Staging on the Road, 1586-1594: A New Look at Some Old Assumptions

Leslie Thomson

Staging on the Road, 1586–1594:
A New Look at Some Old Assumptions

Leslie Thomson

Iꜰ ᴡᴇ ᴋɴᴏᴡ ᴛᴏᴏ ʟɪᴛᴛʟᴇ ᴀʙᴏᴜᴛ sᴛᴀɢɪɴɢ ᴄᴏɴᴅɪᴛɪᴏɴs in the playhouses of early modern London, we can be even less certain about the conditions players found in the provincial venues where they performed when on tour. This lack of evidence has been particularly useful to those who have argued that certain playtexts reflect adjustments required by inadequate provincial facilities. But this negative view has been challenged by those who argue not only that such conclusions are unsupported but also that there are good reasons to adopt a more positive approach to staging on the road. I propose to refute some earlier assumptions about provincial playing conditions and examine a group of representative plays for what they might tell us about the kinds of facilities London companies might actually have expected to find in the provinces.

The idea that playtexts were altered to produce shorter versions adapted to the poor conditions players found on the road was advanced by A. W. Pollard and J. Dover Wilson in 1919.[1] In the first of a series of articles, working from the premise that the manuscripts behind the so-called bad quartos "had been deliberately shortened," they posited the existence of "longer originals from which the abridgments were made." Needing a reason for this cutting, they concluded that "these abridgments can only have been made for audiences in the provinces, where the conditions of performance and the smaller number of actors, as compared with the full London companies, compelled drastic excisions."[2] In their second article, they took this further: these shorter manuscripts were "useless for London performances [and therefore] likely to have been less carefully guarded than the complete texts"; as a result, they were stolen. To prove these hypotheses,

---

This study is dedicated to the memory of Barbara D. Palmer, who died in 2009, not long after chairing the Shakespeare Association of America (SAA) seminar, "Mobility in Shakespeare's England," for which an earlier version of this study was written. Her thorough archival research and healthy skepticism about previous conclusions, especially regarding provincial touring, provide a model for a productive revisionist approach to theater history.

1 A. W. Pollard and J. Dover Wilson, "The 'Stolne and Surreptitious' Shakespearian Texts," *Times Literary Supplement* (*TLS*), all in 1919: 9 January, 18; 16 January, 30; "*Henry V* (1600)," 13 March 1919, 134; "*The Merry Wives of Winds*or (1602)," 7 August 1919, 420; "*Romeo and Juliet*, 1597," 14 August 1919, 434; and Alfred W. Pollard, correspondence, 28 August, 461.

2 *TLS*, 9 January 1919, 18.

Pollard and Wilson added supposition to fact: "About 1594, indeed, a flood of playhouse manuscripts got on to the market, especially from companies in low water, such as the Queen's or Pembroke's men, and many of these bear obvious traces of having been shortened for provincial playing."[3] In subsequent articles on the "bad" quartos of *Henry V*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *Romeo and Juliet*, they used the same premise about inadequate provincial performance conditions as a basis for their arguments. Pollard and Wilson's theories were soon challenged by W. J. Lawrence who, referring to their "double-barrelled postulate" about audience and conditions (quoted above), noted that "no attempt is made to prove either of the assertions."[4]

Nevertheless, in 1919 Pollard and Wilson found a very influential defender in W. W. Greg, who considered it "an ingenious and attractive hypothesis" that these "shortened versions were prepared for use on provincial tours."[5] So it is not surprising that in Greg's 1922 study of the quarto and plot of *The Battle of Alcazar* (which he dedicated to Pollard and Wilson), one reason he offers for the existence of two versions of the play was "the adaptation of plays to special conditions of performance." Echoing and expanding on the Pollard-Wilson rationale, Greg argues:

> It has been usual to suppose that the circumstances necessitating such adaptation were performance at court and provincial tours. That a travelling company, acting in inn-yards and town-halls, would require to limit severely the spectacular side of their performances seems tolerably obvious, while the probability that the number of their members would not be very great suggests that any opportunity of reducing the number of parts in their plays would be welcomed. It is also reasonable to suppose that a provincial audience would be satisfied with a shorter and less elaborate performance than it would have been prudent to submit to the censure of London prentices and gallants.[6]

Since Greg and his fellow bibliographers were chiefly concerned to find an explanation for the so-called bad quartos, these interrelated theories had a lot to recommend them. This is probably why their conclusions and the "anti-provincial bias"[7] underlying them have gone largely unchallenged. But while consider-

---

[3] *TLS*, 16 January 1919, 30.

[4] W. J. Lawrence, correpondence, *TLS*, 26 August 1919, 461.

[5] W. W. Greg, correspondence, *TLS*, 21 August 1919, 449.

