



Magnum Photo Inc.

The Arthur Miller Society Newsletter

In Association with The Arthur Miller Centre, University of East Anglia

Volume 7

June 2003

Words from the Society's President

I am pleased to present to you the latest edition of the *Arthur Miller Society Newsletter*. I would like to thank Susan Abbotson for her efforts in publishing this publication. Sue has agreed to assume the job of Newsletter editor for which I am grateful. I am pleased that she also will continue as the society's webmaster and organizer of our Miller sessions at the annual ALA convention. Sue clearly is the keystone of the society.

At this year's ALA in Boston, the society sponsored two panels, details of which you will find below. The first session which focused on teaching Miller plays was the first pedagogical discussion that the society has sponsored at the ALA, and was a great success. Next year's ALA will return to the West coast, in San Francisco. We would like again to sponsor two panels, so please send any papers to Sue.

Former society president Paula Langteau is planning the 8th society conference at Nicolet College in Rhinelander, Wisconsin on October 3-4, 2003. The conference topic is "Miller and Middle America." (See the "Call for Papers" inside.) Deadline for submission of papers and abstracts is July 15, 2003. Chris Bigsby will be delivering the keynote address and Steve Centola the closing remarks. This promises to be a fine conference; I hope to see many of you there. Sue has travel information for the conference on the website.

We are still searching for a venue for our 2004 conference. I have been speaking to a scholar in London who is exploring the possibility of holding it in the UK. Saint Francis College is eager for us to return to Brooklyn. I will keep you informed.

This edition of the newsletter once again offers reviews of recent publications in Miller scholarship and productions of Miller plays. Carlos Campos analyzes the "Arthur Miller" entry in the new edition of the *Dictionary of Literary Biography*. David Garey offers his perspectives on teaching *Salesman* in secondary school. Frank Bermann reviews a Syracuse Stage production of *The Crucible*, and I have included a review of the New York Metropolitan Opera's production of *A View From the Bridge*. This edition also contains information on Howard Blue's new book on radio drama, the banning of a production of *the Creation of the World and Other Business*, and "Notes From New York." We have also added a new feature "Notes and Queries," the first of which comes from Ashis Sengupta, an Indian scholar, who briefly examines the nature of politics and theater, and another contributed by Sue on naming in *The Ride Down Mt. Morgan*; we hope this will become a regular column in the newsletter.

Please continue to send Sue information about productions of Miller plays, publications, or related links for her to post on the website and/or include in our next edition.

Enjoy the newsletter. Appreciate the summer. See you in Wisconsin.

--Steve Marino

American Literature Association Sessions

The Arthur Miller society presented two panels at the American Literature Association Meeting, on May

30 and June 1st, 2003, in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The first panel, was a seminar on "Teaching Arthur

Miller: Text, Subtext, and Context,” led by Stephen Marino of St. Francis College with the help of Steven Centola of Millersville University and Carlos Campo of CC of Southern Nevada. The other panel was chaired by George Castellitto of Felician College, titled “Radio Drama, Short Stories and Plays: Connective Relationships in the Works of Arthur Miller;” and abstracts of the papers presented are given below.

**Paper Abstracts for the Miller Panel
for 2003 ALA**

**The Nature of the Beast: An examination of *The Pussycat and the Expert Plumber Who Was a Man*,
by Arthur Miller**

At 10:30 PM Eastern Standard Time on Sunday 29 September 1940, the CBS radio network aired *The Columbia Workshop*, an experimental radio series specializing in original radio plays. On that evening, the broadcast was entitled *The Pussycat and the Expert Plumber Who Was a Man*, written by twenty-five-year-old Arthur Miller. Although the bulk of his early radio work evaded publication, as had most radio plays by other writers, *The Pussycat and the Expert Plumber Who Was a Man* found its way into a 1941 collection of radio plays. For the next six decades, scholars dissected this printed script and used quotations from it to illustrate Miller’s literary themes and development as a dramatist. However, Arthur Miller did not intend to radio scripts for *reading* audiences. He did intend these creations to serve as the impetus for productions of broadcasts directed toward *listening* audiences. An examination of the radio career of Arthur Miller uncovers important questions for scholars concerning evidence and the nature of objects under investigation. The primary question is: in regards to a radio play, what should be the nature of the object under examination? Is it the published script, a recording of the audio broadcast, or a combination of both? This paper addresses this question by comparing the published script of Miller’s radio play to its original incarnation as a radio broadcast in 1940. The analysis reveals differences that point to not only what Miller could do as a dramatist, but also what he was precluded from doing.

*Presented by Richard K. Tharp
University of Maryland at College Park*

“Family Romances” and the Struggle to Form Desire as depicted in Arthur Miller’s Short Story “I Don’t Need You Anymore”

This paper examines the oedipal struggles that make “I Don’t Need You Anymore” an intertext drawing upon Freud’s “The Uncanny,” “A Child Is Being Beaten,” and “Family Romances.” The main character’s rivalry with his brother and the libido-anguish projected on each parent in this 1959 story underlie the attempt to establish one’s own desire as the basis of identity. That five-year old Martin is not yet a self-sufficient individual is clear by his inability to maintain borders and separations. Constant references to boundaries such as skin, clothes, the blanket, or bedroom doors cast the struggle in figurative terms. In its effort to establish temporal narrative within the individual conscience of a five-year old boy, this story defines desire and individuality in a way that gives new resonance to how the uncanny haunts the psychic trap of recurring

contd. top of next page

In This Volume

Words from the Society’s President	1
ALA 2003 Panels/abstracts	1-3
Lists of current officers and members	3
Call for Papers:	
8th International Conference	4
Teaching Death of a Salesman	5-7
New Book on Radio Drama	7
<i>Resurrection Blues</i>	7
Notes from New York (and beyond)	8
Miller Play Banned	8-9
<i>The Crucible</i>	9
<i>A View from the Bridge</i> as Opera	10
Notes and Queries	11-12
<i>Dictionary of Literary Biography</i>	13-14
Minutes of 2003 AMS meeting	14
Contributors’ Biographies	15
Membership Form	16

primal scenes. An inability to establish one's own desire, free of familial expectation, plagues many of Miller's mature protagonists in the plays. In "I Don't Need You Anymore," we can see the psychic dilemma dramatized in the earliest stage of human development.

*Presented by Lew Livesay
St. Peter's College, NJ.*

Materialism, Socialism and Paternal Conflict in Arthur Miller's *All My Sons*

The 1940s began amidst the throes of destructive international conflict, but saw the development of an even more destructive, domestic conflict, within the family itself. Many fathers and sons had been dislocated from their homes by the draft, some never returning. Those who did return, either found that the world had changed in their absence, or felt a need to change it in the light of the experiences they had gone through. Both change, and efforts for further change, met with angered resistance.

