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PREFACE

Background

The Crucible, Robert Ward’s most well-known and successful work, has been designated an “American national opera.” Understanding how it came to be so regarded entails more than providing definitions of the words “American”* and “national.” Both terms, and the multitude of socio-political elements included in their definitions, are matters of ongoing debate among scholars. Applying them to music seemingly exacerbates a situation already tenuous. The purpose of this study is to investigate Robert Ward’s The Crucible and, despite the looming pitfalls, offer a possible explanation for the perception of a nationalistic content.

This dissertation evolved over the course of many years and is the result of my varied interests in musical aesthetics and philosophy, as well as a fascination with “all things American”—American opera, theater, literature, history, culture, philosophy (especially nationalism), and language—which I have attempted to incorporate into this investigation. Although such diverse disciplines and interests seemed impossible to combine in a single study, I began to understand that the “uniqueness” of American culture and music, and the relationship to their roots in the aesthetic and philosophical tenets of European culture and art music, could possibly provide some connections between the disparate cultural, aesthetic, philosophical and artistic media. Specifically, the relationship between two

*The expression “American” music used in this study is restricted to music by American-born composers (or naturalized citizens) whose work clearly follows the traditions of European art music, both sacred and secular. The term, of course, is broad enough, in other contexts, to include the indigenous musics of the North and South American continents, elements of popular or “folk” music, Jazz, Native American music, and music of the Caribbean Islands.
separate modes of conveying emotion and meaning. "American" English and "American" music, began to crystallize in my mind as potentially explainable, both on aesthetic and technical levels, in somewhat of a Hegelian-dialectic fashion involving the synthesis and ultimate resolution of two disparate elements. The theory resulting from this belief is that, at least as concerns the operatic genre, perceptions of musical nationalism are intimately linked to the music and the specific language used by the composer. If a composer bases an opera on an "American-English" text, the music, itself, may reflect the syntax and accent patterns of the spoken language. If this holds true, the perception of the opera as a work of "nationalistic" music could be strengthened by the interaction and synthesis of music and text.

With this nucleus of a theory in mind, I began researching American operas with the goal of finding one that would best exemplify and, hopefully, support my hypothesis. To this end, a work supervised by Edith Borroff proved most valuable. In this seminal publication, American Operas: A Checklist, Borroff offers information (presented in alphabetical order by composer) on over four-thousand American operas, composed since the early days of colonial America, which includes titles, publication information (if any), and performance dates (if known). With this research tool as a point of departure, together with further research on American operas composed after the publication of Borroff's work, I attempted to identify as many American operas that exhibited identifiable nationalistic traits as possible. In an effort to refine this investigative process, I devised a system of categorizing American operas by various types of nationalistic features exhibited. The ten categories included in this classification system are:

(1) Discovery, (2) American History, (3) Patriotism, (4) Immigration, (5) Nativism,
(6) American Literature—Gothic, (7) American Literature—The Mississippi and Beyond,
(8) American Literature—Colonial America, (9) American Literature—Folklore, and
(10) American Literature—General. This methodology yielded a total of 212 operas that,
to one degree or another, exhibited various aspects of American life and culture. For ex-
ample, in the category Immigration, Douglas Moore composed an opera in 1949 based on
Ole Edvard Rølvaag’s novel, Giants in the Earth (performed in New York City in 1951),
a tragic tale of Swedish immigrants attempting to settle the American West during the
nineteenth century. In the category American History, Martin Kalmanoff wrote an opera
in 1975 titled Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death, which was performed in New York
City as part of the U.S. Bicentennial celebrations. Although works such as these offered
possibilities for further investigation, they did not contain enough of the various elements
I wished to examine. One opera did stand out, however, as containing all of the diverse
characteristics mentioned above: Robert Ward’s, The Crucible. In this one opera, I was
fortunate enough to find a work penned by a well-known, living American composer who
based his work on an acclaimed stage play authored by Arthur Miller, an acknowledged
figure in the world of American letters. An added benefit for my investigation was the
fact that Miller not only took a well-documented event in colonial American history as
the premise for his play, he also paid close attention to the linguistic properties of Ameri-
kan speech patterns in its composition. It seemed plausible that, should the theories I
formulated bear fruit, Ward’s opera was a most likely vehicle for their expression.

Once I had decided upon the existence of a single American opera that might yield
fertile results in terms of the interrelationship of text and music, I examined Ward’s
opera with relation to various theories of musical nationalism. During the process, I concluded that the writings on musical nationalism by the German musicologist, Carl Dahlhaus, might possibly be the most applicable to the conclusions I had drawn about Ward’s The Crucible. This dissertation is the result of these investigations.

Format

This study consists of two parts, each with two chapters—which will examine The Crucible from various perspectives. In Part One, Robert Ward, Arthur Miller, and The Crucible, Chapter I, “Robert Ward: A Biography,” is concerned with Robert Ward’s life and career, not only the historical facts of his life but also those influences that led him to consider The Crucible as a subject for musical treatment: his musical education, his social, political, religious and philosophical beliefs, and his attitude about opera’s dramaturgical requirements. This chapter also includes information about Ward’s professional career from an economic standpoint, for without an adequate means to support himself and his family, the opera could never have been realized. The information here will provide the most comprehensive biography of Robert Ward yet presented, largely made possible because of the composer’s prodigious memory and the generous donation of his time.

Chapter II, “Forging The Crucible: Play and Opera,” focuses on Arthur Miller’s play and the opera’s libretto. It is generally assumed that Miller wrote the play as a reaction to the hearings conducted in the 1940s and 1950s by the House Un-American Activities Committee, of which he was an unwilling participant. As will be seen, Miller’s motivations for writing the play were many. This chapter explores not only the socio-political
climate that existed in the United States in the mid-twentieth century but also the historical background of the Salem witchcraft trials and the religious overtones that intrigued Miller from an early age. Further discussion involves the play’s dramatic structure, central themes and characters, viz., those features first commanding Ward’s attention. An examination of Ward’s personal philosophy and the role it played in his decision to compose The Crucible leads to an act-by-act comparison of the play and libretto, emphasizing the alterations made in order to achieve an appropriate literary vehicle for musical treatment.

In Part Two, Towards a Nationally Characteristic Music, Chapter III, “Questions Regarding Nationalism in Music and the Opera’s Reception,” focuses on the concepts of musical nationalism from a historical perspective. Although the theories of numerous scholars, composers, and critics have been promulgated, those of the German musicologist Carl Dahlhaus, and his belief in nationalism as a “post-referential aesthetic fact,” seem most relevant to the present study. The reception history of The Crucible illustrates how it coincides with Dahlhaus’s theories.

Chapter IV, “The Creation of an Idiomatic Musical Syntax: Robert Ward’s The Crucible,” details Ward’s treatment of text and music. Although this study supports Dahlhaus’s assertion of a “post-referential” musical nationalism, Ward’s “pre-referential” treatment of linguistic and musical materials plays a subtle but determinable role in one’s perception of The Crucible’s as having nationalistic content.
Editorial Procedures

Throughout this study, the effort has been made to effect ease of reading while adhering to the editorial procedures followed in the various source materials cited. For instance, when applied to musical references, designations such as "Major" and "Minor" are supplied with capital letters in order to distinguish them from their use as adjectives in a non-musical context. While the published version of Arthur Miller's play, from which I worked, designates acts as "One," "Two," "Three," and "Four," the published full score of Robert Ward's opera labels them with Roman numerals (I, II, III, and IV). For the sake of consistency, I have chosen to apply the latter designations to both the play and opera.

The principal analytical discussion offered in Chapter IV, "The Creation of an Idiomatic Musical Syntax: Robert Ward's The Crucible," provides examples from Ward's unpublished manuscript drafts compared to corresponding sections of the published score. Because Ward's original manuscripts have faded considerably over the years and thus relatively difficult to read, I have "digitally recreated" them as faithfully as possible, although certain alterations were necessitated because of the technical limitations of digital processing. In those places where Ward "crossed out" something in the manuscript, I have placed a series of small "Xs" underneath the words or note-heads to indicate his intentions. Because the printed score is clear and legible, musical examples taken from it did not require digital recreation of the type used for manuscript examples. For examples drawn from the printed score, the most accurate method for reproducing
faithfully Ward’s intentions proved to be photo reproduction, and this method has been applied here.

The labels applied to examples cited in Chapter IV indicate three things: first, whether the example is drawn from the manuscript or printed score; second, the Act number identified by Roman numerals; and third, the number of the specific example within that act, identified by Arabic numerals. For some examples, a further division is indicated by the use of small letters. For instance, “Manuscript Example II-2b” indicates that the example is taken from the manuscript, “II” identifies the act from which the example is drawn, “2” specifies this as my second example from the act, and “b” (if present) indicates that the illustration is part of the larger example (“2”) under discussion. Likewise, if comparative references between manuscript and score examples require more than one citation, this alphabetic division is applicable. For instance, “Score Example I-4a” and “Score Example I-4b refer to and coincide with “Manuscript Example I-4.” It is hoped that these editorial procedures will facilitate the reader’s understanding of the theories herein offered for their consideration.

*See Appendix B for photo reproductions of these manuscript examples. For the reader’s convenience, examples drawn from the manuscripts and the printed score have been enlarged to varying degrees.
This work is dedicated to the loving memory of my father,
Paul Joseph Kolt (1929-2000), a man without peer.
Although diminished greatly by his absence,
I rejoice in his memory.

Robert Paul Joseph Kolt
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PART ONE

Robert Ward, Arthur Miller, and *The Crucible*
I. Robert Ward: A Biography

Formative Years

Robert Eugene Ward was born on September 13, 1917 in Cleveland, Ohio, the youngest of five children. His gregarious, mild-mannered father, Albert, operated a successful moving and storage company and his mother, Carrie (nee Mollenkopf), a loving, nurturing, church-going matron, oversaw the running of a bustling household and the raising of her five talented children. Through the care and affection of his parents and older siblings in these early, pre-Depression-era years, Ward experienced an almost idyllic existence.

Ward’s earliest years approximated those of many middle-class American children of the era. Like numerous young boys, Ward read about the daring, romantic exploits of World War I soldiers and pilots, which led to interests in designing, building and flying model airplanes. Saturday afternoons found the family at movie theaters that offered first-run silent films combined with live stage shows. The latter often included swing bands and exposed Ward to the early sounds of Benny Goodman, the Dorsey Brothers, Glenn Miller and Duke Ellington. Other influences came via the musical interests of his older brothers and sisters, all of whom who studied piano and/or violin. Growing up at a time of relatively little music available on radio or through commercially-available recordings meant that music making was largely a home-grown affair for the Ward house-

---


2Robert Ward, All the Things I’ve Been: An Autobiography (Unpublished manuscript), 1, Used by Permission, hereafter referred to as Ward, Autobiography. Ward had two older sisters, Rhea and Peg, and older brothers, David and Albert, all of whom involved with the arts in some capacity.

3Ibid., 1.

4Ibid., 2-3.
hold. At weekend parties, Ward’s older sisters played the piano, and everyone gathered around to sing popular hit tunes of the day, beloved religious hymns or excerpts from well-known operettas. When radio became a viable medium of mass communication, the Ward family listened to everything from *Amos and Andy*, prizefights, and afternoon baseball games, to broadcasts of the Philadelphia Orchestra and Metropolitan Opera. The entire family experienced live performances by attending the Cleveland Orchestra’s regular series of children’s concerts, as well as the annual visits of the Metropolitan Opera.⁵

From an early age Ward displayed an affinity for all things musical and expressed his budding talents by participating in various church choral groups and local operetta productions, moving easily from one vocal part to another as his voice changed throughout elementary and high-school years. At age thirteen he began taking piano lessons but soon dropped them because of his interests in sports, model airplanes and other similar adolescent activities.⁶ As he progressed through high school Ward grew more fond of music by exposure to new genres of vocal works, including madrigals, a repertory that opened new vistas of musical coloring for him. During his junior and senior years in high school, Ward began studying harmony, which led to his first attempts at composition. His brother Albert, who was on staff at the Cleveland Playhouse, asked if Robert could compose some incidental music for a play, an offer Ward enthusiastically accepted and an experience to which he attributes his later interest in opera and dramatic music. As a result of this initial foray into the world of dramatic music, Ward began to

---

⁵Ibid., 3.
⁶Ibid., 2. Although a most able pianist, Ward believes his keyboard proficiency could have been considerably better had he continued his early lessons.
compose other songs, stylistically influenced by brief examples of Stravinsky, Ravel, Debussy and Hindemith offered in his harmony textbooks.⁷

By observing his parents, Ward began to understand the intricate concepts of human nature and social interaction that have remained with him. As he recalls,

Parental discipline was never oppressive in our home. High standards of conduct prevailed and were exemplified in the actions of my mother and father. I remember only once when, for what infraction of the rules I can’t recall, my mother insisted that I be switched by my father. After cutting a very small switch from a tree in the yard Dad took me into a small hallway to administer my punishment. After the first stroke he struck the door-jam before the switch reached my backside. The switch broke, Dad banged his knuckles and cried, “Oh, pshaw,” his strongest expletive. Thus ended my punishment.⁸

Ward’s religious education began when, as a child, he attended the Miles Park Presbyterian Church in Cleveland, Ohio, with his family. He remembers the minister, Reverend Peter Macauley, as an unsanctimonious, down-to-earth man who exemplified the more humanistic side of Christianity. Sunday services and church-sponsored social events became mainstays of Ward’s early life, and he describes these activities as a “consistent influence.” The teachings of liberal American Protestantism remained with Ward until high school, when he began to question the “mythological” aspects of Christianity.⁹

The Great Depression and Its Effects

As with many American children of the era, the innocence of childhood came to an abrupt end for Robert Ward with the onset of the Great Depression. It was during these

---

⁷Ibid., 3-4. Only major works will be cited here; complete catalogs appear in various other sources, all listed in the Bibliography.
⁸Ibid., 3.
⁹Ibid., 1.
years that, listening to his older siblings discuss such things as bread lines, labor unions, socialism and the perceived failure of capitalism, Ward first began to form the political and social views that eventually found expression in much of his music, especially the dramatic works.  

Ward’s parents and siblings did their best to shield him from the economic and social upheavals caused by the Depression. Ward recalls an evening when his father returned home from his rounds of bill collecting empty handed. Although he did not realize it at the time, Ward’s father avoided bankruptcy only because Robert’s brothers and sisters, all college graduates, still lived at home and contributed to the family income. Ward’s sisters taught in the public-school system and his brother, David, who earlier had graduated at the top of his class from the Cleveland School of Architecture, worked for one of the city’s finest firms, but that was in 1929. By 1930, the nation’s economy and his brother’s professional world collapsed. From listening to his brother’s discussions with friends about the apparent failure of capitalism and the seeming inability of democratic government to solve the problems, Ward began to understand a need for social justice and governmental responsibility.  

It was also during this period that Ward decided to become a composer. For Christmas in 1933 he asked for books on orchestration, form and harmony. With these to assist him, Ward began to understand more clearly the harmonic vocabularies and formal structures of the great composers. Two years later he received his diploma from Cleveland’s John Adams High School, having already decided that the next step towards realizing his goal of becoming a composer was to attend the Eastman School of Music. Before  

\[\text{Ibid., 4.}\]  
\[\text{Ibid.}\]  
\[\text{Ibid., 5.} \text{ Ward’s mother was a church organist and fully appreciated the talents and aspirations of all her}  

\[\text{5} \text{.} \]
applying to Eastman, Ward decided to spend a year working as a copyist in order to spend more time practicing piano and composing vocal works that he could use as college application pieces. In 1935 an event occurred that almost derailed his budding compositional aspirations. Because of his excellent grades in school, a law firm in Cleveland offered to underwrite the cost of Ward’s college and law-school educations. If Ward had accepted this opportunity, it would have substantially relieved his parents’ anxiety over paying for his continued education. But because of his desire to compose, Ward found that he could not accept this offer in good conscience, and the following year he was accepted as a composition student at the Eastman School of Music.13

Higher Education—Eastman and Juilliard

Ward’s education at Eastman combined required course work with healthy doses of self-instigated investigations into various subjects. As a freshman, he studied theory with Irwin McHose, music history with Warren Fox and composition and orchestration with Bernard Rogers. In order to acquaint himself further with the craft of orchestration, he attended rehearsals of the Eastman Orchestra conducted by the school’s director, Howard Hanson. For the required performing ensemble, Ward sang in the school’s chorus, where he became familiar with many of the standard works for massed voices. His parents’ difficult financial situation during these years meant that Ward needed to find employment while attending school. Fortunately, he secured a position at the Sibley Music

---

children, but Robert’s decision to become a composer during the economic ravages of the Depression is remarkable considering the fact that his father possessed only a sixth-grade education and had relatively little appreciation for the arts. As Ward notes, however, his father fully supported and funded the childrens’ educational and professional ambitions. Robert was an excellent student and was graduated from high school a year early, in 1935.

13 Ibid., 5-6.
Library, where he thoroughly immersed himself in the pedagogical luxury of the numerous scores and recordings at his disposal. Ward’s course requirements also included studies in English literature, a subject in which he became so enthralled that he minored in it, going well beyond the basic requirements.\(^\text{14}\)

During his first year at Eastman, and in the subsequent summer vacation, Ward expanded his compositional horizons. Until this point he concentrated mostly on songs for solo voice with piano accompaniment, but now he began to think in terms of instrumental genres. He commenced work on his 1st *String Quartet* (1937)\(^\text{15}\) and an orchestrated set of two songs collectively titled *Fatal Interview* (1937), based on poems by Edna St. Vincent Millay and originally set with piano accompaniment. The orchestrated version eventually became a means of early recognition for the aspiring young composer, as it was one of the works chosen by NBC Radio for broadcast by Howard Hanson and the Rochester Civic Orchestra. Its success inspired Ward to make initial attempts at writing a symphony, a project he diligently pursued over the course of the next two years, only to discover that he was not yet up to the task. With a better understanding of his abilities and limitations, Ward continued writing solo songs and also began to compose small-scale piano works and choral settings.\(^\text{16}\)

At Eastman, Ward found that his intelligence, easy-going manner and friendly demeanor earned his classmates’ admiration. He was elected Treasurer, Class President and, eventually, President of the Student Association. The duties of these posts enabled Ward to exercise his social and political beliefs formed during the Depression years—

---

\(^{14}\)Ibid., 6-9.

\(^{15}\)Robert Ward, Personal Interview, December 28-30, 2004, Used by Permission, hereafter referred to as Personal Interview. Not to be confused with his later *First String Quartet* of 1966, published by Highgate Press. This preliminary effort was subsequently withdrawn from Ward’s catalog of works.

responsibilities that also whetted his appetite for administrative and leadership/service positions, the very things that would assist him in his later career.17

As a student at Eastman, Ward was responsible for making all the decisions governing his life. He lived alone in a Rochester hotel room and, for the first time, experienced loneliness. He attended church on Sundays to fill the void in his life but found the sermons uninspiring and social life unfulfilling. Ward soon discovered that religion answered few of his questions and began to reconsider what he truly believed. After classes he took long walks around the city, contemplating such dilemmas as “good versus evil in an imperfect world.” While crossing a bridge one evening, Ward stopped to gaze down at the river below. At that moment he experienced what he describes as an “epiphany:”

It seemed to me that there was no proof, one way or the other, of the certainties which were preached. One simply had to have faith in whatever one believed. And since I had no intention of making a career out of evil, I must make one out of whatever I saw as good... If I didn’t take the course of having faith in what I believed as good, then life had no point at all, and I should throw myself into the water below. These thoughts somehow settled my religious questioning, and only many years later have I more clearly defined and extended my belief.18

Ward came to believe that references to God actually allude to “good behavior,” and that the principle of the Golden Rule was an infallible guidepost for human relations.19

According to Ward,

The well-known Bible stories were pleasant history but the mythology which had been propagated about Jesus'[s] life began to come into question from then on. The virgin birth seemed as reasonably explained in Robert Graves'[s] 'Jesus, the King' as in any other source. Jesus'[s] profound sensitivity and love toward his fellow men and women... were for me... the basis of my admiration for

---

17 Ibid.
18 Ibid., 8.
19 Ibid.
the man... I do not believe in the Resurrection. Jesus’[s] afterlife is the survival of the humanitarian ideals for which he stood.20

Ward was interested in history, philosophy, sociology, psychology and science in general, and his investigations into these areas of knowledge affected his religious beliefs. When he read about the religions of India, China and the Near East, Ward discovered that his Presbyterian upbringing had not prepared him for the diversity of philosophical beliefs encountered. He found it comforting to realize that the fundamental ethical principles of Judeo-Christian philosophy are present in religions that predate the Christian era, a fact reaffirming many of his own conclusions.21 He investigated the political and social philosophies of Aristotle, Abelard, Giordano Bruno, Washington, John Adams, Jefferson, Lincoln, Eugene Debs, Karl Marx, Ghandi, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Thorstein Veblen and Bertrand Russell.

What Ward learned from these authors led to his embracing a philosophy of socialism and pacifism colored with a Hindu/Buddhist outlook.22 As he recalls,

I concluded that the reasonable explanation of being is that matter, space and time are infinite. Every aspect of being is perpetually changing. Those aspects which we deem ‘good’ or ‘evil’ are dependent one upon the other as are positive and negative charges and are the very essence of being. Man... has the power to make certain choices and changes. The degree of freedom he possesses in making these choices is directly proportionate to the degree in which they are in accord with the choices of other living complexes and the environment around him... Death is the moment when a living form breaks down and freedom to function independently ceases. The atoms which made up the complex disperse until they re-emerge in a new living complex.23

---

20Ibid., 123.
21Ibid., 104.
22Ibid., 12, 123.
23Ibid., 123.
During his final two years at Eastman, Ward studied composition with Howard Hanson, while his extracurricular activities included summertime participation at the MacDowell Colony in Peterborough, New Hampshire, and attending various music festivals throughout the nation. By the time Ward received his Bachelor of Music degree from Eastman in June, 1939, he had long since decided to pursue further studies at Juilliard, where he had been accepted into the graduate composition program.²⁴

Ward’s political views were further affected by the social and economic conditions of the era. Ward befriended many people who shared his attitudes about social and political matters. They often met informally to discuss the effects of the Depression on their lives and the alarming political events taking place in Europe. He became leftist and pro-Russian but, unlike many of his friends, never advocated communism, unable to accept the idea of a dictatorship. This belief became all the more clear to Ward during the summer of 1939, the year he received his degree from Eastman. In August, 1939, the signing of the “Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact” (also known as the Molotov-Ribbentropp Pact) appalled Ward because of its implications for the rise of dictatorial governments and the resulting threat to world peace.²⁵ A week after the Nazi-Soviet Pact was signed, Germany invaded Poland and the world exploded into armed conflict. Within three years, Ward’s religious, social, and political views would be tested in the crucible of war.

Ward’s first graduate year consisted of difficult but interesting work, forays into new career fields, and a continued interest in political and social matters. He studied fugue and orchestration with Bernard Wagenaar and composition with Frederick Jacobi, who instructed Ward to study and analyze the phrase structures and harmonic practices of

²⁴Ibid., 10-12. At that time all students accepted at Juilliard were granted full scholarships, a fact that made living and studying in New York City possible for Ward.
²⁵Ibid., 12.
Mozart, Haydn, Schubert and Stravinsky. During this same year, Ward received his first academic position, at Queens College, where Joseph Machlis mentored him in teaching music appreciation. In his second year at Juilliard, Ward decided to double-major in composition and conducting and studied with Albert Stoessel and Edgar Schenkman in the orchestral conducting program. During his second year teaching at Queens College, Ward attained the position of Assistant Professor.26

Through his association with Jacobi and a burgeoning friendship with Aaron Copland, Ward became involved with the League of Composers and its journal, *Modern Music*, for which he became a reviewer. Ward soon studied with Copland at the Tanglewood Music Festival, where fellow students included Lukas Foss, Norman Dello Joio and Leonard Bernstein.27 Of his compositional studies with Copland, Ward recalls,

> As a teacher Aaron was remarkable in his ability to zero in on a student's central weakness. Almost immediately he made me aware of the handicap which working at the piano was for me. "Your ear and sense of the orchestra are good but your limitations at the keyboard cramp your imagination." ... He also advised a study of Beethoven's sketchbooks. This counsel proved worth the summer. Sketching away from the piano and at the same time getting away from the sound of rehearsals or practicing on the grounds of Tanglewood was impossible. The porch of the boys' school dormitory where we lived... proved ideal however. It was a new experience and a difficult one for me, but how rewarding.28

At Tanglewood that summer Ward also arranged a luncheon in an unsuccessful attempt to reconcile the long-standing differences between his two mentors, Aaron Copland and Howard Hanson. Both may have had similar aesthetic ideas about the formal and stylistic properties of music, but they had never formed more than a polite, uneasy toleration of each other.

26 Ibid., 12-17.
27 Ibid.
28 Ibid., 17.
Between the two men there might have also been the antipathy which Hanson, a Republican WASP, felt toward Aaron, whom he viewed as a Jewish, homosexual Communist. The lunch was a bit stiff and the conversation remained on the surface. My hope was that these two men would find their common ground and enjoy the occasion, but it didn’t happen.29

In addition to his studies and professional activities, Ward always found time for political involvement. At Eastman he had found common ground with many of his classmates and younger faculty members who were also attracted to the socialist doctrines ostensibly being espoused in communist Russia. But during his first year at Juilliard, news of the war in Europe modified Ward’s views. Although his sympathies for Russian-styled socialism somewhat abated, his views against Western European colonialism remained. Ward also considered himself a conscientious objector based on political and humanitarian grounds, but after hearing accounts of Nazi-occupied Europe from the many refugees flooding into New York, he found such views increasingly difficult to justify.30

This period was personally and professionally satisfying for Ward. Through his studies at Juilliard and Tanglewood, Ward was solidifying his compositional style and technique; and with his newly-found abilities as a conductor, he led the première of his First Symphony with the Juilliard Orchestra in 1941, which won the Juilliard Publication Award.31 Ward had also become an effective and successful young college professor who was beginning to rise through the academic ranks at Queens College. He had befriended and worked with some of the most respected figures in the world of American music, the political situation in Europe was little more than a matter for lively debate, and

29Ibid., 18.
30Ibid., 15.
31Kreitner, Bio-Bibliography, 3.
Division was issued cold-weather gear for their new duty station—the Aleutian Islands.32

After landing in the Aleutian Island chain, Ward’s unit had little to do in the way of playing concerts and raising morale—their duties were of a far more serious nature. The many casualties suffered by U.S. troops required that the band members temporarily serve as medical aids. The injury and death Ward witnessed there was his first, but unfortunately not his last, experience with human suffering on such a wide and impersonal scale. When they were again able to perform their musical duties, the band members set up in remote, forward positions where fierce fighting was either on-going or had recently taken place. One of Ward’s most vivid memories of the war was seeing the glazed stares and expressionless eyes of men who had witnessed the horrors of combat “come back to life” hearing his intrepid little band playing favorite swing tunes. Fortunately for Ward and his fellow musicians, the cold, bleak climate and harrowing combat conditions of the Aleutian campaign was about to be replaced with much more agreeable surroundings.33

In August, 1943, Ward and the 32nd Infantry Band were transferred to Schofield Barracks at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, and they combined with another regimental band to form a new, larger Division band, assigned to play dances and concerts for USO shows, hospitals and other units that had no band of their own. At one concert Ward noticed an

32Ward, Autobiography, 17-21. The Japanese invaded the Aleutian Island chain on June 2, 1942, as a diversionary tactic designed to draw attention away from their assault on Midway Island that took place two days later. After their failed attack on Midway, the Japanese remained in the Aleutians, waging a defensive campaign, hoping to prevent the Allies from invading Japan via the Aleutian Islands. This strategy was successful to some degree; but the two Allied commanders of the Pacific Theaters of Operation, General Douglas MacArthur and Admiral Chester Nimitz, essentially bypassed the Aleutians and advanced towards the Japanese home islands through the South and Central Pacific regions in what has become known as the “Island-Hopping Campaign.”

33Ibid., 21-23.
attractive Red Cross worker helping to set up the stage. Although there were hundreds of eligible men for every woman, Ward decided to throw caution to the wind and asked for Mary Benedict’s phone number. She gave it to him, and thus began an intimate, loving relationship that has lasted throughout the years.34 Because of the uncertainties of war, Ward had always resisted the idea of marriage, but the prospect of marrying Mary overcame all concerns, and the couple were married on June 19, 1944, less than two weeks after D-Day, the Allied invasion of Europe. When Mary became pregnant, Red Cross policy dictated that she return to the United States. At the same time, Ward’s Division participated in the “Island-Hopping Campaign” that was designed to set the stage for the final Allied thrust into the Japanese home islands. In their new assignment, the band continued to play morale-building concerts for the fighting troops, and Ward even found time to compose. During periods of relaxation on the islands of Leyte in the Philippines and Okinawa, Ward composed the Adagio and Allegro (1944) for large orchestra and Jubilation, an Overture (1945).35

Although usually assigned to non-combative roles throughout the war, Ward and his men often found themselves in the midst of dangerous and potentially deadly situations—events that would help shape Ward’s future views of the world. One such incident took place on Leyte Island, where he had orders to take a small, armed patrol of his men and flush out a Japanese soldier hiding alone in a foxhole. Upon pacifying the hapless enemy soldier, some of the men wanted to shoot him, but Ward intervened and ordered them to hold their fire. They took their prisoner to the Division’s intelligence unit where he duly

34Ibid., 23-26. Personal observation reveals that after almost sixty years, the marriage of Robert and Mary Ward is intensely supportive and loving.
35Ibid.
cooperated and revealed the location of his entire unit. This led to a heavy bombardment of the location and the probable killing of many Japanese soldiers. As Ward relates,

For me there was a cruel irony in the sequence of events. My commitment to the war was complete yet I could never feel any hatred toward individual soldiers who opposed us. If I had come under direct attack I would have used my rifle as effectively as possible. But I was happy to have prevented the killing of an enemy who was surrendering. The irony of the situation was that perhaps the saving of his life may have resulted in the death of many of his comrades under our bombardment. Terrible are the fortunes of war.36

Also while stationed on Leyte, in March, 1945, Ward received news from his wife in Florida that their first child, Melinda, had been born. Soon thereafter he and his Division were sent to Okinawa to begin the assault of the Japanese home islands. Ward and everyone else aboard the transport ships experienced moments of sheer terror as Japanese Kamikaze pilots desperately attempted to repel the invading American forces. In early August, 1945, American and Allied forces, poised to continue their attacks into the heart of Japan, received news of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, resulting in the cessation of hostilities.37

While stationed in Seoul, Korea, at the end of the war, Ward’s band performed for a group of British officers who had recently been released from Japanese internment camps.38 The sight of these men, many more dead than alive, reaffirmed his belief that all people be responsible for the welfare of others, and with the abrogation of that responsibility, profound and needless suffering ensues. According to Ward,

The war years had broadened and deepened my perspectives on life. Sharing the grim realities of war with men from all the di-

---

36Ibid., 27.
37Ibid., 28.
38Ibid.
verse peoples of America added a new dimension to my social concerns.\textsuperscript{39}

Within a few months, Ward was mustered out of the Army and reunited with his wife and new daughter, as well as his parents and siblings at the family home in Cleveland, where they spent the Christmas holidays.\textsuperscript{40} In January, 1946, Ward and his young family were back in New York City so that he could complete his last semester of graduate work at Juilliard. He received his Master of Music degree in the early summer of that year.\textsuperscript{41}

\textbf{Professional and Family Life}

The problem of making a living and supporting a growing household as a composer was now a concern for Ward. Many twentieth-century composers, including Paul Hindemith, Vincent Persichetti, Walter Piston, and Arnold Schoenberg, became full-time educators to meet their financial needs. Others, notably Aaron Copland and Igor Stravinsky, avoided such careers. While Stravinsky astutely and successfully secured performance rights for his compositions, Copland spent his early years living a rather modest life, writing prose works to supplement his income from composition. Ward’s desire was to insure that, in whatever occupation he engaged, his contracts provide adequate time for him to compose.\textsuperscript{42}

Unlike the pre-war years in which jobs were relatively scarce, the booming American post-war economy made jobs plentiful. Douglass Moore, Music Department Chairman at Columbia University, invited Ward to teach several classes and direct the university

\textsuperscript{39}Ibid., 29.
\textsuperscript{40}Ibid., 27-29.
\textsuperscript{41}Ibid., 29-30.
\textsuperscript{42}Personal Interview. Ward discussed the times he went to visit Copland in his New York City loft and related how it was a rather modest dwelling, just large enough for Copland’s piano, some bookshelves and other “small pieces of furniture.”
band. Edgar Schenkman also arranged for Ward to be hired as a conducting teacher at Juilliard.\(^43\) Ward taught at Columbia from 1946 to 1948 and at Juilliard from 1946 to 1956, and in 1955 he became assistant to the president, William Schuman, in which capacity his duties included heading the newly-established Development Office and overseeing fund-raising activities.\(^44\) Ward’s first Juilliard contract (1947) allowed him sufficient time to compose and paid him the yearly sum of $3,500.\(^45\) An additional $1,000 grant from the American Academy and Institute of Arts and Letters\(^46\) assured an income far exceeding that of the average U.S. worker.\(^47\) Although it did not allow for a lavish lifestyle, this income provided Ward and his growing family an adequate level of comfort.\(^48\)

In addition to securing academic appointments, Ward began to receive increasing public interest in his compositions. His pre-war First Symphony and Jubilation, an Overture became popular with many of the city’s conductors. As a result, new commissions were forthcoming, the first of which was the Second Symphony (1947), commissioned by Hans Kindler and the National Symphony Orchestra. After a successful premiere in Washington, D.C., in 1948, the work was performed the following season by Eugene Ormandy and the Philadelphia Orchestra. The Third Symphony, commissioned by William Strickland and the Friends of Dumbarton Oaks, appeared a few years later.

\(^{46}\)Ibid., 32.
\(^{47}\)In 1947 the average U.S worker’s salary was $1300. In this regard see, Glenn W. King, General Supervisor, *Statistical Abstract of the United States 1990* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990), 428. When viewing the salary figures as reported in this work it should be kept in mind that they refer to full time, part-time, seasonal and minimum wage employees in all career fields.
\(^{48}\)Personal Interview. See also Ward, *Autobiography*, 31-32.
income relative to the rest of the nation.\textsuperscript{56} Two years later Ward established a development office at Juilliard. These new duties demanded more of his time, so he resigned his position at the Third Street Music School Settlement. Despite the loss of earnings from leaving the Settlement position, his income increased slightly, from $8,300 to $8,500 per year. From 1948 through 1955, a part-time position conducting the Doctor’s Symphony of New York also brought Ward a small amount of additional earnings.\textsuperscript{57}

During the 1950s, new opportunities in arts management and administration came to Ward as he served on the boards of the Alice M. Ditson Annual Festival of Contemporary American Music at Columbia University, The American Music Center, the Composers Alliance/Recordings Inc., The American Symphony Orchestra League, The National Opera Institute, the Martha Baird Rockefeller Fund for Music, and subsequently, on the panels of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, The Pulitzer Prize for Music, Opera America, and the National Endowment for the Arts. Ward’s affiliations with these organizations brought him into professional contact with such luminaries in the world of American music as Elliott Carter, Henry Cowell, Douglass Moore, Vincent Persichetti and Wallingford Riegger. His years at Juilliard also brought him into association with well-known international composers such as Benjamin Britten, Darius Milhaud and Francis Poulenc.\textsuperscript{58}

As Ward built his career and raised his family after the war, he also maintained an active interest in world affairs. He was deeply disturbed by the government’s takeover of atomic research and development, fearing that military priorities would overshadow the

\textsuperscript{56}The average worker’s income for that year was $1700. See King, \textit{Statistical Abstract of the United States 1990}, 428.

\textsuperscript{57}Personal Interview.

\textsuperscript{58}Ward, \textit{Autobiography}, 35-38.
benefits that might be derived from peaceful applications of nuclear technology. He was also troubled by the "witch hunt" carried on by Senator Joseph McCarthy and the House Un-American Activities Committee in the 1950s. Though never called to testify before the Committee, as were many of his more unfortunate friends and colleagues, Ward maintained his leftist/socialist views and remained in complete sympathy with those who dared openly defy Senator McCarthy, although he realized it was a dangerous stance to take. Ward also saw troubling parallels between America's refusal to join the League of Nations following the First World War and what he considered a general retreat from the ideals of the United Nations after the Second World War. He hoped that America's oversight of Japan's reconstruction, the Marshall Plan for rebuilding Europe, and President Truman's stance against the spread of Communism would keep the world from once again descending into chaos and armed conflict. It was during this period that he came to definite conclusions about the nature of society and humankind's place within it. As he recalls,

> Each living complex chooses... how to act to survive and enjoy the best life. Out of the reflections of my experience of life I have arrived at certain conclusions.

> Life is best in a society governed by laws which protect life, liberty and property [and] created by citizens of the society. Land which is part of the Universal whole should be communally owned and only available for occupation and use by an individual or group during its life span and be subject to such restrictions as the society may impose. Individual's privacy should be protected to the extent that any action involved is not harmful to others.²⁰

²⁰Personal Interview. Ward feels he was probably too young at the time to be called before the House Un-American Activities Committee, as most of those summoned were older. More importantly, he did not fear being subpoenaed because he had (and has) never joined a socialist political party.

Ward's philosophy also mirrors George Washington's ideal of good government as expressed in his *Admonition to the States* of 1783. With only slight changes in Washington's wording, Ward's beliefs, cited herein, reflect a relatively global viewpoint:

There are four things which are essential to solve present conflicts and bring lasting peace to the peoples of the world.  
1st. An indissoluble union of the nations under one Federal Head,  
2ndly. A sacred regard to Public Justice,  
3rdly. The adoption of a proper Peace Establishment, and  
4thly. The prevalence of that pacific and friendly disposition among the Peoples of all nations, which will induce them to forget their local prejudices and policies, to make those mutual concessions which are requisite to the general prosperity, and in some instances, to sacrifice their individual advantages to the interests of the World Community of Peoples.  

With this *Admonition* as a model, Ward believes the government of the future should be a "One World Socialist Democracy" (with present-day Sweden as the closest approximation of his vision), but he is under no illusion that such a system will be in place any time soon. As Ward states, "the path to the achievement of such a state will be tortuous and will require a great educational effort and patience."  

As the reference to George Washington indicates, Ward envisions a global system of government based primarily on the American democratic ideals of individual rights and responsibilities, social justice, and government institutions answerable to all its citizens. To many music critics, Ward's compositions reflect this philosophy, and they consider

---

61Ibid. As related by Ward in his autobiography, Washington's 1783 *Admonition to the States* reads, in part: "There are four things, which I humbly conceive, are essential to the existence of the Unites States as an independent power; 1stly. An indissoluble union of the States under one Federal Head, 2ndly. A sacred regard to Public Justice, 3rdly. The adoption of a proper Peace Establishment, and 4thly. The prevalence of that pacific and friendly disposition among the Peoples of the United States, which will induce them to forget their local prejudices and policies, to make those mutual concessions which are requisite to the general prosperity, and in some instances, to sacrifice their individual advantages to the interests of the Community."

62Personal Interview.

his work to be both "American" and "optimistic." Ward agrees with this assessment and considers himself an American "nationalist" composer. As he relates, this self-assessment is "not a result of conscious effort on my part but rather the result of growing up surrounded by the boundless advantages of American musical life and the rich environment of my home and our great country." If Ward's music is both reflective of his values and "American nationalist" in character, it very well may be in his staged, dramatic works where this characteristic becomes most evident; as he has stated on numerous occasions, in order "to understand composers' deepest beliefs, one should study the texts of their vocal works where in the fullest measure they reveal themselves." 

Ward's First Opera

By 1955, Ward decided his compositional skills had developed sufficiently for him to attempt the writing of an opera. In order to begin, he needed to find subject matter that would provide the musical, non-musical and dramaturgical possibilities he desired, and the collaborative services of a sympathetic librettist. Ever since Ward had met Bernard Stambler, one of his Juilliard colleagues who taught in the school's Academic Department, he knew he had found the right librettist. From the beginning there was a complete meeting of the minds, and they set about the task of finding an appropriate subject for their first joint venture. Ward soon came upon Leonid Andreyev's play, He Who Gets Slapped (1916) and urged Stambler to read it. Although both were excited about the

---

64 See Chapters III and IV infra.
65 Personal Interview.
66 Ward, Autobiography, 125.
67 Ibid., 47. Not all composers would agree with this statement. Ward has always taken great care to find the right words to convey his beliefs.
68 For a biographical sketch of Bernard Stambler see Appendix C. Ward joined the Juilliard faculty in 1946, and Bernard Stambler joined a year later. The two would have met, ostensibly, at that time, but it was not until 1955 that Ward decided to attempt writing his first opera.
work's colorful setting and taut, engrossing drama, a problem existed. In the original, the main character, He, a circus performer and idealist, and Baron Regnard, his rival in love, murder Consuelo, the heroine of the tale. Regnard and He then commit double suicide in order to see who can be the first to reach Consuelo in Heaven. Ward and Stambler decided to rewrite the finale in a manner compatible with their beliefs about the nature of human relationships. Fortunately, there was no copyright agreement between the U.S. and Russia, and they were free adapt the story any way they chose. Although retaining Andreyev's original title, they changed the name of the main character, from “He” to “Pantaloons,” which they felt better described his occupation as a circus performer, and decided such an individual could not commit murder and suicide. But they also felt it necessary to keep the tragic nature of Andreyev’s original, so they wrote a bittersweet dénouement in which the heroine ultimately rejects Pantaloon, who is forever resigned to being “He Who Gets Slapped.” This ending better suited both Ward and Stambler, neither of whom believed in the kind of heaven and afterlife that the original play assumed. It also reflects Ward’s conviction that human beings have responsibilities to one another which, when ignored or overlooked, can have tragic consequences. In May, 1956, He Who Gets Slapped was premiered by The Juilliard Orchestra and a cast of local professionals in New York City. The favorable critical response received for Ward’s and Stambler’s first collaborative effort gave them enough confidence to continue their association. Before beginning their next operatic venture, The Crucible, Ward’s career took a dramatic shift in direction.