[6] W. W. Greg, *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: "The Battle of Alcazar" and "Orlando Furioso"* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1922), 251–52. For trenchant analyses of the complexities and circularities of Greg's argument, see Paul Werstine, "Touring and the Construction of Shakespeare Textual Criticism," and Michael Warren, "Green's *Orlando*: Greg Furioso," both in *Textual Formations and Reformations*, ed. Laurie E. Maguire and Thomas L. Berger (Newark: U of Delaware P, 1998), 45–66, 67–91.

[7] The phrase is Alan Somerset's: "The anti-provincial bias has affected theatre historians, leading to a number of little-examined presuppositions that have long affected scholarship;

ing the long-lasting influence of these ideas, we should bear in mind that Greg plainly admits, "While there can . . . be no longer any doubt as to the existence of a class of stage abridgements, the occasions or circumstances of their production remain largely a matter of speculation, and no direct proof of their alleged provincial origin has been attempted in these pages."[8] Because many subsequent editors and critics have simply followed Greg's biased lead without testing his assumptions, the condition of certain playtexts is still often unquestioningly attributed to inadequate provincial performance conditions.[9]

Recently, however, the assumptions about provincial limitations and London companies' reluctance to tour have begun to be seriously reconsidered, notably by Records of Early English Drama (REED) researchers and others using evidence found in provincial records. This work shows that more companies traveled more often than previously thought. For example, while acknowledging that "nobody would argue that the London companies of actors preferred touring," Alan Somerset draws on REED and other data to show that not only did London companies travel regularly to perform, they did so with considerable success. In contrast to repeated assertions such as those of Gerald Eades Bentley that touring was unprofitable and traveling players often turned away, Somerset's evidence—drawn from Malone Society and REED records for the period between 1563 and 1617—supports his conclusion that traveling players were welcomed by the authorities 95 percent of the time.[10] While Bentley based his conclusion on only fifteen attempts by players to be given permission to perform, Somerset found "3,119 successful visits out of a total of 3,279 records" and no "observable

---

among these we might examine the idea that the players only travelled when they absolutely had to, especially when the plague was raging, or the notion that little theatrical activity occurred outside London." See "'How chances it they travel?': Provincial Touring, Playing Places, and the King's Men," *Shakespeare Survey* 47 (1994): 45–60, esp. 48. For a detailed focus on this attitude and its effects on theater history, see Alan Somerset, "The Lords President, Their Activities and Companies: Evidence from Shropshire," *Elizabethan Theatre* 10 (1988): 93–111.

  [8] Greg, *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements*, 5.

  [9] As Lukas Erne observes, the notion that the "bad" quartos are records "*for* provincial performances" has persisted and is still advanced by some scholars; see *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003), 206 and note. He cites Michael J. B. Allen and Kenneth Muir: "It may well be that all the bad quartos were abridgments for touring purposes"; see *Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1981), xiv. He also cites Gary Taylor, who writes of "memorial texts": "Often these texts have been much abbreviated, always by the foreshortening and compression of memory, sometimes because they report an abridged text used or intended for use on provincial tours"; see Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor with John Jowett and William Montgomery, *William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 28. Significantly, neither Allen and Muir nor Taylor justifies their assertions with evidence; they merely present them as assumptions.

  [10] Somerset, "'How chances it they travel?'" 47, 50. See also Gerald Eades Bentley, *The Profession of Player in Shakespeare's Time, 1590–1642* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984), 177–205, passim.

rise in the numbers of visits during plague outbreaks."[11] If anything, visits declined as provincial authorities sought to protect their jurisdiction from infection. Similar revisions to previously accepted ideas are advanced by Peter Greenfield, who notes that "professional players expected to tour as a normal requirement of their occupation, not as an act of desperation." As he observes, "Most acting troupes must have at least broken even, since they returned to the provinces time and again."[12] These tours were not only numerous but far reaching.[13] Barbara Palmer's research, for example, shows that professional players regularly toured in the north of England, visiting not only such cities as York and Doncaster but also the great houses of the Clifford and Cavendish families.[14] But perhaps the most striking and illustrative example of the routine nature of touring is provided by the Queen's Men. According to Scott McMillin and Sally-Beth MacLean, "From the year of their formation in 1583, the Queen's Men were the most active touring troupe on record."[15] McMillin and MacLean's map of the Queen's Men tour stops and their list of all the known performances of the company in the provinces—with records of payment—make it abundantly clear that this company regularly toured most of England and was well rewarded for doing so.[16]

Given, on the one hand, the accumulation of findings that question or completely refute the idea that touring was a desperate measure undertaken irregularly and, on the other hand, the absence of evidence that provincial performance necessitated shorter playtexts and resulted in corruptions, there is dwindling cause to think that traveling players would have had to "limit severely the spectacular side of their performances" and that those performances were "less elaborate" than on the London stages. While Greg did not explain what he meant by "spectacular" or "elaborate," he (and Pollard and Wilson) believed that touring casts were smaller than in London, so possibly he was referring to scenes re-

[11] Bentley, 189–94; and Somerset, "'How chances it they travel?'" 50.

