SUNDAY IN THE PARK WITH GEORGE

Music and Lyrics by Stephen Sondheim
Book by James Lapine
Directed by Rob Ruggiero
At The Rep, we know that life moves fast—okay, really fast. But we also know that some things are worth slowing down for. We believe that live theatre is one of those pit stops worth making and are excited that you are going to stop by for a show. To help you get the most bang for your buck, we have put together **WU? @ THE REP**—an IM guide that will give you everything you need to know to get at the top of your theatergoing game—fast. You’ll find character descriptions *(A/S/L)*, a plot summary *(FYI)*, biographical information *(F2F)*, historical context *(B4U)*, and other bits and pieces *(HTH)*. Most importantly, we’ll have some ideas about what this all means *IRL*, anyway.

**WELCOME!**

The desire to learn, insatiable when awakened, can sometimes lie dormant until touched by the right teacher or the right experience. We at The Rep are grateful to have the opportunity to play a role supporting you as you awaken the desire for learning in your students.

Georges Seurat was known for using dots of pure colors to create other colors and shapes that only exist when blended by the viewer’s eye—in short, he “made a hat where there never was a hat.” In *Sunday in the Park with George* your students are invited into the mind of the artist, not only as he creates something new and different, but also as he deals with the impossible task of explaining his personal vision to those around him. As your students watch George try to reconcile his day-to-day life with his artistic ambition, they will see him face peer pressure, criticism and the unexpected failure of relationships. In the end, it is the simple messages that George leaves that helps those that come after and offers hope.

It would be a good idea to take a minute on the bus to give your students these quick theatre etiquette reminders:

- This show has an intermission; there will be time for bathroom breaks before the show and partway through.
- The actors can hear the audience and appreciate the laughter, gasps and quiet attention to action. However, talking, moving around and eating is very distracting to others and can dampen the energy of what is happening on stage.
- Pictures, phone calls and texting are not allowed at any time during the performance.

Live theatre won’t allow your students to take a passive role—they must work with us to create the experience which takes the learning deeper. Our unique ability to fuse words and images onstage allows your students to explore new ideas as well as excites their imaginations. We will do our part so your students will be stirred to understandings and self-awareness while delving into new and familiar worlds. You are doing your part by using The Rep to extend your intellectual and aesthetic curriculum. Thank you!

__Marsha Coplon__  
Director of Education
GEORGE is an eccentric, energetic and devoted artist. His painting is his life, and he works tirelessly around the clock at his art.

Unfortunately, DOT, George's longtime love, sometimes gets pushed aside as George pursues his work. She is a patient and loving woman that requires more attention than George is willing to give.

THE OLD LADY is a curmudgeonly type who doesn't go far without her NURSE (who struggles to attract attention of her own).

JULES and YVONNE are the prototypical perfect couple—he's a successful artist and she's his biggest fan. They're smart about art and they know it, and they don't believe George's work will ever amount to much.

A little rough around the edges, the BOATMAN doesn't mind telling you what's on his mind, so be careful not to offend him!

FRANZ and FRIEDA are both servants of Jules and Yvonne, and they both seem to have issues with fidelity.

A kind and caring man, LOUIS seems to be everything that Dot needed George to be...but which man is really everything DOT wants?

THE CELESTES and THE SOLDIERS are quite the pairs, at least for the brief moment that they seem to get along!

Like his great-grandfather of the same name, GEORGE is an artist most enraptured with color and light, but does anyone else appreciate what he's going for?

MARIE, the daughter of George and Dot, is proud to see that her grandson is an artist.

A slew of attendees at George's exhibit, including art critic BLAIR DANIELS, seem to eerily echo harsh critiques that his namesake received a hundred years ago.

Even DENNIS, a technician working for George, reminds the artist of his own insecurity—is he just doing the same thing over and over again?

READ MORE ABOUT IT

We encourage you to explore the following books, movies and websites for more information.

Clement, Russel and Houze, Annick. Neo-Impressionist Painters, Greenwood, 1999. Want to know more about Neo-Impressionism and the artists that made up the movement? Then look no further—this is the definitive resource!

Secret, Meryle. Stephen Sondheim: A Life, Vintage, 2011. This biography featuring interviews with Sondheim himself and his friends, family and collaborators is not to be missed!