69 Although Ward does not mention it in his memoirs, this decision follows in the “tragic clown” tradition of I Pagliacci, Petrushka and Pierrot lunaire, all loosely based on the Commedia dell’ arte stock characters, Pantalone and Arlecchino.
70 Ward, Autobiography, 40-42.
A New Career—The Publishing Industry

Ward’s earlier positions in student government helped him develop a keen sense of organization and a flair for administration, skills that made it possible for him to increase his earning capacity. In 1956 John Kernochan, a law professor at Columbia Law School, inherited Galaxy Music Corporation from his father, Marshall Kernochan. To Ward’s surprise, Kernochan asked him to reorganize and head the company’s day-to-day operations as Executive Vice-President and Managing Editor. Ward agreed, but with the proviso that the duties not seriously curtail his composing. The obliging Kernochan promised Ward ample staff assistance and no regular office hours, provided he fulfill the responsibilities of the position.71 Another unique feature of this contract was the fact that it was non-exclusive. Ward was free to pursue any business venture he desired, musical or non-musical, as long it did not conflict with Galaxy’s interests.72

When Ward assumed the position at Galaxy Music Corporation, its catalog consisted almost entirely of vocal music, a fact that reflected the interests of the former owner, Marshall Kernochan, a composer mainly of songs and choral music. Aside from vocal works, a relatively small amount of variety resulted from Galaxy’s role as the American agent for Stainer & Bell and Elkin music publishers, both London-based firms offering a greater variety of music. Ward and his staff met extensively with representatives of both companies to formulate sweeping changes in Galaxy’s organization, business practices and editorial policy. These changes, along with increased capital from the new owner,

---
71Ibid.
72Personal Interview.
soon put Galaxy Music and Highgate Press, its newly reorganized, London-based, BMI affiliate, on a solid business footing.\(^73\)

As operational head of Galaxy Music Corporation, Ward earned five times the national average.\(^74\) In 1956 he made $10,000, a figure that rose to $15,000 a year by the time he left to become President of the North Carolina School of the Arts in 1967. During his final year at Galaxy, Ward received his third Guggenheim Fellowship, and Kernochan granted him a leave-of-absence that enabled Ward to concentrate fully his efforts on composing. The fellowship’s $15,000 stipend\(^75\) substituted for his salary at Galaxy and kept him at the same level of income proportional to the national average.\(^76\) Ward also realized an added financial benefit during his years at Galaxy, the opportunity to see first-hand which types of compositions were most commercially viable, such as high-school band and choral works. He used this practical knowledge to enhance his earning power by tailoring some of his own compositions to meet the needs of these more lucrative markets.\(^77\)

Ward found time to maintain a regular schedule of composition during this period and wrote such works as *When Jesus Rode into Jerusalem* (1956), *The Wondrous Night of Christmas Eve* (1957), *Prairie Overture* (for band, 1957), the *Fourth Symphony*, which was premiered in 1958 with the composer conducting the Musical Arts Society of La Jolla, California, *Hymn and Celebration* (1962), *Night Fantasy* (1962), *Music for a Celebration* (1963), *Let the Word Go Forth* (1965), and the *First String Quartet* (1966).

\(^73\)Ward, *Autobiography*, 44. One of the firm’s editors was the British musicologist Thurston Dart who, at the time, was also their principal music advisor.

\(^74\)In 1956 the average U.S. worker’s salary was approximately $2,000 per year. In 1966 the average was approximately $3,000 per year. See, King, *Statistical Abstract of the United States 1990*, 428.

\(^75\)Personal Interview.

\(^76\)In 1967 the average U.S. worker’s salary was $3,000 per year. See, King, *Statistical Abstract of the United States 1990*, 428.

\(^77\)Personal Interview.
During this prolific period Ward also composed his most enduring work, *The Crucible* (1961).

In 1964, Ward’s and Stambler’s third collaborative effort turned away from the serious philosophical issues raised in their first two operas and dealt with human relationships in a more lighted-hearted fashion. Their opportunity to create a new work came about from the success of a previous opera, but not one of theirs. Shortly after Douglas Moore’s *The Ballad of Baby Doe* (1956) received public and critical acclaim, Emerson Buckley, Music Director of the Central City Opera Association in Colorado, commissioned Ward and Stambler to write a new work based on a Western theme. The commission called for a setting of Homer Croy’s *The Lady from Colorado* (1957), a tale featuring numerous picturesque locales and colorful Western characters. Ward and Stambler decided to turn the story into a satirical look at American politics set in 1876, the year Colorado achieved statehood. They concluded that the light-hearted plot was best suited to a form consisting of short scenes and set numbers (including choreographed numbers) and created what later become known as a “cross-over” work—neither a full-blown, dramatic opera, nor merely incidental music—and thus in the manner of *Porgy and Bess* (1935) and *West Side Story* (1957). Though the critics reacted favorably, Ward felt the cinema had saturated the public’s desire for tales of the Wild West, so he and Stambler revised the work. They changed it into an operetta form, made it even lighter in character, and retitled this new version *Lady Kate*. Although there are fewer social and philosophical messages in *Lady Kate*, Stambler’s libretto provided Ward ample opportunity to comment, albeit humorously, on the stilted social mores and corrupt political

---

78Ibid., 42-61.
conditions of nineteenth- and twentieth-century American society. The work was premiered in 1964, with Emerson Buckley conducting the Central City Opera Association.\textsuperscript{79}

\textbf{A Return to Academe–The North Carolina School of the Arts}

By 1965, the lack of sufficient funding for the arts in public schools had reached crisis proportions. The launch of Sputnik by the Soviet Union in 1957 created a near-panic attitude within the American public education system because it was felt that the Soviets had gained technological superiority over the Western democracies. This fear caused many public-school systems to reduce spending for arts-related programs in favor of increased financial support for mathematics and science curricula. What innovations did occur in arts education programs took place mostly in private schools, which did not rely on public funds for support. One of the best examples of this was the formation of the North Carolina School of the Arts—hereafter referred to as NCSA—in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. The idea for the school was conceived by John Ehle, a novelist, social visionary and staff member of North Carolina’s Governor, Terry Sanford.\textsuperscript{80} Ehle managed to secure a major Ford Foundation grant to get the project started. The operating premise of the new school provided for meeting state requirements at junior and senior high-school levels and a Bachelor of Arts degree in music, drama or dance. The first President of the new school was Vittorio Giannini, a long-time friend and former colleague of Ward’s on the Juilliard faculty. One of Giannini’s first acts was to invite

\textsuperscript{79}Ibid., 57-58.
\textsuperscript{80}Personal Interview. Sanford served in the North Carolina State Senate from 1953 to 1961, as Governor of North Carolina from 1961 to 1965 and as President of Duke University from 1969 to 1985 during which time he also made two unsuccessful bids for the White House, in 1972 and 1976. He was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1986 and served one term. His contributions to the State of North Carolina earned him the nickname, “Uncle Terry.”
Ward to become the Dean of Music, an offer Ward declined because of his publishing industry commitments. Two years later, Giannini died suddenly, and the school called Ward, ostensibly to seek his advice about finding a successor to the post. Ward quickly realized he was being considered for the position. With the gracious consent of Jack Kernochan, owner of Galaxy Music, Ward accepted the offer with the proviso (once again) that he have ample time to compose. To insure this, Ward’s contract with the NCSA stipulated that, after five years, he could ask the Board of Directors to appoint a successor should he feel that his composing was suffering.

As President of the NCSA, Ward had numerous new duties. His immediate goals were to reorganize the administrative arm of the school and to stabilize what had been a rather fractious faculty. He accomplished both by appointing new deans to head the various divisions of the school. Also on the agenda was a continuation of the work begun by Giannini in establishing foreign-country summer programs so that students in all divisions could acquaint themselves with the European roots of their respective crafts.

In addition to administering the overall operation of the school, Ward had to make a yearly presentation of funding needs before the Finance Committee of the State Legislature, a task he considered somewhat odious because it entailed dealing with legislators who were not always receptive to financing the school. Although the NCSA was (and remains) a primarily state-funded institution, Ward maintained productive relationships with major grant foundations—Ford, Rockefeller, Kresge, Mellon and numerous others—in order to enhance the school’s operating capital. His years of service on various boards

---

81Ibid. According to Ward, Giannini had suffered a prior heart attack. The cause of death was most likely the result of a heart-related illness.
83Ibid. The music program became loosely allied with the Accademia Musicale Chigiana in Siena, Italy.
of directors in New York City prepared him well for these duties. The numerous personal-
and professional contacts he had made during those years also eased the task of raising
funds for the NCSA.84

During his tenure at the NCSA, Ward established several new program offerings.
Most notable among these was the School of Design and Production, a program that,
for the first time, created classes in painting and sculpture. Because of the school’s dis-
tance from the nation’s principal artistic centers, Ward also brought in guest artists to
give lectures and conduct master classes. The Dance Division hosted visits from Agnes
DeMille, Robert Joffrey, and José Limon; in theater, Helen Hayes, Jean Arthur, Marcel
Marceau and Clive Barnes; and in music, Aaron Copland, William Schuman, George
Crumb, Yehudi Menuhin, Janos Starker, and Andres Segovia, to name but a few.85

The first two years of Ward’s presidency of the NCSA were marked by solidifying the
original plans set forth for the school from its inception. Now the institution was poised
to proceed with its long-range growth program, which included raising the school’s aca-
demic standards, soliciting new sources of public financial support, establishing an equit-
able faculty ranking system, increasing faculty salaries and embarking on a capital build-
ing program in order to accommodate the needs of the rapidly growing student popu-
lation. Ward’s leadership was so successful that within five years his administration
doubled the size and enhanced the quality of the student body, reorganized and stabilized
the administrative structure, and was able to approve plans for increasing the size of the
physical plant.86

84Ibid., 66-70.
85Ibid.
86Ibid., 70-77. When Ward arrived in 1967 the student body numbered three hundred. At the end of his
presidency, the number had increased to six-hundred students. Creative faculty and administrative
policies initiated by Ward were so successful that academic standards increased to the point where the
As President of the NCSA, Ward received a salary commensurate with his efforts. His initial salary at the school was $25,000—$10,000 more than he had earned yearly at Galaxy Music Corporation. Moreover, Ward and his family now lived in a region far removed from the expensive New York City area. Although his salary as President of the North Carolina School of the Arts remained comparatively stable throughout his decade-long tenure,\(^\text{87}\) it also remained relatively high.\(^\text{88}\)

Ward’s presidency of the NCSA took place from 1967 to 1972, at the height of the Vietnam War. The school was not immune from the social Sturm und Drang the war caused, as it experienced the same type of student unrest found on numerous college campuses across the U.S. Ward sympathized with those who wished to see an early end to the ordeal because he felt America’s intervention was too costly in terms of money and lost lives. His attitude about the war was driven as much by social and political concerns as they were by the fact that his three sons were of age to be called for military service. He also feared that loosening attitudes towards sexual behavior and drug use during the Vietnam era could affect his children negatively. Although Ward found no easy solutions to the problems the school and his family encountered at this time, they did serve

---

\(\text{87}\) Personal Interview.
\(\text{88}\) In 1978, the year before Ward left the NCSA to assume his duties at Duke University, his $25,000 annual salary was substantially more than nearly three times the amount of the average U.S. worker’s yearly income of $8,141. See King, Statistical Abstract of the United States 1990, 428.
to bolster his belief that every person must assume personal responsibility for shaping the future destiny of humankind.89

During this frenetic period, Ward managed to maintain a consistent schedule of composition. The First String Quartet was completed in 1966, and the National Symphony Orchestra, with Marjorie Mitchell as piano soloist, premiered the Concerto for Piano and Orchestra in 1968. The following year Ward and Stambler received a commission from the New York City Opera and began work on their fourth opera together.90

Because their previous operas relied heavily upon male voices in principal roles, Ward and Stambler now sought a story with a woman in the lead. They eventually decided on Ibsen’s Hedda Gabler (1890). As with Arthur Miller’s The Crucible, Ibsen’s personae were of varied types and the story tightly written, features both composer and librettist found attractive. The bleak Norwegian milieu of Ibsen’s story did not suit Ward’s personality, so he and Stambler reset the story in an American locale. They considered both San Francisco and New Orleans in the 19th century, and even Long Island in the 1920s, but eventually settled on Charleston, South Carolina, at the end of the Civil War, and they were able to retain all of Ibsen’s important dramatic elements. They also changed the name of the principal character to Claudia Legare, the title of the new opera.91

In Claudia Legare, Ward returned to the intense, emotionally-laden drama that characterized his first two operas. The heroine of Ibsen’s tale is a possessive, domineering woman obsessed with controlling, and ultimately destroying, everyone in her life, including herself. This story allowed Ward to infuse the opera with his ideals concerning personal integrity, human frailty, distorted love and the misery that results when individuals ab-

---

89Ward, Autobiography, 70-77.
90Ibid., 77-84.
91Ibid.
rogate their higher obligations towards humanity.\footnote{Ibid.} Although Stambler completed the libretto quickly, Ward’s administrative duties at the NCSA limited his progress, and work soon ground to a halt. Ward was not able to finish \textit{Claudia Legare} until 1973. By then, significant changes in critical taste had occurred in the world of American music. As Ward recalls,

> During these years important changes were taking place in the \textit{N[ew] Y[ork]} scene with respect to musical criticism. The older critics who had been reasonably favorable to those composers who had resisted the twelve-tone/atonal tide which flooded our universities in the sixties and seventies were retiring and being replaced by younger men who had succumbed to the blandishments of the serialists and later to a lesser degree by the minimalists…\footnote{Ibid., 77-80.}

Ward and Stambler were shocked to discover that, when the score was finally completed and submitted, the New York City Opera rejected it because of its conservative style.

The première of \textit{Claudia Legare} was finally given in 1978 by the Minnesota Opera, a production Ward felt was flawed, accounting for its favorable, but not enthusiastic, reviews.\footnote{Ibid.}

\section*{A Return to Teaching}

Because Ward felt that the time required to fulfill his administrative duties was causing his compositional skills to deteriorate, he announced to the NCSA’s faculty and administration in 1973 that he would step down as President the following year but stay on as a member of the composition faculty. The following Spring, Robert Suderberg was named as Ward’s successor. For the next four years, Ward enjoyed his new role as faculty member because it allowed him more time to concentrate on other activities. During
this period, The Crucible was enjoying successful productions on many college campuses, and the extra time Ward now had allowed him to attend the performances of it and give guest lectures. Ward also composed the Concertino for Strings (1973), a reworking of part of his First String Quartet, The Promised Land (1974), based on Appalachian hymn tunes; the Fifth Symphony--Canticles of America (1976), commissioned for the U.S. Bicentennial celebrations, and Four Abstractions for Band (1977).95

While Ward was on a one-year leave of absence from the NCSA in 1978, Frank Tiro, Music Department Chairman at Duke University, asked Ward to substitute teach composition one day a week. As with so many other events in Ward’s life, this offer opened new career paths for him. The position was as the Mary Duke Biddle Professor of Music, and, during the same year, a search for a permanent replacement took place. Tiro asked Ward to apply, and he received the appointment in the Spring of 1979, holding the position until 1989, when he retired from active teaching. Because Ward was used to the conservatory-like atmosphere at Eastman, Juilliard and the NCSA, he found Duke’s more academically-oriented structure a sometimes difficult environment with which to deal.96 He managed this problem in creative fashion. Although he could have earned more during his stay at Duke University, Ward’s financial responsibilities were not as crucial as they had once been. The endowed professorship came with a specified salary, but Ward declined a part of it. In exchange for lessened administrative duties he accepted a lower-than-normal salary, which ranged from $20,000 to $25,000 yearly during his eight-

95Ibid.
96Ibid., 80-84.
year tenure, but he was happy with the relatively light teaching schedule and long summer vacations that left him sufficient time for composition and conducting.

**Ward’s Subsequent Works, An Overview**

**Operas**

In 1980, Ward decided to compose another opera. But this one would be without Bernard Stambler as librettist because the latter was engaged in other tasks at the time, and the physical distance between them made collaboration difficult. The circumstances surrounding the creation of this new work were also unusual in another way.

After a televised performance of Ward’s *Earth Shall Be Fair* (1960), Pamela Ilott, a producer for CBS, asked Ward if he would be willing to write a dramatic work for a future one-hour television broadcast. He enthusiastically agreed but said he needed a librettist. Ilott recommended Jan Hartman, who had written several successful teleplays, as librettist. During their initial meeting Ward and Hartman found that they were like-minded in many ways regarding drama and, although Hartman had never written an opera libretto, Ward was impressed with the striking, dramatic imagery in his writing. The two decided to collaborate on the subject of Abelard and Heloise, a dramatic love story set within the context of medieval religious fervor.

---

97 Personal Interview. See also King, *Statistical Abstract of the United States 1990,* 428. In 1979, the national average for personal income was slightly more $9,000 per year, less than half of Ward’s $20,000 first-year salary at Duke. By the time he retired in 1987 his salary had increased to $25,000, a lower ratio when compared to the national average of $15,483.

98 Personal Interview. Ward lived in North Carolina and Stambler in New York at this time. The physical distance between them, plus other professional commitments, resulted in their never collaborating on another opera together. Many years later, while Stambler was a resident in the same retirement community as Ward, the two discussed the possibility of working on another operatic project, but ill health on Stambler’s part precluded any such collaboration. Stambler died in 1994. See Appendix C.

Abelard was a twelfth-century French cleric, scholar and poet-philosopher known for his liberal views, making him popular with his young students. He and Heloise, one of his students and niece of the powerful Canon of Notre Dame, fell in love. Their ill-fated union met with the most dire of consequences. Heloise was sent to a convent and Abelard was executed as a heretic. Ward saw this tale about crossing religious and social boundaries rife with modern-day implications. He also felt that the subject matter closely matched his philosophy about the fragile nature of relationships, social responsibility, and the inherent dangers of rigid, dogmatic political and religious institutions.100

Rather than using someone else's version of the story, Ward and Hartman based their work on the couple’s love letters, which are extensive. Condensing the story into the required time frame mandated by CBS proved highly challenging. The tragic events surrounding the lives of Abelard and Heloise are of such complexity that both Ward and Hartman felt a one-hour time allotment insufficient to recount the drama adequately. When they related this to CBS's management, they learned that the project had already been cancelled owing to other commercial considerations.101 Although disappointed, Ward and Hartman turned the work into a full-length opera. The Charlotte Opera premiered *Aberlard and Heloise* in 1982, and it received the type of positive critical acclaim Ward had not enjoyed for a dramatic work since *The Crucible*. This success immediately resulted in yet another new operatic commission for Ward.102

The applause for *Aberlard and Heloise* had barely subsided when Robert Herman, General Manager of the Greater Miami Opera, commissioned Ward to compose an opera on the subject of nuclear proliferation, *Minutes Till Midnight*. Ward worked with a new

---

100 Ibid.
101 Ibid. Ward saw this as a case of crass commercial interests destroying television’s better programming.
102 Ibid.
librettist—Dan Lang, a writer who covered developments in nuclear energy for the New Yorker magazine. Like Jan Hartman, Lang had never written a libretto but, according to Ward, he was a fine writer and opera fan whose dual interests in nuclear energy and opera led him to conceive the idea of writing a libretto dealing with the political, social and moral ramifications faced by scientists creating ever more destructive weapons of mass destruction. Ward and Lang realized their subject was controversial, but both felt so strongly about it that they forged ahead, completing the opera in a few months. 103

The drama unfolds in the manner of a modern morality play wherein the ethical conscience of the hero, a nuclear physicist on the verge of discovering a means to harness the power of the cosmos, is put to an extreme test by pitting his loyalty to country against his duty to all humankind. The protagonist of the story must decide whether the knowledge he can reveal will remain a military secret or be divulged to the world. His internal struggles unfold against the backdrop of the death of his young colleague in a violent anti-war demonstration, a heart attack, and his recurring, apocalyptic visions of the nuclear holocaust such knowledge could unleash. He ultimately decides he cannot allow his discovery to be in the hands of a single government and sends his information to an international scientific journal, thus allowing the world to decide its own fate. 104

Unlike Ward’s previous operas, which retain moral, social and philosophical considerations at a secondary level, in Minutes Till Midnight, they are primary. The moral issues raised in the work closely mirror Ward’s philosophy of social responsibility—as expressed in the fourth tenet of his model for a “One World Socialist Democracy”—in which the interests of the world’s population supersede those of local or regional

103Ibid., 86-87.
104Ibid.
governments. As Ward stated: "...the safest way for the world to deal with the vast potential power of solar energy, both for good or evil, was to have knowledge of it and the means of its use available to all." The premiere of Minutes Till Midnight took place in Miami on June 4, 1982, but Lang unfortunately had died of leukemia a few months earlier. Lang’s doctors felt he may have contracted the disease while covering a failed atomic bomb test for the New Yorker. Although the audience reacted positively, Donal Henahan, a critic for the New York Times, wrote vehemently against the libretto’s statement of principle for several weeks afterwards. Sadly, this fact, more than the quality of the music, may account for the opera’s relatively brief performance history.

Instrumental Music

A period of intense compositional output ensued, and Ward completed numerous instrumental works, both large and small, from 1983 to 1997. He composed the Dialogues for Violin, Cello and Orchestra on commission for the Chattanooga Symphony’s 50th anniversary (1983). A year later, the Concerto for Tenor Saxophone and Orchestra was completed under a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts. In 1985, a commission from the Raleigh Chamber Music Guild brought about the Raleigh Divertimento for woodwind quintet. The Festival Triptych received its premiere in 1986 at the 25th anniversary of the Eastern Music Festival in Greensboro, North Carolina. In 1987, The North Carolina Symphony celebrated the end of the Cold War by commissioning

---

105 Ibid., 124. "4thly. The prevalence of that pacific and friendly Disposition among the Peoples of all nations, which will induce them to forget their local prejudices and policies, to make those mutual concessions requisite to the general prosperity, and in some instances, to sacrifice their individual advantages to the interests of the World Community of Peoples." See above, p. 22.
106 Ibid., 87
107 Ibid., 86-87.
Dialogue on the Tides of Time, which includes a quodlibet of six national anthems. In 1988, the Florence, South Carolina, Symphony commissioned the First Symphonic Set, the New South (excerpts from Claudia Legare). Then followed A Western Set (excerpts from Lady Kate) in 1989. The DeKalb Symphony celebrated its 25th anniversary by commissioning 5x5, Four Variations on a Five-Part Theme in 1989. The Violin Concerto, infused with the rhythmic and expressive elements of jazz, was written for Sarah Johnson who premiered it with the Winston-Salem Symphony in 1993. And in 1997, the National Gallery Orchestra marked its 50th anniversary by commissioning Ward’s By Way of Memories.\(^{108}\)

**Chamber Music**

Over the course of fifty years, Ward witnessed what he considered the ubiquitous financial crisis suffered by many orchestras in the United States. He felt that this situation, albeit regrettable, created an increased public interest in chamber music. Ward capitalized on the resulting need for new works with Appalachian Ditties and Dances (1987), arranged for either violin and piano or cello and piano, the Sixth Symphony (1988) for solo woodwinds, piano and strings (playable with one person per part), the Second Sonata for Violin and Piano, composed for the Duke Artists Series in 1990, and Bath County Rhapsody (1991), one of the comparatively few programmatic works in the chamber-music repertoire. In 1997, the Sigma Alpha Iota Music Fraternity commissioned Night Under the Big Sky, a nocturne for wind quintet and piano. Also that year, the Chamber Music Guild of Raleigh, N.C., commissioned Echoes of America, for clarinet, cello and piano. In 2001 the faculty chamber-music group at McNeese State

\(^{108}\)Ibid., 87-108.
University in Louisiana commissioned the *Bayou Rhapsody*, scored for the unusual combination of clarinet, piano and percussion.109

_Ballet Music_

For many years the "Lamentation" and "Hootenanny" from *Lady Kate* remained Ward’s only ballet music. The situation changed when Peter Perret, conductor of the Winston-Salem Symphony, suggested a collaboration between Ward and the School of Dance at the North Carolina School of the Arts. Perret was interested in a ballet based on Nathaniel Hawthorne’s *The Scarlet Letter*. Despite the relative lack of dance music in his output, Ward, drawn to the novel’s dramaturgical possibilities, eagerly obliged. Ward’s ballet, *The Scarlet Letter*, was premiered at the North Carolina School of the Arts in May, 1993, and met with favorable critical review.110

_Ward’s Most Recent Opera_

Robert Ward’s seventh opera, *Roman Fever* (1993), sets Edith Wharton’s story of the same title. Its creation resulted from discussions Ward had with Roger Brunyate, Artistic Director of the Peabody Institute Opera Department. Brunyate knew from experience that university and conservatory opera groups tend to have relatively few male singers and a large number of female voices. With this reality in mind he volunteered to write the libretto and adapted the story to provide more female singing roles.111

---

109Ibid.
110Ibid.
111Ibid., 109. In order to relieve the monotony of hearing only female voices, Brunyate gave an important aria to the Italian waiter in which he describes “Roman fever.”
In this opera, Ward concentrates on the more personal aspects of human interaction rather than his philosophical beliefs. The story is set in the 1920s. Two old friends, widows who were rivals in love many years before, meet by chance at a terrace restaurant overlooking the Roman Forum. They are accompanied by their daughters. As the older women reminisce about the past, the full extent of their bitter jealousies and disappointments surface. In Wharton’s original, the daughters are only mentioned, but the opera libretto brings these characters to life, an alteration that serves to enhance the immediacy of the psychological drama. The première of Ward and Brunyate’s *Roman Fever* was given by the Triangle Opera in Durham, North Carolina, on June 9, 1993, and was hailed by the critics for its lyricism, sensitive scoring and rich harmonic vocabulary.  

A Sad Event

In the Spring of 1998, a sad event occurred in the Ward household. Mary Ward awoke one morning with an extreme case of vertigo. Since the condition abated as the day progressed, it was dismissed as a matter of little concern. Later that evening, however, she began to tremble and soon became incoherent. Doctors at Duke University Hospital diagnosed her condition as a massive stroke, and over the next five days Mary lost consciousness. The prognosis was grave, and family members began to lose hope for her recovery. On the fifth day of the ordeal, one of the family members, who was doing a crossword puzzle at Mary’s bedside, asked for help with a particularly troublesome clue. To the amazement of all, Mary suddenly awakened and provided the answer. It was the beginning of a slow and partial recovery. Despite impaired physical movement and

---

112Ibid. Ward was a founding member of the Triangle Opera—“triangle” referring to the “research triangle” formed by the areas of Durham, Chapel Hill, and Raleigh, North Carolina.
short-term memory loss caused by the stroke, Mary continues to thrive with her husband’s assistance.\textsuperscript{113}

\section*{Summary}

To date, the life of Robert Eugene Ward has been an extraordinary one by any account. In his long and “eclectic” career, he has been a successful composer, educator, administrator and businessman. Ward’s various careers have brought him into close association with the most notable figures in the world of contemporary American music and taken him to many parts of the world. In addition to numerous business trips to England as head of Galaxy Music Corporation, Ward and his wife traveled to Austria, Canada, The People’s Republic of China, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Hong Kong, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Korea, Poland, the Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, and Taiwan. While much of this travel was for pleasure, some involved productions of \textit{The Crucible} abroad. There have been performances of \textit{The Crucible} in Japan (performed in Japanese), England, Germany (performed in German with the composer conducting), and Korea (performed in Korean).\textsuperscript{114} Ward’s compositional output includes a wide variety of musical genres, both instrumental and vocal. His achievements in music have been recognized with three honorary doctorates,\textsuperscript{115} numerous grants and fellowships, and, for his best-known opera, \textit{The Crucible}, a New York Critic’s Circle Citation Award and the Pulitzer Prize for Music.\textsuperscript{116} At this writing,

\textsuperscript{113}Ibid., 114. Although Ward is in his late 80s and spends many hours each day caring for his invalid wife, he still maintains the sense of responsibility and devotion to service that have been hallmarks of his life. In 2001, he accepted the Presidency of the Residents Association of the retirement community in which he and his wife live.

\textsuperscript{114}Ibid., 95-103.

\textsuperscript{115}Personal Interview. Ward’s three honorary doctorates are from: the Peabody Conservatory, 1975; the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1992; and Duke University, 1993.

\textsuperscript{116}The financial statistics cited above demonstrate the success Robert Ward enjoyed owing to his abilities,
Ward shows no signs of slowing, his latest project a light-hearted theater piece titled *A Friend of Napoleon,* written in the manner of *Lady Kate.*

Ward has always accepted new challenges and incorporated into his music the vast experiences of his life. Because of this, Ward considers himself an “eclectic” composer whose works reflect the totality of musical styles and vocabularies practiced by composers throughout the history of Western art music. In every aspect of his composition, Ward consciously seeks to express the philosophy of American idealism, which has become part of his being during his multi-faceted career. This desire has never descended to the level of a sophist’s teaching tool or (worse yet) a soap box from which to espouse personal opinions. In his operas, he conceived each as primarily a work of art, with social or political commentary usually kept subtly in the background as matters for reflection and contemplation. His own personal experiences and philosophy of life have formed the basis of artistic expression in the operas, especially in *The Crucible.* As a composer who enjoys the rich palette of life in the United States to its fullest, Robert Ward proudly represents himself as a truly “American” composer.

---

talents, drive and ambition. It should be noted that the monetary figures quoted were not Ward’s only sources of income. Ward estimates that he earned an additional one-third in total earnings from composing (performance fees, grants, commissions). Therefore, while the above salary figures demonstrate his accomplishments as an educator, administrator and businessman, this additional amount speaks to his viability as a composer. The unique feature of Robert Ward’s ability to provide a secure financial life for himself and his family is that he succeeded in doing so by utilizing all of his talents, both musical and non-musical, in such a way that every position he held, to a lesser or greater degree, complemented his calling as a composer.

117Personal Interview.

118Ibid. Notwithstanding the overt political stance taken in *Minutes Till Midnight,* Ward makes clear that his operas are intended to be musical works first and foremost. Accordingly, whatever else may be inferred from them should be considered secondary in nature.
II. Forging The Crucible: Play and Opera

The socio-political climate in mid-twentieth-century America gave rise to what became known as “McCarthyism.” Although the United States and the Soviet Union had worked together during the Second World War to defeat European fascism, the alliance was always suspicion-filled. This led to a subsequent decline of relations between the two nations. For many Americans who wanted to enjoy the economic fruits of their recent victory, the words “communist” and “socialist” were anathema, and anticommunist hysteria spread rapidly. Much like the New England Puritans, wherever they looked, Americans of the 1950s found cause for concern, as they had in the 1930s before the rise of fascism.

Official investigations into communist activities in the United States began in 1938 with the establishment of HUAC, the House Un-American Activities Committee, led by Martin Dies of Texas. Initially, the Committee’s work centered on formulating legislation, but after the Soviet Union signed a non-aggression pact with Hitler in 1939—the “Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact”—and began its own path of aggression by overrunning parts of Poland, Finland and Romania, Americans became concerned about the domestic activities of the Communist Party, and HUAC’s activities took on new dimensions. In 1940, the “Alien Registration Act” (also known as the Smith Act) was passed, requiring aliens to register with the government. It also allowed the government to bring to trial anyone suspected of advocating the violent overthrow of the Government.119 In 1947, the Truman Doctrine articulated the government’s attempts to contain

119 As reported in Claudia Durst Johnson and Vernon E. Johnson, Understanding The Crucible: A Student Casebook to Issues, Sources, and Historical Documents (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998), 30-31, hereafter referred to as Understanding The Crucible. Much of the following discussion concerning the Salem witchcraft trials is gleaned from this source.
the spread of communism by providing aid to non-communist nations seeking assistance against communist aggression. Also in 1947, the “Labor-Management Relations Act” (also known as the Taft-Hartley Act) was passed over President Truman’s veto. This made it illegal for union officials to be members of the Communist Party. Responding to pressure, Truman issued Executive Order 9835, the purpose of which was to forbid anyone judged as subversive from holding a government job. Loyalty review boards were established throughout the nation, and no government employee was exempt from scrutiny. Those who were summoned to appear before the boards had no legal rights and were not allowed to face their accusers or examine evidence. The recommendations of these boards eventually led to dismissal of federal employees if there were reasonable doubts about their allegiance. In 1947, HUAC was re-vitalized under the leadership of Richard M. Nixon. The primary targets of the new investigations were ten Hollywood writers who were or had been associated with communists. In 1949, the Soviet Union successfully detonated an atomic bomb, making it a superpower with military capabilities similar to those of the United States. Shortly thereafter, the Chinese civil war ended when Mao Tse-Tung’s Soviet-backed forces defeated the Nationalist Party troops under Chiang Kai-Shek, who were driven from the mainland to the island of Taiwan. The arrests of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg in 1950 for conspiracy to steal atomic secrets further fanned the flames. In April, 1950, the Supreme Court weighed in with a ruling that allowed congressional committees to force witnesses to reveal their political affiliations. Two months later, North Korean forces poured over the 38th parallel, precipitating a still-unresolved ideological war. In September, 1950, Congress passed

---

120 In this regard, see the comments by James J. Martine, The Crucible: Politics, Property and Pretense (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1993), 8-9, hereafter referred to as Martine, The Crucible.
121 Understanding The Crucible, 131.
the “Internal Security Act” (also known as the McCarran Act) which made it legal to withhold passports and governments jobs from those who had been associated with the Communist Party. In essence, this made membership in the Communist Party a crime.\textsuperscript{122}

Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin became the self-proclaimed champion of anti-communism in 1950 by claiming to have uncovered 205 persons in the State Department who were or had been members of the Communist Party. The fact that these charges were later found to be fallacious did little to stem the growing tide of anti-communist fervor.\textsuperscript{123} By 1952, the worst fears of many Americans had come true, and the perception of “communists-among-us” seemed every bit as real as “witches-among-us” had in 1692.

\section*{The Play: Background}

\textit{The Genesis of The Crucible; The Play and McCarthyism}

The reasons why Arthur Miller wrote \textit{The Crucible} are often partially misunderstood. It is generally assumed that he wrote the play purely as a condemnation of Senator Joseph McCarthy and the House Un-American Activities Committee. This reason was only one of several. Miller first became aware of the Salem witchcraft trials as a student at the University of Michigan in the 1930s. In his American history class, Miller learned from historical accounts of them, but they remained in his mind only as unfathomable mysteries of a bygone era when people readily believed in the inexplicable. When the Senate hearings were taking place in Washington, D.C., Miller came upon a copy of Marion Starkey’s book, \textit{The Devil in Massachusetts} (1950). He was enthralled by the details of the story and began to consider the possibility of writing a play based on the subject. He

\textsuperscript{122}For further discussion of this point, see \textit{Understanding The Crucible}, 135.

\textsuperscript{123}As reported in Martine, \textit{The Crucible}, 8-9.
initially rejected the idea because he thought himself incapable of capturing the wildly irrational nature of the historical events. According to Miller, “A drama cannot merely describe an emotion, it has to become that emotion.”

Over time, Miller began to have a change of heart because he began to see a connection between himself, the events of seventeenth-century Salem, and twentieth-century Washington. Miller believed that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had infiltrated the Communist Party and provided the House Un-American Activities Committee with detailed lists of the participants who had taken part in various, possibly subversive meetings. The Committee’s members knew well in advance what they wanted each witness to provide—the names of their comrades in the Party. As Miller saw it, the point of the hearings paralleled that of the Salem witchcraft trials—public confession of guilt and openly renouncing one’s friends and associates, for which the guilty would be rewarded with acceptance back into the fold of decent society. Miller also saw irony in the fact that many people who were once sympathetic to world socialism had long since abandoned their naïve notions of the Soviet system.

There were other reasons Miller felt compelled to write *The Crucible*. As he once observed, there was

…something which seemed more weird and mysterious. It was the fact that a political, objective, knowledgeable campaign from the far Right was capable of creating not only a terror, but a new subjective reality, a venerable mystique which was gradually assuming even a holy resonance.

125 Ibid., 331-332. An opinion echoed by Ward in his unpublished autobiography.
Miller was also affected by the climate that developed in the New York theatrical world in response to Senator McCarthy and the Committee’s hearings. In 1953, there was no blacklist in New York theaters of the kind that had risen in the Hollywood film industry. The theatrical world was more loosely structured and did not lend itself well to such tactics, at least not at the time. Even so, Miller began to hear rumors of strange occurrences, such as stage actors who were prospective witnesses making deals among themselves to name one another before the Committee to ease their consciences about informing.\textsuperscript{127} Miller’s own state of mind during this period was clearly demonstrated when he wrote:

> For me the spectacle was depressing, and not only for the obvious reasons. Certainly I felt a distaste for those who groveled before this tawdry tribune of moralistic vote-snatchers, but I had as much pity as anger toward them. It bothered me much more that with each passing week it became harder to simply and clearly say why the whole procedure was vile. Almost to a man...the accused of 1950 and 1951 had not had a political connection since the late thirties or early forties... Yet the Committee had succeeded in creating the impression that they were pursuing an on-going conspiracy...[and] they were accused of having violated no law of any kind since the Communist Party was legal, as were its fronts, which most often espoused liberal positions that did not so much as hint at socialist aims.\textsuperscript{128}

On the dramaturgical level, Miller was drawn to the analogous historical events of seventeenth-century Salem and twentieth-century Washington because of their common metaphysical elements—the quasi-surrealistic, spiritual transactions that took place during the ritualized process of accusation, questioning, confession, renunciation and ultimate salvation. He felt as if he bore witness to a dream-like state of affairs in which politics

\textsuperscript{127}Timebends, 328-329.

\textsuperscript{128}Ibid.
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attempts to shed light upon the dark corners of the public’s subconscious mind by using the torch of betrayal.\textsuperscript{129}

In 1952, Miller finally decided to write a play based on the Salem witchcraft trials, but his decision was tentative. He was uneasy with two technical issues, the Puritan’s arcane language and the large number of characters needed. He also had a nagging suspicion he could write himself into a political and personal wilderness.\textsuperscript{130} This latter feeling stemmed from the fact that the story’s central character, John Proctor, is a guilt-ridden man who betrays his wife by having an affair with his teenage servant girl, Abigail Williams, and is then forced to watch in horror as she leads the frenzied, witch-hunting factions of the village. Miller may have been apprehensive about writing this story because he was also a married man and father of two and had recently met Marilyn Monroe. According to one theory, although Miller was not yet involved with her, Monroe’s image was transfixed in his mind, and he feared that Proctor’s marital situation—a suspicion-filled triangle of self-deceit and repressed guilt—and his own marital condition might somehow become similar.\textsuperscript{131} With the twin specters of anticommunist hysteria and Marilyn Monroe occupying his immediate thoughts, Miller decided to make a trip to Salem (now Danvers), Massachusetts, to research the original witchcraft trial records. He never intend to relate the historical accounts with complete accuracy. Rather, he wanted to use the facts in dramatic fashion to portray historical characters and Puritan social structure.\textsuperscript{132}

\textsuperscript{129}Ibid., 331-332.
\textsuperscript{130}Ibid., 332-338.
\textsuperscript{131}This concept is promulgated by Martine, \textit{The Crucible}, 61.
\textsuperscript{132}Timebends, 332.
The Salem Witchcraft Trials of 1692

The Salem witchcraft trials of 1692 resulted from a social paradox. The people of Salem Village lived under a theocratic form of self-government—a combination of state and religious power—the function of which was to unite the community and keep it together by preventing disunity that might open it to destruction by material or ideological enemies. The doctrines of Puritan theocracy became an inherent cause of personal, social, and political upheaval. They directed that life in the American colonies was rigorous and that citizens had to maintain an austere community and strict moral code dedicated to serving the interests of the whole. Self interest was considered a sin. Concomitant with this philosophy was the complete suppression of sexuality, a belief that created an atmosphere of repression and guilt. In time, these doctrines began to erode. Farmers residing on outlying properties began to resist the rising tide of commercialism and its accompanying social mores, ministers began having trouble guiding the behavior of their congregations, and a burgeoning population all contributed to an increasingly unfamiliar and disquieting quality of life that spawned an environment of factional

133 Martine, The Crucible, 1-5. See also Understanding The Crucible, 27-29 for a list of Puritan beliefs and some general misconceptions about them. While the Puritans did believe in the need for communal involvement in ferreting out sin, God’s willingness to inflict punishment, and that activities such as reading for enjoyment, dancing and humor were signs of the Devil, they were not opposed to the ownership of slaves, the wearing of colorful clothing, or education in general. It is also a misconception that the Puritans welcomed other Protestant dissenters, such as Baptists and Quakers, into their midst. In fact, the New England Puritans were leery of any outside influence that might corrupt the sanctity of their religion and the homogeneity of their communities. For a further discussion of the social and religious climate that spawned the witchcraft trials see Marion L. Starkey, The Devil in Massachusetts: A Modern Inquiry into the Salem Witch Trials (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950). The legal aspects of the trials are explored in depth by Peter Charles Hoffer in The Salem Witchcraft Trials: A Legal History (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 1997). Much of the material in the ensuing discussion of the historical events has been gleaned from the above sources.

