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CHAPTER I
HISTORY

Restoration social and political history.

The Restoration marks an historic period in England starting May 25, 1660 with the return of King Charles II from exile, and lasting until the end of Charles' reign in 1685. Charles II was exiled to France around 1649. At this time his father, Charles I, who had ruled England since 1625 was executed due to a political revolt led by Oliver Cromwell. From 1648 until 1660 Cromwell ruled England as a Puritan Commonwealth.

The Restoration under the rule of Charles II was a fairly peaceful fruitful time for England. With no standing English army, and low taxes, political and religious conflict was kept to a minimum by a particularly savvy King who was adept at putting out small political fires before they became more complex. Charles II patronage of English drama still stands as one of his great lasting achievements.

The Puritan Commonwealth had many ramifications for the theatre of the age. Even before the overthrow of the royalists in 1644 the mostly Puritan parliament closed the playhouses in 1642. "With few exceptions no plays were produced in London for 18 years." The Puritans considered the stage to be a place of public immorality. With the return of Charles II, theatre troupes were once again formed. In London there were two recognized companies: The King's Company and the Duke's Company.

---

   Much information contained in Ogden's history and analysis is extrapolated from the 11 volume London Stage 1660-1800 (Carbondale, 1968).
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid. p. 2
Development of the English theatre

The Restoration is an important historic as well as literary era. Although tragedies and mimes were performed during the Restoration, this period is best known for comedies like *The Country Wife*. The *Country Wife* was one of the favorite plays of its day. The comedies of the Restoration were in the main comedies of wit and manner, intrigue and sex. The Restoration theatre is noted for several ground breaking changes. Among these was the use of women as actors in drama, the development of the modern playhouse and the use of moving scenery in England.  

The inclusion of female performers in this era had several important repercussions among which was the shift in the nature of the theatricality of English theatre from the time when men and boys played women’s roles. This shift also had an impact on the employment and apprentice systems for actors.

The second major change accredited to Restoration theatre was in the area of architecture. The model for the modern playhouse was actually developed by English architects, namely Inigo Jones, before the Commonwealth. As early as 1639, however, most of these “new” architectural styles for theatre (based on Serilio and other Italianate models) were cut short in their development due to the ascension of Cromwell and the Commonwealth. The new theatre architecture consisted of an end staging arrangement with an elaborate proscenium, and a raked stage. The development of the new theatre architecture was established for the inclusion of Italianate moving scenery. Painted scenery in perspective became popular.

---

4Ibid. Almost directly from an outline in *London Stage 1660-1800*. 
in England as early as the first decade of the seventeenth century. However, it was confined to court entertainment. The English did not perfect the craft of perspective architectural rendering for the stage until the middle of the 17th century just before the Commonwealth forced the closure of the theatres. The Restoration stage was patterned after the designs of Inigo Jones who took his lessons from the great Italian architects and designers.\(^5\)

The Restoration theatre space was an early ancestor of our modern proscenium stage house. The theatre consisted of a raised platform stage at one end of a large hall. The hall had two to three rows of gallery boxes on 3 sides for audience members. The floor of the hall was known as the "cock pit". The pit, where people would go to be seen, was the social center of the theatre. The audience was not confined to the boxes and the pit. Individuals would bring chairs directly up onto the very wide apron of the stage.

The apron extended from the proscenium arch 30 feet into the house, and stretched across the entire house down stage of the proscenium. The arch was elaborate with architectural detail and it had doors to the wing space at both right and left stage. The playing platform was raked to aid the illusion of space detailed in the painted perspective scenery. Wing and border scenery in the theatres had very sophisticated rigging systems for movement. The scenery consisted of painted panels or flats that would slide past each other guided by floor tracks and driven by winches. Similarly painted borders flew overhead in front of one another to match the appropriate wings. The wings and borders were placed along perspective lines and scaled in order to give an illusion of great depth. Adoption of perspective scenery marked the

---

movement from the Renaissance to the realism of the modern era in England. The earlier theatre of spoken decor where the dialogue contained the information about environment and locale gave way to a theatre where the designers and the painters created elaborate spectacle for the performance.

William Wycherley and The Country Wife

William Wycherley was born in 1641 shortly before the exile of Charles II and grew up in England under the Commonwealth until he departed for schooling in France. His family was royalist in their political orientation and probably wanted their son to have a more cultured education than the Commonwealth could allow him. After France, Wycherley spent time in school at Oxford. Wycherley came to maturity around the time of the restoration. He was 19 when Charles II returned to England. Wycherley's first comedy, Love in a Wood, was produced in 1671 and was a great success. The author enjoyed his good fortune and lived well under the patronage of the Duchess of Cleveland. In 1675, Wycherley opened The Country Wife. By this point in his career, Wycherley had established a reputation and was on his way to fame with the production of his third, and what became, his best known play.

In 1678, James II ascended to the throne, and Wycherley fell from the king's favor when he married the Countess of Drogheda in 1680. The King disapproved of the match. Soon after, Wycherley spent time in debtor's prison until 1786. Wycherley lived until 1716 and died in debt at the age of 74.6

Wycherly lived out his years in a libertine society. The monarchy and the censors had agendas for their National drama. One of the major purposes

6Ogden. p. 15
of the English Restoration drama was to serve as a socially corrective device to ridicule hypocrisy, shame vice and mock affectation. However, these plays were not always fashioned to be corrective. The tone of Restoration society was loose and immoral. The true social goal was not to be caught in a compromising circumstance while maintaining a very virtuous exterior. To be caught in hypocrisy was the worst social disaster that could befall an individual.

The Country Wife is very much about this hypocrisy of the period and the steps people took to elude its consequence. Wycherley’s play pokes fun at the hypocrite not the libertine: the jealous old whore master is cuckolded, the fop is cheated by hisfalsewit, the three town women make fools of themselves in the midst of their own deceits, and the negligent husband is cuckolded as he pursues his own pleasures. In contrast, true wits are lionized and rewarded for honesty, virtue, and sacrifice in their deceits: Margery deceives her husband Pinchwife, whose oppression makes her deserving of extra-marital liberty, Harcourts’ “Frank” nature smooths over the fact that he is stealing the fiancée from one he calls friend in public, and Alithea is rewarded for her true honesty with the hand of a man who she truly finds attractive. Alithea is not so lady like as to disengage entirely with her would be lover. Similarly, it would be Harcourt’s position to respect her initial rejections if he were a true gentlemen. Greatest of all the honorable wits is Horner who, by virtue of his sacrifice of reputation, is seemingly entitled to

---

7Ibid. p. 4
any woman in the kingdom. The real heroes are those who are best at covering their hypocrisy and debt with a heavy veil of rationalization and "honest" virtue. In *The Country Wife* the characters fly in the face of the socially corrective intentions of the theatre in the Restoration era.
CHAPTER II
PRODUCTION CONCEPTS

The OSU Department of Theatre hired a guest director, Stephen Hollis, to direct *The Country Wife*. There was much conjecture on the part of the student designers as to what the director would be like and what he would like to do with the show. It bears mentioning that there was a general feeling of excitement and opportunity surrounding the opportunity to work with a director as experienced as Mr. Hollis.