Georges Seurat: Point Counterpoint, DVD, 75 minutes, 2000. Listen as modern artists Henry Moore and Bridget Riley discuss Seurat and his influence on the world of art.

http://www.georgesseurat.org/ Can't get enough of Seurat? Check out his complete works online and share him with all of your friends!

http://www sondheim.com/ Get the scoop on all of Sondheim's works, including production dates, casts, songs, awards and more all in one place.
SUNDAY IN THE PARK WITH GEORGE

begins in France in 1884 as artist George Seurat is sketching studies (or drawings done for practice or reference) for what would become a famous work of art...though at the time he seemed to have little to show for it!

SEURAT SKETCHES his mistress Dot (who models for him begrudgingly) with the park (and all its inhabitants) as a backdrop. An Old Lady complains to her Nurse about expositions and change in Paris, a coachman hits on the Nurse, and the successful artist Jules (and his wife, Yvonne) take a promenade through the park.

THE SCENE SHIFTS to an art gallery, where Jules and Yvonne heavily critique Seurat’s first painting. They have almost nothing complimentary to say about the piece, believing George’s work to have “no life.” The scene swiftly returns to the park, where the pair engages George and Dot only briefly before departing.

BACK AT THE STUDIO, George obsesses over his work (as usual) while Dot prepares for a night out. Though he promised her a date night, George reneges at the last minute to finish a hat in his painting. This, unfortunately, is that last straw for Dot.

ANOTHER SUNDAY on the island, George sketches the Boatman. Dot and her new beau, Louis, enter, causing a stir among the folks at the park. After the Boatman storms off over an incident with his dog, George sets to sketching a pair of dogs and imagines their “day off.” Jules and Yvonne happen to be on another promenade, and take the opportunity to critique both George’s work and his choice in subjects.

THE CHATTY GOSSIPs of the park, two girls both named Celeste, fight over a handsome pair of soldiers while Dot justifies her choice of Louis over George. When everyone is gone, George reveals he’s not as cold and uncaring as Dot makes him out to be—he misses her terribly and regrets losing her.

BACK AT THE STUDIO later, Dot shows up to confirm that she’s pregnant (with George’s baby) and announce that she’s leaving the country with Louis. Jules and Yvonne also show up to take a look at George’s latest piece, but they quickly leave after once again heavily critiquing his work.

THE NEXT TIME George returns to the park on Sunday, everything is in total disarray—Frieda, Franz’s wife (Frieda and Franz are both servants to Jules and Yvonne) is caught fooling around with Jules, while the two Celestes and their respective Soldiers all quarrel. Only Georges as master of the painting, is able to take control and restore harmony to the park. As the lights go down, he completes the painting—Sunday Afternoon on the Island of La Grande Jatte.

THE SECOND ACT of Sunday in the Park begins in the painting, where the subjects all complain about being stuck in the painting forever. The action then fast-forwards to 1984, where George’s (and Dot’s) great-grandson (also named George) unveils his own work of art in honor of his great-grandfather (a color and light machine called Chromolume #7). Like his great-grandfather, George struggles to be appreciated with his work, though his grandmother (Dot and George’s daughter, Marie) thinks he’s brilliant just like his famous ancestor.

WEEKS LATER, Marie has passed away and George is in France to present the Chromolume in the park of the original painting. He is riddled with doubt and concerns over his future as an artist until he takes a look at a book he got from his grandmother—Dot’s old grammar book. Will words of wisdom passed down from George and Dot be enough to inspire the struggling artist?
STEPHEN SONDHEIM is arguably the most celebrated American theatre composer and lyricist of his generation (if not of any generation!), with a slew of awards to back him up—eight Tony Awards (more than any other composer), multiple Grammy Awards, a Pulitzer Prize, an Academy Award and a Laurence Olivier Award. His many musical theatre hits include *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum*, *Company*, *Follies*, *A Little Night Music*, *Sweeney Todd*, and of course, *Sunday in the Park with George*.

SONDHEIM GREW UP in a well-to-do but dysfunctional home, often finding himself terribly isolated and longing for a little human contact. Though his mother and father did little to provide love and attention, boyhood friend Jamie Hammerstein’s father Oscar Hammerstein (of the famed Rogers and Hammerstein, the Broadway musical writing duo during the 1940s and 50s, often considered the golden age of Broadway musicals) was more than happy to serve as a surrogate parent and mentor for the young Sondheim.

