, the intern had the opportunity to make a valuable contribution to the understanding of English theatre history, by making this collection available to the public.
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MARC Record

245 00 $a Gerard and Georgia Larson Theater Collection $f 1678-1999 $f bulk 1830-1930

300 ## $a 4.2 $f Linear Feet

100 1# $a Larson, Gerard, $f 1923-1999

300 ## $a 3.7 Linear Feet

545 0# $a Gerard Larson was a professor in the Theatre department at California State University, Sacramento from 1957-1994. During his tenure at this institution, he directed numerous student plays including the first musical produced by the theatre program and the early operas. In addition to his work with the CSUS theatre and other area performing arts centers, Gerard was an avid collector of theatre memorabilia, particularly 18th and 19th century memorabilia related to the London’s Haymarket area.

546 ## $a Materials in English and French

520 2# $a The collection consists of over 200 years of theater memorabilia, primarily from the Haymarket district in London, the bulk of which dates between 1830 and 1930. The collection includes a number of autographs from famous actors in the nineteenth-and twentieth-century, correspondence for the Adelphi theatre, original artwork for Lyceum souvenir booklets, staging directions for two nineteenth-century performances, playbills from the eighteenth-and nineteenth-century, and engravings or portraits of both actors and Haymarket theatres.

506 0# $a Collection is open for research

555 8# $a Finding aid available in the Department of Special Collections and University Archives

524 ## $a Georgia and Gerard Larson Theater Collection, MSS 2010.34. Department of Special Collections and University Archives, The Library, California State University, Sacramento.

540 ## $a Copyright is protected by the copyright law, Chapter 17 of the U.S. Code. Requests for permission to publish, quote, or reproduce from collections must be submitted in writing to the Head of the Department of Special Collections and University Archives. Permission for publication is given on the behalf of the
Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Library, California State University, Sacramento as the owner of the physical item and is not intended to include permission of the copyright holder, which must also be obtained by the researcher.

541 # Georgia Larson; |cgift; |d1995

700 1# |a Manby, Charles, |d 1804-1884

700 1# |a Towers, James

700 1# |a Cattermole, Charles, |d fl. 1859

700 1# |a Partridge, Bernard, |d b. 1861

700 1# |a Downey, Thomas

700 1# |a Willett, Ernest Noddall

600 1# |a Irving, Henry, |c Sir, |d 1838-1905-- |v Autographs

600 1# |a Hanks, Tom-- |v Autographs

600 1# |a Martin-Harvey, John, |c Sir, |d 1863-1944-- |v Autographs

600 1# |a Arliss, George, |d 1868-1946-- |v Autographs

650 #0 |a Playbills- |z England- |z London- |x Collections

650 #0 |a Actors- |z England- |z London- |v Autographs

650 #0 |a Actors- |x England - |v portraits

610 2# |a Lyceum Theatre (London, England)

610 2# |a Adelphi Theatre (London, England)

650 #0 |a Theater |z England |z London |x History |y 18th century |v Sources

650 #0 |a Theater |z England |z London |x History |y 19th century |v Sources
650 #0|a Theater |z England |z London |x History |y 20th century |v Sources

650 #0|a Theater |z United States |x History |y 20th century |v Sources
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EAD-Ready Finding-Aid

Descriptive Summary

Title: Gerard and Georgia Larson Theater Collection

Dates: 1678-1999

Bulk Dates: 1830-1930

Collection number: MSS 2010/34.MSS

Creator: Larson, Gerard, 1923-1999

Collection Size: 3.7 Linear Feet (3 manuscript boxes, and 1 oversized box)

Repository: California State University, Sacramento. Library. Dept. of Special Collections and University Archives.