134 Charles Patrick Woliver, “Robert Ward’s The Crucible: A Critical Commentary,” Opera Journal 26/1 (March, 1993), 4, hereafter referred to as CPW, “The Crucible” (Article). See also Understanding The Crucible, 31. Although the Puritans were brutal in their punishment of sex outside of marriage, they believed that sex was a pleasure to be fully enjoyed by both husband and wife in marriage. Failure to fulfill the sexual role in marriage was one of the few grounds for divorce.
jealousy, prejudice, animosity and paranoia.\textsuperscript{135} Such turmoil made for a repressive social climate in which common-sense and reason were too often ignored. This unrest eventually led to rebellion by younger generations and the crumbling of the Puritans' social foundations. The witch hunts that resulted came about because governmental and social checks and balances normally present were weakened by the inherent lack of objectivity such a system espouses.\textsuperscript{136} The trials were a perverse manifestation of the panic that resulted from society's turn toward greater individual freedom. But they were more than merely repressive in nature. The witch hunts were also opportunities for individuals to express their own sin and feelings of guilt publicly under the less stigmatizing cover of accusing others. In this climate it suddenly became possible—even patriotic and holy—for a man to say that, for instance, a woman came into his bedroom one night, and while his wife slept at his side, laid herself down upon his chest and "nearly suffocated him." Of course, it was her spirit only, but his satisfaction at this confession was as great as if the woman had actually been there in person. Ordinarily, one dared not utter such things in public for fear of condemnation. But in the context of accusing someone of witchcraft it was not only possible, but encouraged. In similar fashion, and despite the Bible's injunctions to the contrary, long-held hatreds of neighbors were also openly expressed and vengeance taken. The Puritans' lust for land, expressed for generations by constant bickering over boundaries and deeds, entered the arena of public morality in which one could cry "witch" against a neighbor and feel morally justified. Property disputes were viewed as heavenly combat between God and the Devil; and because this religious con-

\textsuperscript{135}In this regard, see CPW, "The Crucible" (Dissertation), 16. The colonists were also under constant fear of attack by native Americans.

\textsuperscript{136}As promulgated by CPW, "The Crucible," 4 (Article).
text gave legitimacy to the Puritans' suspicions towards their neighbors, the witchcraft trials erupted within a milieu of general revenge.\textsuperscript{137}

The political conditions in seventeenth-century Puritan New England only exacerbated an already tenuous state of social affairs. The original Massachusetts Bay Colony government was abolished by Britain in 1684. The colonists revolted five years later and overthrew what had been put in its place, so by 1692, the colony had existed for three years with no legally-established form of government. Into this legal and governmental void came influential citizens who took the law into their own hands, a situation rife with corruption. Wealthy citizens who wished to make accusations of witchcraft against their neighbors constantly pressured sheriffs and constables to make arrests, and although the lack of legally-recognized courts insured that no trials could take place, arrests and imprisonments were numerous. This state of affairs lasted until the arrival of William Phips in 1692. The newly-appointed Governor carried with him a new charter from the English crown. Courts were hurriedly established and prosecution of the accused witches commenced.\textsuperscript{138}

\textsuperscript{137}In this regard see Martine, The Crucible, 6-7. Perhaps the greatest criticism against the Salem trials was the court's acceptance of "spectral evidence." But it was a natural consequence that such evidence be allowed because, although only rarely claimed to be seen, Satan's existence was taken as a fact. It was logical, therefore, to admit evidence of the Devil's earthly existence. To their credit, the Salem residents quickly ceased the practice. In his research, Miller found that the guilt of illicit sexuality was a more prominent theme in the court records, one he fully exploited in The Crucible. See also Understanding The Crucible, 64-67. The panel of judges appointed by Governor Phips included William Stoughton; Chief Justice, Samuel Sewall, Bartholomew Sergeant, John Hathorne and Jonathan Corwin. Corwin was so zealous in his desire to uncover witchcraft that he heard testimony and imprisoned women on his own, in an extra-legal fashion. John Hathorne was a descendant of Nathaniel Hawthorne (1804-1864), author of The Scarlet Letter. Other prominent supporters of the trials included the Reverend Cotton Mather, while his father, the Reverend Increase Mather, was among the more prominent critics.
Further legal and social turmoil ensued because revocation of the original royal charter cancelled land titles, and new land titles were not yet obtainable. Neighbors began to be suspicious of one another out of fear that their properties might be reassigned. Additional pressures existed because the Salem spiritual community was also in a state of upheaval. Their new minister, Reverend Samuel Parris, had an abrasive personality, and his materialistic view of the world gave many parishioners reason to complain. One of Parris’s most vocal critics was a landowner and inn-keeper named John Proctor.139

Against this tempestuous social, political, and religious climate, the tragic events in Salem began to unfold. The historical record indicates that in early 1692 several young girls in Salem Village became ill and separately displayed alarming symptoms. Accounts indicate that the girls experienced hallucinations and what were described as “hysterical seizures,” which the local doctor, William Griggs, attributed to witchcraft being practiced on them. The girls thus involved were Abigail Williams, age 11;140 Elizabeth Parris, age 9; Ann Puntnam, age 12; Mary Wolcott, age 16; Elizabeth Hubbard, age 17; Mercy Lewis, age 19; and Mary Warren, age 20.141 The situation became so inexplicable it eventually led to the issuing of arrest warrants on February 29, 1692, for the Caribbean-

139 Arthur Miller, The Crucible, Introduction by Christopher Bigsby (New York: Penguin Books, 1995), xv, hereafter referred to as Miller, The Crucible. See Appendix G for a chronology of events leading up to and carrying through the trials in 1692. See also Understanding The Crucible, 78. For five years after the trials ended, the members of the Salem Church attempted to have Parris removed from his post. Arbitrators finally recommended that the congregation buy Parris off and send him on his way. He spent the rest of his life going from one tiny church in New England to another. He died impoverished in 1720. During this period, the spelling of names was inconsistent at best. Both Miller and Ward changed the spelling to “Proctor.”

140 In order to make a sexual liaison between Abigail and Proctor more believable, Miller adjusts Abigail’s age upward to 17, while Proctor’s age (who, historically, was in his 60s) was adjusted downward to 35. See also Understanding The Crucible, 81. Although no one knows with certainty what happened to the historical Abigail after the trials, one rumor has it that she spent the rest of her life as a prostitute in Boston.

141 It should be noted that the girls themselves were not accused of practicing witchcraft, but that witchcraft was being practiced “upon them.” See also Understanding The Crucible, 65. There was also one male among the group of children who made the accusations of witchcraft, John Indian.
Indian slave, Tituba (Parris’s servant), as well as Sarah Good and Sarah Osburn, both older women of somewhat dubious character and reputation. The three accused women were interrogated the next day, causing a rapid increase in the pace of events. Within a month, complaints were filed against Goodwife Cloyse and Elizabeth Procter, followed shortly thereafter by examinations of Giles Corey, Abigail Hobbes and Bridget Bishop. Bridget Bishop, the first to die, was hanged on June 10. Within weeks, the trials of Sarah Good, Susannah Martin, Elizabeth Howe, Sarah Wildes and Rebecca Nurse took place, and all five were condemned and hanged together on July 19, 1692. What began as a probable adolescent prank became full-blown social hysteria preying on new victims from all segments of the community. The town’s latent religious paranoia, petty jealousies, and long-seething animosities—typically present just under the surface in a tightly controlled theocratic community—raged out of control. In an effort to save his wife from the gallows, John Procter wrote a letter to five leading Boston clergymen asking for their intercession with Governor Phips on behalf of all the accused in Salem. The plea was unsuccessful, and Procter was himself imprisoned in Boston on April 11th. Although Procter was a resident of Salem, this change of venue...

---

142 *Understanding*; The Crucible, 74. Tituba and her husband were brought to Salem as slaves by Reverend Parris. She later testified that Parris beat her unmercifully and threatened her in other ways to force her to confess. With no one except her husband to come to her defense, she remained in prison for well over a year, and then sold as a slave to pay for her prison expenses.

143 Ibid., 68. Sarah Good’s four-year-old daughter, Dorcas, was also arrested for witchcraft. Although she avoided the gallows, she was shackled in prison for nine months and went insane.

144 The name “Goody” as it appears for a number of the female characters in the play and opera is a diminutive of the common term “Goodwife,” which married women were given in Puritan New England.

145 As reported by Martine, *The Crucible*, 4-6. In Continental, Catholic Europe the practice of witchcraft was considered heresy, a violation of canon law for which the penalty was death by fire. In Protestant England and New England, witchcraft was a felony, a violation of the civil code for which the penalty was death by hanging. The difference shows the extent to which the theocratic society of Puritan New England completely merged and blurred the distinctions between church and state. To the Puritans, civil law and the laws of God were, for all intents and purposes, one and the same, an attitude that brought with it a heightened sense of moral absolutism, a facet of Puritan thinking in which Miller saw parallels between their justification for witchcraft trials and HUAC’s justification for hearings over 250 years later.
was probably necessitated by the fact that thirty-two of his neighbors had signed a petition seeking his release. The Salem authorities doubtless felt it safer to incarcerate him in a different locale.146

On August 5, 1692, John and Elizabeth Procter, along with George Burroughs, John Willard, George Jacobs, Sr., and Martha Carrier, went to trial. All six were condemned to be hanged. The local sheriff seized the Proctors' property and goods, leaving nothing in the house for the provision of their children.147 John Procter and four of the others with whom he was condemned were hanged on August 19, while Elizabeth Procter escaped their fate because she was pregnant. A month later Martha Corey, Mary Easty, Alice Parker, Ann Pudeator, Margaret Scott, Wilmot Redd, Samuel Wadell and Mary Parker were executed. The total number of hangings stood at nineteen, but this was not the final death toll. Although the condemned were hanged, another form of execution occurred. Giles Corey, a man over eighty, chose to stand mute against the charges leveled against him. Under British law, a man who refused to testify could not be tried; but he could be tortured until he answered, or died. Corey was tortured by “pressing” him with gradually increased weights placed on him, and he died after two days of this brutality. The executions finally ended in September, 1692, all of which took place in

146Ibid., 6, 60.
147Understanding The Crucible, 70-105. In Act I of the play, Miller takes artistic license with the historical facts. When Reverend Hale questions Tituba in the play, he tells her that, “The Devil can never overcome a minister.” In fact, George Burroughs was a minister. The reason he was accused was that Thomas Putnam had a long-standing grudge against him. Long before the trials began, Putnam’s brother-in-law, James Bayley, has been rejected as Salem’s minister by an opposing faction. Burroughs got the post instead. Eventually, Burroughs went bankrupt trying to pay for his wife’s funeral on an inadequate minister’s salary, so the Putnam’s had him arrested for debts he did not owe. In the summer of 1692, Burroughs, then a minister in Maine, was hunted down and arrested again, this time on charges of witchcraft, brought back to Salem for trial, and executed alongside John Procter. The trials and executions came to a conclusion sooner than they might otherwise have because prominent citizens, such as ministers, were accused and hanged. Another prominent citizen accused, but not hanged, was Reverend Hale’s wife. Charges were even brought against one of John Procter’s young sons, William, whose interrogation included torture. They tied him by the neck and heels until blood gushed from his nose. He was kept like this until one of his interrogators took pity on him, but he did not confess to witchcraft.
less than one-hundred days. In January, 1693, Elizabeth Procter gave birth to the child that had fortuitously saved her life, and within a short time Governor Phips issued a general pardon for all the accused.\(^{148}\)

There was no happy ending to the Salem witchcraft trials. At their conclusion, a smallpox plague was ravaging the village, the antagonists were still in power and the social stigma attached to the victims and their accusers took generations to expunge.\(^{149}\)

In 1696, twelve of the jurors in the trials formally asked forgiveness for their part in the hysteria.\(^{150}\) For over a century, many of the farms seized after the victims were hanged went unsold,\(^{151}\) as if buying the land would somehow transfer the sins of 1692 to a new owner. In 1711, the Governor of Massachusetts offered restitution for the miscarriages of

\(^{148}\)Martine, *The Crucible*, 6-7. See also *Understanding The Crucible*, 72. Although the Governor ordered the release of all those still accused after the trials ended, they could not be set free until they repaid the Commonwealth for food, board, travel to and from prison, jailer’s fees, court fees, executioner’s fee’s, and the paper on which any court business was conducted that involved them. They were even charged for their chains and handcuffs. Those who were too poor to pay these fees languished in prison for up to a year until friends and relatives appealed for their release.

\(^{149}\)As pointed out in *Understanding The Crucible*, 21.

\(^{150}\)Ibid., 115-116. The jurors’ apology of 1696 reads, “We whose names are underwritten, being in the Year 1692 called to serve as Jurors, in Court at Salem, on Tryal of many, who were by some suspected Guilty of doing wrong acts of Witchcraft upon the Bodies of sundry Persons: We confess that we our selves were not capable to understand, nor able to withstand the mysterious delusions of the Powers of Darkness, and Prince of the Air; but were for want of Knowledge in our selves, and better information from others, prevailed with to take up with such Evidence against the Accused, as on further consideration, and better Information, we justly fear was insufficient for the touching the Lives of any, Duet. 176 whereby we fear we have been instrument with others, tho Ignorantly and unwittingly, to bring upon ourselves, and this People of the Lord, the Guilt of Innocent Blood; which Sin the Lord saith in Scripture, he would not pardon, 2 Kings 24.4, that is we suppose in regard of his temporal Judgments. We do therefore hereby signify to all in general (and to the surviving Sufferers in especial) our deep sense of, and sorrow for our Errors, in acting on such Evidence to the condemning of any person. And do hereby declare that we justly fear that we were sadly deluded and mistaken, for which we are much disquieted and distressed in our minds; and do therefore humbly beg forgiveness, first of God for Christ’s sake for this our Error; And pray that God would not impute the guilt of it to our selves, nor others; and we also pray that we may be considered candidly, and aright by the living Sufferers as being then under the power of a strong and general Delusion, utterly unacquainted with, and not experienced in matters of that Nature. We do heartily ask forgiveness of you all, whom we have justly offended, and do declare according to our present minds, we would none of us do such things again on such grounds for the whole World; praying you to accept of this in any way of Satisfaction from our Offence; and that you would bless the Inheritance of the Lord, that he may be entreated for the Land.” (Signed by John Batcheler, John Dane, Andrew Elliot, Joseph Evelith, Thomas Fisk, Thomas Fisk, Jr., William Fisk, Henry Herrick, Sr., John Pebody, Thomas Perkins, Thomas Perly, Sr., Samuel Sayer.)

\(^{151}\)Miller, *The Crucible*, 135.
justice. John Procter (long since hanged) and his surviving wife, Elizabeth, were granted 150 Pounds Sterling in damages. Even some of the accusers were awarded damages in what amounted to institutional recognition of the general calamity in which everyone suffered. In so doing the government stopped short of acknowledging its own blame for allowing these events to unfold in the first instance. In an attempt to divorce itself from the guilt and shame felt by the survivors of the madness, the Village of Salem changed its name to Danvers in 1752.\(^\text{152}\) It was not until 1992--exactly three hundred years after the trials--that the courts finally acknowledged the State’s responsibility.\(^\text{153}\)

Although Miller researched the original court records, there was little new he learned from them. His main interest was to see the actual words of the interrogations which, at first, seemed like a gnarled way of speaking. But after working with these speech patterns, Miller learned how to use them and even heard a certain beauty in the audible structures.\(^\text{154}\) He also discovered that the court records were penned by various church ministers whose gifts for descriptive detail gave illuminating mental imagery to otherwise dry testimony. The individual stories they related were interesting and numerous, as were the detailed historical facts, but the true drama lay in the totality of events. After reading this massive amount of information, Miller also realized that the Puritans’ atti-

\(^\text{152}\)As reported in Understanding The Crucible, 118-119. The amounts awarded to the accused ranged from a high of 150 Pounds Sterling to the family of John Procter, to a low of 7 Pounds, 6 Shillings to the family of Martha Carrier. Of the accusers, Dorcas Hoar received the greatest compensation with 21 Pounds, 17 Shillings, while Ann Foster received the lowest amount, 6 Pounds, 10 Shillings.

\(^\text{153}\)Miller, The Crucible, vii-viii. In his introductory remarks, Christopher Bigsby points out that the belief in witches was so pronounced in Salem that, in addition to the twenty people who lost their lives, two dogs were also convicted of witchcraft and hanged.

\(^\text{154}\)Ibid., xxi. Bigsby notes that Miller solved these problems by creating a manner of speaking that made seventeenth-century Puritan speech sound both distant and close. He concentrated on the monosyllabic nature of the words and carefully chose them for their syllabification and rhythmic flow, similar to their seventeenth-century models, yet relatively familiar to modern ears.
tudes were analogous to those of his own faith, Judaism, in that both religions had taken
defensive postures against what they considered polluting elements from the outside.\textsuperscript{155}

\textit{Writing The Crucible}

With his research complete, the technical challenges accepted, and a spiritual connection discovered, Miller fully committed himself to writing the play. When he told Molly Kazan, wife of director Elia Kazan, of his intentions, she objected to the Salem/Washington analogy, an objection Miller heard often in the coming years. She argued that, "there are Communists, but there never were any witches." But Miller persisted in analogy. During his research he read the accounts of Tituba, Reverend Parris's black Barbados slave, who was seen practicing witchcraft with the girls. But this was slight evidence when compared to the fact that the best minds in both America and Europe during the seventeenth century firmly believed in the existence of witches. Beside the fact that the Bible warns against dealing with witches on three occasions,\textsuperscript{156} the practice of witchcraft was recognized as dangerous by the philosophy and science of the day. British law was replete with the legal consequences for practicing witchcraft, and most Europeans so firmly believed in the \textit{fact} of witches that hundreds of thousands of people were burned or hanged for being in league with Satan. In fact, when compared to their European counterparts, the Salem trials, wherein confession saved one's life, were relatively mild by comparison.\textsuperscript{157} Miller came to realize that seventeenth-century New Englanders did

\textsuperscript{155}\textit{Timebends}, 332-338.
\textsuperscript{156}Exodus, 22:17; Leviticus, 19:26; and Deuteronomy, 18:10-12.
\textsuperscript{157}\textit{Timebends}, 339-340.
not believe in witchcraft because they were Puritans, but because they were men and women of their time.\textsuperscript{158}

For Miller, the religious and legal question of whether witches existed was a mute argument. The true connection between seventeenth-century Salem and twentieth-century Washington was the sense of guilt caused by suppressed feelings of alienation and hostility towards orthodox society. Miller never intended the play as a historical report. Rather, he wrote it as an observer of social behavior. The title Miller chose speaks to this role, for a crucible is a severe test or hard trial, and it also refers to a container used for melting ores, with the resulting product being of purer quality than the ingredients that went into it—in this case, Proctor’s moral character. Miller was also cognizant of the fact that a crucible, or melting pot, is a common analogy for America as the great, social melting pot. The play’s commentaries and observations act as a model for America itself—an examination of American society from its colonial days to the mid-twentieth century. For Miller, analogies between the seventeenth and twentieth centuries became clear. The Salem witchcraft trials exhibited how the Puritans supplanted their religious beliefs with suspicion, jealousy and hatred, while the McCarthy hearings did much the same in the American political arena during the 1950s. In both instances, the ideals of American justice, freedom, and human rights were subverted and replaced by what the accusers feared most—an oppressive government.\textsuperscript{159}


\textsuperscript{159}In support of this assertion see Martine, \textit{The Crucible}, iv, 11-14. Miller’s \textit{The Crucible} was premiered in New York City at the Martin Beck Theater on January 22, 1953. It ran for 197 performances and won both the Antoinette Perry and Donaldson awards for best play of the year.
The Play: Analytical Overview

Structure

A well-constructed drama usually displays a particular formal design--exposition, rising action, dénouement and catastrophe--and Miller's play, consisting of four acts, follows this plan. Act I is expository in that it introduces the main characters, and their relationships, and it reveals the reasons for the drama to unfold. Another common feature of dramatic structure is that the story often begins in the middle. In *The Crucible*, two important events have occurred before the opening curtain--Reverend Parris's discovery of the girls dancing in the woods and, more importantly, Proctor's sexual liaison with Abigail. Acts II and III consist of rising action and climax. The action is set in motion by the girls' strange behavior and Abigail's leadership role in the accusations (what is termed "exciting force"), precipitating the ensuing courtroom drama and moral dilemmas. The dénouement, or falling action, of Act IV is capped with the catastrophe revealed in the play's final lines. The play's scenic construction further refines the dramatic structure. Although scenes are not designated as such in the text, Miller's methodology clearly marks them as separate dramatic entities that could be characterized in musical terms as duet, trio, quartet, and ensemble.

Act I begins with a tableau scene in an upstairs bedroom of Reverend Parris's house. The scene moves to one in which initial exposition takes place with the confrontation involving Parris, Susanna Walcot, Tituba and Abigail. Parris has discovered the girls' dancing in the woods and now questions them about it. Abigail attempts to explain that

---

160 Ward followed Miller's division of the drama into four acts. The edition of Miller's play used for this study designates the acts as "One, Two, Three, and Four," while the printed, complete score of Ward's opera uses Roman numeral designations--I, II, III, and IV. For the sake of consistency and clarity, the opera's designations are adopted here for discussions of both the play and the opera.

161 For a further discussion of the play's design, see Martine, *The Crucible*, 34-35.
their dancing was not witchcraft, but “sport.” This is a significant statement because, at this point, it is still not too late to reverse the course of events. Although Abigail is truthful about the dancing, Parris’s weak character and the lack of respect he feels from the community keep him from preventing the ensuing tragedy. Fuel is added to the dramatic fire with the arrival of Ann and Thomas Putnam, who reveal that their daughter, Ruth, is also ill and cannot be awakened.162 To this point, the illnesses were described only as “unnatural,” but now the word “witchcraft” appears for the first time, a word that foreshadows ensuing catastrophe. Events begin to spiral out of control, and no one can stop them. The following scene, with Betty (Parris’s daughter), Mercy Lewis, Mary Warren and Abigail, provides crucial expository information, as the girls realize the full potential of their predicament. More than simply dancing in the woods, they also engaged in conjuring with Tituba. When the girls realize their situation, Abigail threatens them to keep quiet. John Proctor’s entrance provides a scene that begins the rising action. At this point, Proctor’s illicit relationship with Abigail, and his resolve to end it, becomes clear. This revelation motivates Abigail to switch from damage control to an attack posture, as Reverend Hale implores her to redeem herself by “naming names.” She must act quickly to control future events and exact her revenge on Proctor. Abigail diverts attention away from herself by casting Tituba as the scapegoat. In a malevolently inspired outburst, she exclaims,

I want to open myself! I want the light of God, I want the sweet love of Jesus! I danced for the Devil; I saw him; I wrote in his book; I go back to Jesus; I kiss His hand. I saw Sarah Good with the Devil! I saw Goody Osbourn with the Devil! I saw Bridget Bishop with the Devil! ...I saw Goody Sibber with the Devil!163

162 Understanding The Crucible, 83-85. The historical record suggests that Ann Putnam, the elder, was, in all probability, insane.
163 Miller, The Crucible, 45.
Act II takes place eight days later in the home of John and Elizabeth Proctor, and the latter appears for the first time. Although absent in this scene, Abigail has created the conflict and her actions remain the central, driving force behind the dramatic events. At the opening, Elizabeth’s knowledge of John’s affair with Abigail is revealed and creates the underlying tension. The fact that fourteen people have been imprisoned on charges of witchcraft also adds to the dramatic import. In the subsequent scene, Mary Warren (the Proctors’ servant girl) returns home after a long day at the trials and gives Elizabeth a poppet (doll) she made for her in court. John Proctor is angry with Mary for participating in the trials. She reveals that the number of accused stands at thirty-nine, the first death sentence was handed down, and, most importantly, initial accusations against Elizabeth were raised in court. The pace of rising drama increases when Elizabeth accuses John of still being attracted to Abigail. The ensuing scene reveals much about Proctor’s integrity. Reverend Hale enters, and Proctor refuses to conceal his dislike for the materialistic attitudes of Reverend Parris. Hale is troubled by this and attempts to establish Proctor’s knowledge of religious matters by asking him to recite the Ten Commandments. With deep irony Proctor fails to recall “adultery” and is reminded of it by Elizabeth. The following scene builds to an ensemble cast when Giles Corey and Francis Nurse enter with news that their wives have been arrested. Cheever (Clerk of the Court) and Herrick (town Marshall) then enter with a warrant for Elizabeth’s arrest. The evidence that caused this was a needle Mary Warren innocently left in the poppet. Abigail saw Mary Warren place the needle in the poppet and then claimed that Elizabeth used the poppet as a voodoo doll to inflict injury upon her (Abigail). The act ends with Proctor’s resolution to save his wife and expose Abigail’s treachery.164

164Martine, *The Crucible*, 36-37. As it was originally written, Miller ended Act II with an additional scene.
Act III takes place in the vestry of the Salem meeting house, now used as a courtroom. The rising action accelerates with the introduction of a new and powerful character, Deputy Governor Danforth, zealous in his desire to rid the community of the Devil's influence. Danforth's strength of character and position equal Proctor's and, although the principal source of drama is Proctor's struggles with himself, much of the action focuses on this new conflict. In the opening scene, Giles Corey tells the court that the trials are being corrupted by non-spiritual issues, such as Thomas Putnum's desire to attain his condemned neighbor's land. Miller uses this scene to point out the corrupt nature of a justice system in which one must prove one's innocence. In addition to the Proctor-Danforth conflict, three moments of high drama delineate this act. The first is when Abigail "feels a wind" and visibly shudders, causing mass hysteria among the other girls. The second occurs when Elizabeth lies about her husband's infidelity. The third is Abigail's demonic claim that an unseen yellow bird is in the courtroom, spectral evidence of Satan's existence, igniting panic in the courtroom. The act's climactic moment occurs when Proctor realizes that he will be convicted of witchcraft and wildly proclaims,

I say—I say—God is dead! ...A fire, a fire is burning! I hear the boot of Lucifer, I see his filthy face! And it is my face, and yours, Danforth! For them that quail to bring men out of ignorance, as I have quailed, and as you quail now when you know in all your black hearts that this be fraud—God damns our kind especially, and we will burn, we will burn together!  

Three months pass between the frenetic action that characterizes Act III and the relative serenity of Act IV. An early scene in the last act foreshadows changing attit-
udes when it is revealed that the town of Andover, Massachusetts, has decided not to conduct its own trials—an indication that the seventeenth century is drawing to a close and the Age of Enlightenment is at hand. Abigail, sensing her downfall, has fled the village with six months of Parris’s wages. With her departure, the concluding dramatic elements hinge upon the actions of Elizabeth and her husband and, ultimately, on John Proctor alone. In their final scene together, Elizabeth confesses her own culpability in her husband’s infidelity. She believed she was “so plainly made” that no honest love could come her way, and she had been suspicious of John’s true feelings for her. Elizabeth also tells John that Giles Corey’s died by “pressing,” news that will influence the decision he is about to make. Proctor realizes he wants to live and agrees to sign a confession. After the signing, Danforth informs Proctor that the confession must be made public. Proctor argues with Danforth that his signature on the confession be sufficient, it need not be made public. This conflict leads to the exposition of one of the play’s central themes—the importance of “name.” When Danforth asks him why he will not allow his signature on the confession to be made public, Proctor cries out,

> Because it is my name! Because I cannot have another in my life! Because I lie and sign myself to lies! Because I am not worth the dust on the feet of them that hang! How may I live without my name? I have given you my soul; leave me my name!166

Danforth informs Proctor that he may chose either public display of his guilt or his execution, at which point Proctor tears up his confession. Proctor is led to the gallows to the sound of drum rolls that accompany the condemned to their deaths. Reverend Hale implores Elizabeth to intercede with her husband and avert the ultimate tragedy. The

---

166Ibid., 133.
The play ends with her poignant reply, “He have his goodness now. God forbid I take it from him!”

**Themes**

As with most dramatic works, the central theme of *The Crucible* is conflict, typically human vs. nature, human vs. human, human vs. society, or human vs. self. In *The Crucible*, Miller avoids the conflict of human vs. nature. To the contrary, Proctor becomes a Thoreau-like figure, as one who speaks in poetic terms about his relationship with nature, his love of the earth, his farm and its flowers. The struggle of human vs. human becomes much more prominent because Proctor’s character is revealed through his confrontation with individuals. These struggles may be viewed as falling into major and minor levels of conflict. Those with Parris, Hale, and even his friend Giles Corey are minor when compared to the those that result from his interaction with Abigail and Elizabeth. The most obvious area of conflict arise from human vs. society, exemplified by Proctor’s struggles with Thomas Putnam, Judge Hathorne and Deputy Governor Danforth. The most profound conflict results from Proctor’s internal struggles with himself. Various elements of his own nature conflict in what amounts to a battle for ascendancy, and resolution of these internal conflicts is necessary to achieve dramatic closure. Resolution occurs with his transformation as a human-being, brought about in a Hegelian-dialectic manner. The resolution of Proctor’s dilemma, and his ultimate salvation,

---

167 Ibid., 134.
168 In which conflicting forces (thesis and antithesis) are brought together (synthesis) and achieve closure at a higher level (resolution). In Proctor's case, thesis and antithesis are represented by his desire to shield himself from public scrutiny, on the one hand, and his desire to act for the common good, on the other. The interaction of these two opposing forces create the play’s most dramaturgically-significant moral dilemma, one that must be resolved if closure is to be attained.
occurs when he realizes and accepts his inadequacies as a husband and community leader. His death is not what delineates the moment of dramatic resolution but merely serves to highlight the senselessness of the tragic events. The true moment of resolution occurs when Proctor chooses to tear-up his signed confession, for it marks the turning point at which he becomes fully aware of himself and thereby capable of resolving the play’s dramatic conflicts.

Other themes appear throughout The Crucible. On a foreground level, in its portrayal of resistance to authoritarian inquisition and absolutism, the play refers to the collapse of theocratic power in colonial Massachusetts. While other themes may be implicit, Miller emphasizes “resistance to tyranny.” The Crucible presents this by examining the law and its relation to a “sense of justice.” In the play, injustice results from a legal system that presumed guilt until innocence was proven and, whether or not found guilty, a stigma marked the accused for life. Miller believes that this, more than anything other facet of the legal system, is what spawns a witch-hunting mentality in any era.

Other themes presented in The Crucible apply equally well to late-seventeenth-century Massachusetts and mid-twentieth-century Washington, D.C. The psychological phenomenon of mass hysteria, how it spreads, and the resulting effects of accusation, revenge, betrayal, fear, and ignorance apply equally well to both eras. One of the principal themes explored in the play is sexual guilt—a thematic thread running throughout. The guilt of illicit sexuality, so prevalent in the historical accounts Miller read during his research, are synonymous with the social guilt and shame associated with the hearings conducted by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

---

169 Timebends, 348.
170 As promulgated by Martine, The Crucible, 44-48.
Proctor's concern for his name, a central idea and a crucial element in bringing about the play’s tragic conclusion, links the Salem and McCarthy-era “witch hunts.” Proctor fears the loss of his good name more than he does death. This attitude reflects the view of seventeenth-century Puritans, who believed that a lie represented the breaking of one’s own faith, one’s reputation, one’s very name. In choosing to die rather than implicate his fellow citizens—thus preserving their good “names”—Proctor realizes and preserves the importance of his own name, and his honor. Proctor’s actions foreshadow Miller’s when, testifying before the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1956, he also refused to “name names.” In 1958, after the Supreme Court overturned his conviction for contempt of Congress, Miller stated that,

... in every man there is something he cannot give up and still remain himself—a core, an identity, a thing that is summed up for him by the sound of his own name on his own ears. If he gives that up he becomes a different man, not himself.172

Characters

Miller’s The Crucible has a total of twenty-one characters which, for a play often set in small rooms, is a fairly large number, a fact often cited by critics. Miller overcame this problem by insuring that the entire cast is present only during the larger, public scenes. This treatment and the carefully prescribed entrances and exits, help manage the

---

171See Martine, Ibid., 49-65 for a detailed discussion on the importance of “name” in Miller’s The Crucible. See also Blau, “No play is Deeper Than its Witches,” 61. On June 21, 1956, Miller testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee and refused to name persons seen at political meetings. On July 10, he was cited for contempt of Congress by a vote of 373 to Nine. In February, 1957, Miller was indicted on two counts of contempt of Congress and found guilty on May 23. His sentence was a $500 fine and a one-month suspended jail term, a verdict he appealed to the United States Supreme Court. The High Court overturned the conviction on April 8, 1958.


173See Appendix F for lists of original cast members in the play and opera and Appendix A for a list of voice roles in the opera.
large ensemble. Conversely, the large cast establishes an ambiance of “neighborhood”—a critical dramatic element to which the principal characters may (or may not) react. Miller reduced the dramaturgical encumbrances by giving full development to a relatively small number of characters. Of the twenty-one personae, only six are portrayed as complex personalities and nine are portrayed as inconsequential. While John Proctor, Elizabeth Proctor and Reverend Hale display significant character development during the course of the play, Abigail Williams, Reverend Parris, and Judge Danforth are presented as fully-formed characters who exhibit little growth.174

In order to understand fully the dramatic consequences of *The Crucible*, it is necessary to view John Proctor’s actions (as that of any principal character) within the context of the customs and social mores of the community. Throughout, Proctor’s developmental path depends initially on his relationship with the community, his position in it, and its estimate of him. Ahead of his time, he disavows the existence of witches and openly challenges the authority of the theocratic government that rules his destiny. Although guilt-ridden for the sins he committed, Proctor is determined to put this behind him and move forward. Proctor has a heightened sense of his place in the community, and, although he cannot say all of the Commandments, he has little patience with those who place dogma above reason. He looks forward to an age of enlightenment and knowledge, while those around him can see only the past and embrace ignorance. By the end of the drama, Proctor’s development forces him to decide whether to bow to convictions not his own, or make the ultimate sacrifice in defense of his name and personal integrity.

174 The six characters portrayed as “complex” personae are: John and Elizabeth Proctor, Reverend Paris, Abigail, Reverend Hale and Deputy Governor Danforth. Of the girls who act in concert with Abigail to accuse the others of witchcraft, only Mary Warren has some depth of characterization. Rebecca Nurse is portrayed as little more than a model for “goodness” and Giles Corey principally as a cantankerous, litigious old man.
In a play filled with intense and often explosive personalities, Elizabeth’s quiet demeanor serves as a counterweight to those around her. Although the “wronged wife,” Elizabeth is a strong judge of character who, like her husband, does not believe in witchcraft. She grows from the aggrieved wife who cannot lie to a woman who risks eternal damnation by perjuring herself to protect her husband.

Next to John Proctor, the character in whom dynamic change becomes most evident is Reverend John Hale. Initially portrayed as the consummate intellectual whose books are “weighed down by authority,” Hale sees himself as a young doctor on his first call, slightly bemused by the ignorance that surrounds him. He feels himself allied with the best minds of Europe and relishes the opportunity to do battle with Lucifer. But he too late understands his true nature. His development achieves completion when he realizes the falseness of his position, recognizes his part in the tragedy and, more importantly, acts upon this knowledge. Hale becomes a man who allows his heart to balance his intellectual faculties. In shedding his pre-existing notions, he reveals his humanity and becomes a product of the coming Age of Enlightenment.175

Reverend Parris displays his personality through his insecurity, passivity, and vanity, all of which result from the lack of respect he receives. If he had been more assertive at the beginning of the play, tragedy might have been averted. But even his attempts to curry favor by fanning the flames of hysteria in Act III are ineffectual because of the low regard in which he is held. Parris’s inaction and lack of personal growth remain static features, especially when viewed against more evolving personalities.176

---

175 In this regard, see Understanding The Crucible, 34.
176 Parris’s personality is a key factor accounting for the way in which the tragic events of the drama unfold. If he had been more forthright from the beginning, the witchcraft trials might never had occurred. But, by the time he takes a stance against the trials, it is too late to stem the growing tide of hysteria. In fact, he becomes swept up by the events, powerless to control them.
Much like that of her uncle, Abigail’s character shows little dynamic growth, but she has a more spirited personality and becomes the pivotal character around whom events unfold. Cunning and ruthless, Abigail does not change. She remains an incorrigible opportunist who possesses the ability to shift the focus of attention, and blame, away from herself. She plans her histrionics, and she is even willing to harm herself physically (the needle in her belly to implicate Elizabeth) to achieve her goals. Although her character remains relatively static, Abigail does exhibit courage and resolve, as witnessed by her public threat of Danforth. Her strength results from her being essentially alone in the world, an orphan who sees herself as a social outcast. She views the villager’s piety as a sham because she has been awakened to human sexual desire. Her cynicism rejects a sense of honor, a sense of acceptable communal conduct, her actions at least partially motivated by the loathing she feels for the villager’s pretense and hypocrisy.177

The character of Deputy Governor Danforth develops least. Intelligent, perceptive, strong-willed, and determined, Danforth remains unmoved in his view of the world. From a dramaturgical standpoint, he counterbalances John Proctor, for their minds are equally rigorous, and they see each other as peers. But unlike Proctor, Danforth cannot change. He has the power to end the calamity taking place around him but has fears, doubts, and suspicions. He guards the past and struggles against the coming age of reason, as personified by Proctor and Hale, and throughout the course of events he remains single-minded and unwavering in defending the parochial views of a dying era.178

---

177 Abigail, like her uncle, Reverend Parris, also has the ability to avert the tragic events that occur but chooses not do so. In her case, however, it is not because she possesses a weak character, but because she seeks revenge against those whom she views as hypocrites and enemies.

178 For detailed discussions about the character traits of John and Elizabeth Proctor, Hale, Parris, Abigail and Danforth see Martine, The Crucible, 54-57, and Understanding the Crucible, 13-19. See also Edward
Ward’s Philosophy and *The Crucible*

In Robert Ward’s operas, the dramaturgical and musical elements are always in the foreground. On a parallel level, Ward’s dramatic works also reflect his beliefs about the human condition, beliefs that, for him, define the essence of drama. In *He Who Gets Slapped*, *Claudia Legare*, *Abelard and Heloise* and *Minutes ’til Midnight*, Ward’s philosophy of human nature acts as a matrix against which the various dramatic events unfold. Ward’s message in these operas is clear—tragedy occurs when people abrogate their responsibilities to one another.

Although most of the stories he set reflect Ward’s beliefs, Arthur Miller’s *The Crucible*, with its emotionally-charged, dramatic portrayal of historic events, mirrored all of Ward’s social, political and religious concerns. For this reason, it is perhaps not coincidental that Ward’s operatic version of *The Crucible* has become his best-known and most enduring work. Ward’s belief about the individual in society and responsibility to the community is reflected by almost every character in the opera. Each character—especially the principals, John and Elizabeth Proctor, Abigail, Reverend Hale and Judge Danforth—struggles with the moral dilemma of self-interests versus those of society-at-large.\(^{179}\)

---

\(^{179}\)As the above discussion illustrates, Abigail possesses the least social conscience. Aware of the hypocrisy that defines her community, Abigail is the least willing to act in a socially-responsible manner. She acts in purely self-motivated terms and, as with Claudia Legare, with disastrous results. Judge Danforth is unwilling to grow and change, albeit for different reasons. As a leader of society, he acts for the welfare of the community, but his righteous self-assuredness and inability to see beyond his parochial views create untenable situations for those better able to adapt and cope with the changing nature of human relationships. Danforth’s final words exemplify the fact he sees no need to wrestle with fluctuating moral dilemmas. When Proctor refuses to display his signed confession in public, Danforth declares, “Hang them high over the town! Who weeps for these weeps for corruption.” Reverend Hale’s education and standing in the community give him a posture of moral superiority and a belief that society will benefit from his knowledge. The difference between Danforth and Hale is the latter’s ability to recognize his error. Because of this ability, Hale adapts to circumstances that develop as the drama unfolds. Hale’s evolution is significant because it lies in stark contrast to others of his social status, such as
Elizabeth Proctor reflects Ward's religious philosophy of "goodness and Godly behavior." Her character personifies the essential goodness of humankind. But hers is not a wooden characterization, and her virtue not static. Like Hale, Elizabeth evolves and comes to recognize the character flaws that exacerbated the already-strained relationship with her husband. Elizabeth's redemption lies not in becoming a martyr who suffers in silence as her husband marches to the gallows, but in selflessly accepting his need to complete his own moral and spiritual journey.

