

## "Taint Not Thy Mind...": Problems and Pitfalls in Staging Plays at the New Globe

[*New Issues in the Reconstruction of Shakespeare's Theatre: Proceedings of the Conference Held at the University of Georgia, February 16-18, 1990*, ed. Frank Hildy (Peter Lang: New York, 1990), 135-58]

Alan C. Dessen

To satisfy its distinctively different clienteles, the New Globe must serve many functions. Admittedly, the interests of one interested party, the scholar-historian, cannot automatically take precedence over the needs or wishes of other constituencies. Nonetheless, decisions that strongly affect, even undermine, the goals of that scholar-historian bear close examination. And thereby hangs my tale.

For both the academic and theatrical community, one of the attractive possibilities inherent in this project is that the New Globe may serve as a laboratory or testing ground where actors and scholars working together can investigate how Elizabethan plays could or would have been staged. To make those tests or investigations meaningful, however, various pitfalls must be avoided at the start so as not to blur the issues and, moreover, not to end up with just another venue (or tourist trap) for putting on Shakespeare plays or Elizabethan displays in a London already replete with theatres. In contrast, a strong case can be made in behalf of a distinctively different performing space not subject to the same commercial pressures and post-Elizabethan mind sets that bedevil the present theatres and theatre companies.

To talk (often vaguely) about using the new Globe for experiments or testing, however, is much easier than to carry out such experiments successfully, for many roadblocks or hurdles stand in the way, some of them so fundamental that we cannot see or recognize them. My purpose in this paper is therefore to emulate the ghost in *Hamlet* who, after exhorting revenge against Claudius, gives the (perhaps impossible) advice to Hamlet: "But howsomever thou pursues this act, / Taint not thy mind..." (1.5.84-5).<sup>1</sup> If the processes that underlie the use of the new Globe (whether mental, physical, or commercial) are tainted from the outset, the results of any tests or experiments will also be compromised or contaminated.

At the risk of appearing facetious or sacrilegious, I am going to organize my initial strictures in the form of Ten Commandments. I do not, I hasten to add, see myself as Jehovah or Moses nor do I claim prophetic status, but, as one who has been wrestling for more than ten years with the limited evidence available for reconstructing Elizabeth staging and stage conventions, I am especially conscious of how little we know and how many things can get in the way of any investigation, whether on the page or on the stage. My caveats may not be worthy of being etched in stone on Mount Sinai, but they could forestall some wasted effort and some tainted results.

To ensure that the new Globe will indeed be a meaningful testing ground or laboratory:

- (1) Thou shalt sidestep modern editions (and the entire eclectic editorial tradition since the eighteenth century) and rather mount any experiments on the basis of the relevant quarto or Folio scripts.
- (2) Thou shalt honor and respect the original stage directions as precious evidence (as opposed to the casual treatment often given these signals by modern editors), including where such signals are positioned in the original printed editions.

- (3) Thou shalt not retreat from (apparent) anomalies in the early printed editions but shall be open to the possibility that what may seem strange to us today may in turn provide a window into what was distinctive or taken for granted then.
- (4) Thou shalt strain mightily to transcend, as the be-all and end-all in the interpretive process, various manifestations of "realism" (whether psychological, geographical, or narrative).
- (5) Thou shalt start afresh in the new Globe with as few preconceptions as possible about the aside, the soliloquy, and other forms of direct address to (and eye contact with) the audience (and rethink which speeches are asides and how they should be signaled).
- (6) Thou shalt reject as a false god variable lighting (or any equivalent) and all the anachronistic thinking it inevitably (and sometimes disastrously) brings with it. Only the rare theatrical professional can resist the siren call of variable lighting if it is available in any form.
- (7) Thou shalt avoid as another false god Designer's Theatre or Director's Theatre and all the "concept" thinking that goes with it and instead explore in depth the Elizabethan-Jacobean sense of design (e.g., their rationale for costumes and properties).
- (8) Thou shalt eschew intervals-intermissions so as to eliminate the anachronistic single fifteen-minute break that changes the rhythm and dynamics of performance. Without such breaks, seeing a play at the new Globe will be a different experience from seeing a play elsewhere in London (and the added momentum-continuity will help the standees).
- (9) Thou shalt never forget the watchword of the faith enunciated in the choric speeches of Henry V (e.g., "piece out our imperfections with your thoughts" or "eke out our performance with your mind") and therefore always keep in mind the pivotal role of the playgoer's imagination in the unspoken contract assumed between the original players and their audience.
- (10) Above all else, thou shalt trust the scripts (and, as a corollary, the actors and playgoers), for the surviving scripts (as reflected, however accurately or inaccurately, in the early printed editions) are our only evidence. These scripts (not scholarly formulations, directorial concepts, or actor ingenuity) must therefore drive or control all experiments or tests. Without sufficient trust in these documents, the process will be tainted.