The first contact with the director came in the form of a memo from Dr. Conlin (Theatre Department Chair) to the production staff and faculty advisors. The memo served to forward a two page typed concept statement/overview that Mr. Hollis had for the play. His memo, dated September 30, 1994 also directed that a telephone conference in October would be arranged for a further meeting of minds on this project. Mr. Hollis’ concept took a very historiographical approach. The weight of his paper was devoted to communicating the nature of London society. In a very concise manner Mr. Hollis laid out the basic history related in Chapter I of this thesis, and he commented specifically about the nature of the theatre of the age and the social forces that ruled its content. Chief among these social factors was the ideal of “moral wantonness”. For the director, the chief interest in the drama was the illustration of sexual conquest of the characters in a world

---

9Hollis, Stephen “Production Concept for *The Country Wife*”
A copy of Mr. Hollis’ production concept is available in appendix C.
where "individual pleasures lie in bettering each others epigrams and where love affairs were conducted mainly for the sake of having experiences and conquests to brag about."  

Mr. Hollis' goal seemed to be to communicate the libertine nature of period society to the contemporary audience by focusing on the characters of the play and how they related to such a world. It was also clear that the subtle sexual intrigue provided in the language of The Country Wife was to be strictly observed in the acting and costumes of the play.

After his general history of the play, Mr. Hollis identified specific scenic elements and themes. Important points covered were the background of London, focusing on neo-Palladian architecture of 17th century England (Inigo Jones). He also made stylistic references to the work of Hogarth and Rowlandson, artists of this period who captured some of the bawdy comedy of the age through their paintings. The necessary locations for the play were outlined: Horner's rooms, Pinchwife's house, and Covent Garden. He wanted a set that could recombine its elements to create these three locales avista. The elements of the set were to be representational and not naturalistic. The background of London should illustrate the social and commercial nature of the world of the characters. Specifically the need for three doors in Horner's rooms was identified.

This was the basic information available going into the telephone conference on October 4th. To prepare for the meeting I read the play several times and made a list of specific requirements in a scene by scene breakdown; essentially a list of scenic and prop needs. I also reviewed the director's

\[ \text{ibid.} \]
concept carefully in order to understand his strongest messages and key words.

What the director added during our first telephone conference was very significant. The director wanted to see 17th century London as the gritty, muddy place it was. He felt a strong need to illustrate a world, without our modern conveniences; a world where no one bathed or washed their clothing and everyone walked muddy streets day in and day out. This earthy condition was a part of the corruption of London. For contrast he wished to see the characters of the play standing out almost shining and clean against this filthy background. I was to prepare preliminary designs and send them to the director within a week. (Tuesday 11 October, 1994).

I prepared a package consisting of an early design concept statement, a preliminary sketch of the set and a broad variety of photocopied research materials for the director and sought approval at the departmental production meeting on October 11. The package was discussed and approved by the production team and the producer. Two copies of the package were mailed to Mr. Hollis on October 15.  

Upon receipt of the preliminary concept and design package a second conference call was held between Mr. Hollis, Jason Freimark, (stage manager) and myself. Mr. Hollis liked the general approach to the design styles but he did not care for hidden doors in the scenery nor for furniture moving in and out on pallet wagons. He believed both of these devices would confuse the audience and function awkwardly for what he had envisioned for the play. Furthermore, he expressed a strong interest in using an up stage center

---

11 A copy of this sketch (Figure 1) is available in appendix A.
12 A copy of the preliminary design concept is available in appendix D.
entrance. He was also interested in seeing more shop signs in the Covent Garden scene.

I was to prepare a final design package based on this conversation to be submitted in two weeks time (November 4). The package was ready on November 4th as required but could not be mailed until after it was approved by the producer and the design team at the regular production meeting on the 8th. A package of 2 renderings, a concept statement, furniture plots (ground plans), selections of pertinent research and an action plot detailing characters entrances and exits was mailed to Mr. Hollis in New York around the 9th of November.

The essential scenic design concept for *The Country Wife* stemmed from a need to communicate the feeling of period London to a contemporary Ohio audience. To do this I borrowed directly from William Hogarth engravings, specifically *Gin Lane*. To me the images of *Gin Lane* most clearly depict the contrast sought in this production between the script’s "slick" heroes placed against the grittier earthier side of London. A great part of the design was derived from selected Hogarth engravings which were included in the preliminary research packet. The use of Hogarth’s style clearly set the flavor of the show and made the period in question well defined for the audience in a visually interesting manner. The use of this style was to be consistent throughout the design with the exception of the wood planked deck, and the various set and furniture items that travel on and off stage. These were depicted in realistic period detail. I thought Hogarth’s engraving style in black and white cross hatching would be visually

---

13 A copy of *Gin Lane* and a detail illustration (Figures 2&3) is available in appendix A.
monotonous when blown up to real life scale. The images needed to be treated with shadow washes, light spatter breakup, and selected placement of color washes. The colors would break the monotony and reinforce the commie nature of the play.

The set, as presented in the second design package consisted of a back wall, a painted plank deck set at a gentle rake of 1:14 and is 20'-0" deep. A portal was designed to enhance the period style and wit of the production through the depiction of fanciful figures while allowing us to close the 37' wide X 22' high opening to about 28' wide X 16' high. Entrances and exits were to be through door units that travel on tracks on and off stage. There were two of these units immediately up stage of the Proscenium; one right and one left. A third traveling door unit that was to play up stage center. Behind this door unit was a hidden door in the back wall built to allow masked up stage center entrances through the center door unit. Aside from the traveling door units there was a hidden door built into the stage right false proscenium, and hidden doors and window openings in the traveling building units of the New Market scene.

Interior scene shifts were to be handled by rearranging furniture and accessories to establish different locales. To aid in the distinction between Horner's and Pinchwife's lodgings there was to be a window unit for each apartment. Some of the furniture was to have different paint treatments on either side to enhance the sense of another locale while still allowing the scene changes to go rather smoothly. The real impact of this effect was overestimated, and it was soon cut.

The exterior at the New Market were achieved by trading out the up center door unit for two market stalls. The down stage door units rolled out
to be replaced by traveling building units. The window units would have flown out and in their place pairs of period shop signs came in. Remaining furniture was stacked into the market stalls and became merchandise at the market. The scene would also be populated by extras that adorned with market props.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN SOLUTIONS

DESIGN PROCESS

This chapter is to recount the specific events from which the scenic design for *The Country Wife* evolved prior to the time of actual set construction. The design process started with careful analysis of the script, listing the scenic requirements defined by the text, and incorporating information from the director's concept and conversations with the director over the phone.

