

## **Massed Entries in *The Winter's Tale***

Alan C. Dessen

["Massed Entries and Theatrical Options in *The Winter's Tale*," *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England*, 8 (1996), 119-27]

Five of the plays in the "comedy" section of the First Folio exhibit features that scholars link to the work of the scribe Ralph Crane. In three of these plays (*The Merry Wives of Windsor*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and *The Winter's Tale*) the reader encounters "massed entries" (in which all the figures who are to appear in a scene, no matter when, are listed in the initial stage direction)<sup>1</sup> as opposed to normal practice (wherein characters are cited only at the point at which they enter). Crane's idiosyncratic use of the massed entry is comparable to yet different from the "continental" practice (often used by Jonson) in which a new scene is initiated whenever a new character enters (so that the 1607 quarto of *Volpone* has no stage directions whatsoever, only characters listed at the head of each scene).

For most Shakespeareans, massed entries in these three plays and in the 1623 quarto of *The Duchess of Malfi* (another Crane play) are a curiosity to be noted and then forgotten. Indeed, few scholars or teachers are even aware of this practice, because modern editors of these four plays pare down that inclusive initial grouping and then insert subsequent entrances for figures who arrive during the course of the scene. Most of these editorial adjustments are straightforward, even obvious, with few if any implications for the critic, director, or general reader. Some interesting problems, however, are generated by the massed entries in *The Winter's Tale*, problems that have not received the attention they deserve. My purpose in this essay is therefore to peek under the editorial carpet so as to explore in several key scenes some theatrical options that have been screened out by the widespread assumptions about massed entries.

To sidestep *The Winter's Tale* for a moment, the other three printed play texts linked

to Crane that provide massed entries are, with very few exceptions, consistent in their format. Thus, *Two Gentlemen* provides no within-the-scene entrances at all; *Merry Wives* has only one ("*Enter Fairies*" in the last scene--TLN 2518)<sup>2</sup> as opposed to the many stage directions in the 1602 quarto. In general, *Duchess* follows suit, with the exception of "*Enter Bosola with a Guard*" in 3.5 (H4r--"*Bosola, Souldiers, with Vizards*" is included in the massed entry) and "*Enter Antonio with a Pistoll*" (G1v) in 3.2. The latter, however, is a re-entry for Antonio (who is listed in the massed entry and is onstage at the outset of the scene) and is typical of this edition which (unlike the Folio's *Merry Wives* and *Two Gentlemen*) offers various stage directions that involve actions or properties (e.g., "*Ferdinand giues her a ponyard*"; "*giues her a dead mans hand*"; "*Shewes the children strangled*"). In *Duchess*, moreover (as in Jonson's plays), the massed entries include only character names and never the word *Enter*, but, with a few exceptions, the massed entries in the Folio plays do start with *Enter*.

Except for a few minor discrepancies, then, the approach to such massed entries in three of the four Crane plays is consistent and, once the reader adjusts to the practice, unremarkable. To turn to *The Winter's Tale*, however, is to confront a murkier situation. The Folio text of this romance contains more stage directions than *Two Gentlemen* or *Merry Wives* but still very few (apart from scene headings, only forty-three), with many necessary exits and entrances missing. In thirteen of the fifteen scenes, moreover, all the characters to appear throughout the subsequent scene are massed in the initial heading. The New Arden editor, J. H. P. Pafford,<sup>3</sup> therefore distinguishes among three categories: (1) scenes that follow "normal" practice (4.3, 5.2) so as to have various figures (the clown, the old shepherd, Paulina's steward) enter as needed with no initial massed entry; (2) scenes that provide a massed entry that makes no difference (1.1, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2, 5.3) in that no figures arrive after the initial entrance; and (3) scenes that provide a massed entry and need adjustment because some figures in the initial Folio stage direction do not appear until later (1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 4.4, 5.1). Pafford, like other editors, sees little difficulty in distinguishing the third

group of eight scenes from the second group of five scenes (only one of the second group, 5.3, has more than two figures) and alters his text accordingly.