[12] Peter Greenfield, "Touring," in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia UP, 1997), 251–68, esp. 252, 254. On the plague as the reason why London companies traveled, Greenfield echoes Somerset: "Provincial records of visits by prominent companies like the Queen's Men, the Lord Admiral's Men, and the Early or Worcester's Men reveal no increases in touring activity because of the plague" (252).

[13] See Sally-Beth MacLean, "Players on Tour: New Evidence from Records of Early English Drama," *Elizabethan Theatre* 10 (1988): 55–72, and "Tour Routes: 'Provincial Wanderings' or Traditional Circuits?" *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 6 (1993): 1–14.

[14] Barbara D. Palmer, "Early Modern Mobility: Players, Payments, and Patrons," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 56 (2005): 260–305, esp. 265. In an appendix, Palmer provides charts of detailed information taken from the records of all four locations: the date of the players' visit, patron, payment, and any notes. These charts amply justify her inference that "the profit motive" was "the primary force driving professional troupes toward northern income" (266).

[15] Scott McMillin and Sally-Beth MacLean, *The Queen's Men and Their Plays* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998), 37.

[16] McMillin and MacLean, 50, 175–88.

quiring large numbers as being spectacular and elaborate. But of course scenes requiring more than basic facilities also typically include many players on stage. More generally, as Paul Werstine has pointed out, the antiprovincial bias that Greg shared with Pollard and Wilson was compounded by an "anti-theatrical bias,"[17] so that their theories about performance requirements and conditions are fundamentally flawed. However, it is not difficult to understand why Greg assumed that the elaborate and spectacular were avoided by London companies on tour, or why his assumptions were easily accepted; after all, we probably share at least his antiprovincial prejudice. To my knowledge, no one has so far tested his conclusions against any of the plays themselves.

In what follows, I have taken "spectacular" and "elaborate" to refer to any stage business that would have been visually impressive and would have required more than a basic platform, hand-held properties, and necessary costumes. With these criteria in mind, I analyze the staging *requirements* in a representative group of plays for the *possibility* of considerable provincial sophistication in performance conditions.[18] In particular, although "elaborate" might be used to describe costumes and properties, and certainly "spectacular" could describe the special effects often called for in stage directions, I contend that both adjectives would be most applicable to those kinds of stage business that put the greatest demands on a performance space—action "above," ascents to or descents from an upper level, descents into or ascents out of a trap, discovery scenes, and the appearance of large properties such as a throne or bed. I will focus on these conventional and recurring elements.

In an eight-year period between 1586 and 1594, five companies of players originating in London—the Admiral's, Pembroke's, Queen's, Strange's, and Sussex's Men—are known to have toured the provinces with some regularity; thirty-five extant plays have been linked with some certainty to these companies during this time.[19] This combination of information provides a virtually unique collection of evidence to apply to a consideration of the relationship between staging requirements and conditions. Nevertheless, this survey is necessarily in-

[17] Werstine, 48–50. Werstine describes the antitheatrical bias as the assumption "that the purely theatrical—rather than authorial—process of cutting must necessarily have been transparently incompetent, producing rough seams in the printed texts of these performance scripts" (48).

[18] My emphases are a reminder that there is no certainty that the staging requirements indicated in stage directions or dialogue were ever actually implemented, in London or anywhere else. Nevertheless, since a play's action and language are equal parts of a whole, and assuming that printed plays reflect the manuscripts used as a basis for performance, it is a reasonable working hypothesis that players would have wanted to implement the staging elements indicated in these playtexts.

[19] For easily accessible lists of companies, plays, and records of provincial performance, see Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearian Playing Companies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

complete, in part because these companies owned and performed many more plays, now lost. But as with almost everything to do with the plays, companies, and performance venues of this period, we must work with what we have; and based on the similarities shared by the extant plays, it seems reasonable to assume that the stage business in them is representative of what was popular with audiences and would likely also have featured in the lost plays. Furthermore, as Roslyn Knutson has demonstrated, emulation if not outright plagiarism was not uncommon amongst these competing companies, so it is unsurprising that many plays included similar spectacular business.[20] Also worth emphasizing is that the language and kinds of stage directions are very consistent in plays written between the 1580s and 1642, whether they occur in manuscript or printed versions of plays.[21]