The list of requirements consisted of entrances and exits (traffic needs), preliminary property requirements, basic furniture needs, general environments and anticipated actor use of any of the mentioned items. The list was then turned into an extensive research guide containing specific production needs as well as general concept information including word clues from the director such as, Hogarth, Rowlandson, neo-Paladian, and flowing contemporary scenery. The list provided an outline to develop a compilation of textual and visual research materials. The task was then to sift through the materials gathered in order to glean necessary details about period scenery, furniture, and literary criticism.

The director had been specific about several particulars of the design but he had made no broad stylistic statements about what the production should look like. I began to prioritize the goals of a period comedy. The most
important among these was communicating the meaning of the play to the audience. I made the assumption that the general OSU audience probably knew little about the English Restoration. With this assumption in mind, it became my chief goal to design a set that would allow the audience to understand a bit about the function of the theatre of this period.

The engravings of Hogarth spoke very clearly about the nature of Restoration London. I started to explore ways in which Hogarth's wit and style could be communicated in a scenic style for *The Country Wife*. At this point in my research I turned back to a class project from a year before where I used a pen and ink paint treatment for the scenic elements in a design for *The Recruiting Officer*. The design for the project consisted of a series of drops painted in the Hogarth engraving style of English country homes. The house units would fly in combinations in front of a backdrop depicting a town in the English country side. The deck for this design was wood planked, There was a false proscenium portal that was made of soft goods and served as a traveler curtain. The proscenium could therefore open and close in order to create different scenic compositions. Scenes could also be played in front of the closed curtian while different furniture on wagons was traded behind. The painting style for *The Recruiting Officer* project was in a sketch style not unlike that of the Hogarth engravings I had been looking at for *The Country Wife*. The old concept for my class project seemed to apply well, and was instrumental in guiding the initial development of the design for *The Country Wife*. There were similarities between the projects through the sketch style of Hogarth, the elaborate false proscenium, and the raked deck of painted planks.
Before beginning my visual research I had made an action plot for the production that listed all of the entrances and exits on the stage. This play is very much about coming and going and it serves the pretense of the period to have actors making entrances and exits as often as possible from a variety of stage locale. This, along with the fact that the theatres of the period had stage doors built into the architecture of the proscenium, caused me to design camouflage doors in every imaginable place on the set. Doors everywhere would give the director a very versatile stage setting to create quickly shifting traffic patterns of actors. During a second telephone conference Mr. Hollis stated that he very much wanted to maintain the same scenic units on stage throughout the performance. He also needed to see a clearer delineation of the different stage locales. He especially wanted to see greater differentiation between Horner’s and Pinchwife’s rooms. The solution to this problem was that the tracked wagons carrying the furniture were to be cut and the furniture would be rearranged from scene to scene to identify the different households. Furthermore, flying window cutouts were to be added to each of the interoirs in order to identify them more specifically. Mr. Hollis also thought it odd that people would be opening doors in the back wall and he asked for three “real” doors to be added to accommodate the traffic needs of the production. Specifically he wanted a larger door on a stair through which he could block strong up stage center entrances and exits.

The first step in the final design process was to draft a final ground plan.\textsuperscript{14} It was to be the first of several plans for this production of \textit{The Country Wife}. The plan was very detailed and illustrated how different units would fly in and out and how floor units tracked. By this point in the process,

\textsuperscript{14}A copy of the first Ground Plan (Figure 4) is available in appendix A.
it was very firmly decided that we did not want to see stage hands moving large units of scenery around the stage. I believed that a deck with tracking scenery would still be the quickest way to achieve this goal.

During the last phone conversation on October 21, 1994, a meeting was arranged with Mr. Hollis in Cincinnati on October 30. Mr. Hollis was to be in Cincinnati on business and there would be an opportunity to discuss directly with him the finished ground plan and how it reflected the changes he requested during our previous conversations. The meeting also allowed a chance to meet the director face to face and become familiar with him prior to his residence at OSU.

The trip to Cincinnati was a very comfortable one. Matt Kizer (lighting designer) and I met Mr. Hollis at his hotel room and after a bit of polite conversation we began to examine the ground plan and determine entrances, exits and general traffic patterns. Mr. Kizer also had the opportunity to talk very generally with the director about lighting possibilities. A few practical changes in the ground plan resulted from this meeting. The doors in the false proscenium were cut. The sixteen foot stage depth was identified as too shallow and the stage was made four feet deeper. No further concrete judgments about the set without renderings or a model could be made.

A second ground plan was drafted. From the revised ground plan I proceeded to draw a series of furniture plots\textsuperscript{15} detailing the arrangement of furniture that was to appear in each scene. From these I moved on to fabricate a series of three renderings\textsuperscript{16}.

\textsuperscript{15}A copy of the Furniture Plots (Figure 7) is available in appendix A.

\textsuperscript{16}Copies of the design renderings (Plates I,II) are available in appendix B.
I chose a collage process for the execution of the renderings. This process allowed me to create intricate pen and ink sketches of the scenery in large scale and then use a photocopy process to reduce the images to an appropriate scale for the renderings. The first and most difficult item to draw was the false proscenium. The design allowed the false proscenium to wrap out around the front wall of the black concrete arch that is the architecture of Thurber Theatre. The themes of the proscenium dealt with mischief. I utilized images of statues of men and women staring at each others naked torso, also a satyr and a partially naked sibyl were depicted lounging across the top among cartouches and ferns. These were details extrapolated from the work of Inigo Jones.

The style of the market booths was derived from research on Covent Garden and the market there. The furniture and objects from the previous scene was to be stacked into these booths and sold as wares in the market place. The booth units would have tracked on as the up stage center door unit tracked off.

The back wall, already drawn in the preliminary design sketch, was to be recopied in a cleaner style. The basic drawing was also embellished with more neo-Palladian buildings. It was a general consensus that the actual Hogarth image from *Gin Lane* posessed the essence of a country rather than a city sky line. Several more buildings were added to the image to reinforce the city theme of the backdrop. The images for the exterior building wagons were also borrowed from Hogarth engraving *Beer Street*.

The photo-reducing the images for the set renderings presented a significant challenge in terms of determining ratio and proportion of the items in a perspective grid. Once all of the items were drawn and photocopied
onto canson paper it was a fairly easy task to cut them out and glue them down in various arrangements. Once assembled light and shadow effects were penciled in and the renderings were done. Due to the complexity of collaborating over distance the design deadline was extended to Friday November 4. The Renderings were complete on time, but the mailing would have to wait until November 8 for production staff approval.

The completed renderings satisfied the needs of the play. The images spoke of the earthy London without being oppressive. The color remained very light in value which was appropriate for the comedic nature of the play. The Hogarth engraving style was one with which the general audience would be familiar and would associate with the Restoration.