Some of these adjustments are obvious: for example, 2.3 (where the initial entry includes Paulina); 3.3 (where the massed entry includes not only Antigonus, the baby, and the mariner but also the shepherd and the clown); 4.4 (where Autolycus is cited at the outset); and 5.1 (where the opening stage direction includes Florizel and Perdita). Nonetheless, for several scenes in this group of eight the massed entries *could* work as printed. Camillo and Mamillius *could* be onstage from the outset of 1.2 (with the former in charge of the latter); even though Camillo exits with Archidamus at the end of 1.1, he *could* reappear with the boy at the tail end of the group that starts 1.2 and then remain onstage the whole time so as to come forward when called by Leontes (the Folio provides no *enter* at this point for Camillo). Similarly, Leontes and his lords *could* be onstage from the outset of 2.1 observing Hermione, Mamillius, and the ladies (as he had observed Hermione and Polixenes in the previous scene--again, the Folio provides no *enter* for Leontes and his group).

To those accustomed to "our" version of this play, such alternatives may appear strained or quirky. But, given the irregularities in the Folio procedures for this play (as opposed to the far greater consistency found in *Merry Wives*, *Two Gentlemen*, and *Duchess*), to assume too much about massed entries may be to run the risk of blocking out possible options left open in the Folio but closed down in modern editions. *If* doubt does exist about some of the initial stage directions in Pafford's third group or *if* the Folio version of one or more of those scenes can be played with no loss (and indeed with some gain or special force), is emendation indeed necessary or obligatory? To what extent has the obvious presence of massed entries in *some* scenes (and in two other Folio plays) become a blank check that has led to a blurring of Jacobean stage practice?

At the risk of appearing obstreperous or overly ingenious, let me focus upon three scenes. At first look, the opening stage direction for 2.3 *seems* to be an obvious massed entry ("*Enter Leontes, Seruants, Paulina, Antigonus, and Lords*"--TLN 898-9), for (1) Paulina and

servants are included at the outset (though, unlike 3.3, the baby is not mentioned) and then (2) the Folio provides "*Enter Paulina*" (TLN 928) with the baby and "*Enter a Seruant*" (TLN 1126) with news of Cleomines and Dion. The Folio, however, signals no comparable entrances for the first servant (who, in response to Leontes' "Who's there?", brings news of Mamillius at 2.3.9) or for Antigonus and the lords, who first speak after Paulina's entrance at line 26. Nonetheless, given the delayed arrival of a Paulina who is cited in the initial stage direction, some editors (e.g., Pafford, G. B. Evans) have tinkered with the entire entry.

In support of this emendation an editor can also cite the ordering of the named figures, for if Antigonus and the lords are placed after Paulina in the massed entry, then, presumably, they do not precede her onto the stage but arrive with her or trailing after her. But why then does "*Enter Paulina*" include no mention of the men? Why signal her arrival but not theirs? Why, moreover, provide an entrance for one servant at the end of the scene (with news of the oracle) but not for another (perhaps the same) servant at the outset of the scene (with news of Mamillius)?

Here and in comparable moments in this script what is easily missed or blurred for the reader is the potential theatrical effect of figures who are onstage but silent (though possibly active). Whether in 2.3 or earlier with Camillo ("What, Camillo there?"--1.2.208), Leontes's "who's there?" or "what...there?" lines need not necessarily be directed at an offstage figure but could instead be designed to call forth an attendant already onstage but standing in the background (especially on a wide, deep stage). Whether the figure is on or offstage, the response ("Ay, my good lord"--1.2.209; "My lord"--2.3.9) would be appropriate.

The question then follows: what if Paulina is the only figure in the massed entry for 2.3 who does not belong there? In this reconstruction (chosen by editors such as G. L. Kittredge, Peter Alexander, Baldwin Maxwell, and Frank Kermode), Antigonus, the lords, and a servant would be onstage from the outset (watching Leontes from a distance) and would then try to intercept Paulina. Their presence, visible to the playgoer, would then be signaled by Paulina's gibe that "'Tis such as you, / That creep like shadows by him and do

sigh / At each his needless heavings" (2.3.33-5), for if the lords do not enter struggling with Paulina (and no such group entrance is signaled), they could be in our view (creeping and sighing?) until her arrival.