An inevitable limitation to this analysis is that, as Peter Greenfield notes, "We know very little about what plays provincial audiences saw. Accounts and court records alike rarely mention the titles or describe performances. On the few occasions when they do, the titles and descriptions cannot be certainly linked to any extant play texts."[22] At the same time, though, it makes sense that traveling companies would have wanted to tour with plays that had been successful in London. Not only would it have been practical to take the plays they already owned and with which they were most familiar, their provincial audiences would also have been eager to see (or to see again) what had been popular on London stages and had already traveled outside the city by word of mouth or in print.[23] Henslowe's *Diary* provides the only records of how often plays were performed over a short period in 1594, but fortunately that evidence relates to a few of the plays included in this survey. In the course of her detailed analysis of Henslowe's records, Knutson observes that "a few plays, no doubt because of their spectacular audience appeal, were given runs unusual in length and number of performances." And "some plays, it seems, were never really retired. *Doctor Faustus*, introduced in [September 1594] stayed in production over twenty-nine months and received twenty-four performances." Knutson also notes that "between May

---

[20] For a consideration of evidence that companies competed by duplicating each other's subject matter and other "commercial features," see Roslyn Lander Knutson, *Playing Companies and Commerce in Shakespeare's Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001), 56–63.

[21] For exhaustive evidence of the consistency of stage directions, see Alan C. Dessen and Leslie Thomson, *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama, 1580–1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999).

[22] Greenfield, "Touring," 263.

[23] As Palmer's study demonstrates, "London playgoing needs to be recognized as part of a much larger, highly mobile communication network. . . . Clearly communication existed among troupes, players, musicians, aristocrats, gentry, court officeholders, lawyers, civic authorities, and such providers of goods or services as merchants, stablers, and innkeepers" ("Early Modern Mobility," 278).

1601 and November 1602, the Admiral's Men revived five plays from the Sep-
tember 1594 repertory"; three of these were *The Jew of Malta*, *The Massacre at
Paris*, and *Doctor Faustus*.[24] The reason for reviving these plays must have been
their earlier popularity—it was not that they were easy to stage. In particular, all
three include important scenes using a "discovery space" large enough for proper-
ties, scenes that are very unlikely to have been eliminated on the road because
their spectacular nature was surely one reason for their audience appeal. And if
success with London playgoers was a main reason for bringing plays on the road
(and why would it not have been?), when the Admiral's/Strange's Men took to
the road in 1593 they would almost certainly have taken Marlowe's audience-
pleasers with them.

The Pollard-Wilson-Greg hypothesis that plays were cut for provincial per-
formance is called into question by almost everything we now know (or think
we know) about how London companies worked. Once a playbook had been
licensed and annotated for performance by a bookkeeper, the players' parts pre-
pared, and the play performed in repertory with other plays, it would have been
at least inconvenient to make the kinds of alterations that cutting a segment
would have required. A company would surely have wanted to perform the more
spectacular business if at all possible, and would have found ways to do so. The
related idea that plays were shortened to accommodate a reduced cast for provin-
cial touring, questioned by Lawrence when first posited by Pollard and Wilson,
has been countered and seriously undermined by more recent studies.[25] As John
Astington observes, during this period "all actors remained touring players, with
the improvisational skills required of touring players. . . . If the company knew
the lines, stage positions, and costume changes required to play a piece, they
might have played it in a wide variety of spaces."[26] This being so, to alter or cut
what the players had already memorized and acted would have done more to
jeopardize a successful performance than any differences or limitations in the
facilities they found on tour.

Instead of assuming generally primitive provincial conditions as a basis for
speculating about adjustments to playtexts or about which plays might have

[24] Roslyn Lander Knutson, "The Repertory," in *A New History of Early English Drama* (see n.
12 above), 461–80, esp. 466, 467–68.

[25] In *The Shakespearian Playing Companies*, a study that draws extensively on Records of Early
English Drama (REED) research, Andrew Gurr notes, "It has almost always been assumed that
because travel was strenuous the London-based companies made economies in their resources
when they had to travel. They cut the numbers of players in the group, it is assumed, and they
cut their playbooks so that the smaller number of players on tour could offer the country cut-
down versions of their London plays. That, I believe, is a mistaken view" (40). For other detailed
refutations of this idea see Werstine; and Erne, 206–10.

[26] John H. Astington, *English Court Theatre, 1558–1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999),
219.

been taken on the road, I propose that the staging requirements of plays belong-ing to these companies are primary evidence for the provincial staging conditions that were available or possible. To put it another way, if all a company took on the road had been plays that did not require a rear wall with doors and/or a curtain and a space behind it, an upper level with some way to reach it, and a raised stage with a trap, the traveling repertoire would have been limited to plays needing only a bare floor, a few props, and some costumes. If the extant plays are repre-sentative, however, such minimalist staging requirements were not the norm by the mid-1580s. While a company could have brought with it some plays with simple staging requirements for those venues where only basic facilities were available, almost certainly a company would also have brought some plays that included characters appearing above, revealed by a drawn curtain, or rising from a trap.[27] Moreover, once a stage has a rear wall with doors through which play-ers can enter and exit, then a curtain in front of that wall, and a raised platform and means of ascent and descent behind that wall become possible; and even if a stage were not high enough for a trap to be used, an opening in the wall to an area behind it (like a "hell mouth") could have served the purpose. Surely it would have been preferable to adapt the performance space rather than to cut those parts of a play most likely to thrill an audience, or to leave behind in Lon-don a play with which the company was familiar as part of its repertory.