The final design mailing was assembled and copies were distributed to the production team on November 8. A copy was mailed to Mr. Hollis in New York on November 9. The package met with the general approval of the OSU production staff, and the production was at a stand still until we heard from Mr. Hollis regarding the design. The mailing consisted of two color photo copy reductions of the renderings for Covent Garden and Horner's rooms a final design concept statement (see Chapter I), a research reference to Gin Lane and an action plot with a scene by scene breakdown of the characters entrances and exits 17.

Mr. Hollis returned his response with a telephone message on the 14th of November. The general message was "Ken, I don't like the look of these sketches at all. Call me tomorrow." I had completed a large body of the design drawings in anticipation of their November 15th deadline. The message forced me to consider the fact that I might have to redesign the entire

---

17A copy of the action plot is available in appendix E.
production. I phoned Mr. Hollis on the 15th and we discussed the changes he felt were necessary. His concerns were mainly ones of scale and placement of door and wagon units. The up stage center door unit needed to be larger and perhaps a double door with two or three steps leading up to it. The side door units needed to be more substantial with reveals that led off stage. The booths for the Covent Garden scene were not what he wanted to see at all. He was looking more for wheeled carts and barrows than for free standing stalls and booths.

The changes the director requested seemed to be simple. However, I anticipated the task of implementing the changes through the design would be a very difficult and time consuming task. It was becoming evident that accommodating larger wagon units would involve an almost complete redraft of the project.

Mr. Hollis also requested a white model of the set for our meeting on November 19th when he would be in Columbus for auditions and casting of The Country Wife. The immediate need for the white model superceded the need the redraft of the design. The project moved forward with redesigns happening as I built the model.

After the November 19th meeting with Mr. Hollis where he saw the white model final design revisions and new draftings were made. The original deadlines for most of the graphic work on the production had passed. I prioritized my list of tasks to accommodate the individuals who needed graphic information from me. First among these tasks was to draft one final version of the ground plan in order to specify the perimeters of the new proscenium arch.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{18}A copy of the Final Ground Plan (Figure 5) is available in appendix A.
By the time of the meeting with Mr. Hollis in Columbus on Saturday November 19. John Thomas, the production costume designer was already moving forward with his preliminary costume renderings. Mr. Thomas presented his basic silhouette, color, and fabric choices the same weekend. My meetings during this weekend resulted in fundamental color shifts in the scenery that might affect Mr. Thomas’ costume designs. The base color of the set shifted from white to an off-white or sepia color, therefore, my second priority was to confer with Mr. Thomas as soon as possible regarding these changes.

The third priority was the scenic art for the production. The set would involve a great deal of technical painting. It was clear that the production would need a staff of student scenic artists from the beginning of Winter quarter to execute the painting for The Country Wife. Along with the scenic artists there needed to be clear painters elevations from which to work. I estimated that seven plates of painters elevations would be needed.

I began to solicit department graduate and undergraduate student painters. I had several positive responses and was instructed to develop a syllabus for the special project course under the heading Theatre 405. There was little way of telling what students had committed to the scenic art project and at the winter break I had to have faith that a paint staff would surface in the quarter ahead. By the time of the winter break the paint elevations were half way to completion the drafting for the production was finished. Only the final scenic model remained to be built in order to complete my preproduction tasks.
I continued through December to create the remaining graphics for the production. By the first of the year I was finished with the paint elevations and the scenic model was near completion. Because of the painters elevations for the production and the existence of an earlier white model the color scenic model was easy to build. It was a simple task to color photocopy the paint elevations and cut them out for application to the model. Much of the furniture was also built previously for the white model. The furniture was easily painted and included with the final version of the model.

The paint elevations were presented at the first production meeting of the winter quarter (January 3, 1995). Mr. Hollis would not be present until the following week. At the meeting Mr. Thomas and I discovered that we had miscommunicated the relationship of the color and detail of the back wall and the color and pattern scale of the several of the costume designs. We both overcompensated by making the patterns more intricate and by moving the colors to very similar hues. Mr. Thomas very quickly responded to this situation by changing several of his fabric choices.

Mr. Hollis arrived from New York for his residency during the second week of classes Winter quarter. At the production meeting (January

---

19Copies of the paint elevations (Plates III-VII) are available in appendix B.
10, 1995) following his arrival I presented the scenic model again. The model was kept in a central location and was at the disposal of Mr. Hollis and Mr. Freimark for rehearsal purposes.

There was a meeting between Mr. Hollis, Mr. Freimark and Carol Smithheisler, prop master, and myself on Friday January 20. During this meeting we discussed prop needs from furniture to hand props. By comparing our individual lists we were able to develop a comprehensive chart of the property needs for the production. After the meeting it was possible to produce a solid prop list with a breakdown of cost estimates. Before the final list was formulated Mr. Thomas and I established what the costume related props were and who was to be responsible for their acquisition. All of the costume props appeared on the list. The chief advantage of being able to run a cost estimate at this point in the production was the fact that several hundred dollars of the $1300 prop budget could be unencumbered and utilized for set needs.

The scenic model was brought to the prop meeting in order to discuss the placement of furniture. Mr. Hollis then began a criticism of the design for the back wall. He had decided that it would be better to have the back area remain black in order to bring the actors into sharper focus. His general complaint was that the drop was too busy and it muddied the focus. I disagreed with Mr. Hollis that a black unit of masking for an up stage wall would help our production. We negotiated the issue, and by the end of the meeting it was tabled. I assured Mr. Hollis that I would rework the image of the back wall with the goal of simplifying its pattern and color. This compromise would bring me into later conflict with the costume designer.

20 A copy of the prop list and budget is available in appendix F.
because the pattern of the back wall that he had worked very hard to balance with his costumes was changed in a manner for which he could not compensate.

After the prop list was approved by Mr. Shanda, Ms. Smithheisler set about the task of collecting rehearsal props and purchase orders. I began to prioritize the craft related tasks that would require my direct attention and those that could be delegated to students. The location of furniture was chief among the tasks that required my efforts. Mr. Hollis and I agreed in November that furniture would be supplied that he would later arrange on the stage. It was surprising to find that the department furniture storage held nearly all of the furniture needs for the production. There were at least three selections of possible chair styles from which to choose. Any of these selections would require new upholstering. In the storage area there was also a handsome replica of a Jacobean side board that would serve nicely as the central table for the set. There were also plenty of small tables and foot stools. I made an appointment with Mr. Thomas for a shopping trip to select upholstery fabric for the chairs. The trip yielded a broad selection of choices. Following the campaign for fabric an appointment was made with Mr. Hollis to join me in selecting the furniture for the play. Mr. Hollis selected the heaviest and most ornate chairs, and found the table to be too narrow for the blocking developed so far. I offered to add a new larger table top to the existing base. The compromise pleased Mr. Hollis and the furniture was delivered the following day to the scenic studio for reconditioning. The upholstery fabric that was finally decided upon was purchased with petty cash. It seemed that the prop area of the design was well on its way.
I was frequently called to rehearsals because the director had concerns about the lack of space on the stage. The design for the space was intentionally small for several reasons. Initially, Mr. Hollis requested that the stage space be reduced in order to establish a more intimate actor audience relationship. The reduced stage area would also make the actors appear larger in relationship to the set. In this way we hoped to lend focus to the actors. In an early phone conversation Mr. Hollis identified 16’ as the recommended depth of the stage the initial ground plan reflected this number. It was later agreed that the stage depth would be expanded to 20’. In retrospect a better design solution would have been to expand the deck back to 24’. For budgetary reasons and for the sake of the actor audience intimacy I refrained from this choice.