Tension runs high between the family characters in Arthur Miller's *All My Sons*. Their "anger" is alternatively repressed and released in a series of explosive conflicts. This article attempts to uncover the historical and sociological roots beneath such outbursts; not only in terms of the characters themselves, but also by comparing them to Miller's own family members. The role of "father," and how that has been affected by the times is central to a conflict which appears to lead to the complete breakdown of the traditional Western family unit. The Kellers are finally torn apart by the underlying, and inherently conflicting, ideologies of materialism and socialism.

*Presented by Susan C.W. Abbotson
Rhode Island College*

ALA 2004

ALA 2004 will be held at the Hyatt Regency (Embarcadero Center) in San Francisco, CA, May 27-30, 2004. Please send ideas, abstracts, or papers to Sue Abbotson <abbotson@hotmail.com>, or mail to 15 Concord Ave., Cranston, RI 02910, by January 20th, 2004. With the success of this year's teaching panel we would be open to something similar again, if we have people who would like to participate. Ω

Officers of the Arthur Miller Society

Founding President, 1995-98.....Steve Centola
Millersville University, PA
Current President, 2002-04.....Stephen Marino
St. Francis College, NY
Vice President, 2002-2004.....Carlos Campo
Community College of Southern Nevada
Secretary/Treasurer.....George Castellitto
Felician College, NJ
Newsletter Editor.....Susan C. W. Abbotson
Rhode Island College

Board of Directors

Susan C. W. Abbotson Steve Centola
Paula Langteau Brenda Murphy
Matthew C. Roudané

Honorary Board Members

Christopher Bigsby, Gerald Freeman, Hal Holbrook,
James Houghton, Robert A. Martin, Kevin McCarthy,
Mashiro Oikawa, and June Schlueter.

Contributing Information Instructions

Information and requests to submit articles are encouraged, including those regarding book, film, and production reviews, and announcements of upcoming productions, events, and conferences, as well as notes and queries regarding Mr. Miller's work. MLA style with files in Word please. Submission address:

The Arthur Miller Society Newsletter
c/o Susan C.W. Abbotson
15 Concord Avenue
Cranston, RI 02910

Subscription Information

Membership and Subscription are available for \$20 per year for individuals in the U.S. and Canada; \$10 for students; \$25/year for joint memberships; \$25/year for overseas members; \$30/year for libraries, and \$45/year for institutions. Membership and subscription address: The Arthur Miller Society, c/o George Castellitto, 28 Elizabeth St., Dover, NJ 07801.

Arthur Miller Society Website

<www.biblio.org/miller/>

Webmaster: Susan C.W. Abbotson
<abbotson@hotmail.com>

The 8th International Arthur Miller Conference

Nicolet College
Rhineland, Wisconsin

October 3-4, 2003

Conference Topic: Miller & Middle America

Looking back on eight decades of dramatic form and art, the conference celebrates Arthur Miller's embrace of middle America (the ordinary man, what it means to be American, etc.) as well as other aspects of Miller's life and works. Papers may address but are not limited to the following topics: comparative studies of his works, significant biographical events that influenced his art, characters and characterization, his dramatic stagecraft, his significance in modern American drama, and his association with other playwrights. Papers may also consider social, linguistic, cultural, political, and aesthetic issues addressed in the plays.

Abstracts or completed manuscripts (not to exceed 10 pages of double-spaced typescript so that papers may read in a twenty-minute presentation) should be forwarded to:

Paula Langteau
Dean of Teaching & Learning
Nicolet Area Technical College
County Hwy G, P.O. Box 51
Rhineland, WI 54501-0518

Documents may also be sent as MS WORD or COREL WORDPERFECT e-mail attachments to:

langteau@nicoletcollege.edu.

The deadline for submission of papers and abstracts is July 15, 2003.

PLEASE SHARE THIS NOTICE WITH INTERESTED COLLEAGUES.

Teaching Arthur Miller's *Death of a Salesman*

By David V. Garey

In the fall of my junior year in high school, the Drama Club held auditions for its production of *Death of a Salesman*. My English teacher at that time, Mrs. Katz, after listening to my portrayal of Juror Eight, in our class reading of *Twelve Angry Men*, encouraged me to audition. After she assured me that I would not have to sing or dance, I expressed a mild interest. She handed me a copy of the script. When I got home that afternoon I locked myself in my room and began reading. It was one of the most moving works that I had read. I determined that I was destined to play Biff. After days of reading and re-reading excerpts from the play, the moment for my audition arrived. I gave it my all in front of the drama teacher, Mr. Dubin. The next day, the cast list was posted on his door. I won the role of Bernard. I was crushed.

Despite the trauma of having to wear horn-rimmed glasses and a geeky cardigan sweater at my high-school debut, *Death of a Salesman* remains one of my favorite plays. The script from high school remains on my bookshelf and I have continued to pick it up at times to read scenes to myself aloud. More importantly, however, is my revenge, which has been more than sweet. A few years ago, I was hired to teach English in the same high school I attended. My classroom is next to, of all teachers, Mr. Dubin's. As *Death of a Salesman* is required reading for the curriculum we both teach, I now have the pleasure of playing the role of Biff as often as I like, next door to the man who denied me the pleasure of doing it in the first place. It gets better. Last year, he and I were sitting in the faculty room when he said, "I heard you reading the other day. You really did a great job with Biff's lines. I imagine the kids really got into it." I smiled and thanked him. Turning away, I caught myself muttering, "What an anemic."

Maybe it is my passion for the play that lures my students into it. I don't know. All I can say is that when June rolls around every year, and I ask my students which of the literary works affected them the most, the majority usually replies *Death of a Salesman*. When I ask them to explain why, they usually respond that they learned more about themselves from

the remaining hours of Willy Loman's life than anything from most of the other characters that they have studied. To me, this is the greatest compliment a student can give to a novel or play.

I begin my unit on *Death of a Salesman* with the most compelling element of the play- its premise. My students are fascinated once I tell them that we are going to watch a man, whom we know is going to die, contend with the shadows of his past as he navigates his way through his last twenty four hours of life. Before I distribute the books, start the video, or even mention the title of the play, I direct my students to freewrite, for ten minutes, from the perspective of someone who knows he or she is about to die. They are to write out the thoughts that they think would pass through their minds at that time. Afterwards, as we discuss their writing, my students invariably begin to express their regrets before they have even happened. I then write the title of the play on the board and explain that *Death of a Salesman* is about, among other things, regrets and how we can overcome accumulating them.