   This is a survey of the staging requirements in thirty-five plays that were *avail-able* for performance in the provinces by five London companies over an eight-year period. The evidence is taken from the primary sources, the extant playtexts, which nevertheless raises difficulties because the authority of those texts varies widely. Those texts are the only ones we have and—especially pertinent here—they have generally similar kinds of staging requirements. In Tables 1 and 2, I provide as much relevant information as concisely as possible, but some justifica-tions and explanations are necessary. The evidence for linking a play with a com-pany ranges from the reasonable certainty of title-page attributions to probable but debatable associations (same printer or publisher) or references (in records or anecdotes). For those plays that might have been in the possession of more than one company during the period, the more certain connection is given. But because my argument rests partly on the premise that the plays listed in the ta-bles were in these companies' traveling repertoires, those plays for which the link

---

[27] Interestingly, in blaming the inferior quality of Q1 *Romeo and Juliet* and Q1 *Hamlet* on provincial performance conditions, Pollard and Wilson (and followers) seem not to have appre-ciated that if certain venues are indeed reflected in these "bad quartos," they would nevertheless have been equipped with an arras and a grave for *Hamlet* and a curtained opening or space for a curtained bed, as well as something to represent a tomb, for *Romeo and Juliet*. Certainly, the presence of such "spectacular" and "elaborate" events in these Q1 versions contradicts the assumptions on which Greg based much of his influential argument.

to a company or companies is extremely tenuous are not included.[28] If a playtext associated with one of the five companies between 1586 and 1594 is extant, it is used regardless of when it was printed, in the belief that staging requirements are more likely to have been introduced when the play was written and first performed. For example, perhaps the most extreme instance of delay between first known performances and publication is that of *The Jew of Malta*, written about 1589 but not printed until 1633. While it is possible that the original version was altered over time so that the printed text is different in some ways from the play as originally performed, the ending of this play is strikingly similar to the endings of two other Marlowe plays—a strong indication that the most spectacular element was part of this play from the start.[29] Questions might also arise because some of the extant playtexts are considerably shorter than others, which might suggest cutting. But some of those shorter plays offer the same "spectacular" staging as some of the longer plays, so if they were cut it was not to simplify the staging.[30] And while some of the plays with the most basic requirements are also among the shortest (such as *Fair Em*, *A Knack to Know a Knave*, and *Orlando Furioso*),[31] there is absolutely no indication, textual or otherwise, that such plays once included more complex staging business, much less that if they were indeed cut, it was to eliminate such business. Regardless of any bibliographic differences, therefore, all the plays with clear links to the five companies during the eight-year period are part of this survey.

Table 1 lists these plays alphabetically, with the common kinds of action that would have required more than a basic platform and/or the more popular sorts of properties that would have taken space behind a wall before being thrust out on stage through an opening in that wall. Staging requirements are considered certain when signaled by stage directions, but when dialogue provides the only cue, certainty is not always possible; I have been conservative in deciding whether (or not) a play includes a particular piece of business, and asterisks designate probability only. These instances have not been included in the counts or percentages. Table 2 lists the plays by company to highlight certain company-related

---

[28] For company provenance of the plays, see Alfred Harbage, *Annals of English Drama, 975–1700*, 3rd ed., rev. S. Schoenbaum and Sylvia Stoler Wagonheim (London: Routledge, 1989). For Queen's Men plays, this information has been emended with reference to McMillin and MacLean's more conservative approach, esp. 84–96.

[29] Similarly consistent is Marlowe's repeated and extensive use of the rear wall and openings; see Leslie Thomson, "Marlowe's Staging of Meaning," *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 18 (2005): 19–36.

[30] For a persuasive analysis of Queen's Men and other contemporary plays showing how casting requirements can explain the nature of extant playtexts, see McMillin and MacLean, 97–120.

[31] I owe this point to Lawrence Manley, whose paper for the same SAA seminar included a consideration of shorter plays with smaller casts that belonged to Strange's Men.

details, but these are secondary because the emphasis in this study is on the plays themselves and on the evidence they provide about staging requirements.