SONDHEIM WROTE his first musical while in school at George School, entitled *By George!* which was based on daily life at the school. Friends and teachers raved about the piece, so Sondheim shared it with Hammerstein. Hammerstein didn’t hold back, telling Sondheim that it was the worst thing he’d ever seen, though as consolation he also offered, “But if you want to know why it’s terrible, I’ll tell you.” Sondheim eagerly accepted, and that afternoon he “learned more about musical theatre than most people learn in a lifetime” (as he put it).

FOR NINE YEARS after finishing school, Sondheim found himself living in his father’s dining room while trying to scrape together work writing music for films and television shows (he even tried out for television game shows!). But in 1957 Sondheim’s luck would change when he penned the lyrics for Leonard Bernstein’s *West Side Story*, a hit that ended up running for 732 performances. He’d also write the lyrics for *Gypsy* before finally putting both his own lyrics and music on stage in 1964 with *A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum*.

FROM 1970-1981, Sondheim teamed up with Harold Prince (a now famed producer and director who would end up winning 21 Tony Awards over the course of his career, more than any other individual!) on a series of varied and adventurous new musicals including *Company*, *A Little Night Music* and *Sweeney Todd*. These pieces were often intriguing both in theme (for example, *Sweeney Todd* is about a murderous revenge and cannibalism) and composition (the scores and vocal parts for *A Little Night Music* and *Sweeney Todd* are so elaborate that musicals are often performed as operas in opera houses).

AFTER THE FAILURE of the musical *Merrily We Roll Along*, Sondheim was ready to call it quits. But before he could throw in the towel, he found a new collaborator (Prince and Sondheim essentially parted ways with *Merrily We Roll Along*) in James Lapine. Lapine brought a more avant-garde (or experimental) sensibility to the table, with a focus on visually oriented theatre. The result was the Pulitzer Prize-winning *Sunday in the Park with George*.

THOUGH HE’S slowed down in his later age (he hasn’t a major work since 2008’s *Road Show*), Sondheim’s work hasn’t. His work is constantly being done around the globe, from college campuses to Broadway. He’s also written a couple of books over the last couple years (*Finishing the Hat: Collected Lyrics (1954–1981) with Attendant Comments, Principles, Heresies, Grudges, Whines and Anecdotes* and *Look, I Made a Hat: Collected Lyrics (1981–2011) with Attendant Comments, Amplifications, Dogmas, Harangues, Digressions, Anecdotes and Miscellany*) which feature collections of his work and his own personal annotations.
ARE THESE WORDS those of an artist talking about his work or a scientist attempting to technically explain the art of painting? While officially the answer is the former—an artist talking about his work (Georges Seurat, in fact)—the latter isn’t entirely incorrect. Georges Seurat is known as an artist who melded both emotion and science in an attempt to create masterpieces of art.

SEURAT WAS BORN at an explosive time in history—the mid-19th century. Before 1833, science as we know it didn’t exist (that’s right—there was no such thing as a scientist or scientific discovery). Natural phenomena and the universe we live in had always been explained by mysticism, legend or through the actions of deities. With the advent of science as a profession in the 19th century, the world took a new form—it became something that we could analyze, explain and understand in a whole new way.

SCIENCE FLOURISHED FAST—establishing groundbreaking ideas of all shapes, sizes and colors. While advances in medicine (thanks in part to Louis Pasteur’s notions on vaccination), biology (Charles Darwin with his groundbreaking and controversial idea of evolution), and technology (the many elements of the Industrial Revolution) were shedding new light upon the world, science was also exploring how our eyes actually perceive the world by examining color, forming a basis for Seurat’s scientific application of color.

WHILE THE TRUE science behind the movement owes its roots to Hermann von Helmholtz (a German physician and physicist) and Sir Isaac Newton (the famous English physicist, mathematician, astronomer, natural philosopher, alchemist and theologian), the four major influences on Seurat where Michel Eugène Chevreul, Charles Blanc, Ogden Rood and David Sutter. Each of these men translated the more inaccessible work of Helmholtz and Newton into a form easily understood by laymen, while adding their own interpretations on what color was.