While the choices made by each of the characters mentioned above partially demonstrate Ward's vision of society both as it is, and as it should be, the character traits of John Proctor most clearly exhibit Ward's overall philosophy. Proctor's beliefs about the role of law and government in many ways parallel Ward's, and Ward intentionally enhanced Miller's portrayal of Proctor to symbolize the American ideal. Proctor believes that society should be governed by laws created by citizens, laws that protect life, liberty, property and privacy. He is the rugged individualist who speaks with authority and enjoys the respect of his peers. Proctor is a man in harmony with nature, one in control of himself and his environment. Above all else, Proctor is a practical man, but he lives in a world that often overrules or ignores practicality. In this atmosphere, his voice of reason and common sense is a lone voice in the wilderness. Yet, he sins against the beliefs of his church, breaks the laws of his community, violates the sanctity of his marriage, and is slow to respond to the oncoming crisis. Although every character in the drama is tested, Proctor must accept the greatest amount of self-realization. Proctor's flawed character traits are cast into a white-hot crucible of public scrutiny that burns away all that is false and pretentious, forcing him to choose between a lie and his good name. His choice to

Danforth and Parris, characters incapable of evolving in ways that benefit either themselves or society.
die is less an act of heroism than an affirmation of responsibility to himself, his family and the community. For this reason, Proctor embodies the model of Ward’s ideal American, the individual who selflessly acts for the greater good of all.

**The Opera**

**Background**

Arthur Miller early on recognized the story’s inherent operatic possibilities and considered learning how to compose so that he could set the play to music. According to Ward, Miller called the composer Marc Blitzstein and asked him how long it would take to become a composer capable of writing an opera. Ward recalls the account of Blitzstein’s and Miller’s conversation:

Miller: Marc! Hey, how long did it take you to learn to write the music for an opera?

Blitzstein: Oh, I don’t know, Arthur. How long did it take you to learn to write a good play?

Miller: Oh, hell... twenty years.

Blitzstein: Well... It will take you that long again to learn to compose an opera.

Miller: Twenty years? Hmmpphh! Well, thanks Marc.\(^\text{180}\)

After this conversation, Miller quickly abandoned the notion that he could set the play to music, but not the idea that it was worthy of operatic treatment. He instructed his literary agent to contact both Aaron Copland and Carlisle Floyd about the idea. Both were involved with other projects at the time, thus allowing Ward an opportunity to make further inquiries after he became familiar with the play.\(^\text{181}\)


In 1959, at a New York City Opera rehearsal of *He Who Gets Slapped*, Emile Renan, one of the opera's lead singers, asked Ward and Bernard Stambler what they had planned for their next opera. They replied that they were in the process of searching new material but had not yet decided on a subject. Renan told them that he recently saw a new, off-Broadway production of *The Crucible* by Arthur Miller and thought it would make a great American opera. Both Ward and Stambler missed seeing the original production five years earlier but were aware that it caused considerable controversy at the time. A week later, Ward went to see the play and remembers it as a gripping experience. He felt the possibilities for operatic adaptation were boundless—strong characters, powerful drama, a stirring message and an ambience ripe for musical setting. Ward was immediately sold on the idea of turning the play into an opera. The only questions remaining were whether the rights were available and he could obtain them.\(^{182}\)

**The Choice of Stambler as Librettist**

Ward decided to avoid possible delays in obtaining the rights by going directly to the source. He telephoned his brother Albert, who was active in the professional theater, to seek his advice. Albert told Ward to arrange for Miller and his producer, Frank Taylor, to have tickets for the next performance of *He Who Gets Slapped* so that they could see the kind of work Ward was doing in the theater. Ward and his brother accompanied Miller and Taylor to the performance, and during après-performance drinks, Ward learned that Miller and Taylor were favorably impressed with his work and that the performance rights were still available. Ward asked Miller if he would write the libretto, but Miller felt his lack of libretto-writing experience made him ill-suited to the task. He was

also involved with the filming of *The Misfits* and did not have the time. But Miller indicated that he wished to be consulted as the libretto and the opera progressed. Ward then suggested Bernard Stambler, whose work on *He Who Gets Slapped* Miller had just seen and enjoyed, as librettist. This was satisfactory to Miller, but he had another proviso. He requested hearing a sample of Ward’s and Stambler’s treatment before giving final approval because he desired that the plot be left intact. Although Ward agreed, he made it clear that turning a play into an opera usually involved extreme alterations of the text. As Ward related to Miller,

> Your play, in my view, is a masterpiece and needs no music... You have even orchestrated it in a sense with your use of language. An opera of reasonable length will require reducing the number of syllables by about two-thirds. Other alterations such as reducing the number of characters and combining scenes may be necessary to keep the essential dramatic plot and motivations you have created. Finally, however, if it is to be a successful opera the music must become the first value. An opera’s longevity is derived from effective conversion of the drama into memorable music.

Ward thought Miller would reject these suggestions and think better of subjecting his work to such treatment. But Miller appreciated Ward’s forthright manner and stated that he understood the various means by which different arts convey powerful emotions. The meeting was concluded, and Ward agreed to set two contrasting scenes and submit them to Miller so he could decide whether to grant final approval. Within a few weeks, Ward and Stambler completed the project and made arrangements to perform the two scenes for Miller. Ward and Lee Venora, who was singing the lead female role in *He Who Gets Slapped*, sang the vocal parts. Miller approved and told Ward he would grant the per-

---

183 For a biographical sketch of Stambler, see Appendix C.
formance rights. But before Ward and Stambler could get the rights they had to overcome one final obstacle, Miller's theatrical agent, Kay Brown.185

Both Ward and Stambler were naïve about the legal process involved in obtaining performance rights and decided to engage the services of Leon Kellerman, who represented them in negotiations with Brown. After two meetings with her, it became clear that, although extremely knowledgeable about Broadway and Hollywood, Brown knew little about the operatic world. She insisted that the opera be completed and produced by a major opera company within a year, and thereafter four major companies had to produce the work every year or the rights would revert to Miller. Ward and Stambler were frustrated by these stipulations so Kellerman suggested they ask Miller to intercede. They told Miller that, on the average, Puccini and Richard Strauss had taken four years to compose their works, so the demand to finish within one year was unreasonable. Also, at the time, only four major opera companies existed in the U.S.—The Metropolitan and New York City Operas, The Chicago Lyric Opera, and the San Francisco Opera—none currently producing contemporary works. This fact made it impossible to assure a consistent performance record. Miller was persuaded by these arguments and told them he would instruct Kay Brown to accept their terms.186 He called Brown on the telephone and instructed her to “give those boys whatever they want!”187 When Ward and Stambler arrived at her office for their next meeting, they found the negotiating atmosphere considerably changed. After hearing them describe the realities of operatic production, Brown said, “Well, I have only one more question. Why do you do it?”188 Ward asked

---

185Ibid., 51.
186Ibid.
187Personal Interview.
188Ward, Autobiography, 50.
her when she last saw [Victorian] Sardou’s Tosca. Brown said she never heard of it, to
which Ward replied, “Well, Puccini’s heirs and publishers are still making millions every
year on the opera based on it.”\textsuperscript{189} With that, the two parties worked out an equitable
contract, and within a short time, The New York City Opera, under a grant from the
Ford Foundation, commissioned Ward and Stambler to write The Crucible.\textsuperscript{190}

There is no simple formula by which a composer and/or librettist transforms a play or
other story into a libretto. The coordinated efforts of Ward and Stambler were aided by
the fact that the original was well crafted. As Ward had explained to Miller about the
need to reduce the amount of text in order to create a tightly-constructed libretto, Ward’s
and Stambler’s principal task was to reduce or cut portions of the play that were of secon-
dary importance to the underlying dramatic structure. True to their verbal agreement
with Miller, they kept him appraised of their progress and sought his advice and approval
as they worked.\textsuperscript{191}

\textit{Creating the Libretto}

Whether a work is considered nationalistic is a process that usually occurs in sub-
stance only after the fact of composition, but a composer’s precompositional intentions
can influence this process.\textsuperscript{192} In opera, as opposed to strictly instrumental music, the
process is aided by the libretto, a verbal language better suited to convey specific details
of a story, thought, or idea. By choosing to set Arthur Miller’s The Crucible—a well-
known American play, authored by a recognized American playwright, set during the

\textsuperscript{189}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{190}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{191}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{192}For further development of this concept, see below, especially Chapter III, 129-131, and Chapter IV,
205-207.
colonial period of New England history and based on historical fact--Ward was doubtless aware that some would view the opera as having an “American” character.

Both Ward and Stambler created the opera’s libretto by following the latter’s beliefs about the basic elements of good libretto construction. According to Stambler,

An opera must have strong scenes, and... characters: strong in the sense of independence from each other, different from each other, and preferably characterizable by music. It need not be of the leitmotif sort, but something which makes for understanding... the lines of development must be equally as clear, strong and/or stark depending upon the musical style of the composer. The libretto must be written [with] either the fairly active collaboration and cooperation of the composer or with the librettist knowing the composer’s style, preferences, and dislikes well enough that he can go ahead on his own. The librettist is writing for a musical setting and his ideals of individuality in writing must always be subservient to the music or else he should get into another business.193

Stambler also believed that the greatest need was to compress the drama into a vehicle best suited for musical expression. He elaborated on this when he stated that

One other thing which is inevitable is the greater compression of the libretto. The libretto is much less than half the size of the number of pages of the play. Compression is arrived at in many ways...the long interchange of comparatively short lines and short speeches would not only have become monotonous, but would not have allowed any sense of musical structure. So what I did was to digest the sense of these... into one long aria for each of them. The aria... met all the requirements: melodic, formal structure and the... obligation... to characterize... In an opera one must have carefully proportioned, carefully placed musical climaxes and obviously then, the libretto must justify these musical developments and climaxes.194

Ward and Stambler followed this philosophy and worked closely with Miller throughout the writing process. Although their collaboration was marked by an air of good will and professional courtesy, submitting the work directly to Miller could sometimes be a

194Ibid., 46.
nerve-wracking experience. During one visit to Miller’s apartment, Stambler handed him a draft of some new material to read. Miller read it quickly, but carefully, smoke billowing from his pipe the entire time, while Stambler nervously awaited Miller’s comments. He finally asked Miller what he thought of the changes he just read. Miller looked up at him with a smile and said,

Bernie, I know how to put a play together and I do it. You obviously know how to put a libretto together, and I see that there is no point in my questioning your ability to do that... I’ve just had a great lesson of my own. In watching some preliminary screenings of the screenplay of The Misfits that Marilyn Monroe is in, I thought I knew something of the power of words, and they are powerful; but to see the face of a beautiful woman, a face thirty feet tall, overpowers any words that I can ever think of. I gather that the power of music, opera, will be of the same sort...  

Encouraged by Miller’s understanding, Stambler’s work progressed quickly.

In addition to cutting about two-thirds of Miller’s text, Ward and Stambler made other changes. In Act I of the opera, these included deleting scenes between Abigail and her young friends, and an early encounter between Abigail and John Proctor, material later incorporated into Act III. Also excluded were numerous quarrelsome exchanges between opposing characters. Important changes in Act II included eliminating scenes with Giles Corey and Francis Nurse as well as lengthy discourses between the Proctors and Reverend Hale.

The most significant alterations of Miller’s play occur in Act III of the opera. It was purely serendipitous that Ward saw the Manhattan Theatre Club’s revival of the play, because their production included a scene with John Proctor and Abigail at the end of Act II that Miller deleted after the first production in 1953.  

195Ibid., 46-47. This conversation was reported to Woliver during a personal interview with Ward in 1986.  
scene’s dramaturgical possibilities and wished to include it in the opera. Miller told Ward he deleted the scene because it was “no good,” and that he wrote it only because the director of the first production wanted it. But Ward felt that, were the scene combined with the Act I confrontation between Proctor and Abigail (in which the fraudulent witchcraft accusations are exposed), character development would be enhanced by revealing important nuances of their relationship. Miller thought about it momentarily and replied, “Hmmm, that’s better than the play.” Ward and Stambler combined these two scenes and placed it at the beginning of the third act.

In this scene, Abigail is portrayed in a manner different from the way she is in other parts of the drama. Here she is overtly sexual, openly suggestive and erotic in her attempts to lure Proctor away from Elizabeth. Ward provided music to emphasize these qualities, which he described as “lush and sensual.” Ward’s treatment of this scene met with negative criticism from at least one writer, who attempted to find musical justification for its inclusion in the opera. In his 1993 article, “Robert Ward’s The Crucible: A Critical Commentary,” Charles Patrick Woliver (“CPW” in the notes)

---

197 Ward, Autobiography, 51. In Miller’s original conception, the meeting in the woods between John and Abigail at the end of Act II is the logical result of Elizabeth’s plea for John to personally confront Abigail and attempt to make her withdraw her charge of witchcraft. But in the libretto Ward and Stambler altered the dialogue in which Elizabeth asks for this personal confrontation, instead asking only that John go to Salem and inform the authorities of Abigail’s treachery. In the opera, therefore, placing this scene at the beginning of Act III is not only dramaturgically possible, it is also understood to be John’s, rather than Elizabeth’s, idea, a fact that enhances his strength of character. Also, Ward related in a personal interview in December, 2004, that when he discussed this scene with Miller in 1959, he told the author he thought it was both powerful and dramatic, and inquired of him why he took it out of all subsequent editions and performances. According to Ward, Miller hesitated briefly, got a “faraway” look in his eyes and said cryptically, “I’ve learned a lot about women since then.” Although he did not understand what Miller meant by this brief reply, Ward discreetly made no further inquiries and the meeting ended. Ward then exited Miller’s downtown Manhattan apartment building, entered the bustling afternoon street and immediately came upon a newsstand. The front page of almost every newspaper contained similar banner headlines, which read, “MARILYN AND MILLER SPLIT!” At that moment Ward understood the reason for Miller’s comment.

198 See Appendix A for a synopsis of the opera’s libretto and Appendices D and E for the text’s of this scene in Miller’s play and the opera’s libretto, respectively.

199 Martine, The Crucible, 106.

200 Personal Interview.
stated that Ward's musical treatment failed because he kept Abigail's and John Proctor's vocal lines separate throughout the scene—a "missed opportunity" for a duet setting. But Woliver overlooks the scene's underlying dramatic premise. Ward felt that if Abigail's and Proctor's voices joined in a duet texture it might suggest an emotional bond, exactly what he wished to avoid. Rather than "miss an opportunity" to compose a duet in this scene, Ward kept the vocal lines separate to highlight the expansive psychological gulf separating Abigail and Proctor. For Ward, dramaturgical considerations in this scene had to take precedence.

In Act III of the opera, the location of the trials is changed from the vestry room of the church to a general court building. Musical considerations are accommodated by ensembles for the courtroom appearances of Francis Nurse, Giles Corey and John Proctor.

Although a minor scene in the play, Ward felt that the opening of Act IV—in which Sarah Good and Tituba appear after months of harsh imprisonment—was especially important, so he highlighted it by giving Tituba a final, musical opportunity to bemoan her fate, and that of the entire community, in song. Act IV also contains a scene absent from the play. Ward and Stambler added a final meeting between John Proctor and Abigail. In the play's final act, it is mentioned only that Abigail fled the village. But Ward believed the audience would wish to see her one more time, so he and Stambler created a new

\[\text{CPW, "The Crucible," 25 (Article). Woliver also takes umbrage with the fact that, in Act II of the opera, Ward "missed" duet and trio opportunities when Elizabeth and John Proctor converse for a total of 262 measures without their vocal lines overlapping, and when Mary Warren enters and her line is kept separate from the others. Again, it appears that Woliver overlooked the essential dramaturgical considerations Ward wished to emphasize at these stages of the drama.}
\[\text{Personal Interview. Ward is in complete agreement with this analysis.}
\[\text{CPW, "The Crucible," 47-48 (Dissertation).} \]
scene in which Abigail goes to Proctor in prison and offers to have him set free if he will run away with her. But Proctor merely shakes his head in disgust and refuses to speak.\textsuperscript{204}

In creating the libretto, Ward and Stambler also had to consider the length of time it would take to develop certain aspects of the story line. This practical consideration necessitated altering both the dramatic content of Miller’s play and the historical record. One such example was Elizabeth’s pregnancy. In the play, Miller accurately depicted the historical Elizabeth Procter as pregnant, a fact that spared her life. Ward and Stambler gave this considerable attention but finally decided it was an aspect of characterization that had to be either fully developed or deleted. They decided on the latter because all that is required at the dramaturgical level is for Elizabeth to remain alive, not how she remains alive.\textsuperscript{205}

\textit{The Première of the Opera}

Julius Rudel, Artistic Director of the New York City Opera, was excited about the \textit{The Crucible} and wanted it produced as soon as possible, so he set the première for the Fall operatic season of 1961, less than a year later.\textsuperscript{206} Although Ward felt that was optimistic, Stambler’s writing at the time was going well, so he accepted the challenge. The composition proceeded rapidly until Ward reached the trial scene in Act III. Difficulties with rapid tempo and speech declamation brought the work to a sudden halt. At this very time, Rudel called to inquire about the opera’s progress. He also informed Ward that he

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{204}Ward, \textit{Autobiography}, 51. Ward speaks to the fact that his and Stambler’s suggestions to Miller for altering the play to better suit the libretto were generally met with favor. See also Martine, \textit{The Crucible}, 107-108. Since Miller was kept appraised of Ward and Stambler’s work as they proceeded, and he undoubtedly approved of this scene.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{205}See Ward, Ibid., 51, and Martine, Ibid., 107.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{206}Ward, Ibid., 50. Since The New York City Opera had recently mounted a successful production of Ward’s and Stambler’s \textit{He Who Gets Slapped}, Rudel was almost immediately aware of their desire to write on opera based on Miller’s play.}
was preparing a press release about the opening, set to occur three months hence. When Ward explained the problems to him, Rudel replied that the cast was already under contract and pre-production activities were ongoing. A few days later Rudel called again, and this time Ward informed him that it was not possible to make the deadline. Rudel was unperturbed and told Ward that the press release had gone out that morning and he had a strong feeling it would all work out. Although initially speechless, feeling trapped by Rudel’s apparent act of madness, Ward soon realized that it was an act of faith and confidence. He returned to his work and discovered that Giuseppe Verdi had the answer to his problem.²⁰⁷ Ward considered Verdi and Puccini the consummate operatic masters and often referred to their work when he ran into difficulty. In this instance, the solution to his problem was the text treatment of the drinking scene in Act One of Verdi’s Otello, in time. In this scene, the orchestral melody moves rapidly under the voices, set in melismatic fashion, thus creating clear declamation for each syllable of text. Although this example solved one of Ward’s problems, he had to compose at a feverish pace to complete the project on time. Verdi had moved his work along, and now Puccini helped bring it to a successful conclusion. Puccini believed that the last act of an opera should contain only development of previously stated music, a rational method for achieving musical reflection in which the strands of the plot are brought to resolution. By applying this principle to The Crucible, Ward completed the score a mere eleven days before the opening.²⁰⁸

The première of Ward’s The Crucible took place on October 26, 1961, by the New York City Opera conducted by Emerson Buckley. In Ward’s opinion, Julius Rudel as-

---

²⁰⁸ Ibid.
sembled a remarkable cast, and Emerson Buckley quickly grasped the subtle nuances of the score and libretto. Although singers regarded Buckley as a taskmaster, he had an uncanny sense for their physical condition on stage and could adjust his tempi to assist a singer who needed it, or showcase one who was in top form. Allen Fletcher was the stage director, and he had a gift for achieving fine detail that highlighted the dramaturgical presentation. Scenery for the first production was created by Paul Sylbert, and costumes were designed by Ruth Morey.209

The orchestration consists of two each flutes, oboes, clarinets and bassoons (the second of each part doubling on piccolo, English horn, bass clarinet and contrabassoon [optional] respectively), four horns, two trumpets, a tenor and bass trombone, timpani, other percussion that could be played by one performer, harp, and the usual compliment of strings. The vocal parts include four sopranos, two mezzo-sopranos, two contraltos, four tenors, two baritones, two basses, and a chorus of six girls (SATB, ad lib.).210 These traditional instrumental and vocal ensembles reflect the generally accessible nature of Ward’s compositions.

Musical Structure

The musical structure of The Crucible follows closely that of Miller’s play. Ward and Stambler decided that the four-act dramatic structure of the original ideally suited their needs, so they retained it for the opera. According to Ward, there was an added musical benefit to this structure in that it lent itself to his ideas about musical construction. Be-

209Ibid., 52.
cause Ward wrote the last act to summarize musically what had taken place in the previous three, the opera may also be viewed as a four-movement, cyclic symphony with voices. Although the musical structure of the opera follows traditional operatic models and is relatively uncomplicated, fashioning the libretto was more problematic.211

**Play and Libretto: A Comparison**

Ward and Stambler did not simply set Miller’s play. Rather, they created a *version* that best suited the operatic medium. Even though they eliminated two-thirds of the play’s text, Ward and Stambler fulfilled Miller’s requirements and left unaltered the basic dramatic structure. The opera is exactly what they promised Miller it would be, a truncated adaptation of the original in which music is the primary vehicle for characterization and dramatic expression.

Alterations were made to the number, types, and personality traits of characters to best wed music with characterization. While both the play and opera contain a total of twenty-one characters each, they are not the same. Ward and Stambler combined the characters Cheever, Marshall Herrick and Hopkins into the single figure of Cheever. Judges Danforth and Hathorne are combined into the character of Danforth, who becomes the sole personification of unyielding, theocratic law. To this end, Ward and Stambler change him from a man of “some humor and sophistication” (as he is described in the play), to a more sadistic, martinet-like figure. In the opera, Danforth’s characterization can be seen in the fact that, in a fit of rage, he orders Giles Corey to be “pressed” for refusing to give testimony.212 Two other characters, Martha Sheldon and Bridget

---

211*Personal Interview. See also Appendix A for the opera’s scene structure.

212*Ward, *The Crucible*, II, 43. See also CPW, “The Crucible,” 47 (Dissertation), and Appendix A for a comparison of characters.
Booth—members of the village’s young girls—do not appear in Miller’s original, but were created for the opera where they, along with Mercy Lewis and Ruth Putnam, have singing roles as part of the chorus. By combining and inventing new characters in this fashion, Ward and Stambler solved both musical and dramaturgical problems by reducing unnecessary dialogue balancing the vocal ensemble.213

Both Ward and Stambler emphasized the linguistic properties of their work214 and understood the degree to which language reflects the social and cultural history of peoples and nations.215 They also recognized that the play’s “American” character was defined, at least in part, by Miller’s use of the rugged, earthy-sounding accents and cadential patterns of colonial, New England speech. For this reason, they decided to retain as much of Miller’s original phrasing as possible, altering it only when musical considerations needed to be highlighted or when greater clarity of declamation was required.216

Miller sought to structure the play by controlling and containing the anguish and anger of the characters. He accomplished by concentrating on the formalities of the court hearings. He first attempted to write the play in verse, and in so doing came to realize that the speech patterns and syntax of Puritan New England would sound too archaic to modern ears.217 This exercise led him to develop a method of speech that was not

---

213 See Appendix A for a slightly-edited synopsis of the libretto as published in the complete score.
214 Personal Interview. Although Stambler is the librettist of record for The Crucible, and he certainly wrote the majority of the text, his working relationship with Ward was such that Ward could, and did, ask for changes to the text throughout the compositional process.
215 Ward, Autobiography, 55. When invited to première The Crucible in Germany, Ward encountered the problems of translating the text into another language while attempting to retain as much of the original meaning as possible. Ward instructed the translator, Thomas Martin, to make an accurate translation of the substance of the libretto and he (Ward) would then alter the melodic line to provide the correct German prosody.
216 Personal Interview.
217 Miller, The Crucible, xxi-ii.
authentic in the sense of reproducing linguistic archaisms or a seventeenth-century vocabulary, but rather, one that makes believable the human dilemmas of those who speak from a different time and place with words recognizable to modern audiences.

The British dramatist, John Arden, commented on Miller's methodology, stating,

> It was not just the monosyllabic Anglo-Saxon strength of the words chosen so much as the rhythms that impregnated the speeches... and the sounds of the seventeenth century...imaginatively reconstructed to shake hands with the *sounds* and speech patterns of the twentieth.\(^\text{218}\)

This process was somewhat similar to that followed by Ward and Stambler when they altered Miller's words and phrases to be more easily understood when sung.\(^\text{219}\) In both play and libretto, then, linguistic constructions became a means of characterization. The way in which characters speak may be analogous to cultural "voiceprints" that identify personality, social status, educational level, and emotional state, as well as time and place. These voiceprints, therefore, mark both individual and socio-cultural identity.

Ward's and Stambler's extensive culling of Miller's play also allowed them to add new text when, for musical reasons, it became necessary to summarize lengthy dialogue in a few words. In so doing, they created a text best suited to the operatic medium.\(^\text{220}\) The following comparisons between selected scenes from the play and the opera illustrate how Ward and Stambler fashioned the libretto while maintaining the dramaturgical integrity of the original.

\(^{218}\)Ibid.

\(^{219}\)Personal Interview. Ward stated that he used this two-thirds reduction of syllables as a general guide when fashioning a libretto from a pre-existing source. It was not something he learned during his student years, or from another composer, but from his own investigation of six different operas which, in his estimation, had excellent libretti. With each opera, he counted the number of syllables in both the libretto and original source and found that, generally speaking, a two-thirds reduction was typical. He also stated that he believed Wagner's operas and music dramas were, on the whole, too verbose, while Verdi and Puccini operas sometimes lacked enough words to express the ideas properly.

\(^{220}\)Ibid. Ward refers to this process as "simplifying the circumlocutions of the play."
Miller’s play opens with a scene that takes place in an upstairs room of Reverend Parris’s house.

Abigail: Uncle, the rumor of witchcraft is all about; I think you’d best go down and deny it yourself. The parlor’s packed with people, sir. I’ll sit with her.

Parris, pressed, turns on her: And what shall I say to them? That my daughter and my niece I discovered dancing like heathen in the forest?

Abigail: Uncle, we did dance; let you tell them I confessed it—and I’ll be whipped if I must be. But they’re speakin’ of witchcraft. Betty’s not witched.

Parris: Abigail, I cannot go before the congregation when I know you have not opened with me. What did you do with her in the forest?

Abigail: We did dance, uncle, and when you leaped out of the bush so suddenly, Betty was frightened and then she fainted. And there’s the whole of it.

Parris: Child. Sit you down.

Abigail, quavering, as she sits: I would never hurt Betty. I love her dearly.

Parris: Now look you, child, your punishment will come in its time. but if you trafficked with spirits in the forest I must know it now, for surely my enemies will, and they will ruin me with it.

Abigail: But we never conjured spirits.

Parris: Then why can she not move herself since midnight? This child is desperate! Abigail lowers her eyes. It must come out—my enemies will bring it out. Let me know what you done there. Abigail, do you understand that I have many enemies?

Abigail: I have heard of it, uncle.
Parris: There is a faction that is sworn to drive me from my pulpit. Do you understand that?

Abigail: I think so, sir.

Parris: Now then, in the midst of such disruption, my own household is discovered to be the very center of some obscene practice. Abominations are done in the forest--

Abigail: It were sport, uncle!

Parris, pointing at Betty: You call this sport? She lowers her eyes. He pleads: Abigail, if you know something that may help the doctor, for God’s sake tell it to me. She is silent. I saw Tituba waving her arms over the fire when I came on you. Why was she doing that? And I heard a screeching and gibberish coming from her mouth. She were swaying like a dumb beast over that fire!

Abigail: She always sings her Barbados songs, and we dance.

Parris: I cannot blink what I saw, Abigail, for my enemies will not blink it. I saw a dress lying on the grass.

Abigail, innocently: A dress?

Parris, it is very hard to say: Aye, a dress. And I thought I saw—someone naked running through the trees!

Abigail, in terror: No one was naked! You mistake yourself, uncle!

Parris, with anger: I saw it! He moves from her. Then, resolved: Now tell me true, Abigail. And I pray you feel the weight of truth upon you, for now my ministry’s at stake, my ministry and perhaps your cousin’s life. Whatever abomination you have done, give me all of it now, for I dare not be taken unaware before I go before them down there.

Abigail: There is nothin’ more. I swear it, uncle.
Parris, *studies her then nods, half convinced:* Abigail, I have fought here three long years to bend these stiff-necked people to me, and now, just now when some good respect is rising for me in the parish, you compromise my very character. I have given you a home, child, I have put clothes upon your back—now give me your upright answer. Your name in the town—it is entirely white, is it not?

Abigail, *with and edge of resentment:* Why, I am sure it is, sir. There be no blush about my name.

Parris, *to the point:* Abigail, is there any other cause than you have told me, for your being discharged from Goody Proctor’s service? I have heard it said, and I tell you as I heard it, that she comes so rarely to the church this year for she will not sit so close to something soiled. What signified that remark?

Abigail: She hates me, uncle, she must, for I would not be her slave. It’s a bitter woman, a lying, cold, sniveling woman, and I will not work for such a woman!

Parris: She may be. And yet it has troubled me that you are now seven month out of their house, and in all this time no other family has ever called you for service.

Abigail: They want slaves, not such as I. Let them send to Barbados for that. I will not black my face for any of them! *With ill-concealed resentment at him:* Do you begrudge my bed, uncle?

Parris: No--no.

Abigail, *in a temper:* My name is good in the village! I will not have it said my name is soiled! Goody Proctor is a gossipping liar!221

This exchange establishes three important facts: Parris witnessed Tituba and the young girls dancing and possibly conjuring spirits in the woods; Abigail’s reputation is questionable; and she feels intense hatred for Elizabeth Proctor, the woman who discharged her for as yet unknown reasons. Ward and Stambler condensed this dialogue in the following manner:

—

221 Miller, *The Crucible,* 9-12.
Abigail, _growing agitated:_ Uncle, the common is packed with people chatterin' of warlocks and witches. You'd best go out and deny it yourself.

Parris: And what do I say? What do I say? That I found my daughter and niece dancing in the forest like heathen?

Abigail: Uncle, we did dance. And Tituba sang her songs. But there, outside, they're speakin' of witchcraft. Betty's not witched.

Parris: Abigail, you've not opened with me. What did you in the forest?

Abigail: We did dance, Uncle, and when you leaped so quick from the bush, Betty took fright and she fainted. That's what happened.

Parris: And Tituba waving her arms o'er the fire, screeching and Gibbering--what of that? What of that? And the dress in the grass?

Abigail: A dress?

Parris: Aye, and someone running naked through the trees.

Abigail, _frightened:_ No, no--no--no--no one was naked.

Parris: Abigail, I have enemies in this miserly town. For three long years I have fought to make this stiff-necked parish respect and obey me. And now, you bring corruption to my doorstep and compromise my very character... Child, I have given you bed and board and the clothes upon your back. now I must have the truth before I leave this room. My ministry here's at stake; can you, do you understand? So give me an upright answer... Why did Goody Proctor discharge you from her service? She comes but rarely now to church; she will not sit so close to something soiled, she says. What meant she by that?

Abigail: That bitter woman, that sniveling woman – Goody Proctor hates me because I will not be her slave.

Parris: That may be. Yet since you left her house no other has sought your service. Tell me, why is that? Tell me.
Abigail: They all want slaves, not such as I. Let them send to Barbados for that. Do you begrudge me my bed, Uncle?

Parris: No, no.

Abigail: I will not have it said my name is soiled. I'm clean, as clean as any woman in Salem. My name is good! Elizabeth Proctor is a liar!222

These two versions illustrate a feature of dramatic characterization essential to both play and libretto. Miller enhanced characterization by carefully assigning speech mannerisms according to an individual's educational level and social status. Abigail, a teenager of low social standing with little formal education, often fails to pronounce the final "g" in gerund verb forms, as when she says, "speakin" and "nothin." This pronunciation creates angular rhythmic patterns that characterize her as a typical New England girl of the era. But Miller also gave subtle nuances to Abigail's character. When angry, as when she describes Elizabeth as a "gossiping liar," Abigail clearly and emphatically enunciates each word. Ward and Stambler retained both facets of Abigail's characterization in the libretto with her pronunciations of "chattin," and "speakin." Unlike Abigail, Parris (a graduate of Harvard College) never fails to pronounce words correctly. His is a loftier, more correct form of speech, which depicts his elevated position in society.

An important feature in the libretto is how the condensed text alters the pace of dramatic events. While Miller's lengthy dialogues unfold information at a relatively slow rate, the libretto combines numerous thoughts into single discourses that accelerate the dramatic flow. This feature of libretto construction complements the musical setting because music tends to retard the dramatic tempo in opera.

The structure of arias and ariosos in *The Crucible* also affect the pace at which
dramaturgically important information emerges. In classically constructed operas, aria
structures—whether solo or ensemble—act as frozen moments that momentarily halt the
dramatic flow by reflecting upon action already exposed in recitative. But in *The Crucible*, Ward’s aria structures often continue to relate new information. This treatment propels the dramatic pace forward, thus more closely approaching a musical/dramaturgical
equilibrium.²²³ One example of this procedure: Parris’s discourse in the middle of the
opening scene. In Miller’s play, dialogue exchange takes place in relatively short
phrases. But, as the above example illustrates, Ward and Stambler combined several of
Parris’s speeches to create a longer monologue that musically accommodates the opera’s
first lyric declamation, an arioso.

Near the end of Act I, the pace of rising dramatic events begins to unfold with a rapid
succession of accusations and denials. The scene includes Abigail, Parris, Reverend
Hale, the elder Putnams, Francis and Rebecca Nurse, and Tituba. Hale, with his expert
knowledge of witchcraft, attempts to ascertain what is afflicting both Betty Parris and
Ruth Putnam. He discovers what Parris already knows but has failed to reveal, that
Abigail, Tituba and the young girls were caught dancing in the woods and possibly conjuring spirits. In the face of Hale’s interrogation, both Abigail and Tituba realize that
they must answer carefully if they are to save themselves. Abigail diverts attention away
from herself by telling Hale that it was Tituba who conjured spirits in the forest. In the
play, Hale’s reaction is swift.

²²³While the aria structures for solo voice in *The Crucible* usually continue to unfold dramatic events, ensemble settings often reflect upon action already revealed.
Abigail: She comes to me every night to go and drink blood!

Tituba: You beg me to conjure! She beg me to charm –

Abigail: Don’t lie! To Hale: She comes to me while I sleep; she’s always making me dream corruptions!

Tituba: Why you say that, Abby?

Abigail: Sometimes I wake and find myself standing in the open doorway and not a stitch on my body! I always hear her laughing in my sleep. I hear her singing her Barbados songs and tempting me with--

Ward and Stambler reduced this exchange to its bare essentials in the following manner:

Hale: Abigail, tell the truth. You’re cousin may be dying, afflicted by a witch. Did you compact with the Devil?

Abigail: No, no, I never. Lashing out in fear: She did, Tituba did.

Tituba: Abby, Abby, what you say? To the others: What she say?

Abigail: She made us drink babies’ blood.

Tituba: No, no, dat only chicken’s blood.

Abigail: She pleads with us to conjure the Devil.

Tituba: No, you beg me to conjure.

Abigail: She sends her spirit on me in church. She makes me laugh at prayer.

Tituba: Why you say that?

Abigail: She comes to me in the deep of night and makes me dream corruptions. At night I wake, naked in the open doorway—not a stitch of clothes, nothing, just my naked body in the moonlight. The ground trembles, a cold wind blows, and Tituba singin’ her Barbados songs, temptin’ me, temptin’ me...

---

224 Miller, The Crucible, 40-42.
In the play’s version of this scene, speech-pattern characterization appear in Tituba’s West Indies’ accent and syntax, such as when she says, “I give she chicken blood!” Miller enhances this characterization with Tituba’s use of double negatives, a grammatical indicator of her low social status, in statements such as, “I don’t truck with no Devil” and “I don’t compact with no Devil.” Although Ward’s and Stambler’s adaptation eliminates much of Tituba’s individual lines, and most of this linguistic characterization, her statement, “No, no, dat only chicken’s blood,” serves equally well to portray her social status.

Miller’s version of this scene also reveals aspects of Abigail’s sexuality. Hale’s accusations of consorting with the Devil strike a nerve with Abigail’s sexually-frustrated psyche, allegations she denies with ardent proclamations of her virtuous self-image, “I have never sold myself! I’m a good girl! I’m a proper girl!” Although these line are eliminated in the libretto, Abigail’s latent sexual desires surface when she says, “At night I wake, naked in the open doorway—not a stitch of clothes, nothing, just my naked body in the moonlight.” This added touch of salaciousness in the libretto reminds us that Abigail’s fervent denial of witchcraft lies, at least in part, close to her heightened sense of sexuality.

After the first line of Abigail’s “temptin’ me” speech in the libretto, Ward and Stambler created new dialogue for a vocal sextet. In this ensemble, Abigail’s sexually implicit speech advances the dramaturgical flow of information while the Putnams, Nurses, and Parris reflect upon their feelings. They express their thoughts in unison as they sing:
Ann: That slave’s a witch. She’s joined the Devil’s crew. Its hurtful, vengeful spirits layin’ hands on these children. My babies’ blood, that’s what she made them drink, a witches’ brew of babies’ blood. Tituba enlists them for the Devil. All this year they’re turnin’ strange. She’s the murderin’ witch, for sure. Mr. Hale, do you hear? She’s the witch, it’s clear. Make her name the Devil’s crew. Lift this curse, we beg of you.

Thomas: She dreams corruption. What does she mean? She wakens naked... Tituba is back of this. She’s the murderin’ witch for sure. Mr. Hale, do you hear? She’s the witch, it’s clear. Make her name the Devil’s crew. Lift this curse we beg of you.

Parris: She dreams corruptions, and in my very house. Those who hope to ruin me will feed on every word she says. She says her name is clean; I wonder. Oh, my God. Tituba is back of this. She’s the murderin’ witch for sure. Mr. Hale, do you hear? She’s the witch, it’s clear. Make her name the Devil’s crew. Lift this curse we beg of you.

Francis: A piteous thing – she’s haunted by the bloody massacre that left her an orphan child.

Rebecca: It’s charity and love she needs. She’s heard too much of witchcraft.

Francis: That’s true. I agree, but Putnam’s crying witch-hunt.

Rebecca: I fear this seeking loose spirits. We should go to God. He will give us help, for sure. No good, I fear, can come of this. It’s evil. It’s silly girls not witches here. It’s charity and love we need.

Francis: No good, I fear, can come of this. It’s evil. It’s silly girls, not witches here. It’s charity and love we need.226

This added text portrays each character’s personality traits and the factional divisions their differences create. Ann Putnam is almost delirious about her children’s premature deaths and desperate to blame them on anything. Thomas Putnam fears corruption of the ordered world in which he has a financial stake. Parris is concerned for his position and

226Ibid., I, 91-96.
the fact that members of his household may cause his downfall. Conversely, Francis and Rebecca Nurse apply reason and speak of Abigail’s past and the silliness of the young girls, charitable views that motivate their attitude of forgiveness and love.

At this point in the drama, fear and desperation have overwhelmed most of the characters, and they must blame someone for their problems. Because her lowly status makes her a convenient scapegoat, Tituba becomes the focus of the escalating hysteria. In the play, Reverend Hale presses forward his interrogation,

Hale, resolved now: Tituba, I want you to wake this child.

Tituba: I have no power on this child, sir.

Hale: You most certainly do, and you will free her from it now! When did you compact with the Devil?

Tituba: I don’t compact with no Devil!

Parris: You will confess yourself or I will take you out and whip you to your death, Tituba!

Putnam: This woman must be hanged! She must be taken and hanged!

Parris, pressing in on her: Who? Who? Their names, their names!

Tituba, suddenly bursting out: Oh, how many times he bid me kill you, Mr. Parris!

Parris: Kill me!

Tituba, in a fury: He say Mr. Parris must be kill! Mr. Parris no goodly man, Mr. Parris mean man and no gentle man, and he bid me rise out of my bed and cut your throat! They gasp. But I tell him, “No! I don’t hate that man. I don’t want kill that man.” But he say, “You work for me, Tituba, and I make you free! I give you pretty dress to wear, and put you way high up in the air, and you gone fly back to Barbados!” And I say, You lie, Devil, you lie!” And then he
come one stormy night to me, and he say, “Look! I have white people belong to me.” And I look—and there was Goody Good.227

This scene reveals important traits of Tituba’s character. Although in the lowest rank of society, she is no fool. When threatened, she resorts to a survival technique that undoubtedly served her well in the past, to acquiesce and hope she will be left unharmed, and she quickly seizes the opportunity. But Tituba knows enough to realize that confessing not only saves her life, it allows her to tell Parris what she thinks of him.