Abstract: The collection consists of over 200 years of theater memorabilia, primarily from the Haymarket district in London, the bulk of which dates between 1830 and 1930. Gerard and Georgia Larson assembled this collection over their lifetimes, focusing heavily on collecting items related to famous nineteenth-century actors such as Sir Henry Irving. This collection includes their extensive autograph collection as well as a substantial collection of early playbills dating back to the mid-eighteenth century, a promptbook for a mid-nineteenth century play, and original artwork created for Lyceum souvenir booklets. The collection also contains literature on nineteenth-and twentieth-century plays and staging, in particular a four year run of Craig Gordon’s publication The Mask, and a small number of letters and play booklets related to Gerard Larson’s teaching career.

Physical location: Some of the CSUS Special Collections and University Archives are stored offsite and advance notice may be required for use. For current information on the location of these materials, please consult the library's online catalog.

Languages: Languages represented in the collection: English, French

Access

Collection is open for research.

Publication Rights

Copyright is protected by the copyright law, Chapter 17 of the U.S. Code. Requests for permission to publish, quote, or reproduce from collections must be submitted in writing to the
Head of the Department of Special Collections and University Archives. Permission for publication is given on behalf of the department of Special Collections and University Archives, The Library, California State University, Sacramento as the owner of the physical item and is not intended to include permission of the copyright holder, which must also be obtained by the researcher.

Preferred Citation

Georgia and Gerard Larson Theater Collection, MSS 2010.34. Department of Special Collections and University Archives, The Library, California State University, Sacramento.

Acquisition Information

The Gerard and Georgia Larson Theater Collection was donated by Georgia Larson in May 2010.

Accruals

No additions are expected.

Alternative Forms of Material Available

There are no alternative forms of this collection.

Custodial History

Gerard and Georgia Larson assembled this collection over Gerard Larson’s lifetime. Although they collected some of the materials themselves, some they bought from Autographs and Documents Historiques. Amongst the items they collected were several pre-assembled collections. These collections include a group of letters either sent to or received by Charles Manby that relate to his management of the Adelphi. Another such grouping is the letters assembled by Charles Willett from various famous actors, during the course of his writing career. Finally, a Haymarket theatre district ephemera collection assembled by James Towers over the course of his lifetime, exists within this collection.

Biography / Administrative History

Gerard (Gerry) A. Larson (1923-1999) was born in Chicago but raised in New York, where due to parental influence, he first fell in love with the theater. He obtained his doctorate in 1957 from the University of Utah, where he met his wife, Georgia. Dr. Larry Shumate recruited him for the newly established CSUS theatre department immediately after graduate school and he worked as a professor in the department until 1994. During his tenure at this institution, he directed numerous student plays including the first musical produced by the theatre program and the early operas. In addition to his work with the CSUS theatre and other area performing arts centers, Gerard was an avid collector of theatre memorabilia, particularly 18th and 19th century memorabilia related to the London’s Haymarket area. This hobby directly affected his teaching activities, on at least one occasion he directed a play at CSUS that dated back to this era. Even
after completely retiring from CSUS in 1993, he continued to be active in the theater, performing with his wife in the 1996 production “Love Letters.” He died after a bout of pneumonia in 1999 at the age of 75, leaving behind his wife and several nieces and nephews.
The daughter of Helen and James Bobolis, Georgia (Bobolis) Larson, a Utah native, married Gerard Larson in 1957. A teacher by profession, her avocation during her husband’s lifetime was assisting Gerard Larson in his work. She acted in several of his plays, including his 1963 production of Hamlet, and their two person performance of “Love Letters.” She is an active member of the Annunciation Greek Orthodox church, and in recent years has written productions for the CSUS theater program. She currently lives in Sacramento.

Scope and Content

SERIES I: Literature

Subseries 1: Unpublished materials, 4ff. Includes the: Theatre Royal Haymarket Chronicle of Events (N.D.); and two auction catalogues (1964-1965)

Subseries 2, Newspaper clippings, 1678-1884, 3ff. Includes the newspaper clippings on Panton Street (1678-1800) as well as an advertisement for Miss C. Heenan’s Tichborne Street show [C. 1870]


Subseries 4: Monographs, 1895-1944, 2 individually cataloged items. Includes a signed copy of Naturalisme Au Theatre (1895) and a copy of Burleyce c. 1931.