Behind these Ten Commandments lies a series of linked assumptions, so let me begin by singling out two basic propositions: (1) Shakespeare wrote theatrical scripts, not literary texts; and (2) he designed his scripts for players, playgoers, and playhouses that no longer exist. Ay, there's the rub. The 37 playscripts do survive (in whatever altered state or multiple versions) in the form of the early quartos and the 1623 First Folio, although most of us know them insofar as they have been filtered through the editorial tradition that started in the 18th century. However, the players who enacted those scripts are gone, leaving behind little evidence about their technique or style of performance. Moreover, the original playgoers who supported this highly competitive commercial theatre are also gone (despite the efforts of Ann Cook and Andrew Gurr to characterize them)<sup>2</sup> as are all of the playhouses of the period (in contrast to the situation in Spain).

Sam Wanamaker's reconstruction of the Globe is an attempt to recover or reconstitute the second of

those four components (to join the extant playscripts). But in considering how to use that reconstruction, we must not lose sight of the obvious: at the original Globe, the playwright, players, and playgoers would have shared a theatrical vocabulary (linked, in large part, to what could and could not be done on their stage) that is lost or blurred today. By playing the original scripts (as opposed to today's editorial text) in the reconstructed Globe, we may be able to recover parts of that shared vocabulary that Shakespeare, his colleagues, and his audience took for granted. If, however, we start this process with our evidence and our questions already tainted by sanitized playscripts and by post-Elizabethan theatrical thinking, both the laboratory and the experiments to be conducted therein will be contaminated from the outset.

Behind my formulation therefore lies the assumption (reinforced again and again during many years of wrestling with such problems) that we no longer speak the same theatrical language as did Shakespeare and his contemporaries. Rather, my own working model is: in reading one of the early printed texts of a Shakespeare play, we enter into the middle of a conversation--a discourse in a language we only partly understand--between a dramatist and his actor-colleagues, a halfway stage that was completed in a performance now lost to us. Although we will never reconstitute that performance, we may be able to recover elements of that vocabulary and hence better understand that conversation. To recover that lost vocabulary, however, we need much more than a playing space close to the original conditions (at best, a point of departure). Rather, we need a fresh, uncompromised approach to looking at the extant scripts, the only pertinent evidence--hence my list of Ten Commandments. The alternative is the situation engendered by Leontes, to whom Hermione can say: "You speak a language that I understand not" (3.2.79). What is the point of building a new Globe, with enormous emphasis upon authenticity of detail and design, only to fill that reconstituted space with scripts and notions that are wildly anachronistic so as to introduce a twentieth century theatrical idiom that, in effect, sets up major barriers between us and them?

To flesh out my commandments and explore the assets and liabilities of the New Globe, I will focus upon representative examples, many of which you have not been forced to confront because they have been filtered out of the editions you use. My iterated question will be: what can such anomalous moments teach us about that lost vocabulary at the original Globe?

Let me begin with a problem that faces any director staging a Shakespeare script today: where to place the intermission (U.S.A.) or interval (U.K.). So far as we can tell, throughout most of his career Shakespeare would have seen his plays performed continuously, from start to finish, with no breaks between acts or scenes. Around 1610, however, the fashion changed, so that performances in the public theatres gradually began to follow the practice of the private theatres in having brief pauses, with musical interludes, between the acts. Elizabethan and Jacobean audiences would therefore have been comfortable with either procedure (continuous flow or act pauses) but would have been surprised by the single fifteen-minute break today's playgoer takes for granted (again, "you speak a language that I understand not"). As a result, the imposition of such a break upon a dramatic strategy predicated upon a continuous flow of action will of necessity introduce changes and sometimes a new set of problems. For example, in making such a decision today's director must not only be concerned with where to stop (some kind of climactic moment) but also where to start up again, for the Elizabethan dramatist, who was not thinking in terms of such a decisive stop and start, did not provide that director with a scene that would re-engage an audience once again settling into their seats after a chat and a drink.