In the opera, Ward sets Tituba’s confession in lyric fashion. Ward and Stambler have lengthened her monologue to include the Putnams on the list of those the Devil has encouraged her to kill. Musically, then, this scene becomes Tituba’s climactic moment, for she does not sing another complete aria for the remainder of the opera. Her lyric declamation reads as follows:

Tituba: Yaa! Ya, he do. He say Mr. Parris a mean man. He bid me rise and cut yo throat. To Thomas: Yo throat, too—and yo’s, Goody Putnam... But I say, “No, I don’ wanna kill.” But he say, “Yo work for me and you get silk dress, big black wings, and I set yo free. You can fly down to Barbados, where the sun is big an’ bright, where dere’s singing, where dere’s dancin,’ where dere’s feastin’ till de night.” A tiny sigh escapes her. Catches herself and quickly returns to earlier mood. But I said, “No.” I save yo throats... Den one stormy night he come an’ say to me, “Look, white people – dey’s mine, too.” I peer into de blackness... An ol’ woman dere—scraggy hair an’ a crooked nose... Couldn’ make her out...228

Although Tituba’s contrived histrionics save her life, her confession opens a Pandora’s Box of deceit and treachery, because she implicates others who will suffer as a result.

227 Miller, The Crucible, 44.
228 Ward, The Crucible, 1, 104-112.
Tituba’s confession also gives Abigail a behavioral model to follow. When, in the play, Abigail sees the reaction to Tituba’s confession, she cries out,

Abigail: I want to open myself! They turn to her, startled. She is enraptured, as though in a pearly light. I want the light of God, I want the sweet love of Jesus! I danced for the Devil; I saw him; I wrote in his book; I go back to Jesus; I kiss his hand. I saw Sarah Good with the Devil! I saw Goody Osburn with the Devil! I saw Bridget Bishop with the Devil!\(^{229}\)

With this, the curtain falls as Abigail and Betty cry out their allegations and Hale orders the town marshal to arrest the accused. In the opera, the act concludes with Abigail’s confession soaring above a chorus of newly-written text for the entire cast who sing a joyous hymn of thanksgiving for their deliverance from the hands of Lucifer.

Abigail: They all rejoice that Tituba’s saved. Their faces beam with holy light—forgive me Lord. I sold my soul, befouled my name, I sinned and I lied, drank Satan’s brews for him, naked, danced, then signed his book, became his loving bride. Now I want Thy love, oh God, can You forgive my mortal fall? Do you send a sign? Do I hear Thy voice? I do! I do! ‘Tis Thy sweet call. I open to Thee, oh Jesus. Open, open Thy arms to me. I kiss Thy hand, sweet Jesus, take me, take me up to Thee, my God.

Ensemble: Jesus, my consolation, Thee do I worship, Thee do I trust. When Satan tempts me to vile corruption, smite Thou the Devil, crush him to dust. Alleluia. Keep me from sin and folly, free me from bonds of earthly delight. Give me the strength to conquer all evil, spare me the pain of Hell’s endless night. God hear our call and send down His Son to take on the sin of mankind’s first fall. Thy blood redeems us, sing we hosanna. Now we adore Thee Saviour of all. Amen, Amen, Amen, Amen.\(^{230}\)

\(^{229}\)Miller, *The Crucible*, 45.
Set in the home of John and Elizabeth Proctor, Act II of the play takes place a week later. They discuss the fact that numerous people have been arrested and a court has been convened to bring them to trial. Abigail Williams told John that her accusations of witchcraft resulted from a prank she and the other girls were playing, and Elizabeth asks John to go into Salem to inform the authorities. But John hesitates because he fears public exposé of his affair with Abigail. Elizabeth suspects John still harbors affection for Abigail. This accusation angers John and he lashes out,

Proctor: Woman. *She turns to him.* I'll not have your suspicion any more.

Elizabeth, *a little loftily*: I have no--

Proctor: I'll not have it!

Elizabeth: Then let you not earn it.

Proctor, *with a violent undertone*: You doubt me yet?

Elizabeth, *with a smile, to keep her dignity*: John, if it were not Abigail that you must go to hurt, would you falter now? I think not.

Proctor: Now look you--

Elizabeth: I see what I see, John.

Proctor, *with solemn warning*: You will not judge me more, Elizabeth. I have good reason to think before I charge fraud on Abigail, and I will think on it. Let you look to your own improvement before you go to judge your husband any more. I have forgot Abigail, and--

Elizabeth: And I.
Proctor: Spare me! You forget nothin' and forgive nothin.'
Learn charity, woman. I have gone tiptoe in this
house all seven months since she is gone. I have
not moved from there to there without I think to
please you, and still an everlasting funeral marches
round your heart. I cannot speak but I am doubted,
every moment judged for lies, as though I come into
court when I come into this house!

Elizabeth: John, you are not open with me. You saw her with
a crowd you said. Now--

Proctor: I'll plead my honesty no more, Elizabeth.

Elizabeth, now she would justify herself: John, I am only--

Proctor: No more! I should have roared you down when first
you told me your suspicion. But I wilted, and, like a
Christian, I confessed. Confessed! Some dream I had
must have mistaken you for God that day. But you're
not, you're not, and let you remember it! Let you look
sometimes for the goodness in me, and judge me not.

Elizabeth: I do not judge you. The magistrate sits in your heart
that judges you. I never thought you but a good man,
John--with a smile--only somewhat bewildered.

Proctor: Oh, Elizabeth, your justice would freeze beer!... 231

This exchange reveals much about Elizabeth’s personality and social status. Although
outwardly reticent and maintaining a calm, exterior façade, Elizabeth stands up to her
strong-willed husband. Even though she and John lack wealth, and presumably Eliza-
beth’s education was like most women of her social class, 232 she is an intelligent, well-
spoken, woman who, unlike Abigail, properly enunciates her words.

232 In this regard see page 50, note 133, supra. Because the Puritans valued education, Elizabeth may have
been taught to read so that she could understand the Bible. She would also have been expected to learn
domestic skills by emulating her mother and, as seen in the play, by serving another family until she got
married.
In the libretto, John and Elizabeth’s individual lines are combined with newly-written material so that each has a longer monologue that can more readily be set in aria fashion.

The opera’s version of this scene reads as follows:

John: Woman, I’ll not have your suspicion more.

Elizabeth: Then let you not earn it.

John: Let you not judge me. Let you look to your own improvement. I’ve forgotten. But you forgive nothin,’ you forgive nothin.’ Learn charity, Elizabeth. I’ve gone tiptoe in this house since she is gone. I have not moved from here to there without I think and try to please you. And still an everlastin’ funeral marches round your heart. I cannot speak but I am doubted, every moment judged for lies, as though I come into court when I come into this house. But you think: think on this. If I go to Salem and call Abigail hud, she’ll strike back. Surely she will. Then it’s Proctor or lecher—the name will be the same. Think of that, and then think of your sons—Besides, it’s not so easy to prove that she is a fraud. I have no hard evidence. What she told me she told me in a room alone.

Elizabeth: I do not judge you, John. That court that judges you sits in your own heart. I never thought you but a good man, though perhaps a little bewildered. That’s all—But, oh, the dreams I had for our proud young love, a love that would never turn or falter. But now, it’s shattered, lost and gone. And an icy hand closes round my heart. How could it be you turned from me to one like Abigail? How could it be, John? How could it be? You say she’ll call you a lecher, but won’t she fear to damn herself? Think of those who rot in jail, those whom you might save. Think of them—and then think of your sons... John, grant me this: you do not know a young girl’s heart. A promise is made in any bed—spoken or silent, it’s surely made. Now Abigail may dream on that. I know she does. Go to her, John, and break that promise—that she may dream no more. All this week I’ve been haunted by the fear of what she may do next. She has an arrow in you yet, and she will twist it home. You must tear
you tear yourself free of her. For know that I will be your only wife or no wife at all.233

This scene marks the first time John and Elizabeth sing together, but rather than compose a duet, Ward wrote separate arias for each. By keeping their musical lines separate in this way, Ward portrays the emotional rift that exists between John and Elizabeth. Conversely, when the emotional barriers between John and Elizabeth are removed later in the opera, a duet texture reflects their accord.

Play vs. Opera—Act III

In the opera's third act, the rapid exchange of dialogue in the courtroom scene presented Stambler and Ward with numerous musical challenges. Although they did not wish to alter the dramatic content, this style of dialogue could be set only to recitative, a situation ill-suited to Ward's lyric sensibilities. In the first two acts, Ward and Stambler usually solved such problems by combining shorter speeches into longer ones appropriate for lyric declamation. But in Act III, the numerous characters and brisk exchanges of dialogue made this procedure less feasible. One solution here was to combine characters. Ward and Stambler also rearranged the order in which characters appear and paraphrased almost the entire original text. These procedures allowed them to retain the dramatic content and pace of the action but in a more orderly fashion musically. Aria structures could then be added to strengthen characterization or orchestrated with an ensemble texture to deliver dialogue in the least amount of time.

Although Danforth's role as the sole, legal authority has more prominence in the libretto, the pace of events made a detailed characterization of him problematic. Ward and

Stambler solved this problem by writing an aria for him comprised entirely of newly-written text. Danforth’s “prayer of invocation” that opens the court proceedings, reveals Danforth’s personality:

Danforth: Open Thou my lips, O Lord,
And let my mouth show forth Thy praise.
Make Thy spirit speak through me
Thy judgment on these evil days.
The people groan, but heed them not!
Let them wail, let them cower.
We may not let this foulness fester.
And yield our world to Satan’s power.

Never, never!

Thy government and central church
Be now, O Lord, within this hand:
Let it falter not to punish those
Who spread this plague throughout our land.\(^{234}\)

This aria fulfills a dual function. On the dramaturgical level, Danforth’s character is shown to be that of a pious, laconic figure who will take a harsh view of the accused; musically, his invocation offers a moment of lyric discourse before the lengthy moments of recitative that follow.

In both play and libretto, the courtroom drama unfolds quickly, with scenes such as the revelation of John Proctor’s adultery, Elizabeth Proctor’s lie, and Mary Warren’s interrogation. A musically significant moment occurs when Abigail, attempting to deflect attention away from herself (as she did in Act I), points to the ceiling rafters and yells out, “Yellow Bird! Yellow Bird! Begone, begone.”\(^{235}\) Ward’s musical treatment of this scene, in which all voices sing together, intensifies the pandemonium.

\(^{234}\)Ibid., II, 27-31.
\(^{235}\)Ibid., II, 86.
Girls: Her claws, her claws.

Abigail: Mary, please don’t hurt me. You cannot want to tear my face, for God made my face.

Mary: She sees nothin.’

Abigail: She sees nothin.’

Mary: Abby you mustn’t.

Girls: She sees nothin.’

Danforth: Why can they only repeat you?

Girls: Abby you mustn’t, mustn’t, mustn’t, mustn’t, mustn’t.236

Play vs. Opera—Act IV

Act IV of the opera takes place within the limited confines of the jailhouse into which various characters enter and exit as scenes develop. The opening scene, in which Tituba laments her fate, is followed by Ward and Stambler’s added monologue in which Abigail attempts to persuade John Proctor to run away with her. A portion of this scene highlights Abigail’s and Proctor’s personality differences:

Abigail: John, my darling. I’ve money and clothes for you. Look, look, John, you are free. (John does not move or even seem to hear her as she sings and shows him the clothes and the money.) (more intensely now) John, do you hear me? There’s a boat at the dock waiting for us. The wind is in the sails. (with great urgency) John, we cannot delay. (John remains as though dead.) John, listen—I forgive you. I have come to save you, only you, to take you away from this town of spite and hate. (Cheever reenters, unseen by the others.) To a land where it’s sunny and warm, where there’s nothin’ but our love forever. (For the first time John looks at Abigail. He slowly shakes his head,

236Ibid., II, 87-89.
then lifts his manacled hands and shuts the gate between them. He then shuffles back and forth into the darkness. Cheever motions the stunned Abigail to leave..."

This scene exemplifies Ward’s and Stambler’s principal concern when adding new material—to enhance characterization. Here, Proctor’s character traits augment with his refusal to run away with Abigail, or even exchange words with her.

Near the end of the drama, Elizabeth has permission to see John before his execution. In the play, their exchange is as follows:

Proctor, *with great force of will, but not quite looking at her:* I have been thinking I would confess to them, Elizabeth. *She shows nothing.* What say you? If I give them that?

Elizabeth: I cannot judge you, John.

*Pause.*

Proctor, *simply—a pure question:* What would you have me do?

Elizabeth: As you will, I would have it. *Slight pause.* I want you living, John. That’s sure.

Proctor, *he pauses, then with a flailing of hope:* Giles’ wife? Have she confessed?

Elizabeth: She will not.

*Pause.*

Proctor: It is a pretense, Elizabeth.

Elizabeth: What is?

Proctor: I cannot mount the gibbet like a saint. It is a fraud. I am not that man. *She is silent.* My honesty is broke, Elizabeth; I am no good man. Nothing’s spoiled by giving them this lie that were not rotten long before.

Elizabeth: And yet you’ve not confessed till now. That speak goodness in you.

---

237Ibid., II, 113-120.
Proctor: Spite only keeps me silent. It is hard to give a lie to dogs. 
*Pause, for the first time he turns directly to her.* I would have your forgiveness, Elizabeth.

Elizabeth: It is not for me to give, John, I am--

Proctor: I’d have you see some honesty in it. Let them that never lied die now to keep their souls. It is a pretense for me, a vanity that will not blind God nor keep my children out of the wind. *Pause.* What say you?

Elizabeth, *upon a heaving sob that always threatens:* John, it comes to naught that I should forgive you, if you will not forgive yourself. *Now he turns away a little, in great agony.* It is not my soul, John, it is yours. *He stands, as though in physical pain, slowly rising to his feet with a great immortal longing to find his answer.* *It is difficult to say, and she is on the verge of tears.* Only be sure of this, for I know it now: Whatever you will do, it is a good man that does it. *He turns his doubting, searching gaze upon her.* I have read my heart this three month, John. *Pause.* I have sins of my own to count. It needs a cold wife to prompt lechery.

Proctor, *in great pain:* Enough, enough--

Elizabeth, *now pouring out her heart:* Better you should know me!

Proctor: I will not hear it. I know you!

Elizabeth: You take my sins upon you, John--

Proctor, *in agony:* No, I take my own, my own!

Elizabeth: John, I counted myself so plain, so poorly made, no honest love could come to me! Suspicion kissed you when I did; I never knew how I should say my love. It were a cold house I kept!... *Proctor, his chest heaving, stares, turns to Elizabeth. She comes to him as though to plead, her voice quaking.* Do what you will. But let none be your judge.

*Proctor turns from her to Hathorne; he is off the earth, his voice hollow.*

Proctor: I want my life.\(^\text{238}\)

\(^{238}\)Miller, *The Crucible*, 125-127.
The libretto version of this scene demonstrates one of the best examples of Ward’s and Stambler’s method of compressing text while retaining Miller’s dramaturgical intentions. In the opera, the following dialogue is presented in lyric fashion and succinctly relates the full spectrum of emotions.

John: Elizabeth, I’ve been thinkin’ that I would confess. What say you?

Elizabeth, As you will, so I would have it... But John, I want you living.

John, *(alive now, in response to Elizabeth’s warmth)*: I cannot mount the gibbet like a saint. Will you forgive me if I lie?

Elizabeth: John, oh John, it was my lie that brought you here. I, not you, should ask forgiveness. It’s a cold wife that drives her man to lechery.

John: No, no, I will not hear it.

Elizabeth: I counted myself so very plain, so poorly made, that no honest love could come to me. Suspicion kissed you when I did; I never knew how I should say my love. But know this now—as I know it—whatever you do, it’s a good man’s doing.

John: Whatever I will do, will you forgive me?

Elizabeth: Whatever you will do, whatever way you go, oh John, I will go by your side.

John: Elizabeth, Elizabeth... *(a great triumphant shout)* Mr. Danforth, Mr. Danforth. I want my life...239

The musical setting of this scene differs from that in Act II, in which John’s and Elizabeth’s melodic lines were kept separate. In Act II, the melodic character of their lines differ distinctly, and Ward does not allow them to overlap. John’s melody is syncopated and “agitato-like” in character, while Elizabeth’s melody is rhythmically

---

smoother. In Act IV, Ward provides music that underscores the dramaturgical significance of the moment. Although John and Elizabeth sing separately most of the time, the contours of their melodies are similar, and entrances and stopping points often dovetail. This procedure musically emphasizes the dramaturgical fact that John and Elizabeth have now reconciled.  

The remainder of the libretto closely adheres to Miller’s original text. After Proctor tears up the confession, he consigns himself to the gallows with the following words:

John: I can. And there’s your first marvel, that I can. You have made your magic now, for now I do think I see some shred of goodness in John Proctor. It’s not enough to weave a banner with, but white enough to keep it from such dogs. (In a burst of terror, Elizabeth rushes to him and weeps against his hand.) Give them no tear! Tears pleasure them. Show honor now; show a stony heart, and with it sink them. (John raises Elizabeth and kisses her with great passion.) (The great gate of the blockhouse is opened and in the rising light of the dawn villagers lining the path to the gallows become gradually visible.)

Proctor’s tearing-up his signed confession is the crucial moment of the play. It is the moment at which he becomes fully self-aware. He can now forgive himself for past failures, thus allowing Elizabeth to forgive him. The opera concludes with a slow, rising crescendo in the orchestra, culminating with accented, C-Minor chords marked “fortissimo” that mark the moment Proctor falls from the gallows.

It was fortuitous that the operatic rights to Miller’s play were still available when Ward and Stambler became interested in it—five years after its initial run. Even more fortunate was the fact that Miller took a personal interest in the project and assisted them

---

240 This type of construction cannot, in the strictest sense, be called a “duet.” Perhaps a term such as “aria for two” better describes the formal process involved.
242 Ibid., II, 192.
in creating the libretto. Reducing the amount of text by two-thirds meant that numerous pages of dialogue had to be condensed into a mere handful of words, while maintaining the dramaturgical essence. Miller carefully wrote dialogue to bring out important features of characterization, a fact that Ward and Stambler understood and built upon. Owing to the play's construction, with its rapid exchange of dialogue, Ward and Stambler had to alter large amounts of text and write new material suitable for lyric discourse. In the final analysis, the success of Ward's *The Crucible* testifies to the fact that the libretto is a work of art in its own right.

Part Two, below, examines various theories of musical nationalism, both historical and contemporary, the focus of which will be how the reception history of *The Crucible* supports Carl Dahlhaus's theory of nationalism. The final chapter explores how Ward created an idiomatic musical syntax akin to the linguistic features of the text and the effect this relationship has had on the perception of the opera as an American national genre.
PART TWO

Towards a Nationally Characteristic Music
III. Questions Regarding Musical Nationalism

and the Opera’s Reception

Many consider Robert Ward’s *The Crucible* an American nationalist opera. But the definition of nationalism in music is problematic at best. Even more difficult to discern: those musical traits that can apply to a specific national group such as American. The seeming plethora of theories about what may (or may not) constitute nationalism in music seems to match the number of scholars who write on the subject and, as indicated by the following, those who attempt to define music’s nationalistic content often stand upon foundations of intellectual and artistic quicksand. In an attempt to avoid some of the pitfalls, let us examine, briefly, those concepts of nationalism that may refer to music in general, and to an “American” music in particular. It is in this context that we can then consider Robert Ward’s *The Crucible*.

Changing Perspectives of Musical Nationalism

In 1867, Carl Engel wrote one of the first comprehensive and ethnographic studies about nationalism in music. His concluded that the national in music is principally seen in, among other things, the use of indigenous scales, melodies, harmonies, poetic texts that influence melodic construction, instruments, and association with native dance.243 But Engel also admitted that, "In some instances… the popular music of a nation has been considerably modified by foreign influences."244

---

244 Ibid.
Near the end of the nineteenth century, Louis Charles Elson wrote that, "In no department of musical history has there been more of careless and unverified statements, of unquestioning acceptance of tradition, than in the chronicles of our national music." Although Elson felt that traditional views of musical nationalism have limitations, his own opinion about nativistic influences remained narrow. In his view, native American (Indian) cultures were not "essentially musical," and that any music produced by them was on a "lower plane." For this reason he doubted that native American cultures could inspire large-scale musical forms. He stated,

Yet Mr. MacDowell has attempted this and brought forth an Indian Suite for Orchestra. The Indian, of course, would find his music unrecognisable in this developed state, and a composer of this rank could take almost any unpromising theme or figure and make it of interest to his public. In other words, the Indian themes, unadorned, have no special inspiration beyond the music of the rest of the savage world.

This view reflects three beliefs prevalent during Elson's era; first, that musical references must be recognizable to those who contributed them; second, that native sources, however manipulated by the composer, cannot induce nationalistic sentiments in other groups; and third, that compositional inspiration was limited to strictly musical sources.

In 1910, William Lines Hubbard came to much the same conclusion as Elson when he wrote,

Of the music if such it may be termed, native to this country, there is little to be said, for it has undergone little or no change and has played no part in our development. ...in general the music of the aborigine, owing to its nature, has been looked upon as of no artistic value.

---

246 Ibid., 271.
Both Elson and Hubbard were contradicted in the ensuing decades when native American cultures provided American opera composers a wealth of inspiration.248

Gilbert Chase has stated that the early nineteenth-century American composer William Henry Fry was the first to seek consciously an American musical nationalism, since Fry advocated that American composers should claim a “Declaration of Independence in Art” by refusing to bow down before Handel, Mozart and Beethoven and suggested that Americans should strike out into hitherto unexplored realms of expression, guided only by their own inspiration. Fry felt that this approach would help American composers discard their aesthetic debt to Europe and assist in founding an American school of composition.249 But, as Chase points out, Fry’s call for musical independence reflected a dichotomy in American music because it came from one who "pleads for artistic independence while imitating European models in his own works."250

As Chase also notes, Edward MacDowell, representative of the Second New-England School, had definite opinions about musical nationalism. MacDowell believed that Russian, Bohemian or other so-called national music had no place in art because anyone could reproduce the characteristics by which they were designated. He also believed that one vital element stood alone—personality. MacDowell was of the opinion that an American national school of music needed composers who truly represented its ideals, composers who sprang from the common roots of American life and idealism, who loved their country, who put into their music what the nation put into its life and, above all, had

248 In fact, this author’s survey of over four-thousand American operas has shown that the influence of native American culture on composers of American opera is greater than that of European settlers coming to the New World.
250 Ibid., 332-333.
a desire to free themselves from restraints that the almost unlimited deference to European thought had created. For MacDowell, American music must be identified with an undaunted tenacity of spirit that characterize the American citizen. Chase notes that MacDowell’s own music, steeped in European musical vocabulary, contradicts his statements.

Chase also cites the American music educator, Daniel Gregory Mason, who claimed that the roots of American national music lay in Anglo-American folk songs. Mason stated that, “This Anglo-Saxon element in our heterogeneous national character, however quantitatively in the minority nowadays, is qualitatively of crucial significance in determining what we call the American temper.” Chase disagrees, since he does not believe that the “American temper” can be determined by an element quantitatively in the minority. He further claims that an American “heterogeneous national character” does not exist and, therefore, no school of American national music exists. But Chase’s claim may be too narrow in its application. The lack of homogeneity in the American national character could simply mean that an American national school of composition cannot be defined in ways comparable to that of other nations, especially true when equating American folk music with nationalism, since there appears to be considerable disagreement over what is national music and what is national in music. Scholars such as Chase, who believe there is no school of American national composition, fail to recognize the means by which a national music may be created.

---

251 Ibid., 355.
252 Ibid., 355-356.
Some music historians discuss the problem of nationalism versus patriotism, especially during times of war. Barbara Tischler has stated that, prior to World War I, American composers depended more on European models than afterwards, and their compositions during the war years were essentially patriotic, as opposed to nationalistic, in character.255 According to Tischler,

Like the nationalistic music of pre-war years [World War I] by Henry F. Gilbert and his contemporaries, these pieces could not be considered European because of their inspiration, popular materials, or simply the nationality and patriotic intentions of their composers, nor were they "American" in the sense their creators hoped they would be. They expressed the feelings of the moment, but did not capture the essential element of American culture...256

Although insightful, her comments fail to explain what is the "essential element of American culture." If folk music cannot create national content, and patriotic elements only "express the feelings of the moment," a viable definition of nationalism in music must lie elsewhere.

The roles played by art music and vernacular sources in creating American nationalism are addressed by Alan Howard Levy. He believes that, from the end of the Civil War to around 1930, the often-frustrating efforts by composers to integrate elements of American art and vernacular music were essentially part of a larger search for a national cultural and political identity. Opinions have varied on exactly how to attain this type of integration successfully. Some wanted to use exclusively the nation's many racial, ethnic, vernacular and regional traditions, while others wished to include European

256 Ibid., 91.
models. Some also advocated combining elements of the two sources, but extremists on both sides tenaciously forbade such combinations.257

Although music historians encounter numerous problems in their attempts to define musical nationalism, composers have often dealt with it more pragmatically. Nicholas Tawa notes that, although composers of the Second New-England School, including Chadwick, MacDowell, Foote and Beach, may have alluded to African, Indian, and even popular music in some of their compositions, they ultimately feared they might compromise the purely humanistic standards they painstakingly tried to uphold. When these composers incorporated an extant musical reference, it was usually British-American, and Gaelic—Irish, Scottish, Welsh and Cornish. Tawa also cites Arthur Foote's belief that American composers could not consciously cultivate nationalism because it would have resulted in a forced, artificial manner of writing, unnatural to the composer and unappreciated by the public. The composers of the Second New-England School believed that, whatever shape nationalism took, it had to evolve spontaneously and be an unconscious presence during the act of composition.258

A generation later, American composer Arthur Farwell went so far as to call nationalism a "dangerous subject," commenting,

It would seem that no one as yet has devised a satisfactory form for the general presentation and study of nationalism in music. The very subject, in esse, would appear to present the very genius of the amorphous and the Protean. It is an interplaying tangle of considerations of geography, race, nation, history, psychology, intermingled with and confused with considerations of musical form, content, and degree of development. The moment that one takes any of these matters as a point of departure, or the basis of a plan, he is confronted by a discour-

aging array of exceptions, modifying conditions and apparent contradictions... One would naturally suppose that the subject of nationalism in music should be handled nation by nation. But the moment one begins this he is confronted with the necessity for innumerable digressions and qualifications.

John Alden Carpenter, another American composer and contemporary of Farwell, felt that although critics practically demanded a more unmistakably American quality in American music, attempts inevitably resulted in the impression that there was greater concern for a national label than for the contents. In Carpenter's opinion, if composers allowed themselves to be unduly influenced by this demand, it would lead to a self-conscious manner of composition that would negatively affect the creative impulse. Carpenter believed that nationalism in music could not be an act of volition, and that American composers were going to be "American" enough because, in the final analysis, they could not be anything else. But these views seem perhaps too simplistic because a definition of musical nationalism that denies reference to musical characteristics, traits, intentions or perceptions in favor of one's birthplace or political allegiance fails to differentiate between musical nationalism and musical universalism. The most current scholarship on musical nationalism addresses many of the same issues.
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Some Current Views of Musical Nationalism

In a recent investigation of nationalism in music, Richard Crawford takes the view that nationalism and universalism are not necessarily diametrically opposed. As he states,

In nineteenth-century Europe... Cultural nationalism was based on the idea that each nation should have its own language, folklore, music, flag, and government institutions, while remaining part of the cosmopolitan Europe and being aware of each other's developments. Indeed, rather than being viewed as opposites, nationalism and universality were closely connected in European musical thought. It was in fact their nationalistic traits that brought composers like Frederic Chopin and Modest Mosorgsky international recognition.261

In Crawford's view, musical nationalism can be thought of as a collection of expressive, idiomatic traits somewhat analogous to varying accents within a common, spoken language, and these traits may separate one nation's music from that of another.

Crawford also refers to Edward MacDowell's views on American national music. He notes that MacDowell may have been the first American composer to grasp the connection between universality and nationalism and did so not by eschewing European models but by linking American elements to European practice in a way that helped him and other American composers emerge from the shadow of Germany. According to Crawford, MacDowell's beliefs were neither contradictory nor incompatible with nationalism because, if folk-music elements emphasized the side of nationalism that acted as a centrifugal force--a force that drove parts of the whole away from the common center--then the desire for national identity had to involve another dynamic that maintained the entirety of the overall musical aesthetic, not by depicting the whole, but by recasting the constituent parts. MacDowell viewed national elements as providing a

261Ibid., 377-378.
convention through which he, as an American composer, could transcend European precedent and find his own expression of the universal state of mind. In this sense, he viewed musical nationalism as a means, not an end.  

Crawford also offers a parallax view of American musical nationalism. This perspective recognizes that, because different answers to the same questions are inevitable, each vantage point yields its own particular insights, and these differences can be highly informative. By applying this parallax view, Crawford believes that the question of nationalism in music remains open in ways that encourage reflection and comparison rather than the disputation and partisanship that have marked nationalist studies in the past.

In her study of musical nationalism, Celia Applegate points out that, although the quantity of new scholarship on music and nationhood has not been great, it warrants some attention. First, definitions of “nation” and “nationalism” are by no means self-evident, especially in reference to a specific historic experience. Those who use them are chronically at risk of reifying something that is protean, controversial and unstable. Moreover, in recent times there has been an increasing tendency towards viewing national factors in music as directly proportionate to the degree of precision in the definition itself. Modern scholars also tend either to eliminate or ignore a sense of historical pragmatism that formed the basis of these definitions from the nineteenth century to the present day. There is a general lack of agreement about what constitutes nationalism in music, and nationalism remains a highly variable concept. The reason seems to be an assumption that national identity in music can be observed simply through

---

its subject matter and structure—an attitude that stems from a pretentiousness that links all later interpretations in terms of "formal generative power" or "elements of generative energy in the material," and the "entelechy of structures," with futile attempts to define the essence of a nation's music. Because such broadly-based theories encompass all genres of music, any attempt to examine concepts of nationalism as they may apply specifically to American music first requires a basic understanding of their shared traits.

Richard Taruskin offers both, a concise definition of nationalism in the large-scale socio-political sense, and an examination of the problems encountered in defining nationalism's effect on music. According to Taruskin, nationalism is,

The doctrine or theory according to which the primary determinant of human character and destiny, and the primary object of social and political allegiance, is the particular nation to which an individual belongs. Nationalism is recognized by historians and sociologists as a major factor in European cultural ideology by the end of the 18th century, and it has been arguably the dominant factor in geopolitics since the end of the 19th. Its multifarious impact on the arts, and on music in particular, has directly paralleled its growth and spread. Nationalism should not be equated with the possession or display of distinguishing national characteristics—or not, at any rate, until certain questions are asked and at least provisionally answered. The most important ones are, first, who is doing the distinguishing? And second, to what end? Just as there were nations before there was nationalism, music has always exhibited local or national traits (often more apparent to outsiders than to those exhibiting them). Nor is musical nationalism invariably a matter of exhibiting or valuing stylistic peculiarities. Nationalism is a condition; nationalism is an attitude.

By asking questions such as, "who is doing the distinguishing?" and, "to what end?"

Taruskin points out that, what constitutes nationalism in music changes depending on the

---

person or group—in this case, composer, critics, audiences—who attempt to define its substance. Moreover, their respective purposes for seeking such meaning may well create further ambiguity. Taruskin's view that "nationalism is a "condition" and an "attitude" is an adequate, if perhaps not completely satisfying, answer. Although Taruskin's conclusions are sufficient in general terms, they fail to provide a means by which one may apply these concepts specifically to music. But he does provide further explanation by which specific applications may be understood.

Taruskin believes that concepts of nationalism depend on the various definitions of "nation" but, because these definitions serve different interests, a consensus seems unlikely. The definition of a nation, unlike that of a state, involves the relationship between the political status of communities and the basis of their self-description, whether linguistic, ethnic, religious, cultural or historical, rather than territorial boundaries. Nationhood is a concept that encompasses a broad spectrum of social behaviors and self-identification. This concept is important in the study of American music because behavioral traits that may be important for defining nationalism within a socially-homogeneous European context becomes crucial within the "melting pot nature" of American society. Although many of Taruskin's conclusions have applications to American society, his claim that nationalism is a matter of group "self-description" remains somewhat unsatisfactory. Most definitions of nationalism insist that national identification be a consensus opinion shared by many groups, rather than the opinion of a single minority, and Taruskin tacitly admits the limitations of his conclusions when he states that, "... general theories of nationalism have always foundered on the minorities question..."
Taruskin also relates what the prominent view of musical nationalism was during most
the twentieth century when he states that,

In the modern historiography of Western art music, the commonly
accepted definition of nationalism has been one promoted by music-
ology's "dominant culture," that of the German scholarly diaspora.
Willi Apel, the editor of the Harvard Dictionary of Music, gave it a
concise and comprehensive articulation in the 1969 edition. The
origins of musical nationalism are there assigned to the second half
of the 19th century, and the movement is characterized as "a reaction
against the supremacy of German music." ...Musical nationalism is
hence cast willy-nilly as a degenerate tendency that represents "a
contradiction of what was previously considered one of the chief
prerogatives of music, i.e., its universal or international character,
which meant that the works of the great masters appealed equally to
any audience." And consequently, "by about 1930 the nationalist
movement has lost its impact nearly everywhere in the world." 269

The belief that nationalist movements lost their worldwide impact by the 1930s, how-
ever, is an erroneous assumption because nationalism, as a driving principal in the music
of numerous cultures on both the North and South American continents, was not fully
realized until the latter half of the twentieth century. 270 Taruskin affirms this: "One of the
principal achievements of recent musical scholarship has been to discredit this definition
and all its corollaries, themselves the product of a nationalist agenda." 271

Taruskin also notes the fact that previous scholarship usually saw musical nationalism
as a reactionary trend in which composers intentionally attempted to discredit or down-
play the international musical legacies they inherited, and that their use of folk-related
musical material was the means by which they achieved a nationalistic music—a method-

---

269 Ibid.
270 Examples may be seen in the nationalist trends exhibited by composers in Argentina centered around
the music of Alberto Ginastera and, concurrently in the United States, Aaron Copland and those in-
fluenced by him, such as Robert Ward. In either case, these trends did not come to full fruition until the
decades of the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s.
271 "Nationalism."
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ology that removed their work from the international mainstream.\textsuperscript{272} But, if this statement is true, it fails to account for compositions that employed means other than folk-music, such as historical accounts as the basis for operas, that are now generally regarded as nationalist.

Taruskin’s references to musical nationalism are not the only problematic ones; previous scholars frequently came to their conclusions by relying on either purely musical characteristics or a composer’s nationalistic intent.

In her study of American musical nationalism, Barbara Zuck avers that the term “nationalism” has multiple meanings. In its simplest form it signifies feelings of attachment to, or sympathy with, the United States and also has connotations of patriotism. Also, the term may refer to something brought from another country, such as a word, an idea, a person, that becomes "Americanized." In this sense, “nationalism” implies a changing process which itself is American. On the other hand, the term “Americanism” implies something originally and identifiably American, significant because it alludes to a process of acculturation by which creation or recreation of things uniquely American takes place.\textsuperscript{273} This process makes clear identification of Americanized national ideals difficult; but, by applying it to American cultural traits (especially musical traits), one may begin to approach a satisfactory definition.

Zuck also notes the views of other scholars. She cites Paul Rosenfeld's use of the term “Americanism” and how it applies to various ideals such as the expression and representation of American life in music, the creation of an indigenous national musical style, and American composers’ attempts to imbue their music with something pecul-

\textsuperscript{272}Ibid.
And like Taruskin, Zuck states that musical nationalism refers to nineteenth-century movements, most notably in Russia, Bohemia and Scandinavia, that sought to end foreign domination and musical incorporations from Germany and Italy, a movement that encouraged the native composers' use of folk idioms. She theorizes that the impetus for these developments in American music came partly from the European Romantic movement that idealized the importance of folk materials, and partly from political events in the nineteenth century that encouraged national aspirations everywhere. Zuck also notes the fact that American art music did not reach its peak until well into the twentieth century, in a period and milieu quite removed from either the European Romantic or nationalist movements. American musical nationalism, therefore, is a distinctly homegrown phenomenon, the result of societal and cultural occurrences peculiarly American. But this claim seems ultimately untenable because much in American music has its aesthetic roots in European traditions.

Zuck also claims that Americans have ceased their attempts to define a truly American art music by stating that,

...the people (meaning all social classes and the musically literate and illiterate) actually desire an art music that they can understand, that appeals to them as both Americans and as human beings. ...Since the end of World War II, however, these assumptions have eroded.

This statement illustrates how inaccurate and inconsistent applications of historical facts can obfuscate the essential characteristics of musical nationalism.

\[274\text{Ibid., 6.}\]
\[275\text{Ibid., 7.}\]
\[276\text{Ibid.}\]
\[277\text{Ibid., 11.}\]
As seen above, most interpretations of musical nationalism incorporate theories raising more questions than answers. The German scholar, Carl Dahlhaus, however, took an approach that seems to bring order out of the chaos.

According to Dahlhaus, by the mid-nineteenth century, concepts of European nationhood were in their infancy and came to fruition only with the eventual political unification of the numerous German principalities and Italian city-states which retained the model of "monarchy-as-head-of-state." Because this political paradigm was retained after unification, the emerging states also quickly embarked upon various policies of imperialism. Nationalism, in this form, incorporated not only the need for cultural self-identity but also a desire to project that identity outside one's borders. The art forms that followed in the wake of these social and political trends tended to reflect the manner in which these events took place. Consequently, European nationalism was seen as a means, not a hindrance, to universality.278

During the same period in the United States, the existing social and political climate gave rise to vastly different attitudes about the need to express national characteristics in the arts. In an era when European nations retained monarchical dynasties, or vestiges of them, The United States was far too fragmented socially, too involved with settling the vast expanses of an untamed continent, and too much in need of solving its own domestic, social and economic problems to express a unified, cultural identity. It was not until many years after the Civil War that Americans even began to think of themselves as citizens of a unified nation, rather than a particular State within a loosely defined con-

---

federation. The existing political, social and economic factors delayed the need to define American cultural unity until the turn of the twentieth century, at a time when a number of art forms also began to seek a means of national identification. It was only after the United States achieved social and political solidarity, then, that the aesthetic premises necessary to define a nationalistic voice became possible.

Dahlhaus also points out that, within the context of nineteenth-century European nationalism, the claim to a citizen's first loyalty (to the state) combined with the idea that "the spirit of the people" (der Volksgeist) formed the creative element in art, as it did in other human activities. According to Dahlhaus, this "national spirit" manifested itself in folk music at an elementary level and eventually produced a national classicism. And most importantly, because the national classicism was seen as the final, perfect expression of something that first took shape in folk music, the enthusiasm for folk sources and the aspiration to national classicism were complementary, not contradictory. The national classical style then represented the essential simplicity of folk music as it became renewed and transformed, and it was not until a later age of nationalism that folk art was regarded as a fully national, rather than regional, or social, phenomenon. The use of folk music in larger compositional processes is not the last word in defining nationalism. Rather, it should be considered as only an elementary level of expression that, alone, cannot carry the full weight of the total expression.\(^{279}\) More importantly, Dahlhaus states that "der Volksgeist" was essential because, until nationalist movements began in Europe, musical content alone had been the usual method by which nationalism in music was assessed and, therefore, the roles of pre-compositional intent and post-compositional reception were never fully appreciated.

\(^{279}\)Ibid.
Dahlhaus asserts that, if a composer intends a work to be national in character, and the listeners believe it to be so, then it is also an aesthetic fact that must be accepted. And this acceptance holds true even when stylistic analysis—the attempt to verify the aesthetic premise by reference to musical features—fails to produce any evidence. The important element here is that listeners must recognize the nationalistic content. In fact, if purely musical characteristics alone are applied too rigorously, distinctions between national style as a musical fact and nationalism as a creed imposed on music from without result, and both descriptions are too crude to be accurate reflections of either the historical or aesthetic realities. If a piece of music is felt to be characteristically national, it is an inseparable feature of the work, not something extraneous. Dahlhaus also claims that, if a work of art is not received by a sufficient number of people as being nationalistic in character, then regardless of its precompositional intent or musical content, it cannot be regarded as such. The label nationalism, therefore, requires collective agreement, and in nineteenth-century Europe, such agreements were influenced by a collective national consciousness represented by the spirit or will of the people to assert national identities. It is the work’s reception then—how it is perceived—that creates the fact of musical nationalism. By extending this idea to its logical conclusion, it follows that what may be a musical fact to one person or group of people need not affect the meaning it has for others. The principle of collective agreement, then, is a logical starting point to seek a substantive understanding of nationalism in music.

Dahlhaus notes that perceptions of nationalistic content do not necessarily take form from the outset:

---
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Greater difficulties lie in the fact that the national element in music, no less than its poetic and programmatic content, is apparently one of those qualities which exist aesthetically but accrue to an object [such as a piece of music] over a period of time—through a confused web of events, circumstances, decisions, and intentions—rather than being arbitrarily given... Musical nationalism] does not stop at its underlying acoustical substrate; it is the outgrowth of a process of categorical formation, and the categories that take a formative part in musical perception are just as aesthetically “real” when they owe their impact less to a solid foothold in the musical material than to associations accumulated over the years.283

The aesthetic fact of musical nationalism, therefore, does not necessarily form from the outset, but may accrue over time.