SERIES II: Plays, 1799-1848.

Subseries 1: Scripts, 1799, 1ff. Consists of the play, Pizzaro (1799).

Subseries 2: Stage Direction, 1829-1848, 3ff. Includes the R.J. Collier promptbook for the play The Gambler’s Life of Thirty Years (c. 1828) and the staging notes for the play Die Huguenots (c. 1848).

SERIES III: Playbills, 1752-1878.

Subseries 1: 18th Century English Playbills, 1752-1805, 3ff. Includes playbills for the Theatre Royal (1752-1805) and Playbills for the Opera house, James Beckett’s and Phillip Breslaw’s theatres (1776-1803)

Subseries 2: 19th Century English playbills, 1809-1878, 4ff. Includes playbills from the Theatre Royale (1816-1878), The Olympic Circus (1809-1878) and the Surrey and King’s Theatre’s (1822-1845)

SERIES IV: Playbills, 1752-1878.
Subseries 1: Charles Cattermole’s Macbeth Collection, 1888, 4ff. Includes four folders containing The Lyceum Theatre souvenir booklet, along with the rejected publication originals and the accepted pen and ink and ink wash originals. All date from 1888.

Subseries 2: Bernard Partridge Collection, [1889]-1892, 2ff. Includes the watercolors for the Lyceum Theatre’s Dead Heart Souvenir Booklet [1889] and the souvenir pamphlet for the Lyceum Theatre production of Henry VIII (1892).

Subseries 3: James Towers Collection 1790-1897, 18ff. Includes engravings and drawings of many of the major Haymarket area theaters such as Drury Lane, Her Majesty’s and King’s (1791-1897), Scene engravings from plays that occurred in the Haymarket area as well as some playbills (1811-1847), Portraits of actors in costume including Edmund Keane and James Carter (1820-1840), regular portraits of actors including one of Helena Modjeska and one of William Farren (1790-1840) and finally, newspaper pictures of the Great Unionist Meeting at the Opera House (1886).

Subseries 4: Thomas Downey Caricatures, N.D., 1ff. Includes several caricatures by Downey of C.H. (Charles Herbert) Workman while in costume for various roles N.D.

Subseries 5: Scene Engravings after 1900, c. 1930, 1ff. Includes an undated reproduction of a scene from Canterbury Tales as well as a 1930 poster for The Taming of the Shrew.

SERIES V: Letters and Autographs, 1802-1999

Subseries 1: Ernest Noddall Willet Collection, 1891-1931, 4ff. Includes several mounted letters and autographs from actors such as Sybil Thorndike, Sir Henry Irving and Genevieve Ward (1891-1931) and several un-mounted autographs or letters from individuals like George Arliss and Lester Wallach (1913-1931)

Subseries 2: Charles Manby Collection, 1853-1885, 4ff. Includes generalized correspondence with the Adelphi Theatre Manager, Benjamin Webster (1855-1856) as well as correspondence related to his resignation from the Haymarket theatre (1853), and general letters sent to Charles Manby from individuals like June Bedford, Charles Braham and others (1847-1885).

Subseries 3: General, 1802-1999, 5ff. Includes letters and notes to Gerard Larson from former students such as Tom Hanks (1964-1999), a grouping of mounted letters including some from Charles Matthews and Charles Mayne Young (1861-1881), several miscellaneous letters including ones from Edith Bolling Galt Wilson, Sean O’Casey, John M. Kemble and others (1852-1946), a grouping of autographed play ephemera that includes a circus ticket signed by P. T. (Phineas Taylor) Barnum (1881-[c. 1940]), and several other autographs including one by Richard Peake and one by Albert Chevalier (1802-1897).
SERIES VI: Modern Shakespeare Ephemera, 1963-1973, 4ff. Includes theatre booklets from the Royal Shakespeare Theatre (1963-1964), an Ashland Shakespeare Theatre Booklet (1973), a newsletter from the Utah Shakespearean festival (1973) and an undated map representing Britain as Shakespeare would have known it.