In making their choices directors often take practical considerations into account. For example, several

plays have busy ensemble scenes midway in the action that entail much onstage furniture that then can be removed during such a break; thus, 1 Henry IV is often divided after the big tavern scene (2.4), Macbeth after the banquet scene (3.4), and As You Like It after 2.7 where, again, an onstage banquet can be cleared away. But such choices have consequences. For example, to break the action with Prince Hal surveying a sleeping Falstaff is to gain a potentially strong closing image (as in Pat Patton's 1988 Oregon Shakespearean Festival production) but also to diminish strongly the contrapuntal effect in which the Hotspur-Glendower relationship in 3.1 comments upon Hal-Falstaff and then the Hal-Henry IV confrontation (3.2) comments upon both. The three scenes are scripted as one continuous sequence, but that sequence is blurred if not eclipsed by the break. Similarly, directors who break Macbeth after the banquet scene usually choose to start up again with the cauldron scene (4.1), a choice that, in turn, means the choric but very useful 3.6 (Lennox and another lord) must either be cut or repositioned (with the inevitable awkwardness that such restitching involves).

Consider *The Tempest* as a particularly good example. Choices as to where to pause may vary, but the most common in my experience has been after 2.2 (the first clown scene), a strong theatrical moment given the three drunken figures and the opportunities provided by Caliban's song. Such was the case in the 1988-89 Royal Shakespeare Company production where Nicholas Hytner used that fifteen minute space to change the set (so Caliban's "rock" disappeared) and to remove such items as the burden of wood brought in by Caliban at the beginning of 2.2. Then, before the actual start of 3.1 (while the playgoers were still retaking their seats) James Purefoy's Ferdinand made a series of trips so as to carry in logs and drop them into an open trap.

To break *The Tempest* here therefore solves one problem (how do you remove from the stage Caliban's "burden of wood"--2.2.0.s.d.?) and also allows for some suggestive business with Ferdinand at the beginning of the next scene (far more than the scripted stage direction in the Folio: "Enter Ferdinand, bearing a log"). The trade-off, however, is that the potential parallel between the two log-bearing figures, Caliban and Ferdinand, is diminished or gone, as, perhaps, is the emphasis upon two distinctively different routes to "freedom" (and here Ariel and others must be factored in as well). In various ways, both subtle and overt, to insert a break after 2.2 is to translate the original theatrical vocabulary into our idiom, for the continuous flow of scenes is an integral part of that lost language; any attendant problems or anomalies may then provide windows into their distinctive onstage practice. For example, what would happen if Caliban's wood remained in view onstage, whether to be carried off by Ferdinand and Miranda in the next scene or by Caliban himself at the end of the play as part of his seeking for grace from Prospero (5.1.296)?

Consider as another problem the aside, particularly what happens when editors or theatrical professionals decide what should or should not be an aside when no such signal is provided in the original text. In many instances, to designate a given speech as an aside is to filter out an apparent anomaly by finding a "realistic" reason why someone who should hear x does not, in fact, hear it. Admittedly, obvious asides often are not signaled as such in early printed editions (e.g., Macbeth's "rapt" speeches in 1.3 or his comment on Malcolm's elevation to Prince of Cumberland at the end of 1.4). Nonetheless, the editor who resorts in all such cases to the aside runs the risk of screening out some suggestive parts of Shakespeare's theatrical vocabulary.

For example, at the end of the cauldron scene [see passage #A] Macbeth, although onstage with Lennox, devotes 12 lines (4.1.144-55) to his plans against the MacDuffs and his innermost thoughts. Most editors treat this passage as an aside, thereby having Macbeth address Lennox again only in the final line and a half of the scene. Consider the possibility, however, that by this point Macbeth does

not care if Lennox (or anyone else) knows what he is thinking or planning or, as an alternative, that he is so rapt in his little world of man that he is momentarily unaware of Lennox's presence. To designate the speech as an aside in a modern edition is to enforce upon the reader, actor, or playgoer one choice at the expense of other equally interesting (and perhaps revealingly Jacobean) options. Here is where the testing at the New Globe should begin--with all options open. For example, can we imagine this moment played with Macbeth not only standing next to Lennox but also directing the entire speech at him?

Many other passages or apparent anomalies in the early printed editions similarly challenge our often unstated notions about "realism." Editors and directors in their own distinctive terms have developed many strategies for sidestepping or neutralizing these challenges, but my purpose here is to revisit such anomalies or seeming glitches. In particular, to provide some continuity I will focus primarily upon moments that involve some form of overlapping of elements that we today would prefer to be kept distinct. In such moments lies a decided challenge to our notions about "realism" and therefore, as I have noted, a potential window into something distinctive in that lost or blurred theatrical vocabulary.