CHEVREUL, A FRENCH CHEMIST, first put forth a fundamental aspect of Seurat’s work—the notion that two colors juxtaposed would be perceived by the eye as another color altogether when seen from a distance. That is—two different colored dots placed right next to each other (say a red dot and a blue dot) from the right distance appears as the combined color (in our example of a red dot and a blue dot, the eye would perceive a purple dot). Chevreul also noted that color echoes or halos the complimentary color due to retinal persistence. That is, stare intently at a red object long enough and then look away—for a brief moment or two you’ll see a cyan echo or halo of the original object.

WHILE MANY ARTISTS may not have actually even read Chevreul (he was still a bit technical for many laymen), they were exposed to his ideas through Blanc, an art critic of the mid-late 19th century. Blanc’s writings echoed Chevreul’s notions, while also stressing the emotional significance of color. Blanc spoke directly to artists, encouraging them to pick their colors as a matter of mirroring reality, not merely a matter of taste. Color should be appropriately nuanced and varied in intensity and hue (as
it is in real life), not simply slapped upon a canvas with severe intensity like a billboard screaming, “LOOK AT ME!”

ROOD, WHO ALSO studied color and optical effects, took a slightly different path than Chevreul and Blanc (who studied Newton and the mixing of light), though he arrived at the same conclusion. Rood worked from the discoveries of Helmholtz, analyzing the effects of mixing material pigments (like mixing paint on a canvas). He issued important recommendations to artists about the proper juxtaposition of color, as the mixing material pigments and optical pigments (light) weren’t exactly the same.

SUTTER’S INFLUENCE, though decidedly less technical from a scientific standpoint, ties all of the influences together into a unifying premise. He states it simply but elegantly in his Phenomena of Vision—

“... the laws of harmony can be learned as one learns the laws of harmony and music.” That is—the color composition of a painting can be thought of as a musical composition, which can achieve harmony and emotional influence in the proper arrangement (which Seurat felt could be achieved by considering the science on color).

WITH THAT IN MIND, Seurat devised a whole new language with his scientific application of color using lines, color intensity and color schema. He called this language Chromoluminarism, also known as Divisionism. Divisionism became the foundation and hallmark of Neo-Impressionist painting, an artistic movement founded by Georges Seurat and his masterpiece Sunday Afternoon on the Island of La Grande Jatte.

Set model by Scenic Designer Adrian W. Jones
THE 19TH CENTURY

The 19th Century certainly added a lot of color to the world, with science as the driving force of investigation and innovation. Here are just a few of the advances that still effect our daily lives today.

INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION!

While the Industrial Revolution started rolling prior to the 19th Century, its effects wouldn’t begin to be fully felt until around the 1850s. As factories began to spring up everywhere, the landscape of life in general changed radically as technology served to shift the way individuals worked, played and interacted.

Though many technological advances would spring from the Industrial Revolution, perhaps most prominent among the troves included textiles, steam power and iron founding. Textiles led to more efficient production of cotton, yarn, flax and linen through the usage of spinning mills. Steam powered engines benefited various industries, from mining to agriculture. Meanwhile, iron founding allowed for a more efficient production of iron by use of coke rather than charcoal throughout the process of production. While we may take these innovations for granted today, these key advances allowed for industry to streamline its process and not be as dependent on certain variables in the environment (i.e.—before steam power, water power relied on being near a consistent water source).

Amid all the new technology, advances in the process of producing goods allowed for greater efficiency. The notion of an assembly line as we know it today comes right out of the Industrial Revolution. For the first time workers would be trained in a specific, single skill, performing only this step in the manufacturing process before passing the product along to another worker to perform another single, specific job, and so on.

There was rise in the middle class by virtue of an innovative efficiency that made the production of goods more profitable (and the opportunity the new factories provided by way of increased job opportunities), thereby redistributing the wealth more evenly among the social strata. Cities became more prominent during the Industrial Revolution, as hordes of workers flocked to factories in pursuit of the chance to move up in the world. Trade unions also formed in this era, and continue even today to protect the interests of workers.

GERM THEORY?