Previous theories that claim to assess nationalistic traits do so mainly with reference to pitch collections or various harmonic and rhythmic structures. But as Dahlhaus points out, on the aesthetic level it is legitimate to hear the drone of bagpipes and sharpened fourths as typically Polish when they occur in Chopin’s music, and typically Norwegian in the music of Grieg. This paradox cannot be resolved by assigning extra-musical meaning to the constituent parts of a common vocabulary for two reasons,

firstly, the national coloring does not reside in separate, isolated traits, but in the “context” in which they are found (and); secondly, the aesthetic element, the “validity,” has to be distinguished from the history of the origin and growth, the genesis.284

---

283 Nineteenth-Century Music, translated by J. Bradford Robinson (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 38-41, hereafter referred to as Dahlhaus, Nineteenth-Century Music. Dahlhaus’s theories regarding post-referential aesthetic reality are analogous to and can often supersede commonly accepted views of linguistic “reality.” For example, audiences have come to accept a modern-day, upper-class British accent as Shakespeare’s linguistic reality when, in fact, such an accent did not exist during the era. The present British accent came into use after 1660, following the collapse of the Commonwealth and with the Restoration and Charles II’s ascension to the throne. Charles II’s French-influenced manner of speech became the new standard. The English accent during Shakespeare’s time had been closer to that exhibited by the inhabitants of Cornwall, the same accent now associated with the New England Puritans. In similar fashion, Miller’s manipulation of language in The Crucible is immediately recognized by English-speaking audiences as a linguistic “reality.”

284 Dahlhaus, Between Romanticism and Modernism, 95.
Dahlhaus feels it was unclear how such ethnic raw material belongs in the category of national at all, because the nineteenth-century assumption that folk music is always the music of a nation is questionable and unfounded—an assumption made no more valid because it found its way into music history texts.  

The nationalistic content of opera has also suffered from a misunderstanding of its aesthetic underpinnings, and perhaps more so because of the genre's inclusion of non-musical elements such as spoken language, dramaturgy, acting, and stagecraft. From its aesthetic inception in the nineteenth century, opera's aspiration towards nationalism was one of the characteristic—and characteristically confused—ideas of the era. That an opera could claim to be "national" at all only becomes intelligible once the preconditions, as they vary from country to country, are understood. The principal point of departure here is not the music or musico-dramatic substance of a work as much as the proclamation of nationalism itself, along with the motives behind it. The nineteenth-century fondness for disguising nationalism in the garb of *national romanticism* could lead one to claim that a national style in opera arose only after the personal style of a major composer became accepted as the style of the nation. This situation seemed all the more plausible if it occurred at a time when the genre was demanding a musical expression or reflection of national political sentiments. If the erroneous notion that nationalism resulted from an individual's stylistic traits is discounted, it can be determined that the national aspect of opera is found less in the music itself than in its political and socio-psychological functions.  

---

Because of the ease with which audiences identify with the main characters in drama, the psychological element of an opera’s reception history should not be underestimated.\textsuperscript{287} Such self-identification, especially in the nineteenth century, appears to have played a key role in the attribution of nationalist traits to opera. At that time, the idea of national opera was closely allied with the question of national identity, a question that bore the hallmarks of cultural politics rather than problems of nationhood and social policies. Because political situations in Europe during the nineteenth century changed so rapidly, the crucial issue with regard to national opera was not its substance and origin so much as the function it served within a politicized musical awareness.\textsuperscript{288} As with absolute music, then, nationalism in opera should best be seen in terms of how it functions within the social and political climate of the era—a matter directly related to its reception.

**The Opera’s Critical Reception**

Robert Ward, a self-proclaimed “musical eclectic,”\textsuperscript{289} mixes elements of tonal harmony, and their accompanying formal structures, from almost every era of music history, with select elements (most notably rhythmic) of twentieth-century musical styles. Critical evaluation of his work has led some to label Ward’s music as “Coplandesque” for the clarity of his melodic lines and orchestrational technique, while others have described his style as everything from “Gershwin-like” to “Wagnerian.” Ward’s ability to synthesize various musical styles has even led to his being called the “American Mahler.”\textsuperscript{290} But

\textsuperscript{287}Ibid., 219.
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such varied opinions, especially when repeated over the course of time, only highlight the fact that critical reception may be one of the more subjective aspects of musical studies and should, in most instances, be taken with a grain of academic salt.

Because the reception history of *The Crucible* has been documented by other writers, it would be more beneficial, for two reasons, to limit the present study largely to critiques that appeared in American newspapers and periodicals during the opera’s first quarter-century. First, since most contemporary operas do not remain in the standard repertoire for more than a few years, this amount of time seems sufficient to establish a consistent evaluation record. Second, because the music of *The Crucible* is intimately tied to the speech patterns of the libretto, English-speaking critics and listeners may have a more innately visceral, and some would say valid, reaction to it than non-English speakers.

Critical response to the October 26, 1961, première was generally favorable. Comments that appeared in the *New York Post* following the opening night performance mentioned the opera’s “accessibility” and the score’s rhythmic variety. In her review for the *New York Post*, Harriet Johnson noted that,

... Ward and Stambler have produced “The Crucible,” an absorbing music drama. The play builds tension in the manner of a thriller and so does the opera. It is rhythmically jagged enough to slash as it moves, yet it is singable.291

According to Miles Kastendieck in the *New York Journal American*,

Just as the story has its consonance and dissonance, so Ward’s music matches this in sound. This is traditional operatic writing shaped within contemporary idiom. Opergoers must again adjust to further proof that the lyric theatre is a play sung. Miller can be pleased that the music enhances the drama, while Ward can bow for accomplishing what some might consider impossible. “The Crucible” is [a] notable achievement in the annals of native opera.292

Kastendieck’s enthusiasm for the opera continued unabated over the next few weeks. In a subsequent review dated November 12, 1961, he wrote,

Ward may show influences of European origin, but his music reflects intelligent digestion and individual assertion. Since he met the challenge of the final scene, the opera emerges as one of the most distinctive of our native products. Some may nominate it as the finest to date.293

Appearing almost simultaneously with Kastendieck’s second review were Irving Kolodin’s positive, if somewhat more subdued, remarks in the Saturday Review in which he stated, “The talents that went into his treatment of Andreyev’s ‘He Who Gets Slapped’... are here under more constant discipline, with rising stride of purpose as the evening progresses.”294 Like Kastendieck, Kolodin later revisited his original opinion, with similarly positive results. On December 29, 1961, he wrote, “What emerges from the sound alone is the overpowering conviction of Ward in the importance of his subject... and his success in converting that conviction into musical meaning.”295 Nor did the passage of time diminish Kolodin’s favorable opinion of The Crucible. In his March 23, 1968, review of the New York City Opera’s production of the opera, he wrote, “… the rehearing attested that in his investigation of time, temper, and locale, Ward achieved a result that can be heard not once or twice but repeatedly with interest and enjoyment.”296

Winthrop Sargeant, long-time music critic for the New Yorker magazine and champion of Ward’s music, reviewed The Crucible’s première, stating,

---

His music, though quite accessible to the average listener, is everywhere dignified and nowhere banal. It is continuously expressive, and it intensifies all the nuances of the drama, from anguish to despair to heroic nobility... This time, he has created an imposing work that will, I suspect, take its place among the classics of the standard repertory.

Sargeant also reviewed the 1968 performances in New York and was even more enthusiastic than he had been seven years earlier. In his New Yorker review he stated that,

In fact, to me, it is one of the two or three best American operas so far written—which, to be sure, is not an overwhelming statement... Its music is masculine, dignified, and capable of rousing emotion, and adds greatly to the stage spectacle instead of being a mere ornament to it.

Some critics, such as Louis Biancolli of the New York World-Telegram and Sun, compared the opera’s dramatic impact to that of Arthur Miller’s play. In his review of the opening night’s performance, Biancolli wrote,

What Mr. Ward has added is a third dimension that can only be supplied by a viable and thrusting score. Mr. Miller’s “The Crucible” has become a still more excoriating indictment in the opera based on it. That Mr. Ward does by using the singing voice and orchestra to sharpen and amplify the mounting mood of frenzied suspicion and superstition.

Still others saw the work as a powerful drama and commented on the social and philosophical messages in The Crucible. Frank Merkling of Opera News wrote that, “... the score adds... a non-topical sense of the development of greatness in the human spirit.”

Although most opening-night reviews were overwhelmingly supportive of Ward’s and Stambler’s efforts, some were ambivalent. In his New York Herald Tribune review the

---

morning after the première, Paul Henry Lang made the following positive, if somewhat tepid, remarks,

Robert Ward’s music gallantly and honestly strives to wring all the drama it can out of the libretto, so much so that the effect is often more theatrical than in the deepest sense dramatic, and is more a matter of idiom than meaning. We observe the work of a good operatic composer who holds our interest because something is always happening, and keeps us on the alert because that something is always changing, and by the seriousness of action and thought preserves the edge of emotions always sharp.\textsuperscript{301}

Several reviewers were openly hostile. Harold C. Schonberg’s assessment was scalding. In his review for the \textit{New York Times}, he stated that,

Mr. Ward is an experienced composer whose music fails to bear the impress of a really inventive mind. Melodically his ideas had little distinction, nor was there much to convey the hysteria and terror of the Salem trials around which the play and libretto are based.\textsuperscript{302}

As seen above, \textit{The Crucible}’s opening-night reception underscores the fact that initial opinions can vary depending on what the evaluator views as important and may, ultimately, have little to do with the quality of the music. While one critic considered \textit{The Crucible} one of the best American operas ever composed, another saw in it a lack of originality, and where one experienced intense emotions, another felt the same emotions to be “theatricality.” Such widely-divergent opinions lead one to conclude that opening-night commentary is, perhaps, more in the nature of “knee-jerk” reaction and should probably be seen in that light. Doubtless, a more reliable criterion would be how long a work can “hold the stage” successfully. In this light, a better test of a work’s viability would be the commentary garnered over a considerable number of years.

The Crucible became popular with college and university opera groups almost immediately. One of the first student productions took place at the University of Iowa less than 10 months after its New York première. A review of this performance written by Les Zacheis of the Cedar Rapids Gazette commented on the technical difficulties created by the large cast, a matter that relates more to the play than the opera. In his remarks, Zacheis stated that the opera was, "... at times unwieldy and weighed down with its preponderance of characters. And yet, once it gets off the ground, it delivers some sledgehammer blows of the highest dramatic impact." Another review of this performance commented on Ward's blending of stylistic features with the remark that, "... the work is a blend of an almost-Wagnerian orchestral texture and a singer's opera." These two reviews again exemplify how the same work can be perceived in different ways--while one critic viewed the large cast as problematic, another saw it as an opportunity for dramatic underscoring.

The popularity of The Crucible among college and university opera groups continued when the New England Conservatory in Boston mounted a production in February, 1963. Geoffrey Bush of the Boston Herald reviewed the performance and observed that, "It was a fine play. It is a finer opera, moving more quickly and expressing itself more strongly—it is as if music was (what) it always needed." But divergent opinions about this production also exist. What was heard in the American heartland as "almost-Wagnerian" just a few months before was judged to be "Gershwin-like" in Boston. Margo Miller, a critic writing for the Boston Globe, reviewed this production and made reference to

---

304 Robert J. Dietz, "Crucible Review—Highly Successful," Iowa City Daily Iowan, Aug. 1, 1962, In Ward Papers, 11/1. This is the student newspaper of the University of Iowa and back issues are neither indexed nor microfilmed for 1962.
Ward’s eclectic style by stating that, “The tension of Ward’s musical setting reminds me a little of portions of Porgy and Bess. It worked for Gershwin and it certainly works for Ward and for the performers.”

In 1963, the first commercially-available recording of The Crucible was issued to the public, and Alan Rich of the New York Times evaluated it. His reactions were mixed:

Its musical material is quite obviously derivative from a number of older operatic styles, and does not always coalesce into an experience worthy of the Arthur Miller play it attempts to underline. But there is a great deal of excitement, however superficial, in the ensemble writing.

This review exemplifies two important aspects of reception history. First, critiques of recorded performances often leave the reader guessing as to what the critic is primarily evaluating—the music, the performance, or the recording process itself. For this reason, criticism based on recordings may be even less reliable than other forms of evaluation. Second, Rich’s comments highlight the fact that an opera based on a well-known play—especially a controversial one—usually influences the reception process. In addition to purely musical evaluations of the opera, therefore, Ward’s music will always be compared to and judged in relation to Miller’s play—for better or for worse.

In early 1964, a German-language version of The Crucible was produced in Germany, and the performances received severe criticism. In Opera magazine, Ralf Steyer wrote, “It is in every respect without originality and tinkles along for two-and-a-half hours in the style of newsreel background music.” By contrast, the opera department of the Hartt College of Music in Hartford, Connecticut, mounted a new production of the opera—

performances that received high praise from George Stowe of the *Hartford Times*. Stowe stated that, “For my money it is the finest American opera of the century, with a libretto good enough to inspire a Verdi or Mussorgsky.” Although speculative, these two reviews indicate that, whereas English-language productions were generally well-received, German audiences, hearing the opera sung in German, may not have experienced the interdependence of language and music critical to Ward’s original score. For an opera such as *The Crucible*, in which language, rhythm and melody are closely intertwined, performance language doubtless affected reception.

Two reviews from the San Francisco Opera’s 1965 season attest to the accessible nature of Ward’s music and its general audience appeal. In a review for the *San Francisco Chronicle*, Dean Wallace stated, “… Ward manages to do three difficult jobs equally well: delineation of character, evocation of mood, and creation of dramatic opinion.” And, in Robert Commanday’s review for the same newspaper, “Ward’s musical language has an immediate appeal that will endear it to those who are forever wanting to go away singing the tunes…” But Commanday went on to say that he believed Ward’s “accessible style” did not lend itself to large-scale dramatic development. A review of the opera performed by the music department at the University of California at Los Angeles in 1965 also praised Ward’s music for its appeal to the opera-going public. According to Donald Dierks of the *Musical Times*,

---

312. Ibid.
Within its conservative frame, Ward's musical idiom is lively, unpretentious and easily grasped. His melodies are the kind which can be easily whistled on the way home, and his traditional harmonies link him with an earlier generation of American composers.  

The subjective nature of musical criticism can also be seen in two reviews written by the same critic six years apart. Robert Finn of the Cleveland Plain Dealer gave his first opinion of The Crucible when it was performed at the Lake George Opera Festival in August, 1966.

It is a first-rate theater piece, the work of a skilled and imaginative composer who knows how to orchestrate cleanly and how to write for the voice. And one who has the rare and wonderful knack of finding the underlying musical rhythm of English prose. In this review, Finn noted the importance of Ward's text treatment and its relationship to rhythm and melody. But six years later, he found fault with the work. In his 1972 review of a performance at the Cleveland Institute of Music, Finn wrote,

Ward's opera is thoroughly traditional in dramatic concept and musical style. Ward makes no attempt to differentiate musically among the many characters, preferring simply to give musical embodiment to the mood and imagery of the text. Because he did not address his earlier comments in this review, it remains a matter of speculation as to why Finn did not initially see the faults he later mentioned.

In the later 1960s, the opera received harsh criticism in some circles. In his review for Opera News of a performance by the Seattle Opera in 1968, Frank Warnke noted Ward's decision to keep the voices separate during important dramatic moments in the opera by stating that,

---

315"Crucible' at CIM Hard to Understand," Cleveland Plain Dealer, Dec. 8, 1972, E/1.
The first two acts... are composed in a fundamentally conservative yet flexible and expressive idiom; however, the composer's curious reluctance to write for more than one voice at a time slows down the action, making the work a play with background music.316

Like Charles Patrick Woliver, Warnke apparently failed to understand that Ward kept voices separate at certain moments in the opera in order to emphasize the emotional separation between characters. A few months later, Alan Kriegsman of the Washington Post also found fault with Ward's music and penned a scathing review of The Crucible.

In some of his comments of a performance by the Opera Theatre of Northern Virginia, Kriegsman drew comparisons between Miller's play and Ward's opera,

Though there are no tunes one could call memorable, the music is sufficiently melodious, and the scoring achieves its effects with skill. On the whole, however, "effects" are all that is there. Not once does the music rise to the dramatic electricity of Miller's play. The score's saccharine veneer, in fact, rules out all the tragic implications of "The Crucible" and reduces it to rather crass melodrama.317

But perhaps the harshest review of the opera appeared after the New York City Opera's 1968 production—the very same production that prompted Winthrop Sargeant to say that The Crucible was "one of the two or three best American operas so far written." In his review for High Fidelity magazine, Patrick Smith stated that, "Nor is the opera helped by Robert Ward's pallid score, precisely the proper shade of inoffensive gray that foundations and awards committees seize on as significant manifestations of American Opera."318 These comments apparently stemmed from the fact that The Crucible had won both the New York Music Critics Circle Citation Award and a Pulitzer Prize for Music in 1962. It is clear, that in Smith's opinion (which now seems out-of-date), awards

318"The Crucible (March 8)," High Fidelity 18/6, (June, 1968), MA/9.
that identify the best of American opera should go to those whose musical language is not so traditionally based.

By contrast, The Crucible’s tonally-based and widely-accessible musical language found favor elsewhere. Writing for two separate newspapers about the St. Paul Opera Association’s 1969 production of the opera, John Harvey noted that, “(The opera) was invested with music which, on the one hand, is both eminently singable and expressive of text, and on the other maintains and heightens the dramatic flow.”\(^{319}\) In his second review Harvey stated that,

Ward is an old-fashioned composer in the sense that he recognizes a difference between orchestral instruments and singers and believes the latter should be... given singable music which directly expresses the text and moves in recognizably melodic patterns.\(^{320}\)

The Toledo Opera Association mounted a production of The Crucible in January, 1971, warmly received by the local music critic, J. Robert Carroll. In his review for the Toledo Times, Carroll noted Ward’s ability to synthesize twentieth-century harmonic practices within a traditional tonal language: “The style is firmly rooted in traditional idioms, but Mr. Ward’s great talent has enabled him to integrate whatever 20\(^{th}\)-century developments have appealed to him without any trace of forcing or awkwardness.”\(^{321}\)

Two years later, Melanie Mattson of the Minnesota Daily reviewed the St. Paul Opera Association’s second production of The Crucible and commented on its “American” qualities by stating, perceptively, that, “The recitatives and arias have nearly the flow of normal speech patterns... which heighten the musicality of the opera and give it a

---


definitely American flavor." In his review of this production a few weeks later,
William Goodfellow of the Chicago Sun-Times also commented on the opera’s emphasis
on the interdependence of music and language:

... the horrifying crosscurrents of the Salem witch trials have
called forth from the composer a score both ruggedly American
in its musical fabric--hymn-tune chorales alternating with the rhyth-
mic and harmonic patterns of natural speech--and of appealingly
melodic directness.

The comments about rhythmic flow, natural speech patterns and melodic “directness”
were particularly insightful because Ward’s method of deriving rhythms and melodies
from language characteristics is central to understanding the perception of The Crucible
as an “American” opera. Not all critics agreed with this assessment. In 1975, the
frequently controversial George Gelles reviewed the Wolf Trap Opera Company’s pro-
duction of The Crucible for the Washington Star, and his remarks are at odds with Matt-
son’s and Goodfellow’s opinions about the opera’s melodic and rhythmic features.
Gelles stated that, “The Crucible... is admirable but academic, and if every note is
arguably in its proper place, the melodic thrust is so insipid and the rhythmic impulse so
banal that it hardly makes much difference.”

322“Reprise: The Crucible,” Minnesota Daily, June 21, 1973, in Ward Papers, 11/1. This is the student
newspaper of the University of Minnesota and back issues are neither microfilmed nor indexed for 1973.
324See Chapter IV, infra.
325For extended commentary on George Gelles, see Janice Eileen Holly’s dissertation in progress at the
University of Maryland regarding music critic Irving Lowens, “Irving Lowens: Music Critic.” According
to Holly, at the time Gelles wrote his remarks about The Crucible, he was serving as a one-year replace-
ment for Irving Lowens, the Washington Star’s chief music critic, despite reservations by some ob-
servers. Gelles apparently stirred controversy wherever he went. Prior to coming to Washington, D.C.,
Gelles had aroused the hostility of Boston’s musical establishment with reviews of the Boston Symphony
Orchestra and guest conductor Seiji Ozawa that were perceived to be contentious and mean-spirited. In
Washington, D.C., Gelles vehemently attacked a performance given by the famed violinist, Jascha
Heifitz, on April 22, 1971. Gelles’s review was so acerbic that members of the National Symphony
Orchestra complained bitterly to the Washington Star’s Editor, protesting Gelles’s lack of journalistic
ethics.
A more positive review appeared in the *Pittsburgh Press* after a performance of *The Crucible* by the Pittsburgh Opera in 1976. In his article, Carl Apone stated that,

Ward's music is honest, fresh and imaginative. The compactness, discipline and craftsmanship of the orchestrating is most apparent. He is a knowledgeable composer totally without any high-flown avant-garde posturing. This is the kind of solid, valuable, thoughtful music which has reaped a great harvest in the past, and seems likely to do so in the future.\(^\text{327}\)

Critics continued to compare Ward's opera to Miller's play long after *The Crucible* became a staple of the American operatic repertoire. After a performance by the Abbey Opera in 1984, Andrew Clements of *Opera* magazine penned the following remarks,

"... while Ward deploys his musical resources with tact and some sensitivity, he fails at any point to find an appropriate instrumental or expressive analogue to the highly charged atmosphere of the stage drama."\(^\text{328}\)

Various other opinions of *The Crucible*'s merits were written in 1986 after performances of the opera at Duke University. Peregrine White of the *Durham Sun* stated that the opera was "... an unending stream of extremely subtle chords, phrases (and) fascinating flights of orchestration."\(^\text{329}\) But R.C. Smith, White's colleague at a competing local newspaper, was less charitable when he stated, "... while Robert Ward's music is at times full of charm, it is not up to the dramatic eloquence that the story demands."\(^\text{330}\)


\(^{328}\)[Review Untitled] *Opera* 35 (1984), 143-144.


As the above reviews indicate, during its first twenty-five years, *The Crucible* garnered a wide variety of subjective critical opinions, although the great majority were positive. One must conclude that *The Crucible*’s artistic value will not likely be found in simply its reception history, but rather, in criteria more firmly rooted in objective scholarship. This survey also reveals that many critics (and presumably some audiences and listeners in general) have perceived elements in the opera felt as uniquely “American.”

The final chapter details how Ward synthesized text and music, and the extent to which the properties of the New England Puritans’ English language ultimately affected the musical material and our general perception of the opera as an American genre.

---

331 Personal Interview. Ward indicated that, although he is aware of published criticism, he is not concerned with it. What has always been more important to him is how a performer might react to the technical aspects his work, or how a work might be received by a particular audience, not the opinions of critics.
IV. Towards The Creation of an Idiomatic Musical Syntax:

Robert Ward’s *The Crucible*

In *The Crucible*, Ward meticulously based rhythmic and melodic aspects of the music on the libretto’s English-language speech-rhythms and inflections. By treating the musical material in this fashion, he created a musical setting that may be associated with the syntactic features of Puritan-American speech. In much the same fashion to which speakers of American English intuitively respond upon hearing various American accents and speech patterns, American audiences can also become familiar with *The Crucible*’s musical syntax at a rudimentary level of aesthetic understanding.

As commonly understood, the term *syntax* generally refers to the systematic, orderly arrangement of structural elements combined to create well-formed, grammatically correct phrases and sentences—a definition that can apply to musical as well as linguistic constructs. Although a limited number of characteristics govern most forms of written and oral communication, syntactic properties, such as word order, inflection and accent pattern, tend to be unique for any given linguistic system. These features are important traits that distinguish one language or dialect from another and help define how users of a particular language convey concepts and meaning and, ultimately, their world view.332

---

332 For a comprehensive and insightful definition of syntax see Charles W. Morris, *Foundations of the Theory of Signs* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 1938, Chapter 1. Syntax deals with the order of words, their agreement, and relationships—how they combine and interact to effect meaning. As one of the first to frame a theory of semiotics, Morris discusses how syntax is defined within the broader study of semiotics as one of its three subfields. The first subfield is syntax, the study of the interaction of signs; the second is semantics, the study of the relationship between signs and the objects to which they refer; and the third is pragmatics, the relationship between the sign system and the user. Also noteworthy is the fact that, because the syntactic properties of language reflect the speaker’s knowledge of word and phrase meaning, poets and librettists often change syntactic order to create rhythmic effects. By creating a libretto that is sensitive to the word order, inflections, and rhythmic characteristics of Puritan New England speech, albeit through Miller’s derivations, and using these linguistic properties as the basis for
An examination of the text-music relationship in *The Crucible* may help explain the perception of it as an “American” opera.

Ward and Stambler used Miller’s text as a paradigm for the linguistic properties with which they imbued their libretto. The portions of the libretto that retain Miller’s text obviously provide the original syntactical constructions; but even when composing a new text, both Ward and Stambler were careful to follow Miller’s syntactic models. The fact that Ward and Stambler collaborated on a prior opera meant that by the time they worked on *The Crucible*, their working relationship was well established. In *Pantaloon, or He Who Gets Slapped*, they devised a system by which Stambler supplied Ward with lines of text tripled-spaced on the page. Ward then took this text and read each line aloud, in “dramatic” fashion, over and again, each time changing vocal inflections until he found the one reading that, both in terms of text-rhythm and syllabic emphasis, best suited his dramatic intentions for that line of text. Above each syllable on the triple-spaced page of text, Ward then wrote out the rhythms in metric fashion derived from his dramatic readings. For each line, and sometimes an entire section of text, he first assigned a governing meter, which may not have been notated with a meter signature, and then notated the rhythmic values derived for each syllable or word within that metric context. By following this procedure, Ward achieved a basic rhythmic scheme for each section of text. In similar fashion, based on the rising and falling vocal inflections inferred from reading the text aloud, Ward then derived a basic melodic curve to accompany the now-rhythmic rhythms and melodic aspects of his musical material, Ward’s music could also be examined, among other fruitful analytical approaches, in terms of its overall semiotic properties.  

333 Ward, *The Crucible*, I, Cover Page. On the cover page of the full score, Ward and Stambler were careful to note that their opera was “Based on the play by Arthur Miller.” In fact, Miller’s name is listed on the cover page before either Ward’s or Stambler’s. In a personal interview with Ward, he stated that this assignation demonstrates the extent to which he and Stambler relied on the play as the source for the libretto, but also that it was not a verbatim rehashing of Miller’s text.
By concentrating on the syntactic properties—accents and inflections—of the American speech patterns and/or their models employed by Miller, Ward and Stambler created a perception of rhythmic and melodic Americanisms.

With reference to selected scene fragments from the complete score and Ward’s working papers and drafts, the remainder of this chapter explores how the rhythmic and melodic content of *The Crucible* grew from the syntactic properties of the text. The methodology adopted here traces the compositional process by recreating portions of the triple-spaced libretto manuscript that show Ward’s rhythmic additions and comparing them to the appropriate sections of the score.

---

334 Personal Interview. Ward found that this compositional method was so successful that he asked all of his subsequent librettists to supply their texts arranged in this triple-spaced fashion. See Chapter II, *supra*.

335 These documents are part of the Robert Ward Papers. In the archives, there are a total of six boxes in “Accession 1998-0564” that contain information relating to *The Crucible*: Boxes 1, 3, 8, 9, 10, and 11. The sketches from which the examples cited herein are found are in Box 10. The collection does not contain a triple-spaced libretto in its entirety of the type described above. Ward stated that there may never have been a complete libretto in this form because he and Stambler so thoroughly understood each other’s working habits and needs that, once they began working on the project in earnest, neither of them needed to rely on a libretto written out in such a fashion for every moment of the opera. Happily, the extant archival material does contain important scenes from each of the opera’s four acts and a sufficient amount of material with which to explain Ward’s working procedures.

336 Using photocopies of Ward’s original documents for the current examination proved to be impractical since they were written mostly in pencil and have faded considerably over the years, and the paper upon which they are written has yellowed and darkened. The digital method of reproduction adopted here, therefore, allows for greater ease of reading. See Appendix B for photo reproductions of the original manuscripts. By contrast, musical examples drawn from the printed score are reproduced photographically and enlarged to varying degrees as this method most clearly and accurately displays Ward’s intentions.
The Four Acts of the Opera, Analyses

Act I

In the opening scene of Act I, Abigail Williams attempts to explain to her uncle, Reverend Parris, that the village doctor can find neither cause nor cure for Betty’s affliction. In Ward’s working papers, Abigail’s arioso-like declamation and Paris’ brief response appear as follows:

Manuscript Example I-1

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Susanna has come from the doctor.}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{He has searched and searched his books}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{But he finds no medicine.}
\end{align*} \]

337 Some pages of the libretto drafts from which Ward worked were hand written and others were typed. In the examples reproduced here, italicized text indicates pages which were hand-written and non-italicized text represents typed pages. Ward sometimes wrote groups of three eighth-notes in compound meters with single, unbroken beams. However, both the limitations of font capability and the need to indicate note-heads adequately as they appear over each syllable in the manuscript necessitated the use of broken beams for such groupings: \( \ddash \) \( \ddash \) \( \ddash \) See Editorial Procedures in the Preface for an explanation of the numbering system used to identify manuscript and score examples in this chapter.

338 Robert Ward, Robert Ward Papers, Accession 1998-0196, Box 10, folio 1, (Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina), hereafter referred to as Ward, Papers, 10/1. Examples cited in Chapter IV indicate three things: first, whether the example is drawn from the manuscript or printed score; second, the Act number identified by Roman numerals; and third, the number of the specific example within that act, identified by Arabic numerals. For some examples, a further division is indicated by the use of small letters. For instance, “Manuscript Example II-2b” indicates that the example is taken from the manuscript and is the second part of a larger example from Act II. Likewise, if comparative references between manuscript and score examples require more than one citation, this alphabetic division is applicable. For instance, “Score Example I-4a” and “Score Example I-4b refer to and coincide with “Manuscript Example I-4.”
He bid her tell you he cannot discover no cure in his books for Betty.

He bids you look to unnatural causes. There be no unnatural causes here.

By examining this excerpt it is possible to speculate on Ward's musical intentions for these lines of text. He notated the rhythmic values into groupings indicative of a compound meter as yet undetermined at this stage. Ward emphasized the words “searched,” “finds” and “bid” by assigning them quarter-note values which, within the relatively static eighth-note context, imply possible melodic consequences because of the added stress and pitch range these words are given when spoken. The fourth line indicates that two possible texts were under consideration but, except for the fact that only the first set of words was set rhythmically, there is nothing to indicate the preferred reading. In the score this text is set in the following manner:
This excerpt reveals that Ward wished musically to portray these lines in the manner in which they are normally spoken—in an iambic pattern. He set the first and second syllables of the name “Susanna” to an initial, rising interval of a Perfect 4th (Su-san-na). This is followed by a rising Major 6th to indicate the importance of the fact that Susanna has come from the doctor.” Likewise, he set the name “Betty” to indicate that the first syllable is accented (Bet-ty), as it is most commonly pronounced. Ward ultimately decided against using either of the two possible texts suggested in line 4 of the libretto manuscript. Instead, he chose to use the words, “He says he has looked but cannot find no cure in his books for Betty.” Because of their relative length (quarter-notes), the words “looked,” “find” and “books” are rhythmically stressed, as they would be if spoken. Also, by using the word “looked” instead of “searched,” Ward avoided the possible problem of singers attempting to pronounce the latter as a two-syllable word, a pronunciation that might sound too arcane or, perhaps, too Shakespearean. The use of a double negative here is a facet of colloquial American speech that enhances Abigail’s charac-

\[\text{\footnotesize Ward, The Crucible, I, 6.}\]
terization as an ordinary girl of the era. The descent of a full octave (to the bottom of the soprano range), on Abigail’s statement that “He bids you look to unnatural causes” is a subtle touch of word-painting suggesting the notion of a possible demonic presence as the source of Betty’s illness. Her statement prompts Parris’s frenetic reply portrayed with a dotted-eighth-note/sixteenth-note rhythmic pattern and wide intervallic leaps. The initial intervallic leap of a Perfect 4th here emphasizes the word “be” as the dramatic high point of the phrase (“There be no unnatural causes here”), while the four syllables of “unnatural” are set to a rising interval, followed by two descending, exactly as if spoken. The rhythmic and melodic material in the above example then, is affected not only by the need to portray the character’s emotional states but also, by the manner in which they would most likely deliver these lines if spoken.

In the play and libretto, Parris’s demeanor changes when he explains to Abigail the reason for his concerns. Ward outlined his musical ideas for this speech in the following manner:

Manuscript Example 1-2

\[
\begin{array}{c}
7 \\
4 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\cd | \cd | \cd | \cd | \cd | \cd | \cd | \cd \\
\text{Abigail I have enemies in this town}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\cd | \cd | \cd | \cd | \cd | \cd | \cd | \cd \\
\text{For three long years I have fought}
\end{array}
\]

---

340 Ward Papers, 10/1.
To make this stiff-necked parish

respect and obey me + now

bring corruption to my doorstep and

You compromise my very character

Child I have given you a home

And the clothes upon your back I must

Have the truth before I speak to them downstairs So

give me an upright answer.
Why did Goody Proctor discharge you from her service

She comes but rarely now to church—she will not sit so close to some thing soiled, - she says

What meant she by that

As demonstrated above, in order to facilitate the musical rendering of the text Ward desired, he set Parris’s aria to an irregular metric pattern of seven beats per measure, alternating with other meters. The first four lines of this example ("Abigail I have enemies in this town") are designated with a 7/4 meter. The way in which Ward assigned note-values here—two half-notes followed by three quarter-notes—gives metrical stress to the words "I have" and "in this," thereby emphasizing Parris’s statement that he is the one who will suffer the consequences of the witchcraft accusations. The score indicates that, although Ward decided to use a 7/8 meter here, rather than 7/4, the prosodic emphasis remained unaltered. Ward also added the word “miserly” to the text, a word that reinforces Parris’s feelings about his parishioners. It also necessitated resetting the metric scheme so that now the word “town” received the greatest stress.
In lines 2 and 3 of Ward's working papers for this example, the same rhythmic pattern used above mimics the usual rhythm of English speech on the words "three long," "fought" and "stiff-necked." The first word of line 4, "respect," is notated so that the first syllable is the rhythmic antecedent of the second, as it would naturally occur when spoken (re-spect). Although the metric scheme here assigns an eighth-note value to the word "years," Ward emphasized it with an upward melodic leap of a Minor 3rd. This combination of rhythmic and melodic stress is similar to the naturally emphatic reading of a native English speaker ("For three long years...")

Ward's manuscript indicates that the fifth line ("You bring corruption...") could have been set with either a duple or triple meter. This phrase of text is followed by a measure of 3/2 on the word "character," followed by return to the original 7/4 meter. The manu-

342Ibid.
script also indicates that Ward wished to extend the text for this line by adding the words "bring corruption to my doorstep." In the score, however, Ward never used the initial quadruple meter he had suggested in the manuscript. Rather, he employed a 3/4 metric setting and shorter rhythmic values for two measures to propel the dialogue forward.

Also, the octave descent from the previous statement reflects the notions of "corruption" and "compromise," while the word "character" was set so as to emphasize its spoken characteristics—the first syllable is rhythmically lengthened and the second syllable is reached by a descending octave leap (char-ac-ter).

Score Example I-2c

Parris

As seen in the manuscript, line 7 of this example ("Child I have given you...") returns to the original meter and a non-literal repetition of the melodic material in the score.

Score Example I-2d

Parris

[343]Ibid., 12.
[344]Ibid.
Line 8 of the working papers ("Have the truth...") suggests a quadruple meter and, in the score, Ward set this section in common time. Parris's emotional stress is portrayed by Ward's addition of the words, "My ministry here's at stake, can you; do you understand?" This line also shows the extent to which Ward relied upon text prosody in that rhythmic consistency is secondary to spoken accent patterns. By creating a syncopated rhythmic scheme of alternating long and short note-values (eighth- and quarter-notes) to reflect Parris's agitation, Ward set each word according to common, English pronunciation patterns. Parris's musical declamation, then, mirrors the spoken pronunciation ("Now I must have the truth before I go down-stairs. My ministry here's at stake, can you; do you understand?").

Score Example 1-2e

As indicated in Ward's manuscripts, the next line of text ("So give me an upright answer") returns to a seven-beat metric pattern that is interrupted for one measure because of prosodic considerations--the final word, "answer," receives two equal beats and is melodically shaped as it would be if spoken in dramatic fashion--with the second syllable falling a full octave ("ans-wer"). Facilitating this descending octave leap is the treatment of the preceding word ("upright"). Here Ward employed word painting in that the first syllable is reached by an ascending leap of a Minor 7th.

345Ibid., 13.
The remainder of Parris’s monologue returns to a basic seven-beat metric scheme, and the text of the manuscript and score are identical. In terms of musical form, this would usually be the place where a return to the principal “A” section occurs in a da capo aria. Although Ward’s melodic material here does refer to earlier content, he chose instead to reinforce the text’s dramatic impact with a change of key (to B Minor) and registration. The aria begins well within the middle of Parris’s tenor range, but this final section starts near the bottom of his range and, in a melodically-jagged fashion, encompasses a Major 9th. Parris’s impassioned remarks end with an ascending leap of a Minor 6th (“what meant she by that?”), an interval that points an accusing “musical finger” at Abigail:

Score Example I-2g

346Ibid.
347Ibid., 13-14.
Later in Act I, the setting moves to the downstairs parlor of Reverend Parris’s home where a group of concerned villagers have gathered to discuss the troubling events unfolding around them. The meeting soon digresses into a heated exchange in which long-standing disagreements boil to the surface, exposing old animosities and bitter feelings. Thomas Putnam refers to John Proctor as an “ignorant farmer,” a statement that prompts Proctor to speak his mind plainly. In Ward’s working drafts, this scene is outlined as follows:

Manuscript Example I-3

\[\text{John:} \quad \text{Ignorant farmers and their betters eh? Put here by God}\]

\[\text{for your kind to cheat. That may be the scheme of things}\]

\[\text{as you and Parris see it. But you}\]

\[\text{(John) will not subjugate this town, never while I breathe. (Orch) We live and vote as equals here}\]

\[\text{You wear no halo Mr. Putnam}\]

348 Ward Papers, 10/1.
The manuscript drafts suggest that Ward had a 4/4 meter in mind for this passage, and this meter was retained in the final score. To attain the best possible rendition of these lines as they would normally be spoken, Ward adjusted the rhythmic notation and placement of bar lines in the score.

Score Example 1-3

As may also be seen in the score, rather than using the word "ignorant" and its rhythmic setting as pick-up beats to the second word, "farmers," the former was placed on the first beat of the measure with reduced metric values (from a dotted-quarter-note/eighth-note/quarter-note \[\frac{3}{4} \] in the sketches to dotted-eighth-note/sixteenth-note/quarter-note

\[\frac{3}{4}\dottednote \quad \frac{1}{8} \dottednote \quad \frac{1}{4} \dottednote\]

\[\frac{3}{4}\dottednote \quad \frac{1}{8} \dottednote \quad \frac{1}{4} \dottednote\] in the sketches to dotted-eighth-note/sixteenth-note/quarter-note

---

[\(\text{\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet}\)] in the score). Although textually this passage remained unchanged, Ward allowed the text’s rhythm to determine note-values and placement within the metric context. Setting the beginning of the phrase “ignorant farmers” to a dotted-eighth-note/sixteenth-note figure not only mimics the rhythmic pace of the word, but the three quarter-notes following musically dramatize the fact that, in his anger, Proctor deliberately draws out the words offending him. The sentence that follows in the manuscript (“Put here by God for your kind to cheat”) was set to a simple pattern of eighth- and quarter-notes. But in the score this passage received a different rhythmic treatment, one more naturally recreating the way these words would be spoken. The words “God,” “your,” and “cheat” are lengthened by assigning them either quarter-note or dotted-quarter-note values. By emphasizing these words in this manner, Proctor’s accusations against Parris and Putnam are given more dramatic weight. In the passage that reads, “But you will not subjugate this town,” Ward retained the triplet-eighth-note pattern (“But you”) as the antecedent figure but altered the time-value for “will” from an eighth-note to a dotted-quarter-note, a rhythmic notation that emphasizes the sentiment expressed.