The general nature of the stage design also offered challenges to the lighting designer, Mr. Kizer. The shallow position of the back wall rendered the location of the third electric useless. The deep plunge and the general low trim height of the false proscenium made it impossible to achieve a good lighting angle from the front of house positions. The result of these awkward lighting angles was that the up stage center door unit had no viable angle from which it could be lit. There was a need to raise the trim of the portal in order to allow the front light all the way up stage. The design solution was quite easy. The portal was moved one foot up stage, and, instead of building the upper section of the arch from 4’ wide stock flats we built it from 3’ wide stock flats. The necessary foot was shaved from the trim height of the portal and none of its design contour was sacrificed.

The lighting designer had many other problems related to the set with which to deal. The tall scenery in the wings greatly limited side light
capability. There was a significant amount of lighting equipment visible at the side stage areas. The light on the up stage light was forced to be very frontal. As a result the light cast undesirable shadows on the scenery. Most of these problems were the result of the reduction of the stage space to a much smaller and narrower area than the lighting positions in the theatre would accommodate.

Early in the design process it was decided that foot lights would be included along the down stage edge of the stage. The goal of including the foot lights was to reinforce the period quality of the scenery for the audience. Mr. Kizer believed the footlights would provide an opportunity for low angle lighting effects. However, the lamps in the foot lights were not strong enough to effectively illuminate the actors or the scenery. They remained primarily scenic units decorating the deck with a dim lighting effect.

By the first week of classes I had established a crew of three scenic artists; Amanda Cotter, Doug Fordyce, and Ardra Stanski. At this early point in the quarter there was little for them to paint. Structural construction priorities, a shortage of finishing materials and the focus on the current production of Gym Rats caused a delay of over a week before there was any paintable scenery constructed. Ms. Stanski photographed the paint elevations. Before the break Mr. Shanda and I decided that the most efficient transfer technique for these elevations would be to create a series of slides to project the exact image on the scenery that had been constructed.

As more and more scenery was built it was possible to have the scenic artists painting more steadily. Having three working scenic artists on the production alleviated the pressures of execution considerably. Although the
paint crew removed some pressures they also presented new challenges regarding time and labor management.

Each of the painters presented individual challenges as well. Mr. Fordyce was an extremely skilled painter and a true asset to the production. His availability was limited to an eight hour work day on Mondays only. It was difficult to arrange adequate work for him that could keep him busy for a full eight hours that could also be completely finished in that time. I could not let one of his unfinished projects stand for a solid week until he returned. There were also several projects on which Mr. Fordyce’s help was needed but could not wait until his Monday work call.

Ms. Cotter also proved to be a strong painter. The primary challenge in working with her was one of reliability. Ms. Cotter would frequently arrive late for or miss calls entirely. It became impossible to plan tasks for her to do. Much of her skill was wasted on lesser projects that did not need much planning.

Ms. Stanski was very reliable. She, however, was the least experienced painter in the crew, and required much more supervision and focus time than the other painters. Her steadfast nature allowed her to improve greatly throughout the production process. By the time for load in she was demonstrating true skill as a scenic artist. I began to feel comfortable leaving her alone on most projects.

The use of slides to project the images on the scenery proved to be a mixed blessing. Without this technique it is doubtful that any sense of style and proportion from the paint elevations could have been kept. The process did accelerate some of the paint process, however, the task of properly aligning the projector and the scenery devoured most paint time that was
saved. The projection process also forced the painters to work in the dark during the transfer steps in the project.

The scene shop was also moving steadily on construction. The Friday before load-in (February 3) the bulk of the scenery seemed to be ready for Monday's call. The top half of the false proscenium, which had been painted earlier in a more accessible up stage position was hung in its place. The load-in on Monday February 6 proceeded as expected and the general construction was progressing well.

I began to feel anxiety about the competition of details. The trim for the door units had long since been painted yet the arduous task of installing a large volume of molding remained untouched. The bulk of the craft work on properties had not been completed. I asked Professor Hastings to finish the furniture upholstery. Student crews were set to the task of decorating the vendor wagons for the Covent Garden scene. I spent a great deal of my time attempting to turn period canes from hardwood dowels. There were many other small prop details that were being handled by the prop master and myself. By the time of crew watch Mr. Hollis was expressing concerns regarding the finished detail of the various units.

We were also confronted with the issue of live flame on stage. The text of *The Country Wife* requires that a letter be sealed with wax in view of the audience. The director decided that he would like to see the authentic act with a real candle and sealing wax. We decided to mount glass globes around the candles to satisfy the safety requirements. The process of sealing a letter with wax proved to be far too complicated to do properly on stage. The actors soon stopped using any real wax in preference of miming the sealing.
The first tech was the night of February 15. Most of my function during the technical rehearsals involved observing the set and props and taking notes on what details would be dealt with the following day. I had to do very little trouble shooting and Mr. Shanda dealt with most technical issues personally and immediately.

The only chronic issue that existed through the technical process was the manner by which the upstage center doors would be closed. The doors had a center closure which made it difficult to for any regular door catch to be used to keep the doors from bouncing or falling open. The technical solution of bungee cords inside the door shutters that attached to the door frames was implemented in a technical rehearsal. The practical result was that the doors would swing shut automatically behind the actors. The solution worked well for practical purposes. It was fail safe. The doors would never swing open awkwardly during a performance and the actors would not need to worry about closing the doors behind them. The director thought that the doors automatically closing behind the actors looked “silly”. Another solution was needed. The bungee cords were cut and a strip of carpet was applied to the top edges of the doors. The carpet strip created a slight friction between the shutter and its frame. The solution worked reasonably well but it was not fool proof.

The only other major design solution that came of the technical rehearsals was the observance of the awkward appearance of the masking flat behind the up stage center hidden door. The masking flat was quite visible during the interior scenes whenever an actor made an entrance or an exit upstage center. It was decided that the flat would be painted so that the lines of the back wall would appear to continue directly on to the masking flat.
behind. Despite the fact the images would only line up from a view point in the middle of the house the treatment would clearly associate the two planes in a manner that would appear intentional.