Let me start with an oddly placed entrance in *Much Ado About Nothing*, 5.1. After the exit of Benedick (who has challenged Claudio and, in turn, been twitted by his two "friends"), Don Pedro and Claudio devote roughly ten lines to a discussion of what has just transpired. To start the next beat, the quarto provides a centered stage direction: "Enter Constables, Conrade, and Borachio." What strikes readers of the quarto as irregular, however, is that this stage direction does not come at the end of the ten lines and just before Dogberry's first speech ("Come you, sir. If justice cannot tame you..."--198) but rather appears two speeches earlier (roughly two thirds of the way through the Prince-Claudio dialogue) at line 193 [see passage #B]. Conceivably, this early entrance could be an error in the quarto or the manuscript that stands behind it (it does not appear to be the result of printing-shop exigencies). It should be noted, moreover, that the entrance of Leonato's group on the facing page (and comparable entrances elsewhere in this quarto) follow normative usage.

What then happens when the sequence as printed in the quarto is taken seriously so as to be played at the New Globe laboratory not as a misplaced signal that must be repositioned (as in the *New Arden* edition, pp. 200-1) but as a consciously contrived theatrical strategy or effect? Clearly, the scene is building to the comeuppance of the two supposedly superior, witty figures who are about to be punched in the stomach by Borachio's revelations. In particular, Don Pedro's arch line referring back to Benedick ("What a pretty thing man is when he goes in his doublet and hose and leaves off his wit!"--192-3) gets an immediate response in the entrance of the two constables and two villains, although the effect is for us (we see the four entering figures, perhaps make the ironic connection) rather than for Don Pedro and Claudio, who "see" nothing (and would the two figures under arrest be clad only in doublet and hose?). An even more strident violation of our sense of "realism" would occur if the two figures already onstage do not have their backs turned but (as with Macbeth speaking to Lennox) are actually facing the entering figures but not seeing or "noting" them. This staging has the potential for a brief but suggestive version of the kind of "not-seeing" confrontation associated with Gertrude and the ghost in the closet scene or with the banquet guests and Banquo's ghost; the entering figures would therefore be there but unseen until Dogberry actually speaks so as to break into the awareness of the two (supposed) wits.

Although such an interpretation is speculative (the early entrance could be an error), nonetheless it is based upon the evidence that survives in the quarto (and is often filtered out of modern editions). In terms of dramatic technique, how better set up for the playgoer the comic hubris of these two

"superior" figures before their balloon is punctured? The pay-off would then come with (1) the Dogberry-Don Pedro exchange (one final bit of witty superiority); (2) Borachio's big speech ("What your wisdoms could not discover, these shallow fools have brought to light"--221-2); and (3) Leonato's entrance and his emphasis upon "seeing" ("Which is the villain? Let me see his eyes, / That, when I note another man like him, / I may avoid him"--246-8). In this interpretation, the early entrance becomes a provocative signal (a form of theatrical italics) that highlights "what a pretty thing man is when he goes in his doublet and hose and leaves off his wit" so as to provide a summary example of the fashion-wit emphasis that reverberates throughout the comedy. To smooth out what appears to be an irregularity in the quarto (as in the Arden edition) may be to translate the scene into our idiom and, in the process, to stifle an interesting and potentially meaningful effect geared to the theatrical vocabulary of the 1590s.<sup>3</sup>

What is surprising is how regularly such "early" stage directions occur and how often they are ignored or tidied up. Perhaps the best known example is to be found in *Romeo and Juliet*, 2.3, where Q2 directs Romeo to enter not at the end of Friar Laurence's 30-line speech but after line 22 (see passage #C). Again, to have Romeo enter just in time to deliver his first line in the scene ("Good morrow, father") is much tidier, but various possibilities emerge if Romeo is onstage for lines 23-30. For example, a Romeo who hears the friar talking about the presence of both poison and medicine within the same flower may be more likely to think of such poison (and the apothecary) in V.1. More in tune with the passage in *Much Ado*, a playgoer who sees Romeo appear and meanwhile listens to the friar may be more likely (as with Don Pedro's comment upon wit) to make a connection between "this weak flower" (in line 23, juxtaposed with Romeo's appearance) and Romeo, so that the friar's subsequent analysis, that builds to a postulation of "grace and rude will" encamped in all of us, is not understood in highly abstract terms but is linked to the key chooser in the tragedy. Whatever the interpretation, the juxtaposition and timing here can be highly suggestive and can form a significant part of the onstage vocabulary of this scene.

