Recovering Elizabethan Staging: A Reconsideration of the Evidence

Alan C. Dessen

["Recovering Elizabethan Theatrical Vocabulary: A Reconsideration of the Evidence," in *Textual and Theatrical Shakespeare: Questions of Evidence*, ed. Edward Pechter (U. of Iowa Press, 1996), 44-65]

The discovery in 1992 of a hitherto unexamined Jacobean printed quarto with playhouse annotations yielded a rare phenomenon for theatre historians of the period--some new evidence. Throughout this century scholars have pored over and argued about a few noteworthy documents (the Swan drawing, several other drawings or illustrations, Henslowe's papers, the Fortune contract, some surviving theatrical "plots," a few eye-witness accounts of performances) in an attempt to recover or reconstitute the staging practices of English Renaissance drama.[1] Such studies have greatly enhanced our knowledge about theatre buildings, theatrical personnel, and the theatre business, but a host of uncertainties persist about what actually happened upon the stages within the Globe and other contemporary playhouses.

The "new" information to be gleaned from the annotations in the Folger Shakespeare Library copy of *The Two Merry Milkmaids*[2] does not resolve such problems and indeed contributes several new puzzles--as with the curious insertion "*Knock Act*." Moreover, only those readers familiar with the evidence in the manuscripts already available with playhouse annotations will fully appreciate what this document can and cannot tell us. Nonetheless, the appearance of something "new" in an area where so much of the terrain has been repeatedly mapped and mined provides an occasion for some ruminations about what today's historian or historicist wrestling with the extant evidence can establish about what the original playgoers actually saw when they watched a given scene. The sporadic and sometimes puzzling annotations found in this quarto will elicit no "Ahas!" or "Eurekas!" from the reader (in Watergate parlance, the two annotators provide no smoking gun), but some insights do emerge from what is *not* specified and what those silences reveal about both English Renaissance playhouse practice and today's scholarly procedures and assumptions. At stake

here are issues familiar to post-modernists (e.g., cultural difference, indeterminacy, essentialism), but issues that are manifested in a comparable yet different arena where ideological battle lines are less clearly defined.

I

Let me start with what would appear to be a straightforward, self-evident, commonsensical proposition: that a playwright fashioning a scene might be vague or sloppy (or "permissive" in editorial parlance) about various details, but a bookkeeper preparing the same playscript for a performance would have to be much more specific about personnel and properties so as to "disambiguate" what had been left "open" in an author's manuscript. Exceptions to this "rule" have been known for some time--at least since W. W. Greg's pioneering work on playhouse documents in 1931. Nonetheless, the self-evident nature of this proposition has been irresistible, so that, despite strong objections from scholars such as William B. Long, editors still use seemingly "permissive" stage directions as evidence in their quest to distinguish between texts that are authorial and those that reflect playhouse use.

The sixteen extant manuscripts with theatrical annotations and the Folger quarto of *The Two Merry Milkmaids* provide ample evidence for such adjustments, for the bookkeepers often (but not always) clarify elements left muddy by the dramatist. In the margins of such documents are to be found (1) anticipatory warnings that a property or actor is be "*ready*"; (2) detailing of personnel when the original stage direction is vague as to number or identity; (3) the names of specific actors (a sporadic occurrence); and (4) the spelling out of properties not mentioned by the dramatist or sometimes the listing in the margin of a property that *is* cited in the playscript to ensure that it catches the eye of the bookkeeper during a performance.[3] The playhouse manuscript of Massinger's *Believe as You List* provides: "*Table ready: & 6 chaires to sett out*" (654-6); "*the great booke: of Accompte ready*" (982-4); "*Gascoine: & Hubert below: ready to open the Trap doore for Mr Taylor*" (1825-31);

"*Antiochus--ready: under the stage*" (1877-9); "*Harry: Willson: & Boy ready for the song at the Arras*" (1968-71). Occasionally such practical in-the-theatre signals survive in printed texts: "two *Torches ready*" (Fletcher, *Love's Cure*, VII, 205); "*Whil'st the Act plays, the Footstep, little Table, and Arras hung up for the Musicians*" (Massinger, *The City Madam*, 4.4.160.s.d).

In this context, consider one of the major scenes in the center of *The Two Merry Milkmaids*, the trial of the virtuous Dorigen, where Bookkeeper B provides some anticipatory warnings (**Ready** / **Sennet** / [**florish** deleted] / **table** / **Duke** / **Barr**--I2v) and then at the outset of the scene adds some specifics not found in the printed text. Thus, with two figures already onstage, the Quarto directs: "*Enter the Duke, Judges,* Raymond, *with others, the forme of a Court*" (I3r); Bookkeeper B adds in the margin: "**A Table** / **A Barr** / **A Sennet**." After a Judge says: "Bring forth the prisoner, place her at the Barre," another Quarto stage direction reads: "*Enter* Dorigen *plac'd at the Barre*"; Bookkeeper A adds: "**Enter Du[chess] & Guard**." At the lower left margin of I2v, moreover, Bookkeeper A had inserted "**boyes**" [i.e., *hoboys*] and below that "**Judges** / **Ranoff** / [s?] **Carolus** / **and Raymond**."

In making these adjustments to the printed quarto the two annotators *have* clarified some matters, as a reader today would expect from theatrical professionals preparing a text for the playhouse, but they have also left open or vague some details that, at least to that same reader today, would seem significant in a document designed to serve as the basis for a performance. First, the annotators *do* spell out several items not available in the printed Quarto: from Bookkeeper B a sound effect (a sennet at the entrance of royalty) and a table (presumably for the judges and perhaps the duke himself); from Bookkeeper A a sound effect (hoboys) and a guard (implicit in the Quarto's signal that Dorigen be placed at the bar). In addition, Bookkeeper A's other annotation, which, along with Judges and Raymond, cites Ranoff, Carolus, and perhaps a third figure (Cornelius?), clarifies the Quarto's signal that the duke, judges, and Raymond enter "*with others*."

Nonetheless, the resulting document is not the orderly, meticulous "promptbook" that

generations of editors have assumed to be typical of Jacobean playhouse manuscripts. For

example, the annotator does not spell out the number of judges (subsequent dialogue has two

judges speak), any distinctive costumes, the presence and number of chairs, or the

configuration of the court (e.g., where or how the table and chairs are to be placed). Also not

specified is the means by which the stage furniture is to be introduced onto the stage: is the

table to be thrust out, as with beds in some extant stage directions, or discovered by the

parting of a curtain, so that the judges are seated in place at the outset of the scene, or carried

out and set up upon the stage? Here then, for a major ensemble scene that requires at least

two significant pieces of furniture, is evidence for some differences between authorial and

playhouse presentation of the same moment, with the latter approach, as would be expected,

more attentive to personnel, sound effects, and properties. Nonetheless, a coded term ("*the

forme of a Court*") is left open, at least from our point of view, to the extent that, despite the

annotations, today's reader cannot clearly visualize the original staging of this scene.

In terms of reading such Jacobean evidence today what is of particular interest is a

playhouse annotator's approach to such signals as the Quarto's "*with others, the forme of a

Court*." A reference to "*others*," with or without further explanation, is more helpful than it

initially sounds, because four courtiers (Fernando, Cornelius, Ranoff, and Carolus) are a

continuing part of the narrative in this romance (and at times the object of satire) and hence

likely to be included in this public scene. In contrast, "*the forme of a Court*," even

accompanied by the subsequent call for a bar in the Quarto and a table by an annotator,

seems less than fully informative to our eyes and ears. The author of the printed stage

direction left a great deal to the expertise of the players; the playhouse annotators have

inserted marginal signals to ensure the availability of large properties or sound effects; but

those annotators have not felt it necessary to expand or improve upon "*the forme of a Court*."