By the time of the first dress rehearsal the molding treatments on the door units were finished. The slow application of detail greatly affected the unity of the paint treatment. To solve this a rich brown glaze was applied with a pneumatic spray gun in order to unify the treatments. The additional layer of color pulled the look of the doors together. It also deepened and enhanced the look of the wood grain significantly.

During technical rehearsals there were occasional difficulties with the tracking units drifting from position but most of these problems were solved by first dress. The dress rehearsals were uneventful. Most of the design notes from the dress rehearsals consisted of small paint and prop details of little import.

The Ohio State University Theatre production of The Country Wife opened on Wednesday February 22, 1995 and ran until Saturday March 4. The morning following the opening Mr. Hollis left for New York City and other projects. The production was followed by department and area talk backs which proved to be very interesting and informative.
CHAPTER V
EVALUATION

Evaluation of a theatre project is always a difficult task. The cliché hindsight is 20/20 holds true. In The Country Wife there are as many design choices that should have been made differently as there were design choices made. It seems far more important to evaluate the lessons learned in the design process for this thesis production. There were many. Here are a few.

The first and greatest among these lessons regards the nature of my contribution to the success or failure of The Country Wife. I see in my collaborative work on the production a stubbornness and a selfish edge.

My original concept for the set, supported the production in an appropriate manner. The first concept would have worked if the director had accepted all of the conventions I brought to the table with the original design. When he did not I was unable or unwilling to let go of my original ideas. I neglected my obligation to search for other ideas that may have better suited Mr. Hollis' direction of The Country Wife. I share the responsibility for this failure with the director. Our communication breakdown was two way. He was unable to communicate his desires with any guidance or clarity. Conversely, I was not listening with an open mind to what he was trying to say.

In producing The Country Wife I learned a great deal about management. I learned through the observation of my faculty when the
constraints of schedule might be let go due to circumstance. Anyone can throw a deadline to the wind. But, a professional knows when it is appropriate to let it slip away with calm faith that, with diligent effort, everything will work itself out.

The production of *The Country Wife* was also a crash course in general labor management. Keeping the three member paint crew supplied, busy, and efficient, while trying to offer them an educational experience was particularly challenging. More importantly I found the ability within myself to let them work on their own on the very delicate work that needed to be done. Giving them their general independence was a most liberating experience for me. As a result I found time in my schedule to deal with many design and construction duties that I would otherwise have had to pass along. I felt considerably less stress as the project progressed. I saw work completed in my absence that normally I would have done myself.

In working with an out of town director I discovered much about the nature of the collaborative process in the professional theatre business. I knew that much creative work for the theatre is handled long distance. *The Country Wife* forced me to deal with a collaborative relationship of correspondence. There are two broad challenges in the professional long distance relationship. Exchange and language is governed by a different and far more limited set of rules than in face to face collaboration. Furthermore, the time needed to carry on a long distance collaboration far exceeds the time needed for collaborations in a residency or academic institution. Much more lead time should be scheduled when dealing with these situations.

The set for *The Country Wife* was successful. It maintained a unified style, and worked well with the costume and lighting design elements. There
was some disunity between interior and exterior scenes. The inclusion of real wood door units in the interior scenes deviated from the drawing style in a way that the exterior building units did not. The design, in retrospect, was in no way a representation of the director's concept of the gritty earthy London he related in our first phone conversation. Ultimately the images were too fanciful and the colors were almost storybook in quality. The Hogarth drawing style did communicate a period feel for the production, but it was too abstract to be considered earthy.

The raked deck was very successful in the way it presented the play. The paint treatment also made the playing space look larger than it was. Actual size was the true short coming of the deck. The space was too small to accommodate the blocking and the scenery effectively. The size and the location of the up center door unit hindered blocking greatly and was especially awkward for the actors to use as an entrance. The moving scenery, in general, was effective only during the shift from the interiors to the Covent Garden. The technology for moving the scenery was utilized so little during the production that it hardly seems to have been worth the effort.

The experience of designing The Country Wife was rigorous. I found systems for communication that I have never used before. I was introduced to a dramatic form for which I had never designed. There were challenges to which I rose and others at which I failed. There were none from which I did not learn.
Appendix A

Figures
FIGURE 8: Front Elevations
Appendix B
Color Plates
PLATE I: Set Rendering, Horner's Rooms
PLATE II Set Rendering, Covent Garden
PLATE IV  Paint Elevation, Proscenium Arch
PLATE V  Paint Elevation, Stage Right Building Unit
PLATE VI Paint Elevation, Stage Left Building Unit
PLATE VII Paint Elevation, Door Units
PLATE VIII
Scenic Model, Homer's Rooms
Appendix C
Director's Concept
THE COUNTRY WIFE
by William Wycherley
Director: Stephen Hollis
Concept Statement

When Parliament recalled Charles II from exile in France in 1660, the theatres, which had been closed by an act of Parliament under Oliver Cromwell's Puritan leadership, were able to reopen. Patents were granted by the king to two companies, the King's Company and the Duke's Company, and these two theatres were the only ones allowed to function for the rest of the 17th Century. Among large sections of the community the habit of theatre going had been lost and for 18 years Cromwell had condemned playhouses as places of lewdness. In the Restoration period, therefore, the theatre became almost exclusively a rendezvous of the fashionable class and their hangers on, the rakes and bullies, ladies of pleasure and the young imps of court men and the principal reason for going was to while away an afternoon, display one's new suit or arrange an assignation with one of the 'ladies of the town'.

For this type of audience, a specialised type of drama was needed and very soon the dramatists were offering plays reflecting the tastes and interests of this audience of courtiers, thus assuring at least SOME attention from the crowd. Wycherley was typical of this class of gentlemen and he wrote about his friends and their interests and pastimes. His plays reflect accurately the social and moral values of the period, which under the leadership of the libertine king, Charles II, lacked any kind of morality. In THE COUNTRY WIFE and other plays of the time, every moral value was turned on its head and mocked and he who could carry off a wanton lifestyle with ease and success was highly regarded and those like SPARKISE, who had to make too much of an effort, or PENCEWIFE, who lacked any social graces, were ridiculed, not only behind their backs, but to their faces as well. This was an age in which the ability to lie, cheat, dissemble and deceive were considered to be highly desirable and those practiced fidelity or who had scruples were seen as losers. Wycherley has recorded the spurious good fellowship of those dandies whose greatest pleasure lay in bettering each other's epigrams and whose love affairs were conducted mainly for the sake of having experiences and conquests to brag about. They aimed to impress not so much the women as the other men. Against this background, HORNER, however, is a true sensualist, interested not so much in what his peers think but in the reality of sexual success, not the glory of it. THE COUNTRY WIFE is an extremely sensual play, everything in it revolving around HORNER's attempts to have sexual relations with as many women as possible. In this regard, he meets little opposition from the women themselves, whose main concern is for the preservation of their 'reputation' and by so doing, Wycherley captures the hypocrisy of the time and moral bankruptcy of the period.
The set should represent London of the period - Inigo Jones, neo Palladian architectural style and the feel of the play is captured in the drawings of Hogarth (The Rake's Progress) and Rowlandson. The action of the play takes place in three basic locations - Horner's rooms, Pinchwife's house and Covent Garden. I would prefer a design that allows these three separate locations to evolve into each other by moving independent pieces of set rather than a complete scene change so that the production can move fluidly without interruption. Architectural features such as doors, windows and staircases can be rearranged to suggest the different locations - a set which is representational rather than naturalistic, all of which should take place against a background of the London of this clique - coffee houses, wigmakers, tailors, restaurants, playhouses etc., The scenes in Covent Garden should represent some kind of arcade with merchants selling their wares, bustling activity, the place in London to see and be seen.