The early entrance, then, may represent a signifier in that lost theatrical vocabulary that, because seemingly anomalous or intrusive or unrealistic, is rejected today. Consider some other moments that do not involve entrances but nonetheless are part of the same family of phenomena. First, consider the problem of how or when to dispose of the on-stage corpse of Sir Walter Blunt in 1 *Henry IV* (see passage #D). With more stage fights to follow, today's director prefers to clear the stage so as to have more free space and to minimize the risk to combatants. Editors or readers can ignore the problem or, in response to the silence in the quarto, can add their own signals after the last mention of the body. For example, editors since the eighteenth century have designated a scene division (signaled by a typographical break and other on-the-page conventions) after Falstaff's final lines on Blunt's "grinning honor" (5.3.57-60) and sometimes have inserted a stage direction such as "Exit [with Blunt's body]."<sup>4</sup> But what happens if the interpreter follows the quarto and keeps Blunt onstage, in full view, for the remainder of the play?

If Falstaff closes the visor on the dead figure's helmet, what the spectator would see is a corpse "semblably furnished like the king himself" (5.3.21) and therefore indistinguishable from Henry IV (who soon appears to fight with Douglas). How then will that spectator view the moments that follow, especially Prince Hal's epitaphs over Hotspur and Falstaff, if such an "image" of a counterfeit king remains on-stage? What would be the effect upon our reaction to Falstaff's disquisition on Hotspur's body in which he uses the term counterfeit nine times? Since the quarto provides neither evidence for Blunt's continued presence nor a signal for his removal, the editor or critic cannot be certain of the body's presence or absence, so what could be a highly visible and meaningful "image" is very much in

doubt.

I cannot prove that Blunt's body remained onstage in full view after Falstaff's speech and presumed exit. Perhaps the point about counterfeit kings and "a borrowed title has thou bought too dear" (5.3.23) has already been made. Perhaps the body would have been lugged off by Falstaff so as not to get in the way of the combats that involve first Henry IV, Douglas, and Prince Hal, then Hal, Hotspur, Douglas, and Falstaff. But if a counterfeit version of Henry IV indistinguishable from the real thing does remain in view, various lines and moments would have more resonance and impact. Indeed, the "image" could emerge as one of the most striking in the entire play, especially if juxtaposed with Falstaff's carrying off of Hotspur.

As with the early entrances already cited, my goal is not to defend any particular interpretation but rather to provide examples that test the working assumptions of those who will stage plays at the New Globe. Do we have room in our theatrical vocabulary or our sense of what "works" onstage for Blunt's body as a continuing presence or "image"? Or, in a comparable climactic moment, consider the effect upon the final sequence of *Macbeth* if young Siward's body remains in sight during much or all of the subsequent action. In some instances, Shakespeare does provide specific signals for the disposition of corpses (e.g., with Hotspur, Polonius, and Hamlet), but, in the absence of such signals, the interpreter should be open to the possibility of strong and potentially meaningful effects that can result from juxtapositions or overlapping easily filtered out by today's editor or director.

Such juxtapositions need not be limited to onstage corpses. Thus, in the climactic sequence of *Macbeth*, what happens to the "boughs" (5.6.0.s.d.--see passage #E) from Birnam Wood that Malcolm orders to be discarded ("Your leavy screens throw down / And show like those you are"--5.6.1-2)? Those boughs could be thrown down eight lines later at the end of this brief scene or could be thrown down at line 2, then subsequently picked up and carried off (a staging that seems to me awkward and redundant). Given, however, the possibility of overlapping images, the boughs could be deposited on the stage at the moment of the command (for me, the simplest interpretation) so as to remain in view for the rest of the action.

Would such a continuing presence then be a meaningful signifier in that shared theatrical vocabulary? For example, what would be the impact upon our sense of an ending if some kind of "greenery" is juxtaposed with *Macbeth*'s encounters with young Siward and Macduff, then the awarding of the crown to Malcolm? Certainly, this climax is far removed from the "green world" of comedy-romance, but the emphasis upon barrenness and sterility is very strong throughout (especially in *Macbeth*'s "My way of life / Is fall'n into the sear"--5.3.22-3). Would onstage boughs juxtaposed with *Macbeth*'s final moments underscore that gap between his Scotland and what has long been missing (see 3.6.32-7, much of 4.3, and 5.2.25-9)? Or would a playgoer see this greenery, now dead, as a discarded ploy, an abuse of nature by Malcolm (so his version of tumbling nature's germens)? How are we to know the validity of any such options without testing?