And thereby hangs my tale.

II

This specific locution ("*the forme of a Court*") is, to my knowledge, unique; nonetheless, it corresponds to signals found in comparable trial scenes, some of them in manuscripts with playhouse annotations. To start with two such manuscripts, for the trial of the title figure in Fletcher and Massinger's *Sir John Van Olden Barnavelt*, the order "Let him be sent for presently" is accompanied by a scribal stage direction: "*A Bar brought in*"; the bookkeeper inserts "**Barre**" and "**Table**" (2159-60). Much more elaborately, a trial scene early in *Sir Thomas More* begins with the authorial stage direction: "*An arras is drawn, and behind it (as in sessions) sit the Lord* Mayor, *Justice* Suresby, *and other* Justices, *Sheriff* More *and the other* Sheriff *sitting by*; Smart *is the plaintiff,* Lifter *the prisoner at the bar*" (1.2.0.s.d.). This scene is the only one I have found in which a curtain is drawn to reveal a court configuration already in place, although such a procedure is possible elsewhere.[4]

Details in courtroom or trial scenes found in printed quartos range from the minimal (no more than *Enter*...) to the highly elaborate. The minimal approach is easily documented, as in: "*Enter the Duke, the Magnificoes, Anthonio, Bassanio, and Gratiano*" (*The Merchant of Venice*, Quarto, G3r).[5] Sometimes a text provides a coded term comparable to "*the forme of a Court*" or *More*'s "*as in sessions*," as in *The Winter's Tale* where at the outset of 3.2 the Folio directs: "*Enter Leontes, Lords, Officers: Hermione (as to her Triall) Ladies: Cleomines, Dion*" (TLN 1174-5). Next to a general *Enter*..., the most common procedure, as in both *Barnavelt* and *More*, is to specify a bar as the key property, so that twice in *The City Night-cap* Davenport directs "*A Bar set out*" (2.3.0.s.d, 3.2.0.s.d.).[6]

Some dramatists, however, call for more than a bar and a table and occasionally spell out considerably more than is to be found in the annotated version of *The Two Merry Milkmaids* or *Barnavelt*. For example, in a climactic scene in a 1590s murder tragedy the emphasis is not upon the bar or even the prisoner but upon the seating of the judges: "*Enter some to prepare the judgement seat to the Lord Maior, Lo. Justice, and the foure Lords, and one Clearke, and a Shiriff, who being set, commaund Browne to be brought forth*" (*A*

Warning for Fair Women, H3v). That same emphasis upon seating can be seen in Webster's *The Devil's Law-Case*, Sharpham's *The Fleer*, and *Chabot Admiral of France*.**7** In the latter, Chapman provides plentiful information for his two trial scenes: "*Enter Officers before the Chancellor, Judges, the Proctor generall, whispering with the Chancellor; they take their places*. To them *Enter Treasurer and Secretary who take their places prepared on one side of the Court*. To them *The Captaine of the Guard, the Admirall following, who is plac'd at the barre*" (3.2.0.s.d.); "*Enter Officers before, Treasurer, Secretary, and Judges, attended by Petitioners, the Advocate also with many papers in his hand; they take their places. The Chancellor with a guard, and plac'd at the Barre*" (5.2.0.s.d.).

Also informative are three scenes that involve a trial-like confrontation but not an actual courtroom. In Heywood's *1 The Iron Age* the contest between Ulysses and Ajax for the armor of Achilles begins with Thersites and soldiers "*bringing in a table, with chayres and stooles plac'd above it*"; then the armor is "*plac'd upon the table, the* Princes *seate themselues, a chayre is plac'd at either end of the Stage, the one for* Ajax, *the other for* Ulysses" (III, 334-5). In Jonson's *The New Inn* to begin a Court of Love: "*Prudence* usher'd by the *Host*, takes her seat of Judicature, *Nurse, Franke*. the two Lords *Beaufort*, and *Latimer*, assist of the Bench: The *Lady* and *Lovel* are brought in, and sit on the two sides of the stage, confronting each the other" (3.2.0.s.d.). The most elaborate special case is the trial of Queen Katherine in *Henry VIII* where an unusually long stage direction drawn from details in Holinshed concludes: "*The King takes place under the Cloth of State. The two Cardinalls sit under him as Judges. The Queene takes place some distance from the King. The Bishops place themselves on each side the Court in manner of a Consistory: Below them the Scribes. The Lords sit next the Bishops. The rest of the Attendants stand in convenient order about the Stage*" (TLN 1343-9, 2.4.0 s.d.).

What is to be learned from such a survey of comparable scenes? The unannotated Quarto of *The Two Merry Milkmaids* is more informative about the staging of its trial scene than most printed texts; moreover, to use a theatrical shorthand that leaves the

implementation of "*the forme of a Court*" to the players is not unusual. The playhouse

annotators (as in *Barnavelt*) then add some details (a sound effect, a second piece of stage

furniture) and some clarification (specific figures to flesh out the Quarto's "*with others*") but

not as much as today's reader might expect. Indeed, the stage directions for comparable

scenes in some printed texts are more detailed than two of the three relevant playhouse

documents and therefore conjure up a more vivid picture of the original staging for today's

reader, especially about seating arrangements or the larger stage configuration. In preparing

the printed Quarto for playhouse use, however, the annotators of *The Two Merry Milkmaids*

did not have today's reader in mind.

To borrow from a late Elizabethan theatre critic, ay, there's the rub. Certainly, the

staging of court and trial scenes may have varied somewhat from theatre to theatre or even in

the same theatre over a span of years, but the basic configuration probably remained roughly

the same: a bar; a table; some distinctive seats and placement for the judges; and something

important that is implicit but not spelled out in the many signals: distinctive costumes for

judges, sheriffs, advocates, and other court personnel. Indeed, along with the bar such

costumes would probably have been the most significant part of the "code" to signify "a

courtroom."[8] An experienced dramatist, however, especially a Shakespeare, a Fletcher, or a

Heywood attached to a theatrical company, could assume a theatrical vocabulary shared by

both players who knew their craft and playgoers familiar with such scenes; such a playwright

could therefore provide few or no details or could fall back upon some formula ("*the forme of

a Court*," "*as in sessions*," "*as to her Triall*," "*in manner of a Consistory*").

III

This gap between a dramatist's working assumptions and today's reader has not gone

unnoticed. A particularly lucid formulation from an editor's point of view is provided by

Gary Taylor. The original manuscripts (or *scripts*) of Shakespeare's plays, as Taylor notes,

"were not written for that consortium of readers called 'the general public'" but "were written instead to be read by a particular group of actors, his professional colleagues and personal friends, who would in turn communicate the plays through performance to a wider public." Shakespeare could therefore "rely on this first special readership to 'edit' his manuscript, at least mentally and perhaps physically, as they read it"; and, more important to the theatre historian, "he could also rely on those readers to bring to the reading much specialist knowledge about the conditions and working practices of the contemporary theatre, and the circumstances of the specific company to which they and he belonged."