What are the consequences of such an interpretation? This staging (endorsed by the Folio stage direction, which now becomes accurate *except* for the inclusion of Paulina) would make Leontes's "Nor night nor day no rest" speech not a soliloquy but an extended Macbeth-like "rapt" delivery in which the speaker is oblivious to his surroundings. Such an interpretation could be reinforced if the actor is wearing a nightgown that in the Elizabethan theatrical vocabulary can denote not only sleeplessness but also a troubled or tortured mind--as reinforced by the servant's lines ("he hath not slept to-night") and Paulina's response that "I come to bring him sleep" and rather it is the lords who "Nourish the cause of his awaking" (2.3.31, 33, 36). More context would therefore be provided for Paulina's critique of the lords and a greater contrast between her forceful behavior and that of the courtiers. To have the lords onstage from the top therefore both changes the nature or value of Paulina's entrance and emphasizes Leontes's self-absorption (so that instead of witnessing a soliloquy the playgoer sees a figure who has isolated himself from a visible human community).

In this context, consider 2.1 as well. The Folio stage direction reads: "*Enter Hermione, Mamillius, Ladies: Leontes, Antigonus, Lords*" (TLN 584-5), but Leontes does not speak until line 33 when he questions one of his lords about the departure of Polixenes and Camillo. Here editors assume that Leontes enters at the point of his speech and find added support for such an interpretation in the colon that separates the two groups. Comparable colons in the Folio also separate three groups in the entry for 3.2 (to be discussed below) and distinguish two groups in 5.1 ("*Enter Leontes, Cleomines, Dion, Paulina, Servants: Florizel, Perdita*"--TLN 2725-6).

The use of colons in such situations, however, is not consistent. In 5.1, the only "servant" cited as such in the scene enters at TLN 2830 to announce the arrival of Florizel and Perdita (so, technically, should also be set off by a colon). More tellingly, the opening

entry for the final scene reads: "*Enter Leontes, Polixenes, Florizell, Perdita, Camillo, Paulina: Hermione (like a Statue:) Lords, &c*" (TLN 3184-5). The two colons here separate groups but do not indicate that groups two and three are to arrive later in the scene. In addition, several scenes with undisputed massed entries lack distinguishing colons: "*Enter Paulina, a Gentleman, Gaoler, Emilia*" (2.2, TLN 820); "*Enter Antigonus, a Marriner, Babe, Sheepeheard, and Clowne*" (3.3, TLN 1437-8); "*Enter Florizell, Perdita, a Shepherd, Clowne, Polixenes, Camillo, Mopsa, Dorcas, Seruants, Autolicus*" (4.4, TLN 1796-7).

To bring Leontes onstage at the outset of 2.1 may indeed be to strain the evidence. Nonetheless, that he first speaks at a given point does not necessarily signal (in the absence of other evidence) that he has just entered. Again, consider the theatrical effect if a silent Leontes (with or without attendant lords) is a silent observer of his queen and son for some thirty lines. Such a stage image would echo his observation of Hermione and Polixenes in 1.2 and (perhaps) anticipate the lords watching him (before Paulina's arrival) in 2.3. Here and earlier such a detached yet intense observing of Hermione would fit with Leontes's own image when (watching his wife and friend exchange courtesies) he announced: "I am angling now, / Though you perceive me not how I give line" (1.2.179-80). Is the angling-fishing limited to 1.2 or does the playgoer see the process at work again at the outset of 2.1 only to be interrupted when a lord arrives with news of the escape?

Such questions provide a useful context for the problems or options found in a pivotal scene, Hermione's trial in 3.2, where the editor, critic, or director must again decide: who is on stage and when? That some doubt about the opening stage directions in 1.2, 2.1, and 2.3 (as massed entries or accurate signals) *may* exist helps to set up the highly problematic status of 3.2 where the scene as printed in the Folio makes very good sense indeed (especially when seen in the context of a comparable moment in *Henry VIII*). Thus, the Folio's opening signal reads: "*Enter Leontes, Lords, Officers: Hermione (as to her Triall) Ladies: Cleomines, Dion*" (TLN 1174-5). Editors, who assume this stage direction to be a massed entry, divide it into three sections as signaled by the colons (as in 2.1), so that Hermione and her ladies appear

after lines 9-10 (the officer's statement that "it is his highness' pleasure that the queen / Appear in person here in court"). Later, when a lord says: "Therefore bring forth, / And in Apollo's name, his oracle" (116-17), editors insert a stage direction (in the Pelican "*Exeunt certain Officers*") so as to have Cleomines and Dion (the oracle-bearers) escorted in at line 122, the end of Hermione's "the emperor of Russia" speech. In another related emendation, most editors change *Silence* of line 9 from a stage direction (as printed in the Folio, TLN 1185) to a word spoken by the officer. The New Penguin editor (p. 185) notes that *Silence* "would be a very unusual stage direction but is a traditional law-court cry. The entry of Hermione may be supposed to cause some stir in the court, which must be silenced before the indictment can be read" (see also Pafford, p. 56).