In the remainder of this example, only one word was added, a repetition of “never.” By repeating this word, Ward made emphatic Proctor’s declaration that Parris and Putnam will not ride roughshod over the Salem community. The repetition of “never” was also set higher melodically, and the intervallic pattern was reversed, thereby musically underscoring the sentiment. This melodic and rhythmic treatment also mimics the usual accent patterns of verbal speech (“ne-ver” = G-sharp up to B-natural; “ne-ver” = D-sharp down to B-natural). In the score, this word was also assigned a rhythmic pattern slightly
different from that which appears in the manuscript. The two eighth-notes that Ward originally intended fall on the ear less naturally than the eighth-note/dotted-quarter-note pattern in the score. Also, the phrase “you wear no halo” was rhythmically altered to approximate a more realistically-spoken accent pattern. In the score, the words “Mr. Putnam” were rhythmically treated as indicated in the manuscript, albeit two beats later, and their melodic treatment is such that the first syllable of “Putnam” receives the highest pitch. The fact that it occurs on the secondary strong beat of the measure (beat 3), highlights both Proctor’s probable speech pattern and his disdainful attitude (‡ Mis-ter Put-nam).

In a later scene in Act I, Reverend Hale attempts to determine if the events unfolding in Salem are the result of a Satanic presence. He questions Tituba about her involvement and, although she confesses, she takes the opportunity to condemn those who accused her. Ward’s working papers outline this scene in the following manner:
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\begin{vern...
Yaa what he say

But I tell him no, I don wanna kill

But he say you work for me you get silk dress

You free, you fly to Barbados he say

But I say no. I don wanna kill

I lead you to Barbados where de sun is big
& bright
They'll be singin, they'll be dancing, they'll feastin
Till the night.

Den one stormy night he come and say to me

"Look, white people, dey is mine too."

163
I peer into the blackness, an old woman der

Scraggy hair and a crooked nose.

 Couldn’t make her out

The differences between the manuscript and score versions of this scene result mostly from the fact that, as a non-native English speaker, the syntactical features of Tituba’s pronunciations and speech rhythms are slightly different from those of the other characters. Ward responded to this by adjusting the melodic contour and rhythm of the music. In the score, the first five lines of this passage appear as follows:

Score Example I-4a

Tituba

He say Mis-ter Par-ris a mean man. He bid me rise... and
cut yo’ throat. Yo’ thief, too, and yo’ Good-y-Pe man. But I say “no, I don’ wan no kill.”

As these two examples demonstrate, with few exceptions, this first strophe retains much of the original rhythmic setting outlined in the working drafts. In the score, Ward indicated that the singer is to perform this passage in a “(sinister)” fashion, the accompanying second violins and violas are marked “sul ponticello,” the tempo has slowed to “Largo (\( \frac{d}{\text{4}} = 72 \))\textsuperscript{352} and there are numerous vocal leaps; all reflect a demonic pall that Tituba’s feigned confession casts over the proceedings. In the first sentence of this strophe, Ward originally thought to set the name “Parris” to equal eighth-notes, exactly as John Proctor pronounced it in the earlier example. But in the score he decided that Tituba’s Caribbean heritage would probably cause a different accentuation pattern, so Ward emphasized the second syllable with a quarter-note and an upward melodic leap of a Perfect 4\textsuperscript{th} (Par-ris). In the next two sentences Ward used word painting by retaining this accentuation pattern for the word “rise,” with wide melodic leaps to characterize Tituba’s comments about cutting the throats of Thomas and Ann Putnam. Although the line of text that reads “Yaa dat’s what he say” is omitted in the score, a new line, “I save yo throats,” was written in the margin. This added text was not placed in the score at this point but withheld until the end of the second strophe. The next full line of text in the manuscript (“But I tell him ‘no, I don’ wanna kill.’”) was set to a simple rhythmic scheme, but in the final score, not only was the text slightly altered (“But I say no, I don’ wanna kill”), but the original rhythmic scheme was also changed to reflect Tituba’s “foreign” syntax.

In the next verse of the aria, the second sentence contains a combination of newly-added text (that Ward wrote down in his working papers at the bottom of the page but did

\textsuperscript{352}ibid., 106.
not set rhythmically) and words apparently added during the process of composition.

This text speaks of the Devil's temptations in offering Tituba freedom, a new silk dress and her return to Barbados:

Score Example 1-4b

In Ward's manuscript, this verse was set to eighth- and quarter-notes used in a manner that simulates the cadence of English speech. But the score indicates that Ward also made rhythmic adjustments to the melodic line in consideration of Tituba's Caribbean-English speech patterns. Ward's combination of quarter-note/eighth-note-triplet patterns here also made this passage more lyrical and lilting.

After her momentary flight of fancy, Tituba returns to dealing with the dilemma at hand. Here, Ward added two brief sentences in the score, relating how Tituba refused the Devil's offer ("But I say 'no.' I save yo' throats.") The words "yo' throats" are also noteworthy because they are set to a downward melodic leap of a Major 11th, an inter-

val that recalls the demonic atmosphere for the beginning of the third strophe. In the score this appears as follows:

Score Example I-4c

Tituba

In Ward’s sketches, this section was outlined in a basic rhythm of eighth- and quarter-notes, a pattern that, as seen above, is easily adapted to English-language iambic penta-

\[354\] Ibid., 109-112.
meter stress patterns. But in the score Ward dramatized the emotional impact of Tituba's fanciful recounting of Lucifer's appearance by rhythmically drawing out each word with a quarter-note/half-note pattern, all the while maintaining her Caribbean accent for phrases such as "dey's mine (\(\text{quarter-note} - \text{half-note}\))", and "peer in-to" (\(\text{quarter-note} - \text{half-note}\)). The contrasting sound of Tituba's accent patterns also affects the musical setting by highlighting the more Anglicized speech patterns of other characters. Ward used another brief instance of word painting here by setting the word "crooked" with a jagged melodic curve. And the entire setting was musically enhanced by Ward's instructions for violins to play "col legno" and the harp to play "with the nail," thus creating effects that bring out the demonic nature of Tituba's story.\(^{355}\) Tituba's aria, then, shows the extent to which Ward altered his rhythmic and melodic material both to accommodate various speech patterns and more accurately portray individual characterization.

\textit{Act II}

While the vast majority of Ward's drafts for Act I appear in handwritten form, the markings are, for the most part, legible. The same cannot be said for those of Act II because, although virtually the entire act is typewritten, Ward's penciled-in rhythmic notations are now quite faded, presenting the researcher with many difficulties. Furthermore, even though the entire act is present in manuscript form, Ward made rhythmic notations for approximately only half of the libretto provided by Stambler, and mostly of recitative. Though the amount of material in Act II that can be applied to this study is

\(^{355}\)Ibid., 110.
limited, important dramatic sections of the opera are not only available for comment but also contain stylistic features unlike those evident in Act I.

This act takes place in the home of John and Elizabeth Proctor. John has returned for the evening meal after a day of working in his fields; an atmosphere of tense politeness permeates the room as they converse. According to the manuscript sketches, Ward’s initial ideas for this scene fragment unfold in the following manner,

Manuscript Example II-1

\[ \begin{align*}
E-- & \, I \, \text{thought you’d gone to Salem you are so late today.} \\
P-- & \, [I \, \text{have no business in Salem. Why should I go to Salem?} \\
E-- & \, You \, \text{did speak of it earlier in this week.} \\
P-- & \, I \, \text{thought better of it since.} \\
E-- & \, Mary \, \text{Warren’s there today.}
\end{align*} \]

\[^{356} \text{Ward Papers, 10/1.} \]
P—She should not be. [You heard me forbid her to go there any more.]

E--I couldn’t stop her. She frightened all my strength away.

P--[It is a fault Elizabeth.] You’re the mistress here. How may that mouse frighten you.

E--She is a mouse no more. I forbid her go, and she raises up her chin like the daughter of a prince and says, ‘I must go to Salem, Goody Proctor; I [a]m an official of the court.’
This example differs from those in Act I in that Ward inserted fewer bar lines in the text. The 4/4 meter signature he used at the beginning of the example, however, indicates that, although less concerned with exact bar-line placement at this stage of composition, Ward did have a rhythmic model in mind. Although some of words do not have rhythmic notation, Ward’s primary concern here was to provide a workable rhythmic scheme based on text prosody. For example, in the first and second lines of this example, the word “I” was not assigned rhythmic values, while the remainder of the text was cast in a simplistic iambic pattern. The common-time meter suggests, however, that Ward intended these to act as pick-up beats. The word “business” presented Ward with a choice of whether to set it as a two- or three-syllable word. Although the two beamed-and-tied eighth-notes followed by a single eighth-note do indicate the proper number of syllables in the word, most speakers of colloquial American English elide the first two syllables and pronounce it as a two-syllable word (biz-ness). The notation in the working manuscripts, then, provided Ward options for the final setting.

In the next line, the phrase “speak of it” shows how Ward considered handling the diphthong at the end of the word “earlier.” Rather than presenting it as a three-syllable word, Ward assigned it two flagged eighth-notes, thereby creating an elided pronunciation evocative of John Proctor’s “common” social class. In this line, Ward also inserted the word “in” and changed the word “this” to “the,” alterations that create a less stilted, flowing pronunciation.

The next three lines are set with a simple eighth-note scheme indicative of an iambic pronunciation pattern. This pattern is punctuated by quarter- and dotted-quarter-notes that provide the rhythmic variety needed to emphasize John Proctor’s anger with Mary
Warren’s disobedience (“She should not be. You heard me forbid her to go there any more.”) In Ward’s working drafts, the latter of these two sentences is bracketed in pencil, which may indicate that Ward considered eliminating it from the final score. Following Elizabeth’s reply, the manuscript indicates that Ward wished to clarify the pronunciation and rhythmic flow of the contracted word “couldn’t” by adding the final vowel and assigning two single eighth-notes to the words “could not.” John’s reply (“It is a fault, Elizabeth”) is also bracketed in pencil, possibly indicating further text elimination. The manner in which Ward notated rhythms in the manuscript for the following line of text supports the hypothesis that he considered eliminating the first bracketed sentence. The eighth-notes assigned to the words, “You’re the mistress here. How may that…” are written in a darker hand than the smaller quarter-notes, suggesting that, although Ward was certain of the rhythmic pattern he wished to use here, he was uncertain of the metric equivalents. Also, unlike the word “couldn’t,” the contraction “You’re” remains a one-syllable word and Ward made no attempt to change it to two syllables.

Elizabeth’s next lines of text are punctuated by the dotted-eighth-note/sixteenth-note patterns seen in the manuscript and give these lines an exaggerated “sing-song” character atypical of either common English pronunciation patterns or Ward’s usual style and may possibly indicate a musical means to portray Elizabeth’s mocking statement.

Unlike the examples from Act I, the final version of this scene shows that Ward made extensive revisions to eliminate unnecessary dialogue.
Score Example II-1

Elizabeth

\[ \text{Piu mosso (J.)} \]

I thought you'd gone to Salem, you are so late to-day.

Mary Warren's there.

John

I changed my mind.

What!

Elizabeth

Prosec'tor, I'm an of - fic - ial of the court.

In the score, the first line remained as it had appeared in the draft, with the common-time meter and simple eighth-note rhythmic declamation originally planned. The descending interval of a Perfect 4th which set the words “Salem” and “Warren” melodically recreates the way in which they are pronounced. Ward substituted the three lines of text that dealt with John’s reasons for not going to Salem with the simple statement, “I changed my mind.” He also reduced the amount of text necessary to express John’s anger with Mary Warren. Instead of the original full line of text (“She should not be. You heard me forbid her go there anymore.”) Ward substituted two brief exclamations (“What? She’s gone again?”). Although there is no indication in the drafts that Ward intended to do so, Elizabeth’s reply was also altered in the final version. Rather than

---

357Ward, The Crucible, I, 133-134.
showing fear from her servant's behavior, Elizabeth's reply has a mocking undertone ("When I tried to stop her she raises up her chin like the daughter of a prince and says, 'I must go to Salem Goody Proctor, I'm an official of the court"). This statement aids in characterizing Mary Warren as someone transformed from a quiet, shy girl into a defiant young woman. This metamorphosis is musically depicted by a change from a secco recitative delivery to a more arioso-like style. Word painting is also evident in Elizabeth's retelling of Mary Warren's haughty statement with the ascending Minor 6\textsuperscript{th} that highlights the word "raises." Ward also eliminated the dotted-eighth/sixteenth-note "sing-song" setting of these lines that he had originally contemplated. Perhaps he decided such an exaggerated delivery was either too far removed from his usual style, or it would be simply an unnecessary embellishment. Instead, the graceful melodic curve and repetition of the ascending Minor 6\textsuperscript{th} that ends the phrase "daughter of a prince," and the ascending Perfect 4\textsuperscript{th}/descending octave set to the word "official," was a musically sufficient means to reproduce Elizabeth's sardonic reply.

Later in Act II, Mary Warren's return from the witchcraft trials prompts a heated discussion with John and Elizabeth Proctor. John is furious with her and threatens to whip her if she disobeys him again. Mary pleads that she is sick and must sleep. Elizabeth relieves the tension by asking Mary if it is true that fourteen women have been jailed on charges of witchcraft. Mary reveals that the number is now much higher; a total of thirty-nine people have been accused, and one, Goody Osburn, has been sentenced to be hung. Ward decided to substitute and rework sections of Stambler's original libretto for this scene. As may be seen in Ward's manuscripts and the score, both the dialogue and
musical setting of this scene clearly display an evolutionary process. The draft version appears as follows:

Manuscript Example II-2a

\[ \text{M- He sentenced her... but not Sarah Good -- for Sarah Good confessed,} \]

\[ \text{That she compacted with Lucifer, \textit{with the Devil}} \]

\[ \text{and Bound herself to torment Christians} \]

\[ \text{Till God's thrown down.} \]

\[ \text{Today she come stumbling into court} \]

\[ \text{And I think -- how can I accuse \textit{her}} \]

\[ \text{This (poor) old woman?} \]

\[ \text{\textit{Substitute}} \]

\[ \text{\textsuperscript{358}Ward Papers, 10/1. The small Xs in the second "A" section above, indicate that Ward crossed out all of this material in the manuscript.}\]
But then—she sits there, denyin' and denyin',
climbing...
And I feel a coldness climb in my back, 'a climbin', 'climbin', 'up
An The skin on my skull begins to creep,
And I choke and cannot breathe,
And then.. I hear a voice screamin', screamin', screamin...
And it's my voice—
John—And so Judge Danforth condemned her to die... You will not go to court again, [Mary Warren.] Hangin' old women is no work for a Christian girl,
Mary Warren
M- (becoming agitated) They will not hang if they confess. It’s God’s work we do. It’s the holy work of God.

The Devil is loose in Salem— we must seek him and rip him out.

J- He’s loose indeed— I’ll whip him out of you. (strides to the whip on the wall)

(M’s) M- (Shrieks in fear) I saved her life today. (points at Elizabeth)

through

This text was designed and musically set as a four-part “arioso for two” (AABA) in compound duple meter (6/8). In the first line of the principal “A” section, Ward substituted the phrase “with the Devil” for Stambler’s original text, “with Lucifer.” In place of Ward’s customary, natural-sounding prosodic treatment, the rhythms assigned to the words “compacted” and “to torment” seem awkward within the 6/8 meter—a matter that he addressed in the final score. The setting for the final line of this first section (“Till

359 As with the previous meetings between John and Abigail, and John and Elizabeth, Ward characterized the psychological distance between John and Mary Warren here by keeping their voices separate during the entire scene. The term “arioso for two,” therefore, seems a more appropriate designation than “duet.”
God's thrown down") created a more natural-sounding delivery by drawing out the
vowels of each word.

The second "A" section is crossed out in the manuscript and in the right margin Ward
wrote the word "substitute," an indication that he intended to provide an alternate text.

This new material appears as follows:

Manuscript Example II-2b

\[ \text{\[ \text{But Goody Osburn won't confess} \]
\text{\[ \text{Still I think when she stumbles into court.} \]
\text{\[ \text{This poor old woman - how can I accuse her?} \]
\text{\[ \text{She's nothin' but skin and bone.} \]

This substitute text is longer and better balances the principal "A" section. It also
reveals more information and heightens the overall dramaturgical effect. The bracketed
eighth-notes on the first syllable of the name "Goody" and last syllable of "Osburn" are
indicative of the naturally-occurring metric patterns of a native English speaker. The

\[ 360 \text{Ward Papers, 10/1.} \]
second line displays an interesting example of proposed word painting. Here, the
sixteenth-note/eighth-note and dotted-eighth-note/sixteenth-note/eighth-note (\(\frac{\text{\luatexverb}1}{\text{\luatexverb}4} \text{\luatexverb}h_{\frac{\text{\luatexverb}3}{\text{\luatexverb}4}} | \frac{\text{\luatexverb}3}{\text{\luatexverb}4}\)) rhythms on the words “stumbles into court” deviate from the basic eighth-note pattern and illustrate the “stumbling” to which Mary Warren refers. The last two lines of this verse return to a basic eighth-note setting with the exception of quarter- and dotted-quarter-notes that emphasize the words “poor,” “skin” and “bone.” The word “accuse” in the third line presented a problem. Ward assigned equal eighth-notes to the two syllables, giving it a somewhat stilted sound. But, as seen in the score, Ward changed this apparent defect by alternating meters throughout the text. Moreover, although the modern phrase “skin and bones” is typically spoken in the plural sense (bones), Ward offered a touch of seventeenth-century colloquial realism by making it singular (bone).^361

It is also noteworthy that this example displays a trait common to Ward’s treatment of text rhythms. Although he often mimicked the way in which native English speakers pronounce certain words by rhythmically lengthening vowel sounds, he did not do so in a mechanical fashion. In the third line, the vowel sounds of the words “old,” “how” and “accuse” could have been lengthened, but Ward’s intention here was to emphasize the character’s emotional state. In this line, Mary Warren’s distressed state of mind is evident in the rapid delivery of text. The vowels lengthened in the fourth line (“skin and bone”) thus become more emphatic.

The “B” section of the libretto draft exhibits a number of notable linguistic treatments. The quarter-note assigned to the word “then” not only provides a correct prosodic reading but also acts as a comma in the sentence structure. With the substituted words,

^361 This section of text is Ward’s and Stambler’s reworking of the play’s text, and it portrays Mary Warren as having a more charitable attitude towards those who have been condemned to hang than Miller’s original.
“a climbin,’ climin’” at the end of the second line of this verse, Ward provided both a characterization of Mary Warren’s social status and a concession to colloquial, seventeenth-century New England speech patterns. The fourth line of this verse displays Ward’s ideas concerning the dramaturgical impact of certain words. Rather than writing simple eighth-notes as he did for the majority of text, Ward assigned dotted half-notes to the words “choke” and “breathe.” This exaggerated lengthening dramatically underscores Mary Warren’s sentiments when recounting how she felt upon seeing Sarah Good in court. In the sixth line, Mary Warren’s realization that “it’s my voice” she heard crying out was also emphasized with dotted quarter-notes. In the seventh line of the “B” section, Ward marked John Proctor’s reply with three eighth-notes per measure, indicating that he intended a metric change from 6/8 to 3/8, which may have been owing to the fact that he chose to place a fermata over the word “die” on the downbeat of a measure for added emphasis, whereas in 6/8 it would occur on the secondary accent. After this section, Ward then remeasured the text to return to a 6/8 metric scheme.

In his manuscript, Ward indicated that, as a result of Proctor’s admonition of her, Mary Warren’s mood was “becoming agitated,” and Ward’s markings show that he wished to highlight her emotional state musically. He made a text substitution—“it’s the holy work of God”—that marks the spot where the rhythmic pace quickens, and the orchestral note in the margin states that the instrumentalists are to begin a pattern of sixteenth-notes. Mary Warren’s subsequent line of text—“we must seek him out, we must rip him out”—set to dotted-eighth-notes/sixteenth-notes/eighth-notes (♩♩♩), also advance the “agitated” emotions. Likewise, Ward reinforced the dramaturgical milieu here with the indication to “sequence up,” a musical gestures designed to illustrate Mary’s rising emotional state. At this, Mary Warren shrieks in fear, and the dramatic pace comes to a
sudden halt when she states that she saved Elizabeth’s life. Ward’s marginalia of a single, staccato eighth-note marked ff shows this to be a significant moment in the opera because it marks the point at which the Proctors become fully aware of their dilemma.

The final version of this scene, which appear as follows, shows numerous changes from Ward’s original manuscript:

Score Example II-2

Mary

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{he sen-tenced her... but not Sarah Good...} & \quad \text{For Sarah Good con-fused...} \\
\text{that she com-pac-ted with the} & \quad \text{Then Goody On-born stam-bles in. That poor old wo-man, I think to my-}
\text{Dev-il,} & \quad \text{down...} \\
\text{and that she bound her-self to tor-ment} & \quad \text{self... how can I ev-er re-come her... such a sor-ry end she be-}
\text{Chris-tians till God’s thorns...} & \quad \text{But the stub-born thing she won’t con-fess she sit there de-sy-lir, de-sy-lir, and then I feel a coldness a-}
\end{align*}
\]

\[362\text{Ward, The Crucible, I, 168-177.}\]
John

Mary

John

Mary

And if the Devil's loose in Salem town, we must seek him and rip him out.
As seen in the above manuscript excerpt, except for minor word changes penciled in by Ward at the end of the second line ("with the Devil"), the first two lines of the principal "A" section text remain unaltered. Rhythmically, a number of problems were solved. In the draft version of this scene, Ward’s marginal notes suggested several possible settings for the end of the first line. By contrast, the final version shows that rather than setting these lines within a 6/8 meter, Ward employed alternating meters emphasizing characterization rather than musical matters.

In the play, Arthur Miller describes Mary Warren as a seventeen-year-old, "subservient, naïve, lonely girl."363 Throughout the drama she is confronted by those whose strength of character is greater than hers, and she consistently shrinks from confrontation. Her personality is like the branch of a willow tree, constantly bending in the wind. But unlike a willow whose strength lies in the ability to sway without breaking, Mary Warren’s personality not only bends but consistently breaks under pressure from those around her. This scene depicts the one time she does attempt to exert herself, for which she is

363 Miller, The Crucible, 17.
nearly whipped. Here, she is confronted by an angry John Proctor and is desperate to explain her disobedience. She returned late from a lengthy day at court where she helped condemn the accused, and she is weakened physically and psychologically by the ordeal. As a result, the words she speaks to Proctor are uttered in a pathetic, faltering voice.

Ward musically portrayed her beleaguered state of mind by composing this section in D-flat Major and assigning different meters throughout. This section begins in 2/4 meter, and the descending octave leap on the word “sentenced” illustrates the ominous nature of the information Mary is about to impart. Beginning with the words “for Sarah Good confessed…” Ward alternated among 2/4, 5/8, 6/8 and 7/8 meters to mimic the uneven, faltering nature of her speech.

The second “A” section of the AABA form exactly reproduces both the alternating metric patterns and melody of the previous one, but here Ward made revisions in the text. As seen above in the manuscript, Ward crossed out Stambler’s version of this section and substituted his own. But, in the score, the text is changed yet again to facilitate the alternating metric scheme.

In the “B” section, Mary Warren’s demeanor changes from that of a reticent serving girl to one who is described in the score as “childishly indignant.” Ward portrayed Mary Warren’s change of demeanor by composing this section in the key of F-sharp Minor and a consistent 6/8 metric scheme. In this final version, Ward also made changes in the text, but they are minor and deviated little from his working drafts. Ward used text painting to illustrate the words “feel a coldness” with an octave descent, and the repeated word “climbin’” was set with two ascending octave leaps. In the lines that follow, Mary Warren’s “choking” and inability to breath were set to relatively long note-values, and

---

the idea of "screamin" was portrayed by four chromatic, sequentially-ascending melodic patterns beginning on B-double-flat, B-flat, C-natural and D-flat.

Although the final "A" section returns to the key of D-flat Major and an alternating metric scheme, this section is not a literal repetition because meter changes, rhythms and melodic features were altered slightly to accommodate the greater number of syllables. As Ward indicates in the manuscript's margin, Mary Warren's final two lines of text ("The Devil's loose in Salem town. We must rip him out.") were composed to a series of rising sequences in the orchestral accompaniment, each beginning on F-natural, G-natural, A-flat, B-flat, C-natural, E-flat, F-sharp, G-sharp), and Proctor's final lines are accompanied by running sixteenth-notes in the strings.

**Act III**

As mentioned above, Act III of the opera begins with the "scene in the woods" that Miller deleted shortly after The Crucible premiered on Broadway. Not only did Ward and Stambler obtain Miller's permission to revive the scene but they also made textual alterations and changed its position within the drama.\(^\text{365}\) Whether placed at the end of Act II--as in Miller's original, or the beginning of Act III--per Ward's and Stambler's revisions, the scene serves as a dramaturgical respite between Elizabeth Proctor's emotionally-charged arrest and the forthcoming courtroom drama. This scene afforded Ward the opportunity to develop further the characterizations of John Proctor and Abigail Williams. Proctor initiates this nocturnal rendezvous because he hopes to make Abigail see reason and put an end to the growing hysteria she created. He soon realizes his efforts

---

\(^\text{365}\)See Appendices E and F for a comparison of Miller's text of this scene and Ward's and Stambler's adaptation.
are in vain when he discovers that, not only is Abigail determined to continue her course of action, she is also quite mad. A portion of the scene in which Abigail reveals the depth of her depravity is outlined in Ward’s working drafts as follows:

Manuscript Example III-1

\[\text{John: } \begin{align*}
\text{Elizabeth lies in jail accused by you.}
\end{align*}\]

\[\text{The village lies under a curse, your curse}\]

\[\text{This is why I am here, to tell you you must free them.}\]

\[\text{You can and you must.}\]

\[\text{Abby: Free them, but I am freeing them.}\]

\[\text{from their own corruption. I am pos}\]

\[366\text{Ward Papers, 10/1.}\]
In this example, it appears that Stambler grouped the text into four-line verses, although the second verse is both incomplete and parts of it scratched out. This text delineation indicates that Ward intended to treat these lines in aria-like fashion, as barline placement and rhythms displayed his intention to employ a common-time meter. From the metric values assigned to each syllable, it is also evident that Ward sought to imitate the most probable, spoken scansion of the text. The name “Elizabeth” in the first line was set so as to emphasize the second syllable (“liz”) by assigning it to a note-value longer than any other in the word, further emphasized by the pick-up-beat nature of the first syllable leading into it (E-liz-a-beth). The longest note-values of the line appear for the lengthy vowel sounds of the words “accused” and “you,” whereas the word “village” in the second line was treated as it is normally spoken by setting it to an iambic stress pattern that gives greater weight to the second syllable. The triplet-eighth-notes assigned to the words “under a” also recreate a declamation reminiscent of commonly-spoken English. At the end of this line, the word “curse” was given special consideration. The first time it appears it was set to a quarter-note value, but on the repetition it was assigned a half-note. This change, and the fact that it disrupts the iambic flow, give both musical and dramaturgical emphasis to Proctor’s opinion of Abigail. The third line returns to a basic pattern of one eighth-note per syllable, a pattern broken only by quarter-notes that stress the longer vowel sounds of the words “here” and “free.” In the final line of the verse, Ward again broke from the simplistic, eighth-note declamation scheme by using dotted half-notes to accentuate Proctor’s pleading words, “can” and “must.”
Abigail's reply begins with the first line of the incomplete second verse. Here, Ward chose again to portray the character’s emotional state, rather than correct prosody. The word “them” was twice set to half-notes, less to emphasize the vowel sound as to exhibit Abigail’s disdain for “them,” the villagers she so loathes. From the end of the second line forward Ward penciled through both Stambler’s text and his own rhythmic notations. Because the archival materials for this scene are incomplete, it is necessary to refer to the finished score to ascertain how Ward ultimately dealt with these two verses. As shown in the following example, Ward altered his original conception in order to highlight the dramatic nature of the scene.

Score Example III-1

Abigail

\[ \text{from their own cor - rupt ion. I am pos - sessed by the Spir-it, I o - pen them to God.} \]

Here again, Ward's manuscript notations displayed a rather straightforward rhythmic and prosodic rendering of the text in which syllables were assigned temporal values based on their commonly-spoken manner of delivery. But, as Ward also often did, the score shows that he decided instead to emphasize the dramaturgical significance of this scene by musically characterizing the emotional state of the two characters involved. Although Ward maintained the common-time meter he proposed in the manuscript, the rhythmic values, melodic curves and singers' vocal ranges were crafted mainly to highlight Proctor's desperation and Abigail's madness.

Later in Act III, Mary Warren and John Proctor have come to the court to deny Abigail's charge of witchcraft against Elizabeth. Proctor's evidence is Mary's written deposition, which states that she made the poppet and placed the needle in it for safekeeping, rather than Abigail's claim that Elizabeth used it as a voodoo doll to inflict injury on her. Judge Danforth questions Mary Warren about her involvement with the other girls and the accusations they have made. Mary claims that it was "sport," and Danforth asks her to pretend to faint, as she and the others have done before. In Ward's manuscript drafts of this scene, Mary's reply to Danforth's demand is, in part, as follows:
Then I could hear the other girls a’ scraminin.. and

it were only sport in the beginning, but

then the whole world cried spirits, spirits, and..

I only thought I saw them, but I did not.

I tell you, I did not

---

368 Ward Papers, 10/1.
This example indicates that Ward contemplated composing this scene in duple meters—common-time combined with 2/4. In the second line of text he imitated the iambic pentameter rhythm of spoken English by emphasizing the word “girls” with a dotted quarter-note. Mary Warren’s social status is also indicated by her use of the phrase “a’ screamin.” From that point forward, Ward seemed less concerned with the metric properties of the language than with portraying Mary’s emotional state. The alternation of meters and use of rests display a “faltering” manner of speech indicative of Mary’s fear at being confronted by Danforth in open court. In the penultimate and final lines of this example, Ward also rhythmically dramatized Mary’s confession that she did not really see spirits with the use of a half-note the first time she says “not,” and a dotted half-note the second time.

In the completed score, Ward decided not to cast this scene in simple duple meters as originally conceived above, but in compound duple, 6/8, as follows:

Score Example III-2\(^{369}\)

Mary

\[\text{\small Score Example III-2}\]

\[\text{\small in-2~~~}
\]

\[\text{\small Ice-eecc}
\]

\[\text{\small 3@Ward, The Crucible, II, 53-56.}\]

In addition to the metric changes in this example, Ward also altered Mary Warren’s emotional state from that presented in the manuscript version. By writing relatively long rests between phrases and eliminating the short rests, which originally indicated a faltering manner of speech, Mary is here characterized less as a hesitant young girl in the face of authority than as one who is frantic. Her state of mind is also portrayed by numerous wide leaps in the chromatic melodic line. In like manner, Ward clarified the situation Mary relates about the other girls by modifying her colloquial pronunciation of the words, “a’ scramin,” to “all screamin.” Even though these alterations indicate a change in Mary’s demeanor, in retaining her manner of dropping the final “g” on the word “screamin,” Ward retained her characterization as a simple, servant girl.

**Act IV**

The extant archival material for Act IV is limited, both in amount and legibility, owing to fading over the years. Enough of this material is in a condition which makes it possible, however, to discern Ward’s intentions for certain significant scene fragments. The opera’s fourth act includes the scene added by Ward and Stambler in which Abigail bribes the prison guards and attempts to convince Proctor to run away with her.
Although the beginning of this scene is absent in the archival record, the majority of it is as follows:

Manuscript Example IV-1:\(^{370}\)

Ab-- John, do you hear me? There’s a boat at the dock, waiting for us.

The wind is in the sails-- we cannot delay. *Come, John, we cannot delay*

*remains as though a dead*  
(he does not move)

to take you away from this town of spite and hate, to a land where it’s sunny and warm, where there’ is nothing but our love, forever and ever.

---

\(^{370} Ward Papers, 10/1.\)
slowly shakes his head. He then

(for the first time he looks at her, utters a maniacal laugh, heavily lifts

his manacled hands to shut the gate she has opened, and shuffles back into

the darkness...)

This example shows that Ward intended a quadruple meter, although there are some measures that fall outside this scheme. There are a total of seven beats in the penultimate measure of the second line, plus two beats in the last measure, which render Ward's intentions somewhat unclear. Most of the text and metrical indications for these two measures were added by Ward after receiving the libretto manuscript from Stambler, suggesting that he had not yet decided whether this material would be included in the final score. Measures 4 through 7 of the last line in which rhythms are notated contain varying numbers of quarter-note beats.

Imitating the manner in which they would normally be spoken, Ward rhythmically emphasized long vowel sounds with either half-notes or dotted half-notes throughout this example. In the first two lines, the words “dock,” “wind,” and “delay” are so notated. In the third line, Abigail lingers over the name of the man she loves, “John,” and on the word “land.” In the following line, the word “warm” received this rhythmic treatment, as well as the last syllables of “sunny,” “forever” and “ever.” Ward also took care to reserve the longest rhythmic value for the word “love,” which dramaturgically reinforces Abigail’s motivation in this scene.
Regarding Abigail's characterization, in this scene, she possesses a romantic frame of mind, as indicated by her speech patterns. Nowhere does she drop the final "g" of words as she often does when she is angry. But Ward did make one change in Stambler's text, one that reminds the listener of Abigail's social status. In the last rhythmically-notated line, Ward crossed out the word "is"—so that the phrase reads "there's" rather than "there is"—and adjusted the rhythm accordingly, a reading less formal sounding and more in keeping with Abigail's station in life.

As outlined in Ward's preliminary sketches, the above rhythmic notation gives the text a somewhat straightforward prosaic recitation. In the final version of this scene, however, a jagged melodic line, and the numerous changes to the rhythmic setting Ward first contemplated, aid in the dramaturgical presentation of Abigail's impassioned speech:

Score Example IV-1

Abigail

\[\text{Score Example IV-1}^{371}\]

Ward, The Crucible, II, 115-120.
The rhythms in the first phrase of this example are almost exactly like those outlined in the manuscript, except for the last measure, where Ward substituted four eighth-notes in the first half of the measure for the syncopated structure he had originally planned.

From this point forward he also made numerous alterations of the rhythmic character outlined in his working drafts. In the score, the half-note emphasis on the word “wind” is replaced with a simple eighth-note. And Abigail repeats John’s name with a whole-note tied to a quarter-note high in her vocal range to indicate the urgency with which she delivers this text (and the score here is marked “with great urgency”). The syncopated rhythm of the words “we cannot delay” in the manuscript version is also altered in the score, yet retains rhythmic irregularity with use of a half-note triplet. Ward also decided to eliminate the text he had added in the second line of the manuscript (“Come, John, we
cannot delay”). The next two sentences in the manuscript (“John, listen, I forgive you. I have come to save you, only you, to take you away from this town of spite and hate.”) was retained almost intact, except for the contraction “I’ve,” which was written out as “I have.” The rhythmic setting of these lines was, in like manner, slightly altered from the original. The most noticeable change here is the use of dotted eighth-note/sixteenth-note figures that lend themselves to the “urgent” nature of Abigail’s speech. The text-phrase “to a land where it’s sunny and warm” is repeated in the score with a whole-note on the word “warm” to emphasize the contrast between the jail-scene atmosphere of this scene and that which Abigail offers in exchange. The final lines of this fragment are close to what Ward outlined in his manuscript, both rhythmically and textually.

Although the text of this scene was kept relatively intact, the rhythmic and parlando melodic structures were crafted to emphasize the dramaturgical necessities. Abigail bribes her way into the jail to see John, and her time is limited. She must quickly convince him to come away with her, and her excitement is the feature Ward wished to bring out. Throughout this scene, he accomplished this by adding relatively short, “dotted” rhythms and angular, melodic curves that explore Abigail’s vocal range in brief, dramatic phrases.

The opera’s dramaturgical high point takes place when John Proctor tears up the confession he signed, thus saving his good name, his personal integrity, and his soul from eternal damnation. In the final scene of Act IV, Danforth is persuaded to give Proctor one final opportunity to make a confession and save himself from the gallows. Proctor initially signs the document, only to discover a proviso Danforth failed to disclose. Danforth insists that the signed confession be nailed to the church door so the entire commun-
ity can bear witness to Proctor’s confession, and his shame. Upon learning this, Proctor takes back the paper and argues with Danforth that it is unnecessary for all to see his confession because God knows his sins. Danforth insists that, if Proctor does not allow the confession to be displayed publicly, he will be hanged. Danforth’s continued insistence prompts the drama’s most impassioned moment as Proctor replies, “I have given you my soul; leave me my name.” This scene is outlined in Ward’s working draughts as follows:

Manuscript Example IV-2

\[\text{Dan} \quad \text{I must have legal proof}--\]

\[\text{But} \quad \text{You are the high court-- your word is good. Tell them I confessed} \]

\[\text{myself; tell them Proctor broke his knees, and wept like a woman; tell them} \]

\[\text{Tell them he} \]

\[\text{what you will...} \]

\[\text{Dan. Do you mean to deny this confession when you are free?} \]

\[^{372} \text{Ward Papers, 10/1.} \]
J- I mean to deny nothin. But this is my name. I have given you my soul;

leave me my name.

Dan- Is that document a lie? I do not deal in lies. You will give me your honest confession in my hand, or I cannot keep you from the gallows... Which signed way do you go, Mister? Proctor (Proctor, weeping in fury, tears the paper) Marshall!

(in greater fury) Marshall!

Par- (hysterically) Proctor, Proctor! Hale: You must not die man
H- You cannot do this, you cannot xxxxx die—

(From this point until the end of the opera, Ward’s manuscript notations are sporadic and incomplete.)

As the most dramatic moment in the opera, Ward chose to set this scene fragment in recitative fashion, which focuses on the drama, rather than music. In the final score, the composer also emphasized the dramaturgical significance of the moment by setting Proctor’s vocal line with a relatively high tessitura:

Score Example IV-2

John

Danforth

John

In the score, this scene begins with a text different from the manuscript version, and there is dialogue exchange. Although the sentiments expressed remain unaltered, this text reduction allows each character a less interrupted flow of thoughts and emotions. In
the manuscript, this scene fragment begins with Danforth demanding that Proctor hand
over the signed confession for "legal proof." In the score, this statement was placed later
in the exchange, thereby allowing Proctor a more fluid pace of expression at this critical
moment. The words, "You are the high court--your word is good," were omitted. Ward
further eliminated the line, "Tell them he wept like a woman." Deleting this text may
have been more than merely a means of linguistic expediency. It may well have been a
way to maintain Proctor's "manly" characterization in the face of disaster. In place of
this text, Ward added the words, "but I shall not sign," which bolsters Proctor's "manly
defiance" at this, the most crucial moment of his life. From this point to the end of the
scene, most of the text remains as presented in the manuscript, with only minor word
changes or repetitions added for emotional emphasis.

In the manuscript, Ward set the text to a simple, common-time meter, but in the score
he changed this to compound-quadruple meter, 12/8, and marked the passage "piu
mosso," both of which serve to propel the text and the drama forward. Although the
overall metric setting was changed, Ward retained most of the long and short note-values
that emphasize the text's stress patterns and allow the recitative style of declamation to
follow English prosody as expected. Exceptions were used to underscore moments of
emotional intensity, such as the word "nothing"--which in the manuscript received a
long-short pattern, but just the opposite in the score--and the phrase, "I have given you
my soul," metrically drawn out to provide greater dramatic impact.

374 Personal Interview. Ward often commented that he preferred to characterize his leading male roles as
"strong and manly." For this reason, he also preferred to set these roles for a baritone rather than a
tenor, because he feels that the lower range is more "masculine sounding."
As in most instances when Ward had to choose between emphasizing musical or
dramatic considerations, the dramaturgical needs of the scene take precedence. The
melodic features here have less to do with characterization—for at this late juncture it is
hardly necessary—than with reinforcing the dramaturgical importance of the opera’s most
important scene. Danforth begins by singing relatively low in his tenor range but slowly
extends upward as he becomes more frustrated with Proctor’s refusal to hand over his
confession. By contrast, Proctor sings high in his baritone range throughout, displaying
the extreme tension under which he labors as he decides his own fate. This melodic
treatment is readily apparent in his statement, “but I will not sign,” which twice achieves
a high e-natural, almost the highest pitch he sings in this scene. This pitch is also sig-
ificant because Ward used it in subsequent moments to emphasize Proctor’s heightened
state of emotion, such as on the words “name” and “soul,” which, significantly, are
equivalent concepts in Proctor’s mind—a fact Ward understood. The highest pitch that
Proctor sings in this scene is a high e-sharp, on the word “me,” and punctuates his
realization of impending doom. In this scene, perhaps more so than in any other in the
opera, Ward treated musical considerations as the handmaiden of drama.
The Crucible, an American Genre

Most historians now view the concept of nationalism in music, as in other fields, as something that changes in time and in response to historical factors.\(^{375}\) Because nationalism has not been a constant that occurred everywhere at the same time and in the same manner, consideration must be given to the possibility that the different manifestations of musical nationalism are affected by the different types and stages in the political evolution of each country.\(^{376}\) What was true for political and musical emergence in nineteenth-century Europe was not necessarily true for the United States during the same period. The various historical factors that gave rise to new concepts of nationhood on the European continent occurred prior to, and were radically different from, those in the United States. "European nationalism emerged as an expression of a politically-motivated need that tends to appear when national independence is being sought, denied, or jeopardized rather than attained and consolidated."\(^{377}\) American nationalism took a different course, one based on its own unique history and socio-political conditions. After many decades of social fragmentation, it was the need for economic and political consolidation that gave rise to nationalist sentiments in the arts. The fact that European nationalist movements occurred before those in America is not the critical difference between the two. Of primary importance is that, by the time nationalist movements in the United States began to occur in the twentieth century, the nation had already identified itself as containing distinct geographical, political and cultural regions, and these factors exist to the present day. It may be claimed that, prior to the twentieth century, expressions of American musical nationalism were more in the manner of nationalism, rather

\(^{375}\) Dahlhaus, *Between Romanticism and Modernism*, 80.
\(^{376}\) Ibid., 89.
\(^{377}\) Ibid., 38.
than the musical expression of a unified national spirit. Because different types of political unification took place in the United States before the twentieth century (loyalties to individual States, the Union, the Confederacy), American art forms can be more correctly described as regional in character, as well as national. Ward’s opera, which relates a localized account of colonial American history and refers to a mid-twentieth century nationwide political event, owes its aesthetic premise to both regional and national aspects of American cultural history.