Shakespeare's ability to rely upon his colleagues, in turn, has significant implications for any attempt at "recovery" today by an editor or theatre historian, for, as Taylor goes on to observe: "The written text of any such manuscript thus depended upon an unwritten para-text which always accompanied it: an invisible life-support system of stage directions, which Shakespeare could either expect his first readers to supply, or which those first readers would expect Shakespeare himself to supply orally." The problem for the editor and especially the theatre historian, then, is that "the earliest editions of the plays all fail, more or less grossly, to supply this unwritten text." Subsequent editors, including Taylor and Stanley Wells in their Oxford edition, have sought "to rectify the deficiency, by conjecturally writing for him the stage directions which Shakespeare himself assumed or spoke but never wrote," but, as Taylor admits, "to fill such lacunae is necessarily hazardous: necessary, if we are to relish the texts as scripts for theatrical performance, but hazardous, because the filling which modern editors concoct might not always be to Shakespeare's taste" (pp. 2-3).

For both the editor and the historian significant problems are therefore generated by the nature of the evidence. In later periods of drama other sources of useful information are available, but for English Renaissance drama eye-witness accounts of performances are few and frustratingly limited,[9] and other documents (e.g., the Swan drawing, Henslowe's inventory, the Peacham drawing of a scene from *Titus Andronicus*) are notoriously difficult to interpret. To recover what would have been obvious to the original playgoers then

requires the teasing out of possible stage effects or shared meanings from often cryptic stage directions, the only substantive evidence available, when, in fact, the norm for most scenes in printed texts is silence or simply *Enter*.... As seen above in my invocation of a group of courtroom scenes, to seek to recover the original staging or stagings is to build mosaics from widely disparate fragments, any one of which may be quirky or unrepresentative owing to authorial idiosyncrasy (as perhaps with Chapman), changes in procedure over a span of time, or varying practice in different playhouses.

As an illustration of the problems and frustrations consider the second appearance of the ghost in the Second Quarto of *Hamlet*, where Horatio says "I'll cross it though it blast me" and the marginal stage direction reads: "*It spreads his armes*" (B3r). The Pelican editor changes this signal to "*He spreads his arms*" (1.1.127.s.d.) so that presumably the gesture is made by Horatio, not by the ghost. Q2's *It*, however, leaves open the possibility of a reaction from the ghost, perhaps in response to Horatio's "stay illusion," an option less likely to be noted or explored given the emendation.

Although the matter may not seem consequential to a reader of the scene today, a spreading of arms by the actor playing the ghost may have been a meaningful signifier in an Elizabethan theatrical vocabulary. Thus, after Horatio's injunctions for the ghost to speak, "*The cock crows*" (138.s.d.), at which point "it started, like a guilty thing / Upon a fearful summons" (148-9). At Horatio's command, Marcellus and Bernardo strike at the departing figure with their partisans, but they are unable to affect it ("'Tis here. / 'Tis here. / 'Tis gone"-- 140-2). In the original production the presentation of such a ghostly departure or vanishing, without access to today's variable lighting, posed various problems, with few opportunities for the kind of verisimilar staging today's interpreter takes for granted. Although apparently anomalous today, "*It spreads his armes*" may have been an onstage signifier then to denote that the ghost was visible or accessible to Horatio. If the signal is read this way, at the crowing of the cock this ghost would then have repositioned its arms to denote that it had faded from sight and was therefore invulnerable to the sentinels' partisans.

Lest the reader find such a hypothetical staging fanciful, consider two instances where X sees but then ceases to see Y, who therefore *vanishes* to *him*, but the playgoer *continues* to see Y, so that unquestionably the *vanish* effect is from the point of view of an onstage observer rather than from the point of view of the playgoer. In *1 Hieronimo*, a play roughly contemporary to *Hamlet*, the penultimate scene starts with Horatio and others at "*the funeral of Andrea*" (xii.0.s.d.), to which group enter the ghost of Andrea and Revenge. Of the mourners onstage only Horatio can see Andrea, although he cannot hear him, so Horatio says: "See, see, he points to have us go forward on. / I prithee, rest; it shall be done, sweet Don. / Oh, now he's vanish'd" (17-19). Horatio and his group may depart here or may stay onstage, but clearly Andrea does not exit, despite "now he's vanish'd," for he has the next speech ("I am a happy ghost"--19). Clearly, from *Horatio*'s point of view Andrea has vanished, but the spectator sees the ghost stay to deliver another speech and then exeunt with Revenge (23.s.d.). The effect is a *vanish* witnessed and described by Horatio but seen in *very* different terms by the playgoer.

Similarly, in Henry Shirley's *The Martyred Soldier* (c. 1620), Bellizarius, about to convert to Christianity, calls upon "some Divine power" to "open my blind judgement / That I may see a way to happinesse"; the stage direction reads: "*Thunder: Enter an Angel*" (188). Initially, Bellizarius cannot see the angel; when the angel finally does speak the man replies: "What heavenly voyce is this? shall my eares onely / Be blest with raptures, not mine eyes enjoy / The sight of that Celestiall presence / From whence these sweet sounds come?" The angel responds: "Yes, thou shalt see; nay, then, 'tis lost agen" (189)--somehow revealing itself, then becoming invisible once more. Here the angel is unseen, seen, and vanished not only without leaving the stage but within a single line.

No evidence survives, here or in other *vanish* scenes--of which there are many, as to how an angel or ghost would suddenly become invisible. Scenes involving magic rings that make the wearer invisible (including several in *The Two Merry Milkmaids*) provide no clues. Presumably the effect in *The Martyred Soldier* was achieved by a combination of the

Bellizarius actor's reaction and some expansive gesture by the angel (e.g., a spreading wide, then closing of its arms) as may perhaps have been the case in *Hamlet*, 1.1. Here as with other supernatural vanishings or departures, we do not know enough about Elizabethan theatrical practice to dismiss "*It spreads his armes*" as an error rather than accepting it as a valid theatrical signifier worthy of investigation. The absence to my knowledge of comparable signals elsewhere in the period, however, makes such a claim problematic.

<p align="center">IV</p>

Such situations, where what was obvious then is murky today, are commonplace. In the quest for evidence the would-be theatre historian must therefore continually make allowances for Taylor's para-text or what I term the shared theatrical vocabulary. Few today would deny that invisible barriers created by an interpreter's unacknowledged assumptions and expectations block any attempt to "recover" meanings from the past, but such pre-disposition is particularly strong when a reader confronting the drama of another age attempts to extrapolate the staging of a given scene from words on a page even when those words come from a playscript actually used in a playhouse. As Bernard Beckerman notes, when such a reader confronts a book containing the printed words of a play he or she simultaneously puts on a pair of spectacles "compacted of preconceptions about what constitutes drama and how it produces its effects" (*Dynamics of Drama*, p. 3). Viewing earlier drama through such spectacles inevitably blurs or distorts the original onstage procedures and vocabulary.

The problem is brought into focus by such signifiers as "*the forme of a Court*," "*as in sessions*," "*as to her Triall*," and "*in manner of a Consistory*." To confront a stage direction that calls for a figure to enter *in prison*, *in his study*, *in the woods*, or *in the shop* is almost inevitably to draw upon the experience gained from reading novels or watching cinema, television, and modern stage pictures linked to properties, sets, and lighting. But what if that

same stage direction read or clearly implied *as in* or *as if in*? How would such an adjustment change our view of both individual signals and the larger problem?