When we begin reading the play, most students are immediately drawn into Willy's glorification of the past. They talk freely about how their parents and grandparents always refer to the "good old days" or "how things used to be." In general, they say that they find most of the stories boring, that they are obviously exaggerated. I then ask a few students to tell me their favorite childhood tales. This year, Barbara, a young lady who always speaks up in class, happily recounted the details of the playdates she used to have with Mary, one of the other girls in the class. In the course of reminiscing, she embarrassed Mary a few times by divulging the secrets of Mary's elementary school crushes. We all laughed and shared similar stories. Eventually we began to explore the significance of our discussion. We acknowledged the value of the present, for it will one day be the past.

As our study of the play progresses, most students begin to detest Willy because of the way he treats people. They jump a bit when he snaps at Linda. They feel bad for Bernard. They want to see Charley knock him out. Above all, the children are appalled by Willy's extramarital affair, especially given the care and dedication with which Linda provides him. This leads to an engaging discussion on personal values. Most students, especially the young men,

exclaim that they would never end up like Willy. I remember Jonathan talking about his alcoholic uncle, about his volatile temper and abusive speech. Willy bore too much of a resemblance to Jonathan's uncle for him to feel anything but loathing for him. At this point, I ask students to reflect on their behavior, on the actions that they have taken against their parents, siblings, peers, and teachers. We discuss fighting, betrayal, cheating, and disrespect. They come to realize that no one is innocent, least of all each of them. We talk about compassion, and that we might regret our behavior today in the future. I often encourage students at this point to make amends to those that they have hurt. They see Willy as a man who has never honestly evaluated his actions and is now haunted by the demons of his past as a result. They grow increasingly uneasy as his denial slowly pushes him into a corner from which he will not be able to escape.

The dysfunctional home life of the Loman family is another element to which some of my students unfortunately relate. Reading *Death of a Salesman* has been a cathartic experience for a few of them. A student last year, Melissa, suddenly exclaimed during the fight at the end of the play, "Holy crap! We've got to stop for a minute. I feel like I'm at home." It was Brian this year, though, that I will never forget. Apparently, his father had just left him and his mother two weeks prior to Christmas without any warning. After Christmas break, Brian volunteered to read Biff. I spoke to him privately about his decision, yet he remained determined to play the role. His performance was outstanding. After we had completed our study of the play, Brian came to me one day after school to thank me. He said it felt great to yell without catching hell afterwards. I think he, as well as a few other students, learned about the importance of venting their feelings.

Miller's portrayal of the relationship between fathers and sons is perhaps one of the most powerful and haunting aspects of the play. The boys in class, especially those that are athletes, relate deeply to the unrealistic expectations that Willy places on Biff. When we talk about the Ebbet's field game or Willy's exclamation, "I am not a dime a dozen! I am Willy Loman and you are Biff Loman!" the boys just somberly nod. They empathize with the need to crawl out from under the load that has been placed on them by their dads. Another group of boys, as well as some girls, relate to Happy's search for approval.

They are the kids that never seem to measure up to the accomplishments of their older siblings. When considering Happy's self-delusion, especially at the end of the play, students recognize the dangers of comparing their abilities to those of others. At that point, I sometimes assign an exercise in which students must write a monologue that is set at Willy's grave five years after the end of the play. They are to portray either Biff or Happy. The results are usually predictable- Happy remains a "philandering bum" in one way or another and Biff has somehow managed to start his ranch out West. Either way, it is rewarding to see students become aware of the shadows from which they must emerge and, in some cases, see them take a few steps towards that end.

As we approach our final assessment of the play, we explore Willy Loman as a tragic hero. This class discussion usually focuses on Willy's tragic flaw- his lack of self-honesty. My students begin to see in Willy, as well as his sons and wife, the dangers of not being honest with themselves about their abilities and dreams. I teach this play to students who will be graduating from high school in eighteen months and I've seen many young men and women view this play as a sort of awakening, that it is time for them to become more realistic about their aspirations. This year, for the first time, I had two students, both on the football team, write in their character analyses of Biff that they both saw the need to look beyond high-school sports. Bernard's pointed comment, that Biff never trained himself for anything, struck home.

The most valuable lesson that *Death of a Salesman* teaches kids, though, is to go on living, no matter what happens. Suicide and the seriousness of depression are subjects that need be discussed in high school frequently. Willy's suicide troubles my students. No matter how much I prepare them for the play's tragic ending, most of them are shocked when he drives off in the end. They were hopeful that someone, somehow, might intervene, or that Willy's sense of false hope, in the end, will prevail. They want to see Willy come to his senses; they mourn when they realize that he is too far gone. When I hit "stop" on the VCR and turn on the lights, my students are usually silent for a few moments. As some begin to speak, they express just how disturbing Willy's suicide is to them.

Teaching *Death of a Salesman* has afforded me many opportunities to reach out to teens in a meaningful way. As we study the play, I get to see

kids reflect on their past, evaluate their behavior in the present, and plan a little more realistically for their future. By the time we are done, I notice a stronger sense of purpose in some students. In others, I see a sense of relief. They have come to realize that they are not alone in their struggles. No matter how I look at it when we are done, I think of Happy's final lines, "Willy Loman did not die in vain." From the impact that I have seen him have on my students, I would heartily agree. Ω

Howard Blue's book, *Words at War: World War II Era Radio Drama and the Postwar Broadcasting Industry Blacklist* came out with a small print run by Scarecrow Press in Dec. 2002.

Blue's book discusses the role of Arthur Miller's radio dramas, alongside sixteen other progressive radio dramatists, and a number of the actors involved during this period of assistance towards the World War II effort. The book also discusses the coalition of right-wing forces which attacked Miller and his colleagues and drove many of them from radio. Radio dramatist Norman Corwin wrote about the book, "... masterly . . . Blue stands with Barnouw and Dunning, and it is high rank indeed." And Paul Buhle of Brown University (author of books including *Popular Culture in America*.) commented "This may well be the best book on American radio ever written." Check <www.howardblue.com> for more details.

For further information including how to purchase a copy at the author's discounted price, contact Howard Blue via the internet at:

<Khovard@Juno.com>.

Or mail:

Howard Blue,
1951 Valentines Road,
Westbury NY 11590

Information on *Resurrection Blues*

Report by Susan C.W. Abbotson

MD Christenson writes theater reviews for the Juneau Empire and hosts an intriguing website which is a kind of homage to Miller's latest play, *Resurrection Blues*, and can be found at:

<http://www.frozenflamingo.com/rez_bluz.htm>.

Just click on the opening page to get in and you'll be taken though an ever-expanding network of quotes, critiques and commentary on issues the play raises (both by content and form).