The scene as emended (with three inserted stage directions and "silence" as a word to be spoken) is the scene most of us know. In defense of such altering of the Folio one might ask: if massed entries are prevalent elsewhere, why not here also? If Hermione is already onstage, why would she be formally ordered to "appear in person here in court"? As to the two oracle-bearers, Pafford notes (p. 60): "It is not strictly necessary to assume that Cleomenes and Dion are off stage. They could quite well have been in the Court from the outset and be simply brought forward at 123." He concludes, however, that "there is perhaps greater dramatic and stage effect...in bringing them in with some ceremonial at 123 than in having them on stage all the time."

But despite such arguments and despite the presence of massed entries in five, perhaps seven other scenes, Hermione, Cleomines, Dion, and the packet containing the oracle *could* be on stage from the outset (in keeping with the only extant theatrical signal). For just such a moment, moreover, one can turn to *Henry VIII*, 2.4.9 where Queen Katherine, not only onstage but also, like Hermione, the focus of attention, is nonetheless called to "come into the court." Obviously, as used here "into the court" has a formal, procedural meaning (as opposed to "bring her to this room from some other place"). Thus, moments earlier, in response to a parallel call ("Henry King of England come into the court"), the king (without

moving from his throne) responds: "Here." At least in *Henry VIII*, 2.4, "to come into the court" is formally to acknowledge one's presence rather than to *enter* from offstage.

Admittedly, the two situations are similar, not identical, but the presence of Katherine from the outset (despite the call for her to "come into the court") points to the possibility, even the likelihood, that Hermione too is present from the beginning (as would be the case if we take the Folio stage direction literally rather than as a massed entry).<sup>4</sup>

More potential insights into the situation in *The Winter's Tale* then follow, for a stage direction spells out Katherine's response to "come into the court": "*The Queen makes no answer, rises out of her chair, goes about the court, comes to the King, and kneels at his feet; then speaks*" (2.4.10.s.d.). That Katherine "*goes about the court*" provides further context for the call for Hermione to appear "in court," for, as is clear in context and in the Holinshed passage upon which this scene is closely based, "*the court*" consists of some but not all of the figures onstage (so that the queen must bypass this group in order to reach the king).<sup>5</sup> More important, the signal in *Henry VIII* that "*The Queen makes no answer*" suggests that "*Silence*" in *The Winter's Tale*, 3.2 may not be an error (as is assumed when editors turn it into a spoken word at the end of the officer's speech) but rather is a signal that Hermione initially should not speak (presumably, an appropriate response would have been: "Here") and thereby (like Katherine) should not recognize the authority of Leontes' court.<sup>6</sup>

The same logic pertains to the oracle-bearers. Indeed, despite Pafford's conclusion about the "greater dramatic and stage effect," which is more "theatrical": to bring the two figures in during the "emperor of Russia" speech ("with some ceremonial") or to have them in sight, waiting, during the entire scene, with the eventual answer or vindication visible in a distinctive casket or scroll? The latter option, with the playgoer conscious of something important not yet seen or addressed by those onstage, can be highly theatrical if it generates for the playgoer a growing tension or anticipation. The Folio version, with the oracle in view from the outset, *could* provide a potent stage effect.

Also in terms of theatrical effect, let me return to the question: is *Silence* a stage

direction or a word to be spoken? If Hermione, like Katherine, is onstage during the officer's appeal for her to appear "here in court," a total silence from her (when all eyes are riveted upon her) could be a highly "theatrical" response. In such situations, "silence" in the theatre can be electric. What follows *Silence*, if it is treated as a stage direction, is Leontes' "read the indictment" (3.2.11) which then can emerge not as a mere procedural command but rather as an act of frustration after her non-response or non-compliance (if she initially refuses to appear or respond as requested--i.e., no "Here" here).