To make my point without inundating the reader with a sea of italics, consider some pairings: (1) "*Enter Bullingbrooke with the Lords to parliament*" (Quarto *Richard II*, G4r) versus "*Enter as to the Parliament*" (Folio *Richard II*, TLN 1921); (2) "*Enter the Lords to Councell*" (Quarto *Richard III*, G1r) versus "*Enter Lords as to Councell*" (Denham, *The Sophy*, p. 18); (3) "*Enter Marcus from hunting*" (Quarto *Titus Andronicus*, E2r) versus "*Andrugio*, as out of the wooddes, with Bowe and Arrowes, and a Cony at his gyrdle" (Whetstone, *Promos and Cassandra*, K4r); (4) "*Enter the King sicke*" (Folio *Richard III*, TLN 1121) versus "*as he were sick*" (Davenant, *The Platonic Lovers*, II, 100); (5) "*Enter Timon in the woods*" (*Timon of Athens*, TLN 1602) versus "*as in a Wood*" (Jasper Mayne, *The Amorous War*, pp. 18, 20). (6) "*Enter Palamon, and Arcite in prison*" (*The Two Noble Kinsmen*, D2r) versus enter "*as in prison*" (Davenport, *The City Night-cap*, p. 176); (7) "*Enter Faustus in his Study*" (Marlowe, Doctor Faustus, A-text, 30, 437) versus "*as in his Study*" (Fletcher, *The Fair Maid of the Inn*, IX, 193); (8) "*Enter* Achilles *and* Patroclus *in their Tent*" (Folio *Troilus and Cressida*, TLN 1888) versus "*as in their Tent*" (Henry Killigrew, *The Conspiracy*, H3r, I3r); (9) "*Enter before Angiers*" (*King John*, TLN 292) versus "*as before the City Corialus*" (*Coriolanus*, TLN 479-80); (10) "*Enter Dogberry and his compartner with the Watch*" (Quarto *Much Ado About Nothing*, E3r) versus "*Two souldiers meet as in the watch*" (Heywood, *Rape of Lucrece*, V, 204); (11) "*Enter the Ghost of Banquo, and sits in Macbeths place*" (*Macbeth*, TLN 1299) versus "*Enter (as in an Apparation)...*" (*Cymbeline*, TLN 3065); and, for a variation, (12) "*locks the door*" (Fletcher, *The Island Princess*, VIII, 137) versus "*seemes to locke a doore*" (Munday, *The Death of Robert Earl of Huntingdon*, 1921). Readers familiar with the drama of this period will recall many shop scenes (as in *The Shoemakers' Holiday*), garden scenes (as in *Richard II*), tavern scenes (as in *1 Henry IV*), and inside-the-house scenes but may not have encountered such signals as "*as in their shop*" (Field, *Amends for Ladies*, 2.1.0.s.d.); "*as in the Dukes garden*"

(Shirley, *The Gentleman of Venice*, 2.1.0.s.d.); "*as in a Taverne*" (Glapthorne, *Wit in a Constable*, I, 231); and "*as in his house at Chelsea*" (Munday, *Sir Thomas More*, 4.4.0.s.d.).

Reading the more familiar signals (*in prison*, *in the shop*, *in his study*, *in the woods*) is further complicated by Richard Hosley's distinction between *fictional* and *theatrical* stage directions. For Hosley (pp. 16-17), *theatrical* signals "usually refer not to dramatic fiction but rather to theatrical structure or equipment" (e.g., *within*, *at another door*, *a scaffold thrust out*), whereas *fictional* signals "usually refer not to theatrical structure or equipment but rather to dramatic fiction" (e.g., *on shipboard*, *within the prison*, *enter the town*). The same onstage event can therefore be signaled by both *enter above* and *enter upon the walls* [of a city], with the second locution the "fictional" version of the first.

The most "theatrical" of signals can be seen in an annotator's call for a specific property such as a bar or a table. At the other extreme are those "fictional" directions in which a dramatist slips into a narrative or descriptive style seemingly more suited to a reader facing a page than an actor on the stage. Some of these "fictional" signals show the dramatist thinking out loud in the process of writing so that the details anticipate what will be evident in the forthcoming action: "*Parolles and Lafew stay behind, commenting of this wedding*" (*All's Well That Ends Well*, TLN 1089-90); "*The King sodainely enters having determined what to doe*" (Chapman, *Tragedy of Byron*, 4.2.164.s.d.); "*Enter two serjants to arrest the scholer* George Pyeboard" (*The Puritan*, E1r). Such stage directions can be valuable insofar as they provide evidence about the dramatist's thought processes or his sense of the narrative but often tell us little about what the playgoers saw.

In interpreting such evidence, however, various complications can arise when today's reader cannot be certain if a signal is "theatrical" and therefore calls for a significant property such as a tomb or a tree or "fictional" so that a sense of a tomb or forest is to be generated by means of language, hand-held properties, and appropriate actions in conjunction with the imagination of the playgoer. Such complications are further compounded by the presence of an explicit or implicit *as* or *as if*. A seemingly straightforward "fictional" signal such as

"*Enter Marius solus from the Numidian mountaines, feeding on rootes*" (Lodge, *Wounds of Civil War*, 1189-90) initially may appear to tell the story rather than provide a signal to an actor, but a starving Marius who has been alone in exile could enter "[*as if*] *from the Numidian mountaine*s" so that the actor will use "*feeding on roote*s" (as in *Timon of Athens*), along with disheveled costume and hair, to signal his mental and physical state. Similarly: "*Enter Sanders yong sonne, and another boy comming from schoole*" (*A Warning for Fair Women*, F4r) may be merely a telling of the story, but, if construed as "[*as if*] *comming from schoole*," the two boys could be dressed in distinctive costumes and carrying books. Again: "*Enter old M.* Chartly *as new come out of the Country To inquire after his Sonne*" (Heywood, *The Wise Woman of Hogsdon*, V, 340) tells the mission of the old man in narrative terms but may also signal some "country" costume or other property (e.g., a staff, a basket). A "fictional" signal such as "*enter on the walls*" requires only that the figure enter *above* or *aloft*; other seemingly "fictional" signals (e.g., "*comming from schoole*") may in contrast convey some practical instructions albeit in an Elizabethan code or argot (as with "*the forme of a Court*").

V

For the theatre historian trying to build edifices from evidence derived from stage directions, the fictional-theatrical distinction combined with explicit or implicit *as if* signals generates a host of interpretative problems to which I cannot do justice in this essay. Let me focus upon several examples from the sampling above.

Consider first the most innocuous of terms, the preposition *to*, as used in the two pairings linked to an onstage council or parliament. Again, most of the relevant scenes merely call for a group of figures to *enter*. Some, however, follow the procedure found in *2 Henry VI*, 3.1.0.s.d. where both the Quarto (D3r) and the Folio (TLN 1292-4) have the king and his entourage enter "*to the Parliament*." Similarly, at 3.4.0.s.d. Quarto *Richard III* (G1r)

has "*Enter the Lords to Councell*," although the Folio (TLN 1964-6) has the same group enter "*at a Table*."