Horner's room needs three doors or, at least, three different entrances to make sense of the China scene.

Costumes should reflect the dandyism and sensuality of the period. BORNER, MARCOURT AND DORILANT are three fashionable men about town and their clothes should reflect their position in society. PINOB - WIFE, although from London, acts and behaves more like a country gentleman and his clothes should be more old fashioned and frumpish. SPARKISH, the fop, should, of course, dress outrageously with too much of everything. Too much lace, too many bows, too many curls. He is so determined to be envied and admired that he ceases to have any judgement and ends up making a complete fool of himself. The ladies of the town, LADY FIDGET, DAINTY, ALITHIA and SQUEAMISH, also dress fashionably and expensively although SQUEAMISH can be a little on the foppish side too, trying a little too hard. By contrast, MARGERY should dress more simply and less suggestively. Her husband would never allow her to dress otherwise. All should wear wigs, especially the men and a lot of the time we will see them dressing and undressing as their appearance is a central theme of the play.

London in the late 17th Century was a time of great poverty and disease (the Great Plague was during this period). Smallpox, venereal disease, gout, miscarriages and infant deaths were rampant. Personal habits were offensive. No one bathed, there was no sanitary system, people and the streets stank. Clothes were made of either velvet or silk, neither of which could be washed nor dry cleaned so people perfumed themselves with orange blossom and other scents to keep away the smells. Wigs were worn because most people were bald, including the women, white make up was worn to hide the disfiguring scars from smallpox. Fine clothes covering stinking bodies, wigs and make up covering ugliness and disease are a perfect metaphor for the plays of this period, in which sparkling wit and superficial behaviour mask corruption and immorality. The 'comedy of manners' explores the conflict between the way people 'feel' and the way they 'behave'. Perception is everything and the fundamental hypocrisy of this group of people is a theme that should be carried through the production.

The movie, TOM JONES, although set later in the mid 18th Century, is a very good representation of certain aspects of this period.
Appendix D

Design Concepts
Dear Stephen:

Here is a package of preliminary design materials consisting of this memo an early perspective sketch and a section of selected research materials. You are receiving duplicate copies of the package so that you may make appropriate notes on one copy that could be sent back to me while you keep a copy for yourself. I have also made a duplicate copy that I can have with me during future phone conversations.

THE SKETCH

Here are several copies of the sketch each with specific notation as to doors, wagons etc. My essential concept for our production stems from a need to communicate the feel of period London to our contemporary Ohio audience. In doing this I have borrowed directly from Hogarth engravings specifically *Gin Lane*. To me the Images of *Gin Lane* most clearly depict the contrast you seek between our slick heroes and the grittier earthier side of London. I would like very much to stick with the style of the Hogarth or the Rowlandson engravings for the presentation of scenery. The use of this style will clearly depict the flavor of the show while making the period in question well defined for the audience in a visually interesting manner. The style would be consistent throughout the set with the exception of the deck (currently depicted as wood planking) and the drapery painted on the front portal. I think a strict black hatching on white would get visually monotonous. The images will need to be treated with shadow washes, light spatter...
breakup, and selected placement of color washes. The color washes should give the images a slightly hand tipped appearance.

The set itself (at this point) consists of a back wall, two side units that could be wagons or stationery that are rendered with stylized period architecture. DS of these units will be wagons SR & SL that will track on across the stage carrying appropriate furniture and props. (The furniture would not be treated in the style mentioned but would rather be more consistent with the level of realism of the costumes. In this way I hope to better link the costumes and the set.) The deck is at a gentle rake of 1:12 and is 16' from back wall to apron edge. Around the arch is a portal designed to enhance the period style of the production while allowing us to close the 37' wide opening to about 30'. It is my intention to build the necessary doors in to the scenery and allow the design treatment to partially camouflage them while not in use. There several options for door treatment for us to look at. We could leave them entirely treated as a part of the scenery they are built into. We could frame them as appropriate period doors and simply allow the paint treatment to cover them. We could also put proper looking period doors into the scenery and create a level of contrast by leaving them with a conventional door treatment. On the sketch I have laid in seven places where there could be doors. Please indicate to the locations you think would work best for our purposes.

I have not yet tackled the manner in which the arcade at Covent Garden is to be handled. My original solution was to use a cut drop but that seems a bit old fashioned and I am wrestling with a contemporary approach to bringing the arcade in.

At this point I am in no way married to any of these ideas, although, I think this approach is my strongest so far for meeting the goals we have laid out for this production. This packet should merely serve as a visual baseline from which the final design will develop. I am very excited to be designing this project and I look forward to working with you more directly soon.

Sincerely,

Ken Canfield

cc: Conlin, Hastings, Knapp, Thomas, Kizer
The essential concept for The Country Wife stems from a need to communicate the feel of period London to our contemporary Ohio audience. In doing this I have borrowed directly from Hogarth engravings specifically *Gin Lane*. To me the Images of *Gin Lane* most clearly depict the contrast we seek between our slick heroes and the grittier earthier side of London. The greater part of the set is in the same style as the Hogarth engravings represented in the preliminary research packet. The use of this style clearly depicts the flavor of the show while making the period in question well defined for the audience in a visually interesting manner. The style is consistent throughout the set with the exception of the deck (wood planking), the drapery painted on the front portal and the various set and furniture items that travel on and off stage. These will be treated in a more naturalistic or more period manner. I think a strict black hatching on white would get visually monotonous. The images need to be treated with shadow washes, light spatter breakup, and selected placement of color washes. The color washes give the images a slightly hand tipped appearance. The General value scale should be from 1-5 +10 (1 being white and 10 being black).

The set itself consists of a back wall, a painted plank deck set at a gentle rake of about 1:14 and is 20' from back wall to apron edge. Around the arch is a portal designed to enhance the period style and wit of the production while allowing us to close the 37' X 22' opening to about 28' X 16'. The entrances and exits will be handled through door units that travel on tracks on and off stage. There are two of these units immediately up stage of the Prosc., one right and one left. There is a third traveling door unit that places up stage center. Behind this door unit is a hidden door in the back wall built to allow for masked up stage center entrances through the center door unit. Aside from the traveling door units there is a hidden door built into the stage right false prosc., and hidden doors and window openings in the traveling building units of the New Market scene.