Prior to the advent of true science in 1833, illness and disease were highly misunderstood throughout history. Various theories have attempted to explain sickness—from displeasing the gods (and thus one is stricken) to spontaneous generation (sickness simply and suddenly springs up out of nowhere). Though it had
been steadily evolving since 1025 through a series of scientists, germ theory (that is, the notion that germs cause many diseases) wasn’t widely accepted until tested by German physician Robert Koch in the late 19th century (in which he determined the bacterium that caused anthrax—Bacillus anthracis). Koch and French chemist and microbiologist Louis Pasteur (more on him in a minute) are often credited as the fathers of germ theory and bacteriology.

SHOOTING UP ...
While Koch was busy proving germ theory to be true, Louis Pasteur was boldly innovating the way vaccines are made. Various forms of vaccinations for diseases like smallpox date back as far as 1718 and are all based on the notion of inoculating an individual with a weakened form of a disease in order to give the individual immunity to the disease. Before Pasteur, this weakened form the disease had to exist naturally, limiting the scope of vaccines available. In creating a vaccine for anthrax, however, Pasteur weakened Bacillus anthracis artificially (by exposing it to potassium dichromate in the laboratory), thus revolutionizing work with infectious diseases from that moment forward.

Oh—and have you ever heard the term “pasteurized?” Chances are you have, especially if you drink milk. Pasteurization is the process by which food or drink like milk is heated to a specific temperature for a definite length of time and then cooled immediately. This process helps to extend the shelf life of the item and make it less likely to cause disease (pasteurization of milk, for example, kills 99.999% of microorganisms that could cause disease). As you might have guessed, this process is named after its creator—Pasteur!

NATURAL SELECTION
As influential as he is controversial, Charles Darwin was an English naturalist who first proposed the theory of evolution. Darwin believed that all life on Earth shared a common ancestry, and that each species evolved through a specialized process he called natural selection.

In a nutshell, natural selection is the notion that organisms better adapted to their environment tend to survive and produce more offspring, thereby overtaking organisms not well adapted to their environment. This theory is also sometimes called survival of the fittest.

Darwin’s ideas are often polarizing, as they are frequently considered atheistic and anti-religious. Perhaps his most incendiary idea was his notion that humans are merely animals further along on the evolutionary scale, and that we continue to evolve even today (he cited evolution of culture, differences between the sexes, and physical and cultural racial characteristics).

Some, however, perceive Darwin’s ideas as support for the existence of God and divine creation. They argue that what Darwin stumbled upon is the revelation of an intricate, divinely driven system from which all life springs.
WHILE SEURAT SEEMS to fit the stereotypical mold of the tortured artist, his deeply scientific approach to painting seems surprisingly inartistic. It embodies a sort of cold intellectual calculation that we don’t often immediately associate with the more often perceived touchy-feely, divinely inspired nature of creation.

BUT DOES THIS MEAN that artists can’t be intellectual or scientific about their methods? Would a scientist be considered ignorant if he or she were to allow aspects of creativity to creep into the laboratory? More importantly, do our perceptions indicate that one is inherently smarter than the other—the artist or the scientist? Surely one excels where the other cannot (and vice versa), so how can we fairly and accurately gauge?

ENTER THE CUTTING EDGE of science—the theory of multiple intelligences. Howard Gardner proposed this theory in 1983, which shifts the perception of intelligence as one all encompassing figure to a consideration of an individual’s abilities in various specific modalities (a particular mode of existence or expression).

WHAT DOES THAT MEAN? Let’s say you pick up math really easily, but your best friend doesn’t. That doesn’t necessarily mean that your best friend is unintelligent, though it might mean that you’re better at math (but he or she might be better in English!). Multiple intelligence theory takes several factors into consideration when attempting to assess intelligence:

1. What’s the best way to learn for the individual (for example—do you learn best watching or doing)?
2. What specific field(s) does the individual excel in?
3. What is the actual process that the individual is using to respond? Is there a fundamental understanding or difference of understanding?

GARDNER PROPOSES that IQ tests and other standardized testing simply gauge knowledge acquired up to a given moment, not truly depicting an individual’s potential or capacity to learn. He believes that by broadening the definition of intelligence beyond what is currently tested for (he proposes that there are nine fundamental intelligences, listed below), we can get a better sense of an individual’s strengths.

1. **Logical-mathematical**—This is the one we all know and love (or hate), involving logic, abstraction, reasoning and numbers. If you have this kind of intelligence, chances are you’re good at math and science.