Should an entrance "*to Councell*" or "*to the Parliament*" then be read as "fictional" and hence a part of the narrative or read as "theatrical" and hence a coded instruction for a particular onstage effect? As noted in my pairing, the latter option is supported by Folio *Richard II* where at 4.1.0.s.d. a group is directed: "*Enter as to the Parliament*," although the *as* is not to be found in the Quarto. Compare as well Caesar's entrance "*with his Counsell of Warre*" (*Antony and Cleopatra*, TLN 3108-9) and two Caroline signals: enter "*as at a council of war*" (Shirley, *The Cardinal*, 2.1.0.s.d.); "*Enter Lords as to Councell*" (Denham, *The Sophy*, p. 18).

As with courtroom scenes, other more explicit stage directions suggest how "*as to Councell*" could be staged or conceived. As already noted, the Folio calls for the council figures in *Richard III*, 3.4 to enter "*at a Table*"; similarly, in Quarto *Othello* the Venetian council scene begins: "*Enter Duke and Senators, set at a Table with lights and Attendants*" (C1r). In *King John and Matilda* (2.4.0.s.d.) Davenport provides: "*A Chaire of state discover'd, Tables and Chaires responcible, a Guard making a lane*," so that King John, Pandulph, and the lords "*enter between them*"; in a later scene, after "*A Table and Chaires set out*," Davenport instructs: "*Sit to Council*" (3.4.0.s.d.). Even more elaborate is *Henry VIII*, 5.3: "*A councell Table brought in with Chayres and Stooles, and placed under the State. Enter Lord Chancellour, places himselfe at the upper end of the Table, on the left hand: A Seate being left void above him, as for Canterburies Seat*e." Five figures "*seat themselves in Order on each side. Cromwell at lower end, as Secretary*"; a few lines later "*Cranmer approches the Councell Table*" (TLN 3035-41, 3055).

The elaborate description of the council scene in *Henry VIII*, 5.3 is far removed from enter "*at a table*" or "*Sit to Council*" and even farther from "*Enter the Lords to Councell*," but all four signals can be encompassed within the simple "*enter to*..." formula. As with "*the forme of a Court*," the reader is eavesdropping on a conversation carried out in an elliptical

theatrical language that made excellent sense to native speakers but can be murky, even impenetrable today.

Consider next the possibility of distinctive, even italicized onstage images that, owing to the nature of the evidence, may be obscured or eclipsed for us. To return to another pairing, in *Titus Andronicus* Marcus is directed to enter "*from hunting*" (2.4.10.s.d.), a signal that can readily be read as part of the narrative fiction rather than as a theatrical signal. But what if this stage direction is construed as "*[as if] from hunting*" and is then linked to Whetstone's 1578 spelling out of "as out of the wooddes" in which a comparable figure had "Bowe and Arrowes, and a Cony at his gyrdle"? If "*[as if] from hunting*" can include a small animal "at his girdle," especially a bloodied animal without its limbs, consider the effect upon the "imagery" of the remainder of *Titus*, 2.4, Marcus's painful confrontation with Lavinia ("*her handes cut off, and her tongue cut out, & ravisht*"--E2r), an encounter that includes such lines as: "what stern ungentle hand / Hath lopped and hewed and made thy body bare / Of her two branches..." (16-18).

Another pairing yields an unusually elastic set of terms, for many options are available to stage "*enter sick*" or "*as he were sick*." A playgoer then or now would recognize an entering figure as sick or dying if he or she is helped onto the stage (as with Queen Katherine in *Henry VIII*, 4.2), accompanied by a doctor (sometimes carrying a urinal), supported by a crutch, or wearing some distinctive garment: a kercher, a coif, a nightcap, or, most commonly, a gown or nightgown (as in *2 Henry IV*, 3.1.0.s.d.). In *The Telltale*, "*Isabella sick*" is juxtaposed with "*Picentio as a doctor with her water*" (1381-2); in *Fair Em*, Trotter enters "*with a kerchife on his head and an Urinall in his hand*" (350-1). In addition, a large number of sick, dying, or counterfeiting figures are linked to beds: "*Enter* Elizabeth *in her bed*" (Heywood, 1 *If you know not me you know nobody*, I, 200); "*Enter Genzerick King of the Vandalls, sicke on his bed*" (H. Shirley, *The Martyred Soldier*, 1.1.0.s.d.).

What is far less visible to the reader today, however, is the widespread theatrical use

of a portable chair in which the sick figure could be carried in and out expeditiously. Indeed, the evidence I have collected suggests that such a sick-chair was by far the most widely used signal for "*enter sick*." In *Othello*, after "finding" the wounded Cassio, Iago cries "O for a chair / To bear him easily hence" (5.1.82-3) and mentions the chair twice more (95, 98); when the chair arrives, he adds: "Some good man bear him carefully from hence. / I'll fetch the general's surgeon" (99-100) and "O, bear him out o' th' air" (104); the Quarto then directs that Cassio in the next scene be brought in "*in a Chaire*" (N1r). Elsewhere in Shakespeare's plays, chairs are specified for sick or dying figures in *1 Henry VI* (2.5.0.s.d., 3.2.40.s.d.), *2 Henry VI* (2.1.66.s.d.), *King Lear* (4.7.20.s.d.), *Henry VIII* (4.2.3), and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (5.4.85.s.d.). Examples are also plentiful in the plays of Fletcher and Brome and can be found as well in Peele, Chapman, Dekker, Heywood, and Massinger and in many anonymous plays.**10**

In this context, consider the moment in *3 Henry VI* when Edward IV, having been surprised and captured by Warwick and Clarence, is carried onstage "*in his Gowne, sitting in a Chaire*" (Folio, TLN 2258, 4.3.27.s.d.). Given this juxtaposition of gown and chair, the initial signal for the original playgoer would have been that this figure is entering "*sick*" or "*as sick*" (all the signs are there, although they are blurred in the television production for the BBC's "The Shakespeare Plays" where director Jane Howell has Edward *bound* to the chair and hence a prisoner). In this instance, the signals are wrong or misleading, for Edward is embarrassed and vulnerable but not sick.

But keep in mind that this play starts and ends with throne scenes, with that royal seat a symbol of the disorder in a kingdom in which three different figures are seen sitting upon the English throne. Indeed, in the opening scene the titular king, Henry VI, comes onstage to discover Richard of York seated upon his throne, an initial usurpation that typifies what is to follow. The presence of a king or pseudo-king brought onstage in what appears initially to be a sick-chair is therefore more than a momentary trick played upon the playgoer. Rather, that initial confusion of throne-chair and sick-chair calls attention to an important set of

associations that links disease to kings and power-brokers, associations reinforced by the unkinging, rekinging, and unkinging of Henry VI in the last three acts. Memories of both the opening confusion about the throne and the momentary sick-chair image of 4.3 should then inform the final moments, where the surface order assumed by Edward ("Now am I seated as my soul delights, / Having my country's peace and brothers' loves"--5.7.35-6) is undercut by a continuing sense of the kingdom's diseases, as typified in Richard's asides (e.g., "I'll blast his harvest..."--21).

What is surprising and, to my knowledge, has not been noted is how often Shakespeare introduces one or more such sick-chair moments into plays that deal with some form of diseased authority, and, moreover, how often such plays also contain scenes with thrones or other chairs of state. Eight of the ten history plays provide clear or likely evidence for such combinations (all except *1 Henry IV* and *Henry V*), along with *Othello* and *King Lear* (and perhaps *All's Well That Ends Well* and *Antony and Cleopatra*). Here, then, is what may have been a highly visible signifier in an onstage vocabulary available to Shakespeare (or to Jonson in the first trial scene in *Volpone*) but easily obscured or lost today owing to the nature of the evidence ("*enter sick*," "*the forme of a Court*").