Only ten or eleven of the thirty-five plays, or no more than 31 percent, require only a basic performance area with doors for entrances and exits and some hand-held properties. These are *The Comedy of Errors, Edward II, Fair Em, John of Bordeaux, King Leir, A Knack to Know a Knave, A Knack to Know an Honest Man, Orlando Furioso, 1 Tamburlaine, The Taming of A Shrew*, and *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London*, an entertaining selection to be sure. But twenty-four of the thirty-five, or 68 percent, include at least one of the eight major kinds of staging business I looked for, and nineteen (54 percent) include at least two of the eight. In other words, there was a preference for more than basic staging. The most common kinds of action and number of plays are characters above (sixteen plays), the opening of a curtain or door to effect a discovery (twelve), and ascents to or descents from an upper level (eleven)—the latter almost always unseen by the audience, the ascent or descent occurring behind a curtain or wall. Seven or possibly eight plays include characters both above *and* discovered. By far the most common larger property is a throne or sick-chair, called for in eleven plays. Perhaps not surprisingly given their size, the three other properties in the table—bed, chariot, and tomb—occur less often, but the first two at least are large items needing to be thrust out from behind a rear wall or curtain.[32] Significantly, I think, most of the plays that include one of these four properties also have action either above or discovered. Also worth noting is that if a part of the stage or a property was used once, it was often used again. This means that where asterisks appear in the table, the associated element or stage property is mentioned elsewhere in the play and probably recurred. Some details will help to convey both the nature of these actions and their importance to the plays in question.[33]

Characters appearing above are always a focus of attention, and typically the raised location is thematically significant. *Alphonsus King of Aragon* begins with Venus being "*let down from the top of the stage*"—that is, she starts the play above and is then visibly lowered to it. The final direction gives an option: "*Exit Venus. Or if you can conveniently, let a chair come down from the top of the stage, and draw her up.*" Certainly, even if the goddess's descent from above might have had to occur behind a tiring-house wall or a curtain, that could be done; and the fa-

---

[32] Also quite possible is that a sick-chair was substituted for a bed in some cases. "Tomb" can signal the use of an opening in the tiring-house wall or the trap or a property; see Dessen and Thomson, *Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama*, q.v.

[33] The tables provide signatures, line numbers, or act and scene; for ease of reading, these will not be repeated for the quotations that follow. Spelling has been modernized in all quotations from the plays.

cilities to "draw up" a character or property were probably not always available on the road. A similar direction in *A Looking Glass for London and England* in which Oseas the prophet is "*set down over the Stage in a Throne*" suggests that "set" should almost certainly be "let," and, again, in a venue without the necessary machinery the descent could occur via unseen stairs. In *Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes*, Providence visibly descends and then ascends. *George a Greene* has a character enter "*upon the walls*" of a castle, whereas in *The First Part of the Contention* Eleanor leaves the main stage and "*goes up to the Tower*" from where she watches the conjuring below. None of the plays uses the upper level more often than *1 Henry VI* in which one or more characters enter on the "*turrets*" or, repeatedly, on the "*walls*"; Joan enters "*on the top,*" and there is a direction for soldiers to "*leap over the walls,*" which although anomalous, I have taken to signal the use of an upper level in the first instance and a visible descent from above in the second. In *James V*, a direction for characters to "*descend down*" indicates that they have been above. *The Jew of Malta* has Abigail enter "*above*" once and Barabas twice; Barabas also somehow descends into the cauldron at the play's end. *Richard III* has Richard enter "*aloft*" with two bishops. Twice in *Selimus*, soldiers appear "*on the walls*" for a parley; on the first occasion of their appearance, opposing soldiers "*scale the walls.*" Similarly, in *2 Tamburlaine* a captain and his wife appear on "*castle walls*"; the governor of Babylon appears "*upon the walls,*" which are then scaled. *The Spanish Tragedy* has "*Balthasar above*" and "*Bel-imperia, at a window.*" *Titus Andronicus* begins with the Tribunes and Senators entering "*aloft*"; other characters ascend to the upper level, exit, reappear there, and descend unseen. In Act 5, when Titus appears in his study, he is possibly above because Tamora tells him to "come down"; later in this act, Marcus and Lucius threaten to "headlong hurl" themselves from where they are standing, so presumably they are above; they then descend and reappear on the main stage. In *The Troublesome Reign of King John* Arthur is on "*the walls,*" as is Warwick in *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York*. Finally, *The Wounds of Civil War* begins with characters who enter "*on the Capitol*" and then "*go down*"; later in the play, Marius appears twice "*upon the walls.*" Although several of the directions could probably not have been implemented as written in a space without machinery to raise and lower one or more players, most of the action "above" requires only a platform, while most of the ascents and descents would have been made behind the tiring-house wall or a curtain.