2. **Spatial**—Spatial intelligence deals with the individual’s ability to effectively visualize and manipulate objects in the mind’s eye. With this kind of intelligence, you can probably solve puzzles easier than the next guy, and you’re best suited to be an architect, visual artist or designer.

3. **Linguistic**—This kind of intelligence deals with words, whether written or spoken. Reading, writing, picking up languages and telling stories are the strong suits of this kind of intelligence.

4. **Body-kinesthetic**—Good body control and the ability to handle objects skillfully are the hallmarks of body-kinesthetic intelligence. Naturally, this sort of intelligence is well applied on the playing field, but dancers, musicians, actors and even doctors (especially surgeons) all utilize this form of intelligence extensively.
5. **Musical**—As the name implies, musical intelligence involves sensitivity to sounds, rhythms, tones and music. If you’re musically smart, you’re probably playing an instrument, singing or writing music.

6. **Interpersonal**—If you’re good at interacting with others, you might just be interpersonally intelligent. This type of intelligence relies heavily upon the sensitivity to others’ temperaments and motivations and an ability to work well as part of a group. Politicians, managers and teachers all typically exhibit a great degree of interpersonal intelligence.

7. **Intrapersonal**—Do you deeply know yourself? Can you truly recognize your strengths, weaknesses and what makes you unique? These are the things that intrapersonal intelligence is all about, which makes for great authors, psychologists, philosophers and clergy.

8. **Naturalistic**—This type of intelligence involves an individual’s capacity to nurture and relate information to one’s natural surroundings. Farmers and gardeners utilize this type of intelligence regularly in the work that they do.

9. **Existential**—While not officially a type that Gardner wishes to recognize, it seems there might be some merit to considering an intelligence that thrives in considering phenomena or questions beyond sensory data, including notions like morality. This sort of intelligence is well suited for physicists, philosophers and mathematicians.

WHEW—that’s a whole lot of intelligence!

- Do you recognize any of these areas as things you might be strong in?
- Can you excel in multiple areas?
- Or do you think that Gardner’s got it all wrong—there’s only one kind of intelligence and either you’ve got it or you don’t?
LA COUPOLE—Literally translated to English, *La Coupole* means “The Dome,” which accurately describes a large domed bunker. Originally built during the Second World War by Germany as a launch base for rockets against London and southern England, it was captured by Allied Forces before construction was even completed. Today, La Coupole serves as World War II museum featuring the specialized V-2 rockets meant to be launched from the site.

EXPOSITION—a large public exhibit of art or trade goods

BUSTLE—a pad or frame worn under a skirt, puffing it out behind

PETTICOAT—a woman’s light, loose undergarment hanging from shoulders or the waist, worn under a skirt or dress

PARASOL—a light umbrella used to give shade from the sun

PASTORAL—portraying or evoking country life, typically in a romanticized or idealized form

SATIRICAL—sarcastic, critical and mocking of another’s perceived weaknesses

PROMENADING—leisurely walking, or sometimes riding or driving, typically in a public place so as to meet or be seen by others

SIMPERING—smiling or gesturing in a coquettish, coy manner intended to gain approval or favor

SCOW—a flat-bottomed boat with sloping ends used in dredging and other harbor services

STERN—the rearmost part of a ship or boat

PROW—the portion of a ship’s bow (the front end of a ship) above water

BALLAST—heavy material, such as gravel, sand, iron or lead, placed low in a vessel to improve its stability

THISTLE—a widely distributed herbaceous plant of the daisy family, which typically has a prickly stem and leaves and rounded heads of purple flowers

SHALLOT—a small bulb that resembles an onion and is used for pickling or as a substitute for onion

PLACID—not easily upset or excited

TOUTED—attempt to sell or persuade people of the merits of something

SEINE—a river in northern France rising north of Dijon and flowing northwest for 473 miles through the cities of Troyes and Paris to the English Channel near Le Havre

ROUGE—a red powder or cream used as a cosmetic for coloring cheeks or lips

NOUVEAU—modern; up to date

PASSE—no longer fashionable; out of date

ADHERENT—someone who supports a particular party, person or set of ideas

NUANCE—a subtle difference in or shade of meaning expression or sound

RESONANCE—the ability to evoke or suggest images, memories and emotions