For a final example, consider the available ways to stage a "shop scene" in an Elizabethan theatre. One option was to "discover" one or more figures in such a shop: "*Enter discover'd in a Shop, a Shoo-maker, his Wife Spinning, Barnaby, two Journimen*" (W. Rowley, *A Shoemaker, a Gentleman*, 1.2.0.s.d.); "A Mercers Shop discovered, *Gartred* working in it, *Spendall* walking by the Shop" (Cooke, *Greene's Tu Quoque*, B1r). Far more plentiful, however, are comparable signals that do not specify a discovery wherein "the shop" would be revealed by opening a curtain but rather direct the players to enter "*in the shop*," a locution that *could* be read as "*enter [as if] in the shop*": "*Enter* Signior Alunio *the Apothecarie in his shop with wares about him*" (Sharpham, *The Fleer*, 4.2.0.s.d.); "*Enter* Luce *in a Sempsters shop, at worke upon a lac'd Handkercher, and* Joseph *a Prentice*" (Heywood, *The Wise Woman of Hogsdon*, V, 284); "*Enter in the shop two of* Hobsons *folkes*,

and opening the shop" (Heywood, *2 If You Know Not Me*, I, 283). In at least some scenes, moreover, the actors were not suddenly revealed "in" this place, a theatrical option that jibes with a post-Elizabethan fourth wall convention, but rather brought "the shop" with them onto the main stage, an option supported by Field's signal: "*Enter* Seldome *and* Grace *working as in their shop*" (*Amends for Ladies*, 2.1.0.s.d.). Thus, some tradesmen enter with their work rather than being discovered: "*Enter a Shoomaker sitting upon the stage at worke Jenkin to him*" (*George a Greene*, 971-2); "Enter *Strumbo, Dorothie, Trompart* cobling shoos and singing" (*Locrine*, 569-70). Several scenes therefore call for a setting forth of furniture on the stage: "*A Table is set out by young fellows like Merchants men, Bookes of Accounts upon it, small Deskes to write upon, they sit downe to write Tickets*" (Dekker, *If this be not a good play*, 2.2.0.s.d.).

Elizabethan players therefore had various options: (1) to draw a curtain so as to discover figures in a shop (and set up an initial tableau); (2) by means of furniture, costume, and properties to have figures set forth "the shop" (so that "*opening the shop*" may have entailed the carrying onto the stage of a stall and merchandise, perhaps even an awning); or (3) to have figures enter working or with the tools of their trade (one way of realizing "*as in the shop*"). The options are comparable to (1) a banquet revealed behind a curtain (from which figures come forth) versus (2) a table and food set up upon the stage versus (3) figures entering "*as from dinner*" (Massinger, *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, 3.3.0.s.d.). Given the demands of a particular narrative and the investment in shop, banquet, or other place-event, the players could present considerable detail or could opt for a more economical approach *as in* or *as from*. The latter option both increases the narrative pace and, if done deftly, sets up "images" that (perhaps) link scenes together.

The only relevant scene in the Shakespeare canon is generated by Romeo's description of the apothecary's "needy shop" in which

a tortoise hung,

An alligator stuffed, and other skins

> Of ill-shaped fishes; and about his shelves
>
> A beggarly account of empty boxes,
>
> Green earthen pots, bladders, and musty seeds,
>
> Remnants of packthread, and old cakes of roses
>
> Were thinly scattered, to make up a show. (5.1.42-8)

The playgoer, however, sees no such interior, for when Romeo seeks out the apothecary ("As I remember, this should be the house"), he notes "Being holiday, the beggar's shop is shut" (55-6). In effect, whatever the actor gestures to at "this should be the house" "becomes" the shop. The apothecary then enters to Romeo's call ("Who calls so loud?"--57) and soon after provides the vial of poison requested ("Put this in any liquid thing you will..."--77).

To discover a shop here would go against the dialogue and interfere with the thrust of the scene. After all, the focus is upon Romeo, not the supplier of the poison, so that an elaborate display of a shop would be counterproductive. But what if the apothecary enters "*[as if] in his shop*"? In addition to some distinctive costume, such a staging would involve some hand-held property or properties, so that the vial would be brought forth not from a pocket but from a larger supply of wares (as with figures cited above who enter bearing their "work").

Such an entrance is conjectural, although it does conform to practice elsewhere. Nonetheless, the particular asset of such an *as [if] in* approach to this moment is that the image presented would then echo comparable images presented earlier so as to set up a potentially meaningful progression. Thus, at the outset of his first scene, Friar Laurence enters "*with a basket*," talks of filling up "this osier cage of ours / With baleful weeds and precious-juiced flowers," and, in his moralization, refers specifically to "the infant rind of this weak flower" (2.3.0.s.d., 7-8, 23). To some readers and editors 2.3 may be a "garden" scene (i.e., located in a "place" where a friar can gather weeds and flowers), but the original playgoer probably saw only an actor carrying a basket from which he produced one object, a flower.

A comparable onstage image is accessible when a desperate Juliet seeks out the friar in his cell. A reader wedded to geographical "realism" may see no connection between the "place" (garden? field?) where the friar gathers weeds-flowers and "the cell" (and such "placing" is reinforced by the locale headings in many editions), but what would the original playgoer actually have seen? Previewing the apothecary ("Put this in any liquid thing you will..."), the friar produces an object: "Take thou this vial, being then in bed, / And this distilling liquor drink thou off" (4.1.93-4). Here as in 5.1, the actor could pull forth the vial from a pocket, but he equally well could be carrying the same basket as in 2.3, a hand-held property that could then reappear in 5.1 as a version of "*enter [as] in the shop*." Back in 2.3 the friar had noted that within the same flower (taken from his basket) "Poison hath residence, and medicine power" and had linked these two opposites or options to "grace and rude will" within humankind (2.3.24-30). If the apothecary pulls *his* vial out of a basket, the links among the three moments need not be subtle, something to be teased out after many readings, but could instead be italicized.

To postulate such a staging, which cannot be established with any degree of certainty, is to move beyond the scripted "shop" signals cited earlier. Yet given the Elizabethan theatrical vocabulary such links and images are possible, perhaps even likely. A post-1660 sense of place-locale that distinguishes firmly among garden-field, cell, and a street in Mantua outside a shop blocks today's interpreter from even minimal awareness of a staging of the apothecary's brief appearance that would establish some meaningful connections and enhance a playgoer's sense of the choices made by the two title figures, choices visibly linked to two contrasting basket-bearing suppliers of vials. As with "*Marcus from hunting*" or "*in his Gowne, sitting in a Chair*e," owing to the nature of the evidence something significant may be lost in translation.

VI

Readers may quarrel with my readings of *Titus*, *3 Henry VI*, and *Romeo* which act out, among other things, my formalist reflexes and penchant for analogues and images, but in setting up such case studies my goal is to provide illustration, not explication. For today's editor, critic, historian, or theatrical professional confronting an Elizabethan play, something has been lost, a something that can have significant interpretative implications. Those readers who can readily accept such a thesis but prefer bold formulations may, in turn, find something distasteful, even wimpish in the abundant sprinklings throughout this essay of the Three Ps: *perhaps*, *probably*, and *presumably*. But, as reflected in the participial *recovering* of my title (that for me signifies an ongoing process), firm conclusions, neat distinctions, and confident truth claims do not emerge from the extant evidence. Rather, the history of scholarship in this area is a narrative replete with Solutions and Answers that have not stood the test of time (the postulation of an "inner stage" provides one chastening example). In Brutus' terms, such a situation "craves wary walking" (2.1.15).