Arrangement

Series 1, Literature 1678-1985
Subseries 1, Unpublished Materials 1964-1965
   Box 1: Folder 1-Theatre Royal Haymarket Chronicle of Events original-N.D.
   Box 1: Folder 2-Theatre Royal Haymarket Chronicle of Events transcription-N.D.
   Box 1: Folder 3-Autographs and documents Historiques catalog and German note-c. 1965
   Box 1: Folder 4-Ifan Kyrle Fletcher History of Entertainment Catalogue-1964-1965
Subseries 2, Newspaper clippings 1678-1884
   Box 1: Folder 5, Panton Street news clippings-1678-1800
   Box 1: Folder 6, Tichborne Street Miss C. Heenan Advertisement-[c. 1870]
   Box 1: Folder 7, Charles Brahm Obituary-[1884]
Subseries 3, Journals and Magazines 1924-1985
   Sub-Subseries 1, The Mask 1924-1929
      Box 1: Folder 8, The Mask Vol. 10 No. 1-1924
      Box 1: Folder 9, The Mask Vol. 10 No. 2-1924
      Box 1: Folder 10, The Mask Vol. 10 No. 3-1924
      Box 1: Folder 11, The Mask Vol. 10 No. 4-1924
      Box 1: Folder 12, The Mask Vol. 11 No. 1-1925
      Box 1: Folder 13, The Mask Vol. 11 No. 2-1925
      Box 1: Folder 14, The Mask Vol. 11 No. 3-1925
      Box 1: Folder 15, The Mask Vol. 11 No. 4-1925
      Box 1: Folder 16, The Mask Vol. 12 No. 1-1926
      Box 1: Folder 17, The Mask Vol. 12 No. 2-1926
      Box 1: Folder 18, The Mask Vol. 12 No. 3-1926
      Box 1: Folder 19, The Mask Vol. 12 No. 4-1926
      Box 2: Folder 1, The Mask Vol. 12bis No. 1-1927
      Box 2: Folder 2, The Mask Vol. 12bis No. 2-1927
      Box 2: Folder 3, The Mask Vol. 12bis No. 3-1927
      Box 2: Folder 4, The Mask Vol. 12bis No. 4-1927
      Box 2: Folder 5, The Mask Vol. 15 No. 1-1929
      Box 2: Folder 6, The Mask Vol. 15 No. 2-1929
      Box 2: Folder 7, The Mask Vol. 15 No. 3-1929
      Box 2: Folder 8, The Mask Vol. 15 No. 4-1929
Sub-Subseries 2, American Mercury-1924 1924
      Box 2: Folder 9, American Mercury Vol. 1 No. 3-1924
Box 2: Folder 10, American Mercury Vol. 1 No. 4-1924
Box 2: Folder 11, American Mercury Vol. 2 No. 5-1924

Sub-series 3, Miscellaneous 1904-1985
Box 2: Folder 12, Samhain-1904
Box 2: Folder 13, Theatre Arts Monthly-July 1935
Box 2: Folder 14, Theatrephile-1985

Subseries 4, Monographs 1895-c. 1944
Box 2: Folder 15, Burleycue-c. 1944
Catalogued and housed with monographs
Box 2: Folder 16, Naturalisme au Theatre signed by Emile Zola-1895
Catalogued and housed with monographs

Series 2, Plays 1799-1848
Subseries 1, Scripts 1799
Box 3: Folder 1, Pizarro-1799

Subseries 2, Stage Direction 1829-1848
Box 3: Folder 2, R. J. Collier Promptbook-1829
Box 3: Folder 3, Die Huguenots staging notes-[c. 1848]
Folder housed in: Large Oversized Folder 1
Box 3: Folder 4, Die Huguenots staging notes documentation-N.D.