Christenson views *Resurrection Blues* as a post-modern play, indeed, he suggests "It's more than that--it's post-political, post-religious. In it, we deserve neither a redeemer nor a revolutionary hero. It's even post-sociological. After the apocalypse, nothing remains but the family (and, unfortunately, psychology)." He reads the play as a bold satire, in an age in which satire has become increasingly difficult given the extreme society in which we currently live. He describes his site as "an eccentric examination of Arthur Miller's new play - a collection of fragments and personal tics that shatters the boundaries of both academic and journalistic drama criticism that *Resurrection Blues* breaks in drama."

For those of you desiring something more traditional, then try the Guthrie Theater's website, at <http://www.guthrietheater.org/act_III/studyguide/toc.cfm?id_studyguide=30923092>, which offers you a wealth of detail concerning those involved in the play's premier production, and essays from an assortment of people from the director (David Esbjornson) to the lighting designer (Marcus Dilliard), as well as other critical pieces; all in all, an excellent study guide, well worth a visit.

Also, if you want a copy of *Resurrection Blues*, the Guthrie Theater still carries some copies in its giftshop. It is a pre-production draft, and so has already undergone some changes, but it gives you a sense of the play. Call the giftshop at (612) 347-1167 (Tuesday- Saturday, 10:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. CST). For \$10 + postage, they will mail you a copy, while stocks last (these are numbered copies, so may become quite collectible!)

You may also want to book a flight to CA, because *Resurrection Blues* will be running there March 13-April 18, 2004 at the Old Globe Theater, based in Balboa Park, San Diego, for its West Coast opening. For tickets or more information, Tel: (619) 239-2255, or check their website at: <<http://www.oldglobe.org/>>. I think we can be pretty certain, this will have gone through some changes since the Minnesota production. Ω

Notes From New York

by Stephen Marino

Arthur Miller continued his occasional appearances at literary events in New York over the past few months. Among the most notable:

—On Monday evening **February 13, 2003**, Miller appeared at the highly publicized event called, “Poems Not Fit for the White House” at Avery Fisher Hall. The poetry reading by some two dozen poets was organized in response to Laura Bush’s cancellation of a literary event to be held at the White House at which some presenters intended to read anti-war poems. Arthur Miller received one of the more enthusiastic responses of the evening, not for his reading, but for his question: “Why can’t this wait for a month, or six months, or years, or long enough for Saddam Hussein to just die?”

—On **April 24, 2003**, Arthur Miller directed Laila Robbins and Bob Dishy in a staged reading of his one act play, “Elegy for a Lady.” This production was featured as part of the “Food for Thought—Lunch Hour Theater,” a reading series devoted to rarely produced one-act plays, which is held on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays from 1 to 2PM at the National Arts Club.

—A new exhibition of the photographs of Inge Morath entitled: **Inge Morath: Last Journey** will open on Thursday, **June 26, 2003** at the Leica Gallery in New York. This exhibit is the product of three trips Inge Morath made to her ancestral home in the region along the border of Styria in Austria and Slovenia in 2001, before her untimely death in January 2002. This trip has been documented as a film, a book, and a photo exhibition.

The exhibit will run from June 27 to August 9, 2003. The Leica Gallery is located at 670 Broadway, New York, New York 10012. Phone (212) 777-3051 for more details. Ω

Outside of New York

—*All My Sons* will be coming to The Westport Country Playhouse, CT (Artistic Director Joanne Woodward), **August 6-23, 2003**.° Directed by Doug Hughes, with Richard Dreyfuss as Joe Keller.° Mon.-Thurs. at 8:00PM; Friday and Saturday at 8:30PM; Wednesday matinee at 2:00PM; and Saturday twilight at 5:00PM.° The final Tuesday of each run is “Talk Back Tuesday,” when the audience can meet the artists for Q&A

following the performance.° Talk Back Tuesday is free and open to the public. Season subscriptions, offering best seating and substantial savings, are on sale now.° Remaining tickets will go on sale May 19, 10:00AM.° For subscriptions, call 203.226.0153.° Regular tickets/info. call the box office at 203.227.4177

Miller’s Plays Still Being Banned!

Report by Susan C.W. Abbotson

A production of *The Creation of the World and Other Business* was recently staged in Greenville, South Carolina. Directed by Dan A. R. Kelly, with the production assistance of Jason Comerford and Xoe Wendy, the play opened on Wednesday, May 7, 2003 and was supposed to run through to the 11th at Greenville Technical College. The opening-night crowd was extremely small due to it being a mid-week opening; there were around fifteen people at the first show. There was a content advisory at the ticket counter, and there was one walk-out during the performance.

The next morning, Kelly received a phone call from Greenville Tech. informing him that there had been a complaint about the show and that it was therefore canceled indefinitely, despite the fact that the college had been provided beforehand with a copy of the play, and been warned of its adult content. The college administration had shown no prior concern with the production of the show, and could have attended any of the rehearsals on their premises if they had wanted to check. The college explained to Kelly that they were canceling the play because of the (one) complaint; though the recording for their box-office, however, posits that the play was canceled because of “technical difficulties,” difficulties which Comerford asserts did not exist. The producers have not been able to get any details from the college as to the nature of the complaint, but are understandably very upset that all their hard work was done in vain.

In the words of Jason Comerford, “I really believe it’s important that word is spread about this. It’s akin to the controversy that surrounded “The Last Temptation of Christ”; it goes without saying that people should be able to make up their own minds and that [it is terrible that] an allegedly non-secular institution like Greenville Tech have refused to allow the performance to continue.” Comerford is hoping to get the college to reverse its decision and allow the

play to go on. If you want to lend him support in his endeavors, he can be contacted at:

<JComerford79@juno.com>

or phone# 864.346.0734.

Greenville Technical College can be reached at 1 800 723 0673, and the current President is Dr. Thomas E. Barton, Jr. Ω

The Crucible at Syracuse Stage

A review by Frank Bergmann, Utica College

Affiliated with Syracuse University, Syracuse Stage is the only equity theater in upstate New York; it has provided that region with—in the words of its anniversary slogan—“30 years of fabulousness.” As part of the promotion for its February 19-March 22, 2003 run of *The Crucible*, the Stage distributed an interview with director Timothy Douglas in which he explains why the cast, except for a few parts, is African American like himself: “The primary thing is that *The Crucible* is a play about persecution and the response to that persecution. It is also a quintessentially American play, and I think that a response to persecution cannot come with any more authenticity than through the descendants of African slaves.”

Now it could be argued that *The Crucible* is first of all a play about a man’s integrity, and that in America no one can speak more authentically about persecution than the survivors of the Holocaust or their descendants or the descendants of the millions who were killed. The one overt connection with the issue of race in *The Crucible* is Tituba, and her response to it, so it seems to me, Miller has rendered clearly and empathically. Douglas promises the listeners (viewers?) that “[n]o matter how well they may think they know this play, they’re going to hear new things.”