My purpose in this exploratory essay has therefore been to call attention to the problematic nature of the extant evidence about the staging of plays in early modern England. To build mosaics from large numbers of stage directions can be highly misleading, for such details are the exception (to butcher Hamlet's final words, the norm is silence). As Gary Taylor notes, Shakespeare and other seasoned playwrights did not have to spell out such details for their colleagues; indeed, what is surprising is how much information *has* survived. Important signifiers such as costumes are therefore not mentioned at all, other than in references to the judges, sheriffs, gaolers, foresters, doctors, clergymen, or sailors who are wearing them, probably because to the players the presence of such items was so obvious as not to need mentioning (as apparently was also the case for how an actor was to become "invisible").

What is at stake here is a form of indeterminacy related to yet different from that invoked by devotees of deconstruction. Five playgoers who saw the original performance of *Twelfth Night* might have come away with five different interpretations of the play's

"meaning," but, allowing for variations in their attentiveness and placement in the theatre, they would have seen the same onstage choices and practices and would have been in tune with both the spoken and the fuller theatrical language. Today's theatre historian, however, often can only guess at what those original playgoers saw (again, I am referring to onstage actions, costumes, properties, and configurations, not to the meaning or meanings that would have been constructed from such phenomena). Choices had to be made, but the passage of time has eroded most of the evidence, probably 90 percent or more, so that what was too obvious to need recording then is murky or eclipsed today. The reliance upon inferences from printed texts of playscripts not of our age rather than upon the in-the-theatre experience of the original playgoers is at the heart of the problems confronted in this essay.

The result of such a situation *is* indeterminacy, but an indeterminacy that results not from the nature of the original phenomena but rather from the nature of the evidence about those phenomena that has survived the wide gap of time. No magical videotape of a performance at the Globe (or Rosetta stone) is likely to surface so as to resolve such problems. To invoke again my pet analogy, in reading from a distance such theatrical signals we are eavesdropping on a conversation being conducted in a language we only partly understand.

I have no wish to end on a note of despair with a Prospero-like lament about great artifacts from the past fading into air, into thin air. Evidence *has* survived; some racks *have* been left behind. As a result, inferences *can* be drawn and connections made (and mosaics constructed, demolished, and reconstructed). To be aware of coded terms ("*the forme of a Court*," "*enter sick*"), *as if* constructions, and the "fictional" versus "theatrical" distinction is not to pluck out the heart of Hamlet's (or *Hamlet*'s) mystery but at the least to make a start towards a fuller understanding of the larger theatrical language in which such plays were conceived. Not to make the effort is to side with Leontes, to whom Hermione can say: "You speak a language that I understand not" (3.2.79).

Notes

1. For an excellent overview on such matters see Andrew Gurr's *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*. The most penetrating and rigorous analysis of the evidence in my view remains Bernard Beckerman's *Shakespeare at the Globe, 1599-1609*; see also Beckerman's subsequent essays for thoughtful analyses of what can and cannot be learned from documents such as Henslowe's papers and the theatrical "plots." For an investigation of theatrical practice that builds upon stage directions rather than evidence outside the playtexts see Alan C. Dessen, *Recovering Shakespeare's Theatrical Vocabulary*.

2. This quarto was donated to the Folger in 1982, put on display in 1983, and noted as "marked for performance" but was not given close attention until July 1992 when both Leslie Thomson and William Long came across the catalogue entry. I am grateful to Professor Thomson for alerting me to this discovery and providing me with a copy of the annotations. This 1620 quarto is only the second known example of a printed text of an Elizabethan or Jacobean professional play that has been annotated for performance (the University of Chicago copy of *A Looking Glass for London and England* has been largely ignored since 1931). In her unpublished paper Thomson notes that the Folger Quarto, which is missing most of Act 1 and virtually all of Act 5, is annotated at two different times by two different hands (she terms them Bookkeepers A and B).

3. Such marginal notations are linked to what William B. Long terms the "glancing bookkeeper." See his informative analyses of the playhouse manuscripts for *John a Kent* and *Woodstock*, particularly pp. 106-8 of the latter essay devoted to the bed.

4. For a recent argument in behalf of the presence and use of a special onstage pavilion for this and other scenes in *More* see Scott McMillin, *The Elizabethan Theatre and "The Book of Sir Thomas More*," pp. 96-112.

5. Typical too are: "AVOCATORI, 4. BONARIO, CELIA, VOLTORE, CORBACCIO, CORVINO, MOSCA, NOTARIO, COMMANDADORI" (Jonson, *Volpone*,

4.5.0.s.d.); "*Enter the old Duke*, Lussurioso, *his sonne, the Duchesse: the Bastard, the Duchesse two sonnes* Ambitioso, *and* Supervacuo, *the third her yongest brought out with Officers for the Rape two Judges*" (*The Revenger's Tragedy*, A4r).

6. Similarly, in *The Lover's Progress* Fletcher signals "*a Bar set forth, Officers*" (V, 144); in Fletcher's *The Spanish Curate* a marginal signal adds more details: "*A Bar, Table-book, 2 Chairs and Paper, standish set out*" (II, 98).

7. Webster directs: "*Enter* Officers *preparing seats for the judges...*" (4.2.0.s.d.); a later signal calls not for one but for two bars: "*Enter* Crispiano *like a judge, with another judge*; Contilupo *and another lawyer at one bar*; Romelio, Ariosto, *at another...*" (4.2.52.s.d.). Sharpham provides: "*Enter two* IUDGES *with their traine, and sit down*" (5.5.0.s.d.); when a figure replaces one of the judges, he is told: "I pra'y assume his place" (17).

8. For a discussion of the relationship between costume and "place" see chapter 5 of Dessen, *Elizabethan Stage Conventions*.

9. For some shrewd comments on the limitations of the evidence provided by such playgoers' reactions, see Gurr, *Playgoing*, pp. 105-14. For two such eye-witness accounts that have emerged in the last ten years, see the essays by Berry and Braunmuller.

10. For a sampling of the evidence, see Peele, *Edward I*, 40.s.d. and *The Battle of Alcazar*, 1193.s.d.; Dekker, *Satiromastix*, 5.2.37.s.d.; Heywood, *2 Edward IV*, I, 155; Fletcher, I, 374, 378; IV, 76; VI, 254; Chapman, *The Gentleman Usher*, 4.3.0.s.d.; 5.4.39.s.d.; Massinger, *The Emperor of the East*, 4.3.0.s.d.; Brome, I, 218, 257; II, 127 (*The Queen and Concubine*); III, 180, 263, 546; *Locrine*, 33; *A Warning for Fair Women*, G4r. Sick-chairs are also to be found in plays as diverse as Marston's *Sophonisba*, Haughton's *Englishmen for My Money*, Middleton's *Hengist King of Kent*, Jonson's *The Magnetic Lady*, Ford's *The Broken Heart*, May's *The Old Couple*, Drue's *The Duchess of Suffolk*, *The Yorkshire Tragedy*, *The Second Maiden's Tragedy*, *The Soddered Citizen*, and *The Telltale*. For a fuller discussion of the sick-chair see Dessen, *Recovering Shakespeare's Theatrical*

Vocabulary, chapter 6.