Another possible overlapping property or image (that, like the leavy screens, is rarely discussed in print) is to be found in the penultimate scene of *Much Ado* (5.3), the mourning at Hero's supposed tomb (see passage #F). If the "tomb" is a physical structure or property of some kind that is introduced for this one scene and then removed (as is assumed by many editors and often happens in modern productions), no such overlapping occurs. But interesting possibilities could arise at the New Globe if that "tomb" around which the mourners circle ("with songs of woe, / Round about her tomb they go"--14-15) is represented by a stage pillar or some other permanent feature of the stage in conjunction with

the imagination of the playgoer.<sup>5</sup>

What is the difference? The speaker of the epitaph (lines 3-10) apparently is reading from a scroll or other object, so that he can conclude: "Hang thou there upon the tomb, / Praising her when I am dumb" (9-10). But if there is no "tomb" to be removed by supernumeraries at the end of this brief scene, what happens to this scroll upon which the epitaph is inscribed when the mourners exeunt and give way to 5.4? If the supposed "place" of the last scene ("Leonato's house") is defined only by the dialogue, the indoor clothing, and the figures present (as opposed to furniture or hangings), what would be the effect if (as perhaps with Blunt's or Siward's body or the leavy screens) the scroll remains visible for part or all of the final sequence? For example, consider how that image held over from the "tomb" sequence (and therefore associated with Hero's "death") would affect our understanding of the climactic exchanges in 5.4, especially such lines as: "One Hero died defiled; but I do live"; "The former Hero! Hero that is dead!"; and "She died, my lord, but whiles her slander lived" (5.4.63, 65-6). Such a visible scroll would also provide added context for the papers written by Beatrice and Benedick that Hero and Claudio bring in as evidence. Again, by translating such a scene or sequence into our idiom we may be missing a distinctive feature or image obvious to the original audience (as also, perhaps, with Caliban's "burden of wood"). To what extent can such an overlapping image, particularly in the final sequence of a play, be construed as part of the original theatrical vocabulary?

The two richest overlaps or juxtapositions are to be found in *King Lear*, 2.3 and *As You Like It*, 2.6. Consider the latter where editors and critics continue to puzzle over Duke Senior's "banquet" that, according to the dialogue, is set up on stage in 2.5 (see lines 26-7, 55-6) and then enjoyed in 2.7 with no indication that it is removed for the brief 2.6 (the first appearance of Orlando and Adam in Arden--see passage #G). After reviewing various options (e.g., use of an "inner stage," transposition of scenes) the *New Variorum* editor (Richard Knowles) concludes: "the early setting of the table seems to me thoroughly puzzling; it is totally unnecessary, for the banquet could have been carried on, as banquets usually were, at the beginning of scene 7" (p. 109). Directors have therefore developed their own strategies for dealing with this anomaly: some transpose 2.5 and 2.6; some cut the offending lines in 2.5 so that the banquet first appears in 2.7; some play the Folio lines and sequence but darken the stage so that neither Orlando or the playgoer can "see" the banquet during 2.6.

As most editors and critics would agree, Shakespeare did not have to introduce a banquet into 2.5. Yet he did. The result, moreover, is a clear example of the kind of simultaneous staging often found in earlier English drama that yields for the playgoer a strong sense of overlap or juxtaposition comparable to that produced by early entrances or by bodies, scrolls, or leavy screens not removed from the stage. What we should be asking, especially given the availability of the new Globe as testing ground, is: what are the advantages of having such a banquet in full view during the speeches that constitute 2.6?

As one possible answer, consider how the presence of such food affects our reaction to Adam's "O, I die for food" and Orlando's subsequent "if" clauses: "If this uncouth forest yield anything savage, I will either be food for it or bring it for food to thee... I will here be with thee presently, and if I bring thee not something to eat, I will give thee leave to die; but if thou diest before I come, thou art a mocker of my labor...thou shalt not die for lack of a dinner if there live anything in this desert." What is the effect of such speeches if the food Orlando eventually finds in 2.7 is indeed visible to us while we are hearing these words? What seems anomalous or unrealistic to a reader nurtured upon our theatrical idiom could, in their vocabulary, be one of the striking moments or images in the show (as perhaps with Blunt's body) if the playgoer somehow gains from the juxtaposition an understanding of the distinctive nature of Arden. To what extent has our sense of "forest" or our resistance to simultaneous staging



eclipsed a major signifier in Shakespeare's theatrical vocabulary?

Here, moreover, is where my strictures about variable lighting and a modern sense of design become especially important. If we can transcend our own theatrical reflexes, we may be able to imagine a Forest of Arden in this instance defined for us not by onstage greenery but by the presence of food in the background while two figures are starving. Through such juxtapositional staging or signifying, that sense of an option available to be exercised or a potential there (under the right circumstances) to be fulfilled could emerge as the point of the sequence and a major building block for the final three acts. A director in a modern theatre who does introduce the banquet in 2.5 and does not remove it during 2.6 may still be tempted to darken part of the stage and highlight Orlando and Adam (as is usually done with Kent in the stocks during Edgar's speech that constitutes King Lear, 2.3). But in a New Globe where that option is not available (and where the whole concept of controlling the playgoer's sense of events by means of variable lighting is thwarted), the rationale behind this moment and its potential richness--in their terms--could be realized.