I was hoping to be enlightened in regard to “the single error” of John Proctor’s life: as John Winthrop reports in his Journal, James Britton and Mary Latham “were condemned to die for adultery” and executed. If even just faint echoes of that early Puritan rigor could still be heard in 1691, then Elizabeth’s urging John to go and denounce Abigail takes on a whole other meaning, as does John’s “I’ll think on it.” Let us remember that Danforth wants to know from Elizabeth: “To your own knowledge, has John Proctor ever committed the crime [my italics] of lechery?” A related problem for me has been John’s responsibility—or more properly lack thereof—toward Abigail. Marcel Aymé put it this way: “Pursued by remorse for having committed adultery,

he shows no regrets regarding his gravest shortcoming, that of having led astray a little soul who had been entrusted to him.” Of course Miller adduces extenuating circumstances for John’s betrayal of Elizabeth, namely the dynamic which Elizabeth eventually describes as “[i]t needs a cold wife to prompt lechery.” However, Miller dismisses Abigail’s case as “a whore’s vengeance”: the abused girl discredits herself by incredible overreaching, unleashing a public storm to right a private wrong.

But to the performance (March 21). Hale, Corey, and the Nurses were white actors. Abigail, Elizabeth, and Parris were light-skinned African Americans; John, Mary Warren, Putnam, and Danforth (yes!) were darker. Given this cast, I set aside Douglas’s announced intentions in order not to get lost trying to figure out his racial calculus; I decided to consider the actors as characters in the play only rather than also as director’s messengers. Judge Hathorne, Marshal Herrick, and Hopkins were dropped, with a new character with an authentic name, Willard, taking Herrick’s place. Parris took over Hathorne’s “Can you faint now?” shtik. I am not sure what the reasons for the changes were (I do not care about Hopkins, who makes the tiniest of cameo appearances in Miller’s text), but I began to understand why Miller has so often inserted himself in casting and other aspects of production.

The rabbit stew scene which opens Act 2 was omitted. At the end of the play, the set did not provide a window whose bars Elizabeth is supposed to grip for support (and, in my opinion, restraint). The most severe change occurred with Hale, who was made into an old man. Conversely, Rebecca’s bathetic “breakfast” line was kept. The set was spare and suitably uninviting, with clever lighting from below as well as from above. The costumes, especially those of the girls, were more colorful than the sumptuary laws would have permitted. There was some fine acting (Cynthia Addai-Robinson as Abigail, Rachel Leslie as Elizabeth, Tyrone Mitchell Henderson as Parris, Larry John Meyers as Hale, Jane Welch as Rebecca Nurse, and Malcolm Ingram as Giles Corey). Kim Sullivan (Danforth), however, inspired no fear, and Tamara E. Johnson’s (Mary Warren) voice was thick, as was Ray Anthony Thomas’s (John Proctor), the latter becoming nearly unintelligible in the emotional scenes.

I came away once again deeply moved by the play’s power, but I did not hear new things and found no answers to my questions. Ω

***A View From the Bridge* Has New York Debut at Metropolitan Opera House**

by Stephen Marino, St. Francis College

The incredible run of revivals of Arthur Miller's work that have appeared on the New York stage in the last seven years continued this season as the Metropolitan Opera presented the New York debut of the operatic version of *A View From the Bridge* for eight performances in December 2002.

The opera, which premiered at the Lyric Opera of Chicago in 1999, is composed by William Bolcom, with a libretto by Arnold Weinstein and Arthur Miller. Bolcom made some changes for the New York version, most notably adding two new arias, one each for the characters of Eddie and Beatrice. The production opened on December 5 and received strong reviews. Howard Kissel of the *New York Daily News* judged that "it is one of those rare times when opera is great theater." Anthony Tommasini of the *New York Times* called it an "involving and significant work."

I attended the final performance on December 28 which was broadcast live over the Chevron Texaco Metropolitan Opera International Radio Network to more than 360 stations in the United States and 40 countries in the Americas, Europe, East Asia, and Pacific Rim. Admittedly, no opera buff, my interest in this work, mainly lies in how Miller's masterpiece would translate into operatic form. I knew that Miller had explained that when he first heard in his Brooklyn neighborhood the story upon which he based the original one act version, he thought he had heard it before as "some re-enactment of a Greek myth." Consequently, Miller designed both the one act and two act plays with the grand structure and themes of tragedy; thus, the play seemed to me, as the composer has said, a "natural" for opera. The gestation for the opera version of *View* actually began with co-librettist Weinstein, who had taught the play in his classes at Columbia. After the composer Bolcom contributed the music for Miller's play *Broken Glass* in 1994, Weinstein, with Miller's approval, encouraged Bolcom to make *View* his next operatic work.

The December 28 matinee featured three particularly strong performances: Kim Josephson's robust portrayal of Eddie strongly conveyed his tragic descent; Catherine Malfitano's vocal range was particularly effective in capturing Beatrice's conflict between her niece and her husband; Isabel

Bayrakdarian, in her Met debut, convincingly expressed Catherine's growth from girl to woman. The standout performance belonged to Gregory Turay as Rodolpho whose tenor voice frequently moved the audience to applause. His performance of "New York Lights" in the first act is one of the more dramatic moments in the opera when Rodolpho sings a paean about his love for New York City. The song has been receiving particular notice from music critics as having a melody that could be attractive to popular music listeners. Composer Bolcom explains that he conceived the song to deliberately fuse Broadway-type melody with an early 20th century Neapolitan one. The song's lyrics also are notable for mixing images from locations in Sicily and New York. Turay's tenor voice sustains notes for so long that the effect is haunting.

The massive set, designed by Santo Loquasto, befits the grandness of both play and opera. The set merges interior and exterior settings without clear delineation. Steel girders and platforms evoke both the docks where Eddie plied his trade as a longshoreman and the Brooklyn Bridge, which has literal and figurative importance in the work. Brick and wood suggest the tenement buildings of the Red Hook neighborhood where the Carbone apartment is located. Scrims and projection screens also cast images of Sicily, Brooklyn, Manhattan, and the Red Hook docks on the back walls. The set also provides necessary space for the production's large chorus. The chorus, fits Miller's scheme to place Eddie among his neighbors because his passion for Catherine begins the violation of the social codes in which the Sicilian-American community operates. The operatic chorus was as powerful as in any stage version of *View* I have seen.

My academic interest in how the play would translate into operatic form was completely satisfied from the opening minutes of Act 1. When I heard Alfieri sing his first lines, I immediately recognized them as belonging to the original 1955 act version of *View*, which Miller wrote in an intriguing mixture of blank verse and prose. In fact, in composing the piece, Bolcom has incorporated a significant amount of this prose poetry. Miller's lyrical dialogue effectively adapted to the dialogue of operatic music.