The opening of a door in the tiring-house wall or the drawing of a curtain to reveal one or more characters, sometimes with large properties, is an action central to many plots, although the signals are often ambiguous. In *Alphonsus King of Aragon* the direction "*let there be a brazen Head set in the middle of the place behind the Stage, out of which, cast flames of fire, drums rumble within*" is similar to

one in *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*: "*Enter Friar Bacon drawing the curtains with a white stick, a book in his hand, and a lamp lighted by him, and the brazen head and Miles, with weapons by him*," suggesting a common use of the stage by these two Queen's Men plays. In *2 Tamburlaine*, "*the Arras is drawn, and Zenocrate lies in her Bed of State*" surrounded by Tamburlaine and several others; Amyras and Celebinus "*issue from the tent where Caliphas sits asleep*." The direction at the start of *The Jew of Malta* for Barabas to enter "*in his counting house with heaps of gold before him*" is almost certainly effected by a discovery, as are "*Enter Ramus in his study*" in *The Massacre at Paris* and the uses of "*enter Faustus in his study*" in *Doctor Faustus*. In the A-text of *Doctor Faustus*, Faustus's penultimate line, "Ugly hell gape not," suggests another discovery.[34] Although a stage direction or clear dialogue signal is absent, there is reason to think that the king is discovered in prison near the end of *Edward II*. The sparse stage directions and sometimes conflicting dialogue in *The Famous Victories of Henry V* make it difficult to be certain, but possibly the king is discovered when his son first comes to him; he asks his lords to "draw the curtains" so that when his son returns the king is discovered again, after which he asks for the curtains to be closed once more. *The First Part of the Contention* also poses problems because although the curtains referred to in stage directions could be those of the cardinal's bed, there is the suggestion that the bed itself is revealed by drawing curtains; these are listed as both discoveries and bed scenes in the table. A discovery is probably indicated in *James IV* when the countess and her daughter enter "*in their porch, sitting at work*." In *A Looking Glass for London and England*, curtains are drawn closed and later opened to reveal a dead body. *The Old Wives' Tale* evidently includes three uses of a discovery space: first Sacrapant enters "*in his study*"; later, two furies enter "*out of the Conjurer's Cell*," and near the end Jack "*draweth a curtain, and there Delia sitteth asleep*." In *Selimus*, "*the curtains are drawn*" closed for Bajazet to sleep; shortly thereafter, he awakens when a messenger arrives and probably the curtains are opened again. In *The Spanish Tragedy*, Hieronimo first "*knocks up the curtain*" behind which he hides the dead Horatio; he then "*shows his dead son*" by opening the curtain, surely one of the most effective uses of a discovery in any play of the period.

In contrast to the frequent uses of the upper level or an opening in a curtained rear wall, there are fewer ascents from or descents into the trap, although plays that include this action always use it more than once. In *Alphonsus King of Aragon*, a conjurer causes Calchas to "*rise up*" from the trap; a subsequent direction has him "*sink down where you came up*." Conjuring is also involved in *The First Part of the Contention* when "*the spirit riseth up*" and then "*sinks down again*." And in *A Looking Glass for London and England* the supernatural is a factor both when

[34] Only staging information from the 1604 A-text of *Doctor Faustus* is included in the tables, but "*Hell is discovered*" in the 1616 B-text supports the idea of a discovery at the play's end.

"*the Magi with their rods beat the ground, and from under the same riseth a brave Arbour*" and when "*a flame of fire appeareth from beneath, and Radagon is swallowed.*" In *The Old Wives' Tale*, Huanebango "*rises up*" out of a "well"; later, "*a head comes up.*" *Titus Andronicus* has Bassanius's body thrown into a "hole"; Martius falls into it, Quintus follows him, and finally all three bodies are "drag[ged] from the pit." A dumb show crocodile and snake "*fall into the water*" in *Locrine*; later directions have Humber "*fling himself into the river*" and Sabren "[*drown*] *herself.*"

As to uses of the properties, signals for large chairs such as sick-chairs or chairs of state (also known as thrones) are, not surprisingly, plentiful: a chair is multipurpose and can be moved on and off stage with relative ease. *Alphonsus King of Aragon* includes several instances: Alphonsus sits "*in a chair*" to be crowned; Albinus is to "*sit down,*" presumably in the same chair, when Alphonsus crowns him; Amurak shall "*rise in a rage from thy chair*"; Alphonsus rises up "*out of his chair*"; and finally there is the direction (previously quoted) to "*let a chair come down from the top of the stage*" if it is convenient. The B-text of *Doctor Faustus* includes "*the Throne descends.*" In *A Looking Glass for London and England*, the "throne" could be carried on if it does not descend. At his coronation, Richard III "*ascendeth the throne,*" and at the end of *The True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York* Edward twice calls attention to being seated once more "in England's royal throne." In *Wounds of Civil War*, a throne is probably on stage from the start, and there are directions for Marius to take "*his seat*" and for Scilla to be "*seated in his robes of state.*" In *Locrine*, Brutus enters "*carried in a chair,*" while later Locrine goes "*into his chair*" of state. Incapacitated characters are often carried on and off stage: *The First Part of the Contention* includes "*bearing the man that had been blind, between two in a chair*"; in *1 Henry VI*, Mortimer enters "*brought in a Chair*"; *Selimus* has an injured character enter "*in a chair.*" In *The Battle of Alcazar*, Abdelmunen is strangled "*in his chair*"; the ill king in *Famous Victories* refers to his "chair." Less often, a bed is used: the first two dumb shows of *The Battle of Alcazar* call for a bed, in which the princes are strangled; in *The First Part of the Contention*, Duke Humphrey is first "*discovered*" then killed in his "*bed*"; the Cardinal is "*discovered*" and dies in his. Twice in *Massacre at Paris*, the admiral appears "*in his bed*" where he dies; and in the direction quoted above from *2 Tamburlaine*, Zenocrate is revealed and dies in her bed; similarly, in *The True Tragedy of Richard III*, the king "*dies in his bed.*" In each case, a bed of some kind is necessary for the action described.