Note that my various categories (most notably the early stage directions and other overlapping images but also the aside and the interval-intermission) involve keeping simultaneous or in a continuous flow that which our reflexes would prefer to have asunder. Clearly, the Elizabethans preferred continuous or nearly continuous action (with no fifteen-minute break) and apparently took for granted other kinds of juxtapositions (as with early stage directions) that seem "unrealistic" and therefore troubling to us. One part of their vocabulary that may not translate readily into our idiom may therefore include signifiers that involve simultaneity (as with triptychs or other works of visual art that are based upon multiple unity). A post-Elizabethan aesthetic predicated upon "realism" and separateness may therefore filter out a play of mind that can produce some distinctive (even if, to us, initially jarring) effects, some of which have been eclipsed since the eighteenth century.

Let me conclude with a particularly provocative example from Macbeth, a moment, moreover, that, given modern editorial practice, is practically unknown. Thus, consider the question: when do we first see Macbeth after the murder of Duncan (that occurs between 2.1 and 2.2)? The Pelican editor, like most modern editors, places Macbeth's first line in the scene ("Who's there? What, ho?"--2.2.8) "[within]" and then places the stage direction "Enter Macbeth" so as to break line 13, the end of Lady Macbeth's second speech (so after "...I had done't" and before "My husband!"). The Folio, however (see passage #H), provides a centered "Enter Macbeth" at line 8 after Lady Macbeth's initial speech and before Macbeth's first line in the scene ("Who's there? what hoa?").

Although I have not done an exhaustive search, I know of no modern editions that follow the Folio here. Note the logic of "realism" at work. How are we to imagine a Macbeth onstage but not noticed by his wife for 5 lines? In the frenzied dialogue that follows, moreover, she asks "Did you not speak?" and he queries in response "As I descended?" so Macbeth's earlier half-line ("Who's there?...") can, by this logic, be envisaged as part of an offstage sequence (or onstage in a production with a visible staircase) before his actual entrance signaled by "My husband!" (in the Folio, "My Husband?"). In modern productions, the playgoer often sees Lady Macbeth below and Macbeth above, backing out of Duncan's chamber, then either descending in our sight or reappearing below at the point marked in modern editions when she first sees him. Such an emendation or adjustment seems to fit with the dialogue ("As I descended?") and avoid any awkwardness with Lady Macbeth not seeing her husband for 5 lines. The Folio, in this instance, is deemed wrong--in a matter of relatively minor consequence.

But the theatrical vocabulary of the 1590s and early 1600s may have included signifiers linked to

onstage figures limited in their ability to "see" important things around them. One possible way to signal or heighten such "not-seeing" (as with Claudio-Don Pedro) is to use an "early" stage direction so as to have an entering figure onstage (and seen by us) before the figure or figures already onstage are aware of his presence. To change the placement of Macbeth's entrance in 2.2 is to produce a much tidier scene, but what about the potential losses? What happens when we stage or imagine the scene as scripted in the Folio?

In practical theatrical terms (as with the moment in *Much Ado*), the Folio scene can be staged with the two figures facing in opposite directions and therefore backing into each other so as to produce a jolt that fits well with the tensions of the moment. But in terms of my emphasis upon "not-seeing," consider as well the related problem (rarely cited by editors and never, to my knowledge, linked to the early entrance): why does it take so long for Lady Macbeth to notice the bloody daggers (not until line 47), even though Macbeth says "This is a sorry sight" as early as line 20, presumably referring to his bloody hands holding the daggers, and also refers to "these hangman's hands" in line 27? Admittedly, the daggers can be covered (as in the 1988-89 Royal Shakespeare Company production) or somehow hidden--again to satisfy the logic of "realism"--but if the daggers are visible to the playgoer but, for some time, are not seen by Lady Macbeth that playgoer witnesses not one but two striking examples of "not-seeing" in the Folio version of this scene. Remember, in a famous speech at the end of the previous scene, Macbeth had seen and described a dagger that was not there: "There's no such thing. / It is the bloody business which informs / Thus to mine eyes" (2.1.47-9). In contrast, for a stretch of time in 2.2, Lady Macbeth does not see two bloody daggers that are there.