View is now touring major U.S. cities and is expected to become a regular part of the American operatic repertoire. Ω

NOTES AND QUERIES

(A new column through which we hope to share ideas, opinions, and ask questions--send in anything you feel might be of interest to include in future editions--I'll include a couple here to get the ball rolling!)

* * * * *

Politics as Theater in Arthur Miller

from Ashis Sengupta, University of North Bengal

If the stage is a world in its own right, all the world is equally a stage. And the world-stage metaphor has preoccupied Arthur Miller ever since he wrote *The Archbishop's Ceiling* (1977[1989]), crystallizing as it were in his delightfully acerbic *On Politics and the Art of Acting* (2001). The former is a critique of the political stage in 1970s Czechoslovakia, while the latter is a discursive analysis of the modern American political scene. Despite wide historical, cultural differences, what brings the two works together, making each a commentary of sorts on the other, is the presentation of political life as a world of competing performances.

[A]cting is inevitable, Miller observes, as soon as we walk out our front doors and into society. But power changes how people act, he adds (*On Politics* 1, 10). The politician-as-performer has to perfect his show to draw together a fragmented public. And the public-as-audience is also called upon to join in the acting since the show must go on. But what happens when the rituals of truth produced for public consumption stand challenged, or the show fails to woo and win? The stage has to be reset, and the theatrics revised. A cynically contrived performance replaces persuasive gestures, disguising the crude exercise of power. No wonder people under the archbishop's ceiling, which is presumably bugged, find it hard to locate reality and turn into contrived selves despite their resistance or dissent. As Sigmund, the dissident writer, laments in the play: We must lie, it is our only freedom. Our country is now a theater, where no one is permitted to walk out, and everyone is obliged to applaud (*Archbishop* 69).

Both politics and theater thrive on lies like truth. However, in the end, we call a play trivial when it illuminates little beyond its own artifices. The same goes for politics which bespeaks some narrow interest rather than the greater good. The fault is not in the use of theatrical arts, Miller concludes in *On Politics*, but in their purpose (83). No Miller work precludes an ultimately moral imperative. *Archbishop*, too, finally

asks if the writer-as-actor, despite his knowledge that survival depends on adaptive performance skills, must not have a permanent allegiance to the love of creating art that would attribute meaning to life. Ω

The Importance of Naming in *The Ride Down Mt. Morgan*

Susan C.W. Abbotson, Rhode Island College

The similarity between the names Loman and Lyman (from *The Ride Down Mt. Morgan*) can hardly be coincidental. In many ways, *Death of a Salesman's* Loman seems to be the prototype for Lyman. While Loman was a man striving against the difficulties of living inherent during the forties and fifties, Lyman is a man for the eighties, and unlike Loman, a very successful businessman. While Loman's name tends to evoke discussion of Willy as a "low-man" in terms of his abilities, character, or prospects, Lyman's name with its possibilities of outrageous deceit (lies), passion (to lie with), and, as June Schlueter suggests, the concept of one who is "lionized" (143), clearly evokes a different sense of being. Where Loman is shown to be powerless, Lyman is fully empowered. Lyman is, what Willy Loman wanted to be, if only he had had that charisma and business sense he so dearly wanted. But we can also see, even more clearly than *Salesman* informs us, just how misguided Willy's desires were, as we witness the dangerous and unsatisfactory life Lyman has created with all those skills and advantages Willy had longed for.

Miller clearly wants us to see the deep irony in Lyman's situation—a life-insurance mogul who may have just tried to kill himself, and in a car just like his predecessor, Willy Loman. As with Loman, Lyman is a character through whom and through whose actions we are being asked to question a number of the values we have so complacently accepted and lived with, without sufficient understanding. Just like Loman, Lyman too seeks that elusive "main thing"; the secret to life each feels exists but is somehow being kept hidden from them.

The scene between Lyman and the lion is an important piece—we see in it an act of identification and test of the self. Getting close to death makes him feel more alive, but it is fraught with danger. Lyman lives life dangerously and tempts the fates by wild acts which are tantamount to hubris. It is as if he wants to be a god—not for the power that would entail, so much as the fact that a god does not have to

feel guilt, and it is this which is continually threatening his peace. The laws of tragedy insist the hero must suffer for his hubris when at the peak of his existence, which is at this point when he faces the lion. Lyman declares that this was when he lost his guilt and therefore felt most godlike—but this is a lie—this is the lie he is indeed most guilty of. We know his guilt exists, after all why marry Leah and give his son a legal father but for the social mores which insist on such actions as right, and also, as he tells us, to assuage the guilt he feels from an earlier illegitimate child. It is with the lion that he decides to keep two wives, and be lionlike with his “pride.” A comparison of Lyman to that Lion of Judah—King David seems not out of place. David was a great uniter of warring factions who tried to build a golden ideal, but was eventually torn apart by the conflict between public appearance and private indiscretions—a similar dynamic to Lyman’s life.

Areligious/Jewish symbolism behind the characters is evidenced in a complex network of predominantly Biblical naming beyond a simple comparison of Lyman to King David—Lyman is also related to another Jewish “founding father”: Jacob, famous for his two wives (perfectly legal in his day!). Lyman’s mother was Esther, recalling the Esther Jews recall every Purim. Esther thwarted the plots of Haman to kill the Jews by using her feminine wiles on the king—through her actions she keeps the Jews alive. We should note that Lyman’s mother was very disappointed that Theo was not Jewish, because Jewishness is passed on matrilineally and so Bessie is not technically Jewish. Lyman eventually marries a Jewish woman in order to preserve his Jewish heritage (passed on to him by his mother) and he names him Benjamin after his mother’s grandfather, Ben also being Hebrew for son—and so finally preserves the Jewish line. In this way Esther is once more victorious.

Lyman’s Jewish wife is Leah. Leah was one of Jacob’s famous two wives, her sister, Rachel, being the other. Between them, Leah and Rachel are the matriarchs of Israel, bearing to Jacob the children who will eventually be the founders of the tribes of Israel. Jacob also had children by another woman, a servant he never married, which could relate to Lyman’s illegitimate child—but he was married to both Rachel and Leah, though Rachel was his preferred wife and so given primary status. Jacob fathered a Ben too, though with Rachel rather than

Leah. But Lyman calls his son Benjamin Alexander, the Alexander being his father’s name, a man for whom religion had no import. Alexander is not a Jewish name, and could recall Alexander Hamilton, evoked in *The Last Yankee* by Miller as one of America’s founders. It seems to me that in the naming of his son, Lyman illustrates the ambivalent nature of the child’s heritage—he becomes an archetypal Jewish-American and therefore the true offspring of Lyman, caught between dueling cultural heritages and possibilities.