Series 3, Playbills 1700-1878
Subseries 1, 18th century English playbills 1752-1805
Box 3: Folder 5, Theatre Royal Drury Lane-1796-1797
Box 3: Folder 6, Theatre Royal Hay-Market-1752-1805
Folder housed in: Small Oversized Folder 1
One item in Misc. Oversized: Large Oversized Folder 13
One item in general newspaper isolation: Large Oversized Folder 14
Box 3: Folder 7, Opera house, James Beckett’s, and Phillip Breslaw’s-1776-1803

Subseries 2, 19th century English playbills 1809-1978
Box 3: Folder 8, Theatre Royal Drury Lane-1816-1878
Folder housed in: Small Oversized Folder 2
Box 3: Folder 9, Theatre Royal Covent Garden-1816-1827
Folder housed in: Small Oversized Folder 3
Box 3: Folder 10, Olympic Circus-1809-1878
Folder housed in: Large Oversized Folder 2
Box 3: Folder 11, Surry and Kings Theatre’s-1822-1845
Folder housed in: Large Oversized Folder 3

Series 4, Artistic representations 1790-1930
Subseries 1, Charles Cattermole’s Macbeth collection 1888
Box 3: Folder 12, Rejected publication originals-1888
Box 3: Folder 13, pen and Ink publication originals-1888
Box 3: Folder 14, Ink wash publication originals-1888
Folder housed in: Small Oversized Folder 4
Box 3: Folder 15, Publication-1888
Subseries 2, Bernard Partridge collection [1889]-1892
Box 3: Folder 16, Dead Heart watercolors- [1889]
Folder housed in: Small Oversized Folder 5
Box 3: Folder 17, King Henry the 8th booklet-1892
Subseries 3, James Towers Collection 1790-1897
Sub-subseries 1, Haymarket theatres 1791-1897
Box 3: Folder 18, Astley’s amphi theatre interior engraving-1791
Folder housed in: Large Oversized Folder 4
Box 3: Folder 19, Drury Lane Theatre-N.D.
One item housed in James Towers Newspaper Isolation: Small Oversized Folder 11
Two items housed in Towers Misc. oversized: Large Oversized Folder 12
Box 3: Folder 20, King’s Theatre Interior and chandelier-N.D.
Folder housed in: Large Oversized Folder 5
Box 3: Folder 21, Her Majesty’s Theatre—1858-1897
Folder housed in: Large Oversized Folder 6
Four items housed in James Towers newspaper isolation: Small Oversized Folder 11
Box 3: Folder 22, New Brunswick Theatre ruins picture-N.D
Folder housed in: Small Oversized Folder 6
Box 3: Folder 23, Theatre Royale Haymarket floorplan-1821
Box 3: Folder 24, St. Paul’s floor plan and Theatre audience -N.D.
Folder housed in: Small Oversized Folder 7
Sub-Subseries 2, Plays 1811-1847
Box 3: Folder 25, Bookplates-c. 1847
Box 3: Folder 26, Production ephemera-N.D.
Box 3: Folder 27, Large Scene Engravings of Unknown play and The Bucks have at Ye All-c. 1811
Folder housed in: Small Oversized Folder 8
Box 3: Folder 28, Hamlet Costuming representations-N.D.
Folder housed in: Small Oversized Folder 9
Sub-Subseries 3, Actors in Costume 1820-1840
Box 3: Folder 29, James Carter, Lion King-N.D
Folder housed in: Large Oversized Folder 7
Box 3: Folder 30, Edmund Keane-N.D.
Box 3: Folder 31, Assorted English Celebrity Actors-c. 1820-1840
Two items in James Tower’s Misc. oversized: Large Oversized Folder 12
One item in James Tower’s newspaper isolation: Small Oversized Folder 11
Sub-Subseries 4, Actor portraits 1790-1840
Box 3: Folder 32, Small Engravings-c. 1790-1840
Box 3: Folder 33, Large Engravings of William Farren and John Lacy-1821-1825
Folder housed in: Large Oversized Folder 8
Box 3: Folder 34, Signed Photograph of Helena Modjeska-N.D.
Sub-Subseries 5-Great Unionist Meeting Pictures 1886
Box 3: Folder 35, Great Unionist Meeting Pictures-1886
Folder housed in: Large Oversized Folder 9
All newspaper
Subseries 4, Thomas Downey caricatures N.D.
Box 3: Folder 36, Thomas Downey Caricatures, N.D.
Subseries 5, Scene engravings after 1900 c. 1930
Box 3: Folder 37, “Canterbury tales” and “The Taming of the Shrew”-c. 1930
Folder housed in: Large Oversized Folder 10
Series 5, Letters and Autographs [c.1720-1764]-1999
Subseries 1, Ernest Noddall Willet Collection 1891-1931