The interior scene shifts will be handled by rearranging the furniture and accessories to establish a different locale. To aid in the distinction between Horner's and Pinchwife's lodgings there will be different flying window units for each apartment. Some of the furniture will have different paint treatments on either side which will enhance the sense of a different locale while still allowing the scene changes to go rather smoothly.

The shift to the exterior at the New Market is achieved by trading out the up center door unit for two market stalls. The down stage door units roll out to be replaced by the traveling building units. The window units fly out and in their place sets of period style shop signs come in. Any remaining furniture is stacked into the market stalls and becomes merchandise at the market. The scene should also be populated by extras that will be adorned with market props.

This overall design concept will help us to communicate the period style of The Country Wife to our contemporary audience while allowing for clever fluid scene shifts that won't slow the action of the play.
Appendix E
Action Plot
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>HORN</th>
<th>HARCOURT</th>
<th>DORLAN</th>
<th>PINCH</th>
<th>SPARK</th>
<th>SHR</th>
<th>MARGERY</th>
<th>ALETHIA</th>
<th>MY FIDGET</th>
<th>DARITY</th>
<th>SQUEAM</th>
<th>OLD SQUEAM</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>LUCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>PREPARED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>HEXHAMMER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>HAMMER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>HOPPER HARCOURT</td>
<td>DURABLE</td>
<td>COLUMBUS</td>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>FLUSH MANSION</td>
<td>ALLON</td>
<td>MIT SHOES</td>
<td>DUNRAS</td>
<td>DUNLAP</td>
<td>DUNNE</td>
<td>BUCKED BU</td>
<td>JACQUELICE</td>
<td>JACQUELUC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ON</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F
Prop List and Budget
The Country Wife
Prop List and Budget.

Furniture: $400.00

1 Large Table
4 Side Chairs
2 Sofas
2 Ottomans
1 Upholstered Chair
1 Dressing Screen
1 Dressing Dummy
1 Full length Mirror

Props From Text: $300.00 (includes food)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horner's Wine Set</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner's 10-12 Period Books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margery Hat Full of Fruit</td>
<td>III:ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margery Writing Set</td>
<td>IV:ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margery Wax and Seal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margery Pack of Period Playing Cards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margery Embroidery Hoop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner's (Lady Fidget) China Plates</td>
<td>IV:iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparkish Letter</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alithea A Torch</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner's Banquet Table</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see food props)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horner's Penknife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinchwife Letter</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food Props:

Pinchwife's Top of II
We Need Margery and Alithea At the End Of A Meal With
Settings and a bowl of fruit. We need a setting for Pinchwife that will
have a couple of chicken legs, bread and drink that He Can Eat.

Banquet Scene -Viv
The Women Come in With A very Plentiful Hamper Of Food
And Drink Most of Which Will Not Be Touched But it Should Look
Extremely Plentiful.
As Parson
- Prayer Book
- Big Cross On a Chain

Dorilant
- Sword
- Kerchief
- Snuff Box
- Purse
- Walking Stick
- Hat

Pinchwife
- Walking Stick
- Kerchief
- Hat
- Keys

Lady Fidget
- Suspended Mask (On a Stick?)
- Parasol
- Fan
- Watch on Fob
- Snuff Box
- Drawstring Bag

Dainty
- Mask
- Hand Mirror
- Purse
- Fan

Squeamish
- Mask
- Fan
- Hand Mirror
- Purse

Alithea
- Mask
- Parasol
- Fan
Margery
-Mask
-Fan
As Boy

Long Stretch And Popovec
- Managable Rustic Baskets With Big Juicy Apples and Oranges

2 Stalls Get Signs About Their-Wares
Appendix G

Production Time Line
PRODUCTION TIME LINE

Friday, September 30, 1994 - Memo with director's concept arrives.

Tuesday, October 4, 1994 - Director's concept deadline.
- First telephone conference.

Tuesday, October 11, 1994 - Preliminary designs presented at production meeting.

Saturday, October 15, 1994 - Preliminary designs sent to Mr. Hollis in New York.

Tuesday, October 18, 1994 - Preliminary set design deadline.

Friday, October 21, 1994 - Second telephone conference.

Tuesday, October 25, 1994 - First ground plan presented at production meeting.

Sunday, October 30, 1994 - Meeting with Mr. Hollis in Cincinnati.

Tuesday, November 1, 1994 - Final design deadline. (Extended to Nov. 4)
- Revised ground plan presented at production meeting.

Friday, November 4, 1994 - Final design complete.

Tuesday, November 8, 1994 - Final design presented at production meeting.

Thursday, November 9, 1994 - Final design sent to Mr. Hollis in New York.

Tuesday, November 15, 1994 - Final set drawing deadline.
- Telephone with Mr. Hollis regarding design revisions.
  * Redraft anticipated.
  * White model needed.

Saturday, November 19, 1994 - Meeting with Mr. Hollis in Columbus.
- White model presented.

Tuesday, November 22, 1994 - Final ground plan presented at production meeting.
Thursday, December 8, 1994 - Final design drawings submitted to Mr. Shanda.

Tuesday, January 3, 1995 - Paint elevations presented at production meeting.

Tuesday, January 10, 1995 - Scenic model presented at production meeting.

Friday, January 20, 1995 - Prop meeting with Mr. Hollis.

Tuesday, January 31, 1995 - Final prop list due.

Monday, February 6, 1995 - Set load in.

Thursday, February 9, 1995 - Paper-tech.

Friday, February 10, 1995 - 1st full run.

Monday, February 13, 1995 - Crew watch.

Wednesday, February 15, 1995 - 1st Tech.

Thursday, February 16, 1995 - 2nd Tech.

Friday, February 17, 1995 - 3rd Tech.

Saturday, February 18, 1995 - 1st Dress

Sunday, February 19, 1995 - 2nd Dress

Monday, February 20, 1995 - Final Dress

Tuesday, February 21, 1995 - *The Country Wife* Opens 7:30 P.M.

Wednesday, February 21, 1995 - Performance 8:00 P.M.

Thursday, February 22, 1995 - Performance 8:00 P.M.

Friday, February 23, 1995 - Performance 8:00 P.M.

Saturday, February 24, 1995 - Performance 2:00 P.M. - Performance 8:00 P.M.

Wednesday, March 1, 1995 - Performance 8:00 P.M.
Thursday, March 2, 1995  - Performance 8:00 P.M.
Friday, March 3, 1995   - Performance 8:00 P.M.
Saturday, March 4, 1995 - Performance 8:00 P.M.
                      - Set Strike
Tuesday, March 7, 1995  - Department talk back 1:30-2:30 P.M.
                      - Area talk back 2:30-3:30 P.M.
                      - Post-Production meeting 6:30 P.M.
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