Lyman’s other child, Bessie, by his Christian wife, Theo, may bring to mind the New Testament figure of Elizabeth, Mary’s cousin who gave birth to John the Baptist. Bessie, too, is a prophet like figure who offers words of wisdom which are largely ignored, words which are also strongly redolent of New Testament philosophy in their insistence that you consider others before yourself. Even Theo’s name has a religious connotation with its root connection to theology, the study of religion—perhaps emphasising her extremely rational nature. She is the hub around which religious concepts spin in America and her father was after all a preacher. Tom Wilson, the Quaker, and other representative of the New Testament side of the matter may bring to mind “doubting Thomas.” At a point near the close of the play, when Theo seems to be won over to Lyman’s outlook, we find Tom seeming to distance himself entirely from the group. Like the doubting Thomas figure he may represent—he wants to believe but has trouble committing himself to a more audacious set of beliefs. In Aramic, the name Thomas means “twin” and in many ways Tom is a twin to Lyman, being a “would be Lyman,” only without the necessary spirit. Early on, Tom advises Lyman to lie and not to be honest because the truth is often too hurtful (*Ride* 29). Such moments allow us to question just how complicitous in all of this is Tom. In a way, he has been living vicariously through Lyman, allowing him to take all the risks. We are all “Tom’s” in a way, with a tendency to let others live the sensational lives as we stand by and watch—becoming virtual “Uncle Tom” figures in our “yes man” complacency. Ω

(This note has been adapted from a section I wrote on *The Ride Down Mt. Morgan* in *The Student Companion* to Arthur Miller. SCWA)

Notes and Queries concludes on the next page

Question on *The Man Who Had All the Luck*

from Susan C. W. Abbotson

Does anyone have any information on Miller's original intent for David Beeves. It seems to me that from various things I have read, including references to the play in *Timebends*, that Miller may have originally allowed this character to actually commit suicide, rather than just contemplate the possibility. Since an early (or even the later) script is hard to come by--can anyone shed light on this issue at all? Send any responses to me either e-mail or mail. Ω

"Arthur Miller" in the *Dictionary of Literary Biography* (226).

A Review by Carlos Campo,
Community College of Southern Nevada

The latest volume of the *Dictionary of Literary Biography* (DLB 266) is entitled *Twentieth-Century American Dramatists*, and is the fourth in a series that began in 1981 with volume seven. Christopher J. Wheatley edits this edition, as he has the three previous in the series, in 2000 (volume 228), and in 2002 (volume 248). The DLB Advisory Board describes their purpose as "to make literature and its creators better understood and more accessible to students and the reading public, while satisfying the needs of teachers and researchers." The entries are summed up as "career biographies, tracing the development of the author's canon and the evolution of his [sic?] reputation" (xiii).

The subject that dominates Wheatley's introduction is the literary "canon," which he defines as "works that are typically regarded as representing the enduring examples of aesthetic and cultural achievement" (xv). Wheatley relates that the first series editor, John MacNicholas, implied that only O'Neill, Wilder, Williams and Albee should be considered canonical American dramatists. He further comments that "If you asked an Irish or Polish scholar of American literature in the early twenty-first century who the canonical American playwrights are, he or she would probably respond O'Neill, Arthur Miller, Williams, probably Albee, and maybe Wilder" (xvi). Wheatley makes an important point about "shifting critical reputations" affecting what is available to teach, and furthermore, that what is taught, of course, is considered canonical. Wheatley recounts a recent review of Albee's *Tiny Alice* which

deemed the play "pretentious," and he comments that "An unknown playwright judged to be pretentious would not be produced" (xviii).

Wheatley concludes his introduction by emphasizing how difficult it is to fully delineate an "official" American literary canon: "Although there are no formal characteristics that sum up the American canon, there are continuities. Most of the best plays tend to be examples of domestic realism: O'Neill's *Long Day's Journey into Night*, Miller's *The Crucible*, Williams's *A Streetcar Named Desire*, and Albee's *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* are some examples" (xix). It is impossible to miss the fact that Wheatley gives Miller short shrift in his introduction; by replacing *Death of a Salesman* (surely the most canonized American play of all) with *The Crucible*, he reinforces his iconoclastic view of Miller and his plays. Miller was not included in the second or third series, either, appearing for the first time in this volume.

The volume features twenty-nine (!) playwrights, from Edward Albee to Elizabeth Wong. Albee and Miller are clearly the "most likely to be canonized" here, with Albee's twenty-four pages of text surpassed only slightly by Miller's twenty-five. Albee's biographer, Lincoln Konkle, enters the canonical fray with: "Scholars have made the case that Albee, having sustained a career in the American theater for more than six decades, has joined Williams as a serious challenger to O'Neill's status as the great American playwright. Comprising more than twenty-five plays, his body of work is as extensive as Williams's, as varied in subject and form as O'Neill's, as experimental as Wilder's, and as reflective on American society as Miller's" (5). Konkle later comments that Albee's plays are "almost certainly the most intellectual of those by the major American playwrights" (26).

Steven Marino was given the daunting task of writing Arthur Miller's entry, and he begins with a terse sentence which sums up his view of Miller's reputation: "Arthur Miller is one of the major dramatists of the twentieth century." Marino's opening line is emblematic of his work here overall; he allows the reader's opinion of Miller's literary contribution to grow out of the body of writing rather than impose his perspective on the reader. In addition, Marino never seems to overwrite, shunning hyperbole over carefully chosen prose that fits his task like a favorite sweater: comfortable, familiar,

classic. Marino closes his opening paragraph with, "Miller clearly ranks with the other truly great figures of American drama such as Eugene O'Neill, Tennessee Williams, and Edward Albee" (188).

Marino then moves on to trace Miller's life and literature, inextricably bound as they are, commenting only once more on Miller's literary stature in his closing phrase: "Arthur Miller is continuing the pace that has made him one of the major figures in American theater" (206). The constraints of DLB's format and the prolific nature of Miller's career make Marino's assignment difficult indeed, as he is forced to cover a wide range of plays and the events that fueled them. As one might expect, Marino calls *Death of a Salesman* Miller's "masterpiece," and then goes on to discuss the play in the subsequent thirteen paragraphs (*The Crucible* gets seven, *Broken Glass* six). While the play's critical reception and major themes are thoroughly discussed, Marino also takes time to nicely cover many of the play's other elements, including Elia Kazan's contribution and Jo Mielziner's stunning set. Marino moves from life to "lit." seamlessly, recounting Miller's writing of the play in his ten-by-twelve cabin as he conjures the name Loman and the play's first two lines, "'Willy' and 'It's alright. I came back.'"