Box 3: Folder 38, Front matter, N.D.
Binder table of contents-N.D.
Autograph list-N.D.
Box 3: Folder 39, Mounted letters and autographs-1891-1931
Henry Irving, Sir-1896
Genevieve Ward-1899
Herbert Beerbohm Tree, Sir-N.D.
John Martin-Harvey, Sir-1897
John Martin-Harvey, Sir-N.D.
Fred Terry, Matheson Lang and “Ellen”-N.D.
Sybil Thorndike, Dame-1923
Franklin Dyall-N.D.
Marie Elba and Irene Vanbrugh-N.D.
William Archer and Arthur Bingham Walkley-c. 1903
Edmund Tearle and Charles Morton-c. 1902
Oscar Asche-N.D.
Unidentified-1904
Johnston Forbes-Robertson, Sir-1902
Ben Greet, Sir-N.D.
Harry Furniss-1905
Israel Zangwill and M. O. Cullen (Max O’Rel)-N.D.
Gerald du Maurier, Sir-N.D
Gerald du Maurier, Sir and Mrs. Patrick Campbell-N.D.
Alfred Austin-N.D.
Frederic H. (Frederic Hymen) Cowen-N.D.
Robert Fowler-N.D.
Frederick Harrison & Ella Overbeck, Baroness-N.D.
Edward Knoblock-N.D.
Robert Machray-1903
Sims Reeves-1891
Kate Santley and Ada Crossley-N.D.
George Arliss-1931
Bram Stoker, Raymond Blathwayt, Henry Dana-N.D.
Box 3: Folder 40, Loose letters and autographs-1913-1931
Charles Abbott and George Manville Fenn-N.D.
Lester Wallach-N.D.
Unidentified-N.D.
B.L. (Benjamin Leopold) Farjeon-N.D.
Fred Terry-1913
George Arliss-1923
George Arliss-1931
Box 3: Folder 41, Binder-N.D.
Subseries 2, Charles Manby Collection 1853-1885
Box 3: Folder 42, Benjamin Webster letters-1855-1856
    [Benjamin Webster]-April, 1855
    [Benjamin Webster]-July 20
    [Benjamin Webster]-September 29, 1856
    [Benjamin Webster]-November 17
    [Benjamin Webster]-October 22, 1856
    [Benjamin Webster]-December 25
    [Benjamin Webster]-N.D.
Box 3: Folder 43, Webster Resignation letters-1853
    Joshua Silsbee-1853
        Item has newspaper
Box 3: Folder 44, General letters-1847-1885
    June Bedford-N.D.
    Hamilton Braham-[1885]
    Charles Braham-N.D.
    Thomas E. Lyan-1854
    Carlo (Pietro Carlo Giovanni Battista) Marochetti, Baron-1863
    R B Pecke-N.D.
    J A Pelk-N.D.
    William Henry Oxberry-1848
    Thomas H. Pitt-1847
    H G Robinson-1854
    J C Saurheel-1854
    Unknown note-1855
    Unknown note-N.D.
    Unknown note -N.D.
    Unknown note-N.D.
Box 3: Folder 45, Autographs-N.D.
    William Sydney Penley Photograph-N.D.
Subseries 3, General [c.1720-1764]-1999
Box 3: Folder 46, Gerard Larson letters-1964-1999
  Misc. Student signatures including Tom Hanks-N.D.
  Tom Hanks-1989
  Tom Hanks-1999
  Laurence Olivier-1964
Box 3: Folder 47, Letter book-1861-1881
  Sarah Bartley-N.D.
  Charles Matthews-1881
  Charles Mathews-N.D.
  Thomas Morton-1831
  Frederic Reynolds-N.D.
  [Charles Mayne Young]-N.D.
  [Charles Mayne Young]-N.D.
  Unsigned note-1861
Box 3: Folder 48, Misc. Letters-1852-1946
  Samuel Beazley-1830
  J. Brasseur-N.D.
  Sergei Eisenstein-N.D.
  David Garrick-N.D.
  Henry Irving-1886
  John M. Kemble-N.D.
  Charles Matthews with envelope-1855
  Mary Marquet-N.D.
  Sean O’Casey-1946
  Ignace Jan Paderewski-N.D.
  H. Phillips-1845
  Cecile Porel-1922
  Lennox Robinson-N.D.
  Timothy Twist-N.D.
  Bernard Shaw-1929
  Sigmund Weber-N.D.
  Edith Bolling Galt Wilson-1951
  Unsigned note-1886
  Unsigned note with envelope-1943
  Unknown signature-1852
  3 mounted autographs W. Furren, Louisa Chatterby and L Colman-c. 1837
Box 3: Folder 49, Autographed play ephemera-[c. 1720-c. 1940]
  P.T. (Phineas Taylor) Barnum signed ticket 1881-1882
  The Playbill signed by with Eva LaGalliene and Margaret Webster-[c. 1940]
  Housed in Misc. Oversized: Large Oversized Folder 13
  William Pitt Lennox, Lord-N.D
  Joe Miller Benefit signed by William Hogarth-[c. 1720-1764]
Box 3: Folder 50, Other autographs-1802-1897
“Fred’s” 1861 autographed picture addressed to Croker
Nazimova note and envelope sent to [Anastazya Skowronska]-Aug 8, 1921
Gaston Baty unsigned 1935 note
Albert Chevalier-1897 quote
Richard Peake-1802 check