The Synthesis of Textual and Musical Accents in Ward’s The Crucible

As detailed in the above examples, throughout The Crucible, Ward was conscious of how text and music need interact so as to portray most effectively the various characterizations of people, their use of the English language as an indication of their place in society, and their changing emotional states. His sensitivity to these musical and dramaturgical subtleties assisted in portraying The Crucible’s tragic events in ways at times obvious, at other times less so. The composer’s musical treatment in relation to the libretto’s American-English speech patterns also plays an important role in the work’s designation as an American national opera. In basing The Crucible’s rhythmic and melodic material on the syntactic features of American speech, Ward created a musical language as unique as the libretto’s verbal content. Although the listener may not be fully cognizant of the fact, The Crucible also speaks with an American musical accent. This coincidence of linguistic and musical accents serves to reinforce the aesthetic perception of the opera’s “American” qualities, especially by American audiences, as they are most likely to be relatively familiar with the various accent patterns. Although subtle
in its presentation, this American musical accent is a detectable feature and one of the reasons for the drama’s post-referential reception as a significant work in the American operatic repertoire.

Perhaps more than any other quality Ward sought to impart to The Crucible is the American national spirit. He accomplished this in numerous ways, from the choice of subject matter and linguistic features of the text, to the musical devices employed to exploit them. Upon first seeing Arthur Miller’s The Crucible, Ward was struck not only by the dramatic rendering of colonial American history, but by the operatic possibilities inherent in the text. This viewing stimulated Ward to set the play’s tragic events to music, for it promised the possibility of expressing here, as in his other operas, Ward’s own interests and philosophical beliefs garnered through his varied life experiences in one format: a musical means of proclaiming the triumph of the human spirit over the failings of dated social mores, political institutions and religious dogma. Ward was also well aware of the connection between nationality and language. Merely composing an opera based on a play inspired by American history was not enough to assure its acceptance as a work of American art. Ward also understood that at least one means of associating music with national identity was an intimate interaction of music and text.378

Ward’s compositional methodology in writing The Crucible was first to concentrate on the syntactic and rhythmic characteristics of the spoken word. Having achieved a rhythmic model for his text, Ward then carefully, often painstakingly, applied melodic features emphasizing the most appropriate dramatic rendering of the words to reflect the manner in which they would be spoken normally. Such a methodology also allowed

Ward to project characterization by highlighting an individual's specific linguistic traits. Ward's methodology was neither pedantic nor rigidly applied, and throughout, musical devices principally serve dramaturgical necessity. The results transcend individual definition of either purely linguistic or musical application, and the unity achieves a broader meaning of accent.

In The Crucible, external associations of Americanisms—a play by an American author, based on subject matter drawn from colonial American history that incorporates language associated with American Puritans and used as the foundation for an opera by an American composer and American librettist—are reinforced by the effective internal union, or synthesis, of the language of the text with that of the music. Although pre-referential text-music relationships alone may not impart a sense of national identity to the opera, their presence is a significant factor that has contributed to the widely-held perception among both critics and audiences that American nationalism is, as Carl Dahlhaus would say, a post-referential aesthetic fact in Robert Ward's The Crucible.
APPENDIX A

The Opera: Synopsis, Scene Structure, Characters and Voice Parts
Synopsis

(The following is a slightly edited version of the material found in Ward, The Crucible, I, 5-6.)

Act I

The curtain rises on the Reverend Samuel Parris kneeling distraught at the bed of his daughter Betty. She lies immobile and scarcely breathing, as she has lain since Parris came upon her and her cousin Abigail dancing in the woods the night before. Tituba comes to ask about Betty but is summarily dismissed.

Abigail enters to say that the town is whispering of witchcraft and that Parris should go out to make a denial. He bitterly questions her about her mysterious dismissal from the service of the Proctors. As she vehemently denies any wrongdoing, attributing her dismissal to Goodwife Proctor's arrogant desire for a slave, the Putnams enter and relate that their Ruth was stricken at the same time as was Betty Parris and that they have sent to Beverly for the Reverend Hale, known for his skill in discovering witches.

While Parris, fearful of any suspicion of witchcraft in his own household, is uneasily doubting the need for Hale, Rebecca and Francis Nurse enter with Giles Corey. Rebecca is comforting, Old Giles is flippant about the illness of the girls. When Putnam insists that witches are at work in Salem, Giles accuses him of using a witch scare to defraud his neighbors of their land. John Proctor's entrance only brings this quarrel to a higher peak. Abigail, though silent in the upper room, visibly reacts with excitement at John's entrance. Rebecca reprimands the men for this untimely squabble in the house of illness, and calls them back to their senses. Giles departs with John.

Those present sing a psalm to beseech God's help. As the psalm proceeds, Betty begins to writhe on the bed and then with an unearthly shriek tries to fly out of the window. They rush to her side. In the midst of the commotion the Reverend Hale enters. He calms them and then methodically sets an inquiry under way. He soon learns that Tituba has played an important role in what has been happening, she having also been present at the dancing. Ann Putnam asserts that Tituba knows conjuring. Tituba is sent for; at her entrance, Abigail, under severe inquisition by Hale, lashes out to accuse Tituba of compacting with the Devil. Tituba, overwhelmed by the sternness of Hale and the malvolent intensity of Parris and the Putnams, finally confesses that she has been visited by the Devil but denies that he has persuaded her into any wrongdoing—for a few moments she frightens Parris and the Putnams with a heartfelt fantasy of the hellish power to bring them harm that the Devil has offered her.

With Tituba's confession the spell over Betty is broken. All return to the psalm in great thanksgiving; Abigail, envious of the attention given to Tituba, hysterically repents her own compact with the Devil and visibly receives an answer to her prayer for forgiveness and for a call to mark out others of the Devil's crew.

209
Act II

John Proctor returns from a day’s planting to find Elizabeth listless and moody. In her mind the witch trials have become an aggravation of her domestic troubles, with Abigail at the center of both. She insists that John expose Abigail’s fraud to Judge Danforth; his reluctance to do so convinces her that he still has a warm spot in his heart for Abigail. John’s self-defense is double; that he has no witness to what Abigail told him, and that she will avenge herself by revealing John’s adultery with her. He is fed up with Elizabeth’s sitting in condemnatory judgment upon him. She gently denies this but regrets the vanished sweetness of their love. Abigail, she says, will not confess the lechery lest she damn herself. And what of those who suffer in jail because of John’s silence? No, John must tear the last feeling for Abigail out of his heart, or she will never give up hope of some day having him for her own.

Mary Warren enters furtively from her day at court as one of Abigail’s crew of witch-finders. Breaking into tears, Mary relates that the number of those arrested has tripled—and Goody Osburn has been condemned to be hung! She is truly troubled by this, and by her own part in it, but she also demonstrates how the mob excitement of the courtroom procedure has turned her into an hysterical accuser even against her will. When John threatens to whip her if she ever returns to court, she blurts out that Goody Proctor herself has been mentioned and that only Mary’s defense of her prevented an outright accusation.

Elizabeth, certain that Abigail is behind this, once more pleads with John to go to the court when Reverend Hale and John Cheever enter with a warrant for her arrest: that very evening Abigail has charged Elizabeth with employing a witch’s poppet to kill her. John makes Mary acknowledge it as her poppet, but Hale, although deeply troubled by these new directions of the witch hunts, feels that he must arrest Elizabeth for examination.

About to burst out wildly to prevent their taking Elizabeth, John instead turns with intense but controlled passion on Mary: she will tell her story in court even though it may provoke a charge of adultery from Abigail and ruin both Abigail and John completely—anything rather than that Elizabeth should be in danger on his account.

Act III

Scene I. Abigail, with a mixture of scheming but passionate love for John and a mystical belief in her mission, tries to persuade John to abandon Elizabeth and join her, Abigail, in the holy work of cleansing the puritanically corrupt town. He will not listen to this but instead pleads that she free the town from the curse of her foolish wickedness and then threatens to expose her fraud. She defies him: now any dire fate that descends on Elizabeth will be his doing.

Scene 2. Judge Danforth’s invocation in court reveals the strength and fervor of his conviction that God’s will is working through him to cleanse the land of a plague of witches.

As court opens, Giles Corey accuses Thomas Putnam, in his greed for his neighbor’s land, of having bragged of his role in the charges of witchcraft. Judge Danforth sends Corey to jail and torture for refusing to name his witnesses for this accusation. There is a
great commotion as Giles leaps at Putnam as the man responsible for the arrest of his wife and himself, and of Rebecca Nurse as well.

John Proctor presents Mary Warren’s deposition that the entire outcry against witches started only as an exciting game for the girls, a complete pretense and fraud. But Abigail, he says, has continued the game in an effort to dispose of Elizabeth. Her encouragement to this arose from the adultery that took place between Abigail and himself, which he now confessed. When Elizabeth, ordinarily incapable of a lie, is brought in and fails to confirm John’s confession, Abigail counterattacks, charging that Mary herself has turned witch. Mary, helpless and then hysterical, turns on John Proctor, accusing him of being the Devil’s man who has forced her into trying to confuse and overthrow the court. All but the Reverend Hale close in on John Proctor with sadistic vindictiveness.

Act IV

Tituba and Sarah Good, crazed by rigors of imprisonment, sing of the Devil and his broken promises to them. Abigail comes into the prison courtyard; she has bribed the jailer to permit Proctor to escape. John, although broken by the months of prison and torture, scornfully rejects the freedom and love she offers him. Abigail runs off weeping.

Hale, and then Parris, try to persuade Judge Danforth to postpone the execution of Proctor and Rebecca Nurse scheduled for that morning; Salem may break into open rebellion at the execution of such respected citizens. Danforth indignantly refuses but agrees to ask Elizabeth to persuade John to confess.

John is brought in and left alone with Elizabeth. She tells him that Giles Corey has died, pressed to death rather than say aye or nay to the charge of witchcraft, but that many have confessed in order to save their lives. John reluctantly brings out his own wish to confess—if it will not make her think ill of him for lying. Passionately she answers that it was her lie that doomed him—and that she wants him alive. Exultant, he shouts that he will confess to the charge of witchcraft.

Danforth, Hale, and Parris rejoice—each for his own reason—over John’s confession, and Parris tries to persuade Rebecca, who has been brought in on the way to the gallows, also to confess. She refuses to damn herself with the lie. John is asked to sign his confession, that it may be exhibited before the town. This is too much: John has deeply shamed himself by confessing, but he will not set his hand to the destruction of his own name and the eternal shame of his sons. He tears up the document. In a fury, Danforth orders John and Rebecca be led out for execution. Hale pleads with Elizabeth that she change John’s decision while there is yet time. She refuses: “He has found his name and his goodness now—God forbid I take it from him.”
# Scene Structure

## Act I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Dramaturgical Function</th>
<th>Musical Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parris, Abigail</td>
<td>Exposition--Intro. Of Parris, Abigail, Betty Parris, Tituba.</td>
<td>Arioso/recitative,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exposition of Parris’ weakness of character.</td>
<td>Duet--arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parris, Abigail</td>
<td>Exposition - Introduction of new characters.</td>
<td>Recitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parris, Ann &amp; Thomas Putnam</td>
<td>Exposition of Ann’s belief in witchcraft.</td>
<td>Arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Putnam</td>
<td>Further exposition.</td>
<td>Recitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parris, Ann &amp; Thomas Putnam</td>
<td>Exposition of Putnam’s self-righteousness.</td>
<td>Arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Putnam</td>
<td>Exposition of Corey &amp; Nurse; exposition of hatred between Corey and Thomas Putnam.</td>
<td>Recitative/arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parris, Putnams, Giles Corey, Rebecca Nurse</td>
<td>Exposes Putnam’s desire to buy up his neighbor’s land; introduces John Proctor.</td>
<td>Arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles Corey</td>
<td>Exposition of Rebecca Nurse’s personality, slows dramatic pace.</td>
<td>Aria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Nurse</td>
<td>Continues exposition and delineation of factional divisions.</td>
<td>Recitative/arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Proctor, Parris, Corey, Thomas Putnam</td>
<td>Proctor and Corey exit; Betty Parris becomes disturbed.</td>
<td>Ensemble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnams, Parris, Rebecca &amp; Francis Nurse</td>
<td>Exposition--Intro. Of Rev. Hale.</td>
<td>Recitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parris, Putnams, Rebecca Nurse, Rev. Hale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characters</td>
<td>Dramaturgical Function</td>
<td>Musical Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Hale</td>
<td>Exposition--Establishes Hale as authority on witchcraft</td>
<td>Recitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Hale, Parris, Abigail, Ann Putnam, Nurses.</td>
<td>Exposition--Accusations. Dancing is exposed, Tituba’s conjuring, Abigail and Tituba’s consorting with the Devil.</td>
<td>Recitative/arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
<td>Reflection--Everyone expresses their beliefs about the accusations. Slows dramatic pace.</td>
<td>Ensemble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Hale, Tituba, Parris, Ann Putnam</td>
<td>Further accusations against Tituba.</td>
<td>Recitative/arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tituba</td>
<td>Tituba confesses to consorting with the Devil.</td>
<td>Aria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Putnam</td>
<td>Ann Putnam accuses Sarah Good.</td>
<td>Arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Hale</td>
<td>Recapitulation of his earlier aria. Slows the pace of dramatic exposition.</td>
<td>Aria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Present</td>
<td>Rejoicing in Tituba’s confession and salvation; Abigail confesses, revealing her cunning nature.</td>
<td>Ensemble finale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Act II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-------</th>
<th>Establishes mood.</th>
<th>Orchestral Prelude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Proctor</td>
<td>Exposition of Proctor’s character--love of farming.</td>
<td>Aria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Elizabeth</td>
<td>Introduction of new major character--Elizabeth. Exposition of John’s infidelity; description of court proceedings.</td>
<td>Recitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characters</td>
<td>Dramaturgical Function</td>
<td>Musical Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Proctor</td>
<td>Exposition of Elizabeth’s character traits. Admonishes Elizabeth for being judgmental and unforgiving.</td>
<td>Aria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Proctor</td>
<td>Rising action; Elizabeth urges John to expose Abigail’s fraud.</td>
<td>Aria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Warren, Proctors</td>
<td>Introduction of new character—Mary Warren.</td>
<td>Recitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Warren</td>
<td>Rising action; further describes court proceedings.</td>
<td>Aria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Warren, Proctors</td>
<td>Revelation of Elizabeth being accused of witchcraft by Abigail.</td>
<td>Recitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Hale, Mary Warren, Cheever, Elizabeth Proctor</td>
<td>Rising action; Elizabeth is arrested</td>
<td>Recitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Elizabeth asks John to bring her home soon.</td>
<td>Arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Proctor</td>
<td>Proctor vows to have Mary Warren tell the truth in court.</td>
<td>Aria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Act III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Dramaturgical Function</th>
<th>Musical Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abigail, John Proctor</td>
<td>Rising action; exposition of Abigail’s fanaticism and passion for Proctor (Deleted from play).</td>
<td>Aria/arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheever</td>
<td>Exposition—Introduces new major character—Danforth.</td>
<td>Recitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danforth</td>
<td>Danforth’s prayer for the power to judge.</td>
<td>Aria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characters</td>
<td>Dramaturgical Function</td>
<td>Musical Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheever</td>
<td>Presents Giles Corey’s deposition to the court.</td>
<td>Recitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles Corey</td>
<td>Corey accuses Putnam; Corey arrested for refusing to name names.</td>
<td>Arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danforth, Parris, John Proctor,</td>
<td>Rising action; courtroom drama.</td>
<td>Recitative/arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Warren, Abigail, Thomas</td>
<td>Rising action; relates Mary’s. hystera.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Warren</td>
<td>Rising action; Proctor publicly reveals his adultery.</td>
<td>Duet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danforth, Abigail, John Proctor,</td>
<td>Rising action; Danforth questions Elizabeth; she lies to protect her husband.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Warren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danforth, Elizabeth Proctor</td>
<td>Hale support’s John Proctor</td>
<td>Arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Hale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Present</td>
<td>Rising action; Abigail accuses Mary Warren and sees the “yellow bird,” causing mass hysteria.</td>
<td>Ensemble finale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Act IV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Dramaturgical Function</th>
<th>Musical Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Good, Tituba</td>
<td>Introduction of Scene.</td>
<td>Music associated with Tituba Aria/soprano Obbligato—First two strophes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheever</td>
<td>Final introduction of Abigail</td>
<td>Recitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td>Rising action; Abigail attempts to free John Proctor if he will run away with her.</td>
<td>Aria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Dramaturgical Function</th>
<th>Musical Setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Good, Tituba</td>
<td>Reprise of earlier material.</td>
<td>Aria--Third strophe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Hale</td>
<td>Relates rebellion taking place because of the hangings.</td>
<td>Arioso--Reprise of aria from Act 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danforth, Parris, Rev. Hale</td>
<td>Discussion of hangings.</td>
<td>Recitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danforth</td>
<td>Lays down rigid rules.</td>
<td>Arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parris</td>
<td>Reveals more behavioral traits</td>
<td>Arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danforth, Elizabeth Proctor</td>
<td>Seeks to have Elizabeth persuade John Proctor to confess.</td>
<td>Recitative/arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danforth</td>
<td>Foreshadowing of conclusion.</td>
<td>Arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctors</td>
<td>Elizabeth seeks forgiveness; John asks for support.</td>
<td>Duet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danforth, Parris, John Proctor, Rebecca Nurse</td>
<td>Denouement; Proctor confesses.</td>
<td>Arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Proctor</td>
<td>Refuses to allow public display of confession.</td>
<td>Arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danforth</td>
<td>Pressures Proctor to allow confession to be made public.</td>
<td>Arioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Proctor</td>
<td>Final tragedy; Proctor tears up confession--seals his fate.</td>
<td>Aria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Remaining Characters</td>
<td>Rebecca Nurse and John Proctor led to the gallows; Hale implores Elizabeth to intercede with her husband.</td>
<td>Ensemble finale&lt;sup&gt;379&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>379</sup> CPW, "The Crucible" (Dissertation), 89-96. Although this information is based upon Woliver's similar chart, it has been heavily edited and added to in order to reflect the dramaturgical characteristics and pace of the action as presented by Ward and Stambler.
### Characters and Voice Parts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>In Play</th>
<th>In Opera—Voice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reverend Parris</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Tenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betty Parris</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Mez. Sop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tituba</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Contralto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail Williams</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Soprano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanna Walcott</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Contralto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Putnam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Soprano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Putnam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Baritone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Lewis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Contralto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Warren</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Soprano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Proctor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Baritone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Nurse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Contralto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles Corey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Tenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reverend John Hale</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Proctor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Mez. Sop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Nurse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel Cheever</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Tenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Putnam</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes—Coloratura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Herrick</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Hathorne</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Governor Danforth</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Tenor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes—Soprano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Sheldon</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes—Soprano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget Booth</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes—Soprano</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Characters ................................ 21  

---

APPENDIX B

Photo Reproductions of Robert Ward's Manuscripts Used in Chapter IV

The photo reproductions presented here are enlarged to varying degrees. The manuscript pages are typically of two basic types; either 8.5 X 11-inch, ruled, legal-pad pages or standard, blank, 8.5 X 11-inch typing paper.
Susanna has come from the Doctor.

He has searched and searched his books.

But he says no medicine.

He must tell you he cannot die now.

Susanna searched her

Come in his books for Betty.

She is sick you look to your health. Come here.
Ah, I have enemies in this town.

For three long years I have fought
to make this stiff-necked people respect me and my laws.

But you compromise my very character?

Child, I have given you a home
And the clothes upon your back and arm
But I know the truth before I speak it down.

Give me an upright answer [ ]

Why did God put you on earth where he saw fit
Where he needed a child.

She says, I'm not sick so...

Close to something... sad...
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Manuscript Example 1-3

John

Significant farmers and their fellows. They'll be heard by God
for your kind to cheat, That may be. The scheme of things
as you said. Fannie got it. But you

John

will not subjugate this town, never while I
breathe. (grow) We live and roll on, gentle

You wear no halo, Mr. Putnam.
He say Mr. Parish mean man
He bid me ride and cut your throat.
Your throat Mr. and yours Johny Putnam!

—Yea! That's what he say!

But I tell him no, I don't wanna kill
But he say you don't mean you get sick, then
You free, you fly to Barbadoes he say.
But I say no, I don't wanna kill.

He lead you to Barbadoes where de sun is by,
They make you do things, they beat you,
They make you do things, they beat you. Fill the night.
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Manuscript Example I-4, continued

Den one stormy night, he come and say to me,

look white people, don't never fear.

I peer into the blackness an old woman den

Scraggy hair and a crooked nose!

Comma make her our [name], were at Sarah Ford, [you]

Manuscript Example II-1

E—I thought you'd gone to Salem you are so late today.

P— I have no business in Salem. Why should I go to Salem?

E—You did speak of it earlier this week.

P— I thought better of it since.

E—Mary Warren's there today.

P— She should not be. You heard me forbid her go there any more.

E—I couldn't stop her. She frightened all my strength away.

P— It is a fault, Elizabeth. You're the mistress here. How may that mouse frighten you.

E—She is a mouse no more. I forbid her go, and she raises up her chin like the daughter of a prince and says, I must go to Salem, Goody Proctor; I am an officer of the court.
Manuscript Example II-2a
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Manuscript Example II-2b

But Godly Oshun won't confess
Still I think when she stumbles into court.
This poor old woman—how can I accuse her?
She's nothing but skin and bone.
Manuscript Example III-1

[Handwritten text]

Manuscript Example III-2

[Handwritten text]
Manuscript Example IV-1

Ab- John, do you hear me? There's a boat at the dock, waiting for us.
The wind is in the sails— we cannot delay.

(he does not move)

Ab- John. Listen. I forgive you, John. I've come to save you, only you—
to take you away from this town of spite and hate, where there's
to sun and warm, where there is nothing but our love, forever and ever.

(for the first time he looks at her. tears well up in his eyes. heavily lifts
his remember hands to shut the gate she has opened, and shuts back into
the darkness, and catches from Tituba and Sarah echo John as the two come
forward.)

Manuscript Example IV-2

Dan- I must have legal spr.

Are you the high court, your word is good. Tell them I confessed
myself, tell them Proctor broke his knee, and went like a lunatic. Tell them
what you will?!

Dan- Do you mean to deny this confession when you are free?

- I mean to deny nothing. But this is my name. I have given you my soul;
leave me my name.

Dan- Is that document a lie? I do not deal in lies. You will give me your
bachelor's confession in my hand, or I cannot keep you from the gallows... Think
way do you go, sir?" (Proctor, weeping in fury, tears the paper.) Marshall

(in greater fury) Marshall

Per- (systatically) Proctor, Proctor! Hold ye must not lie, man,
you cannot do this, you cannot do this.
APPENDIX C

Bernard Stambler
Bernard Stambler

Bernard Stambler was born on June 16, 1910, in Brooklyn, New York. His father worked as a custom jeweler and his mother was a housewife who, like Robert Ward’s mother, was in charge of running a busy household. In 1917 the family relocated to Staten Island. At age nine, Stambler began violin lessons with Leon Berry, head of the Staten Island Lyric Orchestra, and within a few years he joined the orchestra’s violin section. Tragedy struck in 1919 when Stambler’s father was killed in a fire, leaving some of the responsibility for the family income up to the young boy. In 1921, his mentor, Berry, who was also a claque leader at the Metropolitan Opera, invited Stambler to join him. For the next four years Stambler’s musical education consisted mostly of attending two or three operatic performances a week.

From 1926 to 1938, Stambler attended Cornell University, where he received his Bachelor of Arts degree in English in 1931, Master of Arts in Comparative Literature in 1932, and a Ph.D. in Comparative Literature and Musicology in 1938. At Cornell he played viola in the university orchestra, performed violin and piano duets with Richard Hill, who later became Associate Head of the Music Division at the Library of Congress, and studied musicology with Otto Kinkeldey.

After graduating from Cornell, Stambler joined the English Department at Indiana University. There he met and married his wife, Elizabeth, with whom he had two children, Susanna and Peter. In 1942, Stambler taught English at the U.S. Naval Training School, which was based at the Indiana University campus. Two years later he moved to Washington, D.C., where he continued his work for the government, first as assistant editor of the magazine War Progress, then as Associate Historian for the War Department’s general staff, and finally as Chief of the Historical Branch for the War Assets Administration. Two years after the war’s conclusion, Stambler left his government position and joined the faculty at Juilliard as a Professor of Literature and Chairman of the Academic Division. He remained at Juilliard until 1970 when he left to become Chairman of the English Department at the Borough of Manhattan Community College, a position he held for five years. After formally retiring from teaching, Stambler continued to lecture on Dante (his specialty topic), opera, and other topics at universities across the country.382 Stambler and his wife eventually went to live at the same retirement community as Robert and Mary Ward in Durham, North Carolina, where he died in 1994 from natural causes.

A representative sample of Bernard Stambler’s non-operatic publications includes Dante’s Other World--The Purgatorio as a Guide to the Divine Comedy (1957); Inferno (1962), which is a revision of Longfellow’s translation of La Divina Commedia, and some thirty articles, reviews and translations in publications such as Cross Currents, Hudson Review, Italica, and Books Abroad. His opera librettos include Vittorio

APPENDIX D

Arthur Miller’s Deleted Scene:

Act II, Scene 2
Proctor and Abigail Meet in the Woods
Scene: A wood. Night

Proctor enters with lantern, glowing behind him, then halts, holding lantern raised. Abigail appears with a wrap over her nightgown, her hair down. A moment of questioning silence.

Proctor, searching: I must speak with you, Abigail. She does not move, staring at him. Will you sit?

Abigail: How do you come?

Proctor: Friendly.

Abigail, glancing about: I don’t like the woods at night. Pray you, stand closer. He comes closer to her. I knew it must be you. When I heard the pebbles on the window, before I opened up my eyes I knew. Sits on log. I thought you would come a good time sooner.

Proctor: I had thought to come many times.

Abigail: Why didn’t you? I am so alone in the world now.

Proctor, as a fact, not bitterly: Are you! I’ve heard that people ride a hundred miles to see your face these days.

Abigail: Aye, my face. Can you see my face?

Proctor, holds the lantern to her face: Then you’re troubled?

Abigail: Have you come to mock me?

Proctor, sits lantern on ground. Sits next to: No, no, but I hear only that you go to the tavern every night, and play shovelboard with the Deputy Governor, and they give you cider.

Abigail: I have once or twice played the shovelboard. But I have no joy in it.

Proctor: This is a surprise, Abby. I thought to find you gayer than this. I’m told a troop of boys go step for step with you wherever you walk these days.

Abigail: Aye, they do. But I have only lewd looks from the boys.

Proctor: And you like that not?

Abigail: I cannot bear lewd looks no more, John. My spirit’s changed entirely. I ought to be given Godly looks when I suffer for them as I do.
Proctor: Oh? How do you suffer, Abby?

Abigail, pulls up dress: Why, look at my leg. I'm holes all over from their damned needles and pins. Touching her stomach: The jab your wife gave me's not healed yet, y'know.

Proctor, seeing her madness now: Oh, it isn't.

Abigail: I think sometimes she pricks it open again while I sleep.

Proctor: Ah?

Abigail: And George Jacobs—sliding up her sleeve—he comes again and again and raps me with his stick—the same spot every night all this week. Look at the lump I have.

Proctor: Abby—George Jacobs is in the jail all this month.

Abigail: Thank God he is, and bless the day he hangs and lets me sleep in peace again! Oh, John, the world's so full of hypocrites! Astonished, outraged: They pray in jail! I'm told they all pray in jail!

Proctor: They may not pray?

Abigail: And torture me in my bed while sacred words are comin' from their mouths? Oh, it will need God Himself to cleanse this town properly!

Proctor: Abby—you mean to cry out still others?

Abigail: If I live, if I am not murdered, I surely will, until the last hypocrite is dead.

Proctor: Then there is no good?

Abigail: Aye, there is one. You are good.

Proctor: Am I? How am I good?

Abigail: Why, you taught me goodness, therefore you are good. It were a fire you walked me through, and all my ignorance was burned away. It were a fire, John, we lay in fire. And from that night no woman dare call me wicked any more but I knew my answer. I used to weep for my sins when the wind lifted up my skirts; and blushed for shame because some old Rebecca called me loose. And then you burned my ignorance away. As bare as some December tree I saw them all—walking like saints to church, running to feed the sick, and hypocrites in their hearts! And God gave me strength to call them liars, and God made men to listen to me, and by God I will scrub the world clean.
for the love of Him! Oh, John, I will make you such a wife when the world is white again! *She kisses his hand.* You will be amazed to see me every day, a light of heaven in your house, a - *He rises, backs away, amazed.* Why are you cold?

**Proctor:** My wife goes to trial in the morning, Abigail.

**Abigail, distantly:** Your wife?

**Proctor:** Surely you knew of it?

**Abigail:** I do remember it now. How - how - Is she well?

**Proctor:** As well as she may be, thirty-six days in that place.

**Abigail:** You said you came friendly.

**Proctor:** She will not be condemned, Abby.

**Abigail:** You brought me from my bed to speak of her?

**Proctor:** I come to tell you, Abby, what I will do tomorrow in the court. I would not take you by surprise, but give you all good time to think on what to do to save yourself.

**Abigail:** Save myself?

**Proctor:** If you do not free my wife tomorrow, I am set and bound to ruin you, Abby.

**Abigail, her voice small - astonished:** How - ruin me?

**Proctor:** I have rocky proof in documents that you knew that poppet were none of my wife's; and that you yourself bade Mary Warren stab that needle into it.

**Abigail, a wildness stirs in her, a child is standing here who is unutterably frustrated, denied her wish, but she is still grasping for her wits:** I bade Mary Warren - ?

**Proctor:** You know what you do, you are not so mad!

**Abigail:** Oh, hypocrites! Have you won him, too! John, why do you let them send you?

**Proctor:** I warn you, Abby!

**Abigail:** They send you! They steal your honesty and -

**Proctor:** I have found my honesty!
Abigail: No, this is your wife’s pleading, your sniveling, envious wife! This is Rebecca’s voice, Martha Corey’s voice. You were no hypocrite!

Proctor: I will prove you for the fraud you are!

Abigail: And if they ask why Abigail would ever do so murderous a deed, what will you tell them?

Proctor: I will tell them why.

Abigail: What will you tell? You will confess to fornication? In the court?

Proctor: If you will have it so, so I will tell it! She utters a disbelieving laugh. I say I will! She laughs louder, now with more assurance he will never do it. He shakes her roughly. If you can still hear, hear this! Can you hear? She is trembling, staring up at him as though he were out of his mind. You will tell the court you are blind to spirits; you cannot see them anymore, and you will never cry witchery again, or I will make you famous for the whore you are!

Abigail, grabs him: Never in this world! I know you, John - you are at this moment singing hallelujahs that your wife will hang!

Proctor, throws her down: You mad, you murderous bitch!

Abigail: Oh, how hard it is when pretense falls! But it falls, it falls! She wraps herself up as though to go. You have done your duty by her. I hope it is your last hypocrisy. I pray you will come again with sweeter news for me. I know you will - now that your duty’s done. Good night, John. She is backing away, raising her hand in farewell. Fear naught. I will save you tomorrow. As she turns and goes: From yourself I will save you. She is gone. Proctor is left alone, amazed, in terror. He takes up his lantern and slowly exits.383

---

383 Miller, The Crucible, 139-143.
APPENDIX E

Ward’s and Stambler’s Version of Miller’s Deleted Scene:

Act III, Scene 1
Proctor and Abigail Meet in the Woods
Scene: Woods, misty moonlight. The edge of Reverend Paris' house is barely visible. Abigail and John enter, she with a cloak thrown over a nightdress. She is tender and Amorous. He is serious and under strain.

Abigail: John, John, I knew you'd come back to me. Night after night I been waitin' for you. She comes to be embraced. He extends his arms to hold her off, but she only nestles within them.

John: No, no, you could not--

Abigail: I cannot sleep for dreamin.' I cannot dream but I wake and walk about, thinkin' I'd find you comin' through some door. Oh, John, my love, come to me now as you came before, like some great stallion wildly pantin' for me. We are free now, free to love.

John: No, Abby, we are not free.

Abigail: John, surely you sport with me.

John: You know me better. We are not free, I say. Elizabeth lies in jail, accused by you. The village lies under a curse, your curse. That is why I am here, to tell you you must free them. You can, and you must.

Abigail: Free them? But I am freeing them—from their own corruption. I am possessed by the Spirit. I open them to God—these psalm-singin' hypocrites who say I danced for the Devil. Let them suffer for it now who must, but some day they will come to me and thank me on their knees.

John: Abby, Abby, what do you say? You become a monster of evil. You whelp of the Devil, how can you do these things? Are you lookin' to be whipped?

Abigail, she looks him full in the face and as she moves toward him drops her cloak from her shoulders: No, no, I look only for John Proctor that took me from my sleep and put knowledge in my heart. For him that awakened me and taught me to love. Oh, John, John, you too are possessed of the Spirit of God!

John: The Spirit of God?

Abigail: Leave Elizabeth, your sickly wife!

John: Speak nothin' of Elizabeth.

Abigail: Together let us do our holy work..

John: 'Holy work' you call it! It's fraud, pretense and fraud—and I shall expose it.
Abigail: Call it what you will... Do what you like. But if your sniveling Elizabeth dies—remember, remember, it is you who kill her. *Picks up her cloak, hastily slips it over her shoulders and haughtily exits*  

APPENDIX F

Original Cast Members: The Play; The Opera
The Play
(In Order of Appearance)

Reverend Parris -- Fred Stewart
Betty Parris -- Janet Alexander
Tituba -- Jacqueline Andre
Abigail Williams -- Madeleine Sherwood
Susanna Walcott -- Barbara Stanton
Ann Putnam -- Jane Hoffman
Thomas Putnam -- Raymond Bramley
Mercy Lewis -- Dorothy Joliffe
Mary Warren -- Jennie Egan
John Proctor -- Arthur Kennedy
Rebecca Nurse -- Jean Adair
Giles Corey -- Joseph Sweeney
Reverend John Hale -- E.G. Marshall
Elizabeth Proctor -- Beatrice Straight
Francis Nurse -- Graham Velsey
Ezekiel Cheever -- Don McHenry
Marshall Herrick -- George Mitchell
Judge Hathorne -- Philip Coolidge
Deputy Governor Danforth -- Walter Hampden
Sarah Good -- Adele Fortin
Hopkins -- Donald Marye

Miller, *The Crucible*, 137.
The Opera

John Proctor -- Chester Ludgin
Elizabeth Proctor -- Francis Bible
Reverend John Hale -- Norman Triegle
Abigail Williams -- Patricia Brooks
Mary Warren -- Joyce Clements
Reverend Parris -- Norman Kelley
Deputy Governor Danforth -- Ken Neate
Tituba -- Debra Brown
Betty Parris -- Joyce Ebert
Ann Putnam -- Mary Lesawyer
Rebecca Nurse -- Eunice Alberts
Francis Nurse -- Spiro Malas
Thomas Putnam -- Paul Ukena
Giles Corey -- Maurice Stern
Cheever -- Harry Theyard
Sarah Good -- Joan Kelm
Ruth Putnam -- Loma Ceniceros
Susanna Walcott -- Helen Guile
Martha Sheldon -- Elizabeth Schwering
Bridget Booth -- Beverly Evans.

---

386 Personal Interview. Ward stated that he always scored a baritone to sing the male leads in his operas because this vocal timbre gives a more “manly” quality to the roles.

387 The last two named characters are not in Miller’s original play.
APPENDIX G

The Salem Witchcraft Trials:
A Chronological Overview
(The material in this appendix is a conflation of information found in: *Understanding The Crucible; Martine, The Crucible; Marion L. Starkey, The Devil in Massachussets: A Modern Inquiry into the Salem Witch Trials;* and Peter Charles Hoffer, *The Salem Witchcraft Trials: A Legal History.*)

A Chronological Overview

1658  Puritan leader Oliver Cromwell dies; and the monarchy, publicly favoring the Anglican church, resigns the throne.

1660  Church membership begins to fall. The community feels the loss of the older generation.

1660-61  Appeals to halt Puritan persecution of Quakers, Baptists, and others received sympathetically by King Charles II, who blocks the Puritans’ persecution of Quakers.

1660-89  A series of shipwrecks results in substantial monetary loss.

1662  The charter that allowed Massachusetts Bay freedom to govern itself is revoked.

1675-76  Puritans find themselves attacked by the Native American chief, King Philip, and his French allies.

1676  Fire destroys the North Church and forty adjacent houses in Boston.

1677  The Puritans again perceive a threat from a new wave of Quakers in their borders. The Crown appoints a council to examine the laws of Massachusetts and issues objections to them.

1679  A fire in Boston’s business district destroys most of the businesses.

1679  Anglicanism is introduced into the Puritan colony.

1684  Increase Mather and other New England ministers and magistrates travel to England to argue unsuccessfully that their charter not be revoked. An outbreak of smallpox occurs in the New England colonies.

1685  With King James’ ascension, Puritans face an even greater loss of liberty with regard to their charter.

1687  Crops are destroyed by locusts, other insects, and a drought.

1688  An epidemic of measles causes many deaths.

1689  The tyrannical Royal Governor Edmund Andros is sent to the colonies. At his request, construction begins on an Anglican church building in Boston. Andros is kidnapped and jailed by the colonists, but William and Mary, the new king and queen, refuse to uphold the Puritans’ charges of wrongdoing.

1689  Samuel Parris arrives in Salem Village and is ordained as minister of the newly formed Salem Church. His ministry ignites dissent among various factions. A new wave of hostilities with the Native Americans breaks out. Colonists, especially those in Maine, fear an imminent invasion by the French from Canada. The colonists suffer a devastating epidemic of Smallpox.

1690  In an attack by Native Americans, the settlement of Schenectady is burned, and other outposts damaged. Several hundred settlers are killed and sixty taken prisoner.

243
1691 Despite hoped for restoration of the original charter, reinstituting self-government with a religious purpose, a new charter is issued specifying property ownership rather than church membership determines voting rights. The hated royal governors continue on. Cotton Mather publishes his alarming accounts of a witchcraft case in Boston.

1692:

Jan. Young girls in Parris’s household begin behaving in strange manner.  
Feb. Parris’s servants bake witch cakes to heal girls. Other girls become involved, and first charges of witchcraft are made. Aggressive interrogations begin.  
Mar. Three women are sent to prison and others charged. Afflictions prompt a day of prayer. Reverend Deodat Lawson and Parris deliver sermons that rouse the populace. Martha Corey, Rebecca Nurse, and Sarah Good’s four-year-old daughter are sent to prison.  
Apr. John and Elizabeth Procter, Giles Corey, and George Burroughs are among twenty-three more people jailed.  
May Governor William Phips appoints a judicial panel to hear cases; arrests mount.  
June 10 Bridget Bishop is hanged. A group of ministers in Boston convey their alarm to the Governor. Five more are sentenced to death.  
July 19 Rebecca Nurse, Sarah Good, Sarah Wildes, Elizabeth How, and Susanna Martin are hanged.  
Aug. 19 John Procter, George Burroughs, George Jacobs, John Willard and Martha Carrier are hanged.  
Sept. 19 Giles Corey is pressed to death.  
Sept. 22 Martha Corey, Mary Esty, Alice Parker, Ann Prudeator, Margaret Scott, Wilmot Reed, Samuel Warwell and Mary Parker are hanged.  
Oct. Lady Mary Phips, wife of the Royal Governor, is accused of witchcraft. Soon thereafter, Governor Phips forbids any more arrests and dissolves the witchcraft court.

1693:  
May Governor Phips orders the release of all accused witches upon payment of their fees.  
1696 Twelve of the jurors who participated in the witchcraft trials of 1692 issue a formal apology.  
1697:  
Jan. Fast Day is held in Massachusetts in penance for the witch trials. Judge Samuel Sewall apologizes.  
1706 Ann Putnam, the younger, apologizes.  
1711 Disgrace is officially removed from those accused, and compensation is ordered for both the accused and some of the accusers.

---

388 Refer to Chapter II, page 56, note 150 for the full text of the jurors’ apology.
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