As already noted, an editor or a director can readily "solve" this problem, but what then is the price-tag for such a "solution"? If twice in this short sequence Lady Macbeth does not see something that is there to be seen by us (first Macbeth, then the daggers), especially after the dagger speech of 2.1, what kind of "image" or effect is set up for the playgoer? Given such a staging of the Folio signals, are we not better prepared for the sleep-walking (and her seeing or imagining there) or for the banquet scene when no one but Macbeth sees the ghost? Even here, we can emerge from the Folio version with a different understanding of her "A little water clears us of this deed. / How easy is it then!" (66-7) if, twice, she has not seen something we have seen. The scene and the tragedy as a whole are about darkness and blindness in various senses, so what happens if we trust the Folio version that, in a curious but potentially telling fashion, sets up, even italicizes (in symbolic or metaphoric terms), just such darkness and blindness? To filter out this effect is to produce a much tidier scene, especially in terms of "realism," but, in doing so, we may be translating a rich moment into our (less metaphorical, less symbolic) theatrical language and losing something significant in the process.

The pitfall in my line of argument (as many an editor will note) is that interpretive ingenuity may elevate errors or printing shop exigencies into meaningful, significant signals. But how are we to learn how to distinguish between meaningful signals in their theatrical vocabulary and, on the other hand, errors in the journey from script to printed page if those signals are never tested or trusted? If Shakespeare could resort to such seemingly anomalous staging as found in *As You Like It* 2.6 in order to set up symbolic or ironic juxtapositions, why should we rule out an early entrance as in *Macbeth* 2.2 that also could italicize some link or point (e.g., as a possible equivalent to a drum roll or trumpet that signals "look at me")?

Interpreting Shakespeare today is a constant process of translation into our idiom, a process often unacknowledged by director, editor, or reader (here the playgoer's expectation of one fifteen-minute break is a particularly good example). Such a process is natural, to be expected, and, in many respects,

healthy and fruitful. But not at the New Globe. Again, why go to all this trouble and exert so much effort in behalf of authenticity merely to create a theatrical space wherein will take place the same modern or post-modern appropriations or translations of the original scripts? To justify all this effort, the focus at this presumably special, one-of-a-kind theatre should be upon recovery and discovery, particularly in terms of those signifiers in that lost vocabulary or discourse that informs Elizabethan-Jacobean drama. Let us begin with the assumption that, in theatrical terms, they knew what they were doing. If productions at the New Globe provide only more translation of Shakespeare's theatrical language into our realistic-naturalistic-post-Ibsen idiom, we are showing little trust in the dramaturgy behind the plays to which we pay such mouth-honor. As the Archbishop of York asks: "What trust is in these times?" (2 *Henry IV*, 1.3.100) The answer remains to be seen.

1. Unless otherwise noted, quotations are from *The Complete Pelican Shakespeare*, gen. ed. Alfred Harbage (Baltimore, 1969).

2. See Ann Jennalie Cook, *The Privileged Playgoers of Shakespeare's London, 1576-1642* (Princeton, 1981) and Andrew Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London* (Cambridge, 1987).

3. In a workshop at Goucher College on October 15, 1988 (built around the five ACTER actors who were performing *Much Ado*), this early entrance was instinctively resisted by the actors playing Claudio and Don Pedro (Allan Hendrick, Dudley Sutton) who immediately moved as far downstage as they could with their backs to the entering figures so as to justify their not seeing them. The only one who liked the effect was Dogberry (Richard Cordery), for it gave him a moment to strut or call attention to himself while waiting to be noticed by his superiors. Modern theatrical professionals (like modern editors) have well-developed reflexes (often linked to psychological realism) that can come into conflict with the onstage vocabulary of the 1590s--a conflict that will surface repeatedly at the New Globe.

4. For a recent example of "Exit [with Blunt's body]," see William Shakespeare, *The Complete Works*, gen. eds. Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), p. 539 [see passage #D-2; passage #D-1, with a formal scene break and an indication of a new locale ("Another part of the field)", is from the Peter Alexander edition].

5. The New Arden editor (A. R. Humphreys) speaks for many scholars when he asserts that "an impressive tomb (a stage-property, as in *Romeo and Juliet*), is essential" for staging this scene (p. 210), a property or structure that (presumably) must be introduced at the outset and then removed from the view of the audience at the end of 5.3. In contrast, a tomb that is "created" by gestures to some permanent part of the stage in conjunction with the poetry and the imagination of the audience will just cease to exist when the actors exeunt--unless some detail (such as a scroll) persists as an echo or reminder.