There is a quiet, but unmistakable confidence in Marino's writing, a sure-handedness that undoubtedly springs from a lifetime of interest in Miller and diligent background study. He covers *The Price* with the same aplomb as *The American Clock* and *The Last Yankee*; plays that even some Miller aficionados might find puzzling. Miller's penchant for all things political is a prominent feature of the entry, as Marino details Miller's active political life and its clear affect on his drama. Marino concludes the piece by relating Miller's relentless artistic activity, from the publication of *Echoes Down the Corridor*, a collection of non-theater essays to the August 2002 premiere of his latest play, *Resurrection Blues*.

Miller's section also includes eight photos and *Playbills* for *View* and *The Price*. DLB's illustration policy reflects its concern with "the iconography of literature," and icons such as Marilyn Monroe, Lee J. Cobb, and Miller himself grace the pages here. *The Price's Playbill* is especially reflective of its time, as a terrific photo of the actors engaged in a scene is flanked by a prominent ad for Kentucky bourbon: "Old Grand-Dad is waiting for you in the bar." A

massive list of further readings concludes the entry, with exhaustive sections entitled "Interviews," "Bibliographies," "References," and "Papers," respectively.

Steve Marino's work here clearly indicates that he was a fine choice to author this important reference work, which provides a reliable and comprehensive overview of Miller's life and work. While one would expect to see Miller in a subsequent volume in this series, Marino's yeoman effort will surely stand as a worthy testament of Miller's unmistakable contribution to American letters. Ω

The Arthur Miller Society
Minutes of Meeting: Friday, May 22, 2003
American Literature Association Conference in
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Aquarium Meeting Room

8:00 AM

Present: Steve Marino, Carlos Campo, Steve Centola, George Castellitto, Susan Centola, Mary Castellitto.

George distributed a membership/email list and the current financial report. The Society has 34 active members, and intends to follow up some of those members, previously in good standing, who have now lapsed. The present balance of the Society treasury, based on 2003 dues, is \$738.07.

The members discussed the upcoming Miller Conference scheduled to be held at Nicolet College in Wisconsin from October 3-4, 2003. Steve Marino encouraged attendance.

Steve Marino mentioned that tentative plans were being discussed regarding a possible Miller Conference in London in Spring 2004. If those plans are not successful, then Steve will plan the Spring 2004 Conference for St. Francis College in Brooklyn; Steve mentioned that the college President of St. Francis is supportive of the conference being held at St. Francis. Steve Centola mentioned that 2004 will be the sixtieth anniversary of Miller's first Broadway production.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 AM.

Respectfully submitted,
George Castellitto, Secretary/Treasurer Ω

Contributors

Susan C. W. Abbotson is an Adjunct Professor at Rhode Island College, and the new editor of the *Arthur Miller Society Newsletter*. Her latest book *Thematic Guide to Modern Drama* was just published by Greenwood (2003), and she is also the author of *The Student Companion to Arthur Miller* (Greenwood 2000), and co-author, with Brenda Murphy, of *Understanding Death of a Salesman* (Greenwood 1999).

Frank Bergmann is Professor of English and German at Utica College of Syracuse University.

Carlos Campo teaches English and Drama at Community College Southern Nevada in Las Vegas. He has written extensively on Arthur Miller, and has been published in *English Language Notes* and the *Film/Literature Quarterly*. He is also the Arthur Miller Society's current Vice-President.

George Castellitto is Professor of Modern American literature at Felician College in New Jersey and is presently serving as the curator of the A. R. Ammons collection housed at the college. He has published articles on Miller, Stevens, Ginsberg, and Williams. He is also the Arthur Miller Society's current Secretary/treasurer.

David Garey is an English teacher at Wantagh Senior High School, Wantagh New York.

Stephen Marino teaches at Saint Francis College in Brooklyn and at Saint Francis Preparatory School in Fresh Meadows in New York, where he is chairperson of the English Department. His work has appeared in *Modern Drama* and *The Journal of Imagism*. He edited "*The Salesman Has a Birthday*": *Essays*

Celebrating the Fiftieth Anniversary of Arthur Miller's "Death of a Salesman" (UP America 2000), and recently published *A Language Study of Arthur Miller's Plays: The Poetic in the Colloquial* (Mellen 2002). He is the Arthur Miller Society's current president.

Ashis Sengupta is Reader in English at the University of North Bengal (India). His work on Arthur Miller includes his Ph.D. dissertation and more than a dozen articles in prestigious Indian journals. Sengupta is also planning to edit a volume on Arthur Miller, with special emphasis on his late plays. Recipient of the Olive I Reddick Award (1995) and fellow at the Fulbright American Studies Institute in New York (2002), he has published several other papers on Tennessee Williams, David Mamet, James Baldwin, Toni Morrison, and on Indian drama in English. Sengupta has just completed his term as chair, Board of UG Studies in English at NBU. His email address is: ashmit_2000@rediffmail.com.

Call for Newsletter Material

The newsletter is always looking for new material to print. If you have written anything on Miller that you would like reviewed, please send me a copy and I shall find a reviewer (find details on how to do this on page 3). Submissions via e-mail are fine too, send to <abbotson@hotmail.com>. If you attend any performances or appearances of Miller and/or his work you are welcome to send in a review. If you have a particularly interesting teaching approach to any of his work, knowledge of any events/controversies regarding his work, or would like to contribute any ideas or queries to our new Notes and Queries column, please send me details. Deadlines are usually a month prior to publication, and we hope to bring the next edition out in November, 2003.

-- Sue Abbotson

Current Members

Sue Abbotson, Estelle Aden, Frank Bergmann, Martin Blank, Richard Brucher, Jackson R. Bryer, Carlos Campo, George Castellitto, Steve Centola, Allan Chavkin, Robert Combs, Jane K. Dominik, Robert Feldman, Herbert Goldstein, Harry R. Harder, Samuel Hatch, Peter Hays, Joseph Kane, Stefani Koorey, Lewis Livesay, Stephen Marino, Brenda Murphy, Beverly Newton, Ana Lúcia Moura Nouvais, Gerald O'Grady, Terry Otten, June Schlueter, Ashis Sengupta, William B. Thesing, Jon Tuttle.

The Arthur Miller Society

Annual Membership Fee:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$20 per year for individuals in U.S. and Canada | <input type="checkbox"/> \$10 per year for students |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$25 per year for joint memberships | <input type="checkbox"/> \$25 per year for overseas members |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$30 per year for libraries | <input type="checkbox"/> \$45 per year for institutions |

Name _____

Address _____

Phone # _____ E-Mail _____

Mail to: The Arthur Miller Society

c/o George Castelletto

28 Elizabeth St.,

Dover, NJ 07801.

The Arthur Miller Society

Newsletter c/o Susan C. W. Abbotson

Department of English

Rhode Island College

600 Mt. Pleasant Ave.

Providence RI 02908