Series 6-Modern Shakespeare Ephemera 1963-1973
Box 3: Folder 51-Royal Shakespeare Theatre booklets and cast lists-1963-1964
Folder housed in: Small Oversized Folder 10
Box 3: Folder 52-Ashland Shakespeare Festival booklet-1973
Box 3: Folder 53-Utah Shakespearean Festival Newsletter and booklet-1973
One item in General Newspaper Isolation: Large Oversized Folder 14
Box 3: Folder 54-Shakespearean Souvenir material-N.D.
Folder housed in: Large Oversized Folder 11

Indexing Terms

The following terms have been used to index the description of this collection in the library's online public access catalog.

Manby, Charles, 1804-1884
Towers, James
Cattermole, Charles, fl. 1859
Partridge, Bernard, b. 1861
Downey, Thomas
Willett, Ernest Noddall
Larson, Gerard Arthur
Irving, Henry, Sir, 1838-1905--Autographs
Hanks, Tom--Autographs
Martin-Harvey, John, Sir, 1863-1944--Autographs
Arliss, George, 1868-1946--Autographs
Playbills--England--London--Collections
Actors--England--London--Autographs
Actors--England--Portraits
Lyceum Theatre (London, England)
Adelphi Theatre (London, England)
Theater--England--London--History--18th century--Sources
Theater--England--London--History--19th century--Sources
Theater--England--London--History--20th century--Sources
Theater--United States--History--20th century--Sources
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