Works Cited

Beckerman, Bernard. *The Dynamics of Drama*. New York: Knopf, 1970.

------------------. *Shakespeare at the Globe, 1599-1609*. New York: Macmillan, 1962.

------------------. "Theatrical Plots and Elizabethan Stage Practice." *Shakespeare and Dramatic Tradition: Essays in Honor of S. F. Johnson*, ed. W. R. Elton and William B. Long. Newark: U. of Delaware Press, 1989. Pp. 109-24.

------------------. "The Use and Management of the Elizabethan Stage." *The Third Globe: Symposium for the Reconstruction of the Globe Playhouse*, ed. C. Walter Hodges, S. Schoenbaum, and Leonard Leone. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1981. Pp. 151-63.

Berry, Herbert. "The Globe Bewitched and *El Hombre Fiel*." *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 1 (1984): 211-30.

Braunmuller, A. R. "'To the Globe I rowed': John Holles Sees *A Game at Chess*." *English Literary Renaissance* 20 (1990): 340-56.

Brome, Richard. *The Dramatic Works*. 3 vols. London, 1873.

Chapman George. *The Plays of George Chapman: The Comedies*, gen. ed. Allan Holaday. Urbana, Chicago, London: U. of Illinois Press, 1970.

--------------. *The Plays of George Chapman: The Tragedies with Sir Gyles Goosecappe*, gen. ed. Allan Holaday. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1987.

Cooke, John. *Greene's Tu Quoque*, ed. John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Texts. Amersham, 1913.

Davenant, William. *The Dramatic Works*. 5 vols. Edinburgh, 1872.

Davenport, Robert. *The Works*. *A Collection of Old English Plays*, ed. A. H. Bullen. 4 vols. London, 1882-9. Vol. III.

Dekker, Thomas. *The Dramatic Works*, ed. Fredson Bowers. 4 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1953-61.

Denham, Sir John. *The Sophy*. Wing D-1009. 1642.

Dessen, Alan C. *Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.

--------------. *Recovering Shakespeare's Theatrical Vocabulary*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.

Fair Em, ed. W. W. Greg. The Malone Society. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1928.

Field, Nathan. *The Plays*, ed. William Peery. Austin: U. of Texas Press, 1950.

Fletcher, John (and Francis Beaumont). *The Works*, ed. Arnold Glover and A. R. Waller. 10 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1905-12.

-------------- and Philip Massinger. *Sir John Van Olden Barnavelt*, ed. T. H. Howard-Hill. The Malone Society. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1980.

George a Greene, ed. F. W. Clarke. The Malone Society. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1911.

Glapthorne, Henry. *The Plays and Poems*. 2 vols. London, 1874.

Greg, W. W. *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931.

Gurr, Andrew. *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.

------------. *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642*. Third Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.

Heywood, Thomas. *The Dramatic Works*. 6 vols. London, 1874.

Hosley, Richard. "The Gallery Over the Stage in the Public Playhouse of Shakespeare's Time." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 8 (1957): 15-31.

Jonson, Ben. *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford and Percy and Evelyn Simpson. 11 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925-52.

Kyd, Thomas. *The First Part of Hieronimo* and *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. Andrew S. Cairncross. Regents Renaissance Drama. Lincoln: U. of Nebraska Press, 1967.

Locrine, ed. Ronald B. McKerrow. The Malone Society. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1908.

Lodge, Thomas. *The Wounds of Civil War*, ed. J. Dover Wilson. The Malone Society.

Oxford, 1910.

Long, William B. "'A bed / for woodstock': A Warning for the Unwary." *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 2 (1985): 91-118.

----------------. "*John a Kent and John a Cumber*: An Elizabethan Playbook and Its Implications." *Shakespeare and Dramatic Tradition: Essays in Honor of S. F. Johnson*, ed. W. R. Elton and William B. Long. Newark: U. of Delaware Press, 1989. Pp. 125-43.

----------------. "Stage Directions: A Misinterpreted Factor in Determining Textual Provenance." *Text* 2 (1985): 121-37.

Marlowe, Christopher. *Marlowe's "Doctor Faustus" 1604-1616*, ed. W. W. Greg. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950.

Massinger, Philip. *Believe as You List*, ed. Charles J. Sisson. The Malone Society. Oxford: Oxford, UP, 1928.

-----------------. *The Plays and Poems*, ed. Philip Edwards and Colin Gibson. 5 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1976.

Mayne, Jasper. *The Amorous War*. Wing M-1463. 1648.

McMillin, Scott. *The Elizabethan Theatre and "The Book of Sir Thomas More."* Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1987.

Munday, Anthony. *The Death of Robert Earl of Huntingdon*, ed. John C. Meagher. The Malone Society. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1967.

---------------. *Sir Thomas More*, ed. Vittorio Gabrieli and Giorgio Melchiori. Revels Plays. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990.

Peele, George. *The Dramatic Works*, ed. Frank S. Hook, John Yoklavich, R. Mark Benbow, and Elmer Blistein. 2 vols. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1961-70.

The Puritan, ed. John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Texts. Amersham, 1911.

"The Revenger's Tragedy" Attributed to Thomas Middleton: A Facsimile of the 1607/8 Quarto, ed. MacD. P. Jackson. Rutherford, Madison, Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson Press, 1983.

Rowley, William. *All's Lost by Lust* and *A Shoemaker, a Gentleman*, ed. Charles Wharton Stork. Philadelphia, 1910.

Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Pelican Shakespeare*, gen. ed. Alfred Harbage. Baltimore: Penguin, 1969.

--------------------. *The Norton Facsimile: The First Folio of Shakespeare*, ed. Charlton Hinman. New York and London: Paul Hamlyn, 1968.

--------------------. *Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto*, ed. Michael J. B. Allen and Kenneth Muir. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U. of California Press, 1982.

-------------------- and John Fletcher. *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, ed. G. R. Proudfoot. Regents Renaissance Drama. Lincoln: U. of Nebraska Press, 1970.

Sharpham, Edward. *A Critical Old Spelling Edition of the Works of Edward Sharpham*, ed. Christopher Gordon Petter. New York and London: Garland, 1986.

Shirley, Henry. *The Martyred Soldier*. *A Collection of Old English Plays*, ed. A H. Bullen. 4 vols. London, 1882-9. I, 165-256.

Shirley, *James*. *The Cardinal*, ed. E. M. Yearling. Revels Plays. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1986.

--------------. *The Gentleman of Venice*, ed. Wilson F. Engel. Salzburg, 1976.

Taylor, Gary. "General Introduction." *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion*, ed. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

The Telltale, ed. R. A. Foakes and J. C. Gibson. The Malone Society. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1960.

Thomson, Leslie. "A Quarto 'Marked for Performance': Evidence of What?" Unpublished paper.

The Two Merry Milkmaids, ed. John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Texts. Amersham, 1914.

A Warning for Fair Women, ed. John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Texts. Amersham, 1912.

Webster, John. *The Devil's Law-Case*, ed. Frances A. Shirley. Regents Renaissance Drama. Lincoln: U. of Nebraska Press, 1972.

Whetstone, George. *Promos and Cassandra*, ed. John S. Farmer. Tudor Facsimile Texts. Amersham, 1910.