The *Silence* problem becomes more interesting, moreover, when one thinks forward to the famous final scene. For example, would a conspicuously silent Hermione in 3.2 prepare us more tellingly for the "statue" later (and for Paulina's "I like your silence; it the more shows off / Your wonder"--5.3.21-2)? Similarly, would the highly visible onstage presence of the oracle in some distinctive package or container, here and in 3.1, somehow link up with two other significant properties--the baby of 2.3 and 3.3 and the fardel of 3.3 and 4.4? What "images" or building blocks does the Folio version establish or italicize at the beginning of 3.2?

Such questions and conjectures cannot be easily resolved, nor do my various claims about the theatrical effectiveness of several entries as printed in the Folio necessarily undermine the more familiar editorial choices. Nonetheless, the massed entries as printed in this Folio play *are* demonstrably inconsistent (as opposed to the nearly uniform procedures in *Two Gentlemen*, *Merry Wives*, and *Duchess*). Need we therefore automatically assume that 3.2 begins with a massed entry that must then be emended, especially if that initial stage direction *can* work as written for Hermione and the oracle-bearers and if (given the paradigm provided in *Henry VIII*) "*Silence*" *can* make good theatrical sense for a Hermione already onstage? To invoke an alternative paradigm, what if Crane in transcribing *The Winter's Tale* was still in the process of learning how to set up massed entries and had yet to perfect his system? How would such a working hypothesis affect an editor's approach to emendation?

Without doubt, some changes in the Folio entries *are* called for (as with Paulina's

entrance in 2.3). But the choice as to who is onstage and when (in 3.2 but also in 2.1 and 2.3) has major interpretative consequences, especially in the theatre, so that any emendations of Folio stage directions should be made cautiously and judiciously, with full awareness of the theatrical implications. Interested scholars who do puzzle over the massed entries in this play may end up siding with Pafford and with the traditional choices (although editors *are* divided on how to treat the beginning of 2.3). But various questions do (and should) persist. Have the various inconsistencies linked to "massed entries" in this play (as opposed to the other three Crane plays) been acknowledged and factored into the choices to emend? Have all the options, particularly for potential in-the-theatre effects, been given full consideration? Whose sense of "what is most theatrical" should prevail? Both versions of 3.2 (or 2.3 or even 2.1) make good sense, but, especially given the comparable scene in *Henry VIII*, I, for one, confess to a fondness for the staging of Hermione's trial as printed in the Folio. Should not other interpreters of the scene also be given a vote? Whose play is it, anyhow?

## Notes

1. Why three of the Crane comedies in the Folio provide massed entries and two (*The Tempest* and *Measure for Measure*) do not remains a puzzle. For a full discussion of this anomaly and of Crane's characteristic procedures, see T. H. Howard-Hill, *Ralph Crane and Some Shakespeare First Folio Comedies* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1972).

2. Citations from the First Folio are from *The Norton Facsimile*, ed. Charlton Hinman (New York, 1968). All other Shakespeare citations are from *The Complete Pelican Shakespeare*, gen. ed. Alfred Harbage (Baltimore: Penguin, 1969). Citations from *The Duchess of Malfi* are from the 1968 Scolar Press facsimile.

3. For Pafford's discussion, see his New Arden edition (1963), p. xx and also his essay in *N & Q*, 206 (May 1961): 176-7.

4. For a later example of figures already onstage who are ordered to "come into the court," see the Court of Love scene (3.2) in Jonson's *The New Inn*.

5. In the elaborate stage direction that begins 2.4, "*The King takes place under the cloth of state; the two Cardinals sit under him as Judges. The Queen 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.*" A marginal note in Holinshed (New Arden, p. 195) refers to the queen's "lamentable and pithie speech in presence of the court." That speech is prefaced by: "And bicause shee could not come to the king directlie, for the distance severed betweene them, shee went about by the court, and came to the king..." Note also that in Holinshed "the judges commanded silence whilst their commission was read," but then Katherine "made no answer, but rose out of hir chaire" (so that this account would support either interpretation of *Silence*).

6. A similar argument in behalf of *Silence* versus "Silence" is provided by E. A. J.

Honigmann in "Enter the Stage Direction: Shakespeare and Some Contemporaries,"  
*Shakespeare Survey* 29 (1976): 124-5.