Finally, Tamburlaine is drawn on "*in his chariot*" at least twice in part 2; a similar direction occurs in *The Battle of Alcazar*, and a direction in *The Wounds of Civil War* gives a sense of the intended spectacle: "*Enter Scilla in triumph in his chair triumphant of gold, drawn by four Moors, before the chariot: his colours, his crest, his captains, his prisoners: . . . bearing crowns of gold, and manacled.*" A tomb is called for in only two plays: in *James IV*, characters "*dance about a Tomb,*" and a

body is "*laid in a marble tomb*"; *Titus Andronicus* includes several men who "*open the Tomb*" into which are put the coffins of two of Titus's sons and later the body of Mutius. Again, when these properties are called for they play an important role, so probably some attempt was made to represent them.

In light of the information summarized above, it is worth returning to *The First Part of the Contention* because it includes all the kinds of business I looked for except a chariot and tomb. William Montgomery concludes that this playtext "seems to have been performed in a space which possessed a raised stage equipped with a trap door; two entryways to this stage, one of which, visible from the audience and capable of being curtained, sometimes functioned as a discovery space; and an upper acting area at least several paces wide with an entryway from off stage and possibly also with a direct means of ascent from the lower, main, stage. . . . the text reports a need for staging facilities of a degree of sophistication almost certainly unavailable in the provinces."[35] Montgomery provides no evidence for the antiprovincial assumptions of this conclusion, presumably because he thought it unnecessary to prove a long-accepted idea. But my analysis suggests that the need for a trap, an opening in the tiring-house wall, space behind the wall, and an accessible upper platform does not disqualify *The First Part of the Contention* as a candidate for provincial performance. Even if Montgomery is correct that the extant text does not reflect provincial performance, the play nonetheless could have been performed on the road.

As Table 2 makes clear, each company owned plays with minimal requirements, as well as plays that called for something like the full facilities known to have been available in London theaters. The most plausible and obvious argument is that the companies traveled with both kinds of play; furthermore, playwrights very possibly kept such matters as staging requirements in mind. In the absence of any hard evidence to support the latter suggestion, I make it tentatively. But given that virtually all the dialogue and most stage directions in a playtext are authorial, if plays can be differentiated between those that place only minimal demands on a venue and those that require what might be termed "theatrical" facilities—and they can—then it seems reasonable to conclude that this basic distinction was intentional. For example, that Marlowe probably wrote with two different theatrical configurations in mind might explain why part 1 of *Tamburlaine* needs only doors for numerous entrances and exits, whereas part 2 requires only a "discovery space," an upper level with some means of ascent and descent, a bed, and a chariot. When they went on tour, did the Admiral's Men take only part 1, or did they take both plays and perform the pair when the facilities necessary for part 2 were available? Part 2 seems to have been written in re-

[35]   William Montgomery, "The Original Staging of *The Contention* (1594)," *Shakespeare Survey* 41 (1989): 13–22, esp. 17, 21.

sponse to the popularity of part 1 with London playgoers; might the desire to see the second part have motivated a town to provide the necessary facilities if they were not already available? These questions cannot be answered, but they are worth asking when looking for provincial possibilities, rather than restrictions.

The example of the Queen's Men is particularly telling because although this company performed in London from 1583 until 1593 (including at court), Mc-Millin and MacLean argue that it was "formed primarily for touring."[36] As the breakdown by company on Table 2 shows, the staging requirements of plays that were certainly or probably in the Queen's Men's repertory during this period range from the basic to the very demanding. Furthermore, McMillin and MacLean's analysis of casting and doubling in Queen's Men plays shows that the largest scenes require between ten and seventeen players to be on stage at one time.[37] Although partly inferential, therefore, that the Queen's Men traveled with plays that required a sizable number of players and fairly sophisticated staging, together with the company's extensive and regular touring schedule and the substantial payments received, indicates considerable and continuing success on the road with plays that included something very like elaborate spectacle.

The venues where the Queen's Men and other companies performed when on tour included "the halls of noble households, churches, churchyards, streets, inns, private houses"; "the most common location for a touring performance [was] the town hall."[38] Astington usefully likens provincial performance conditions to those at court:

> Where halls were available they were used to stage plays, exactly as similar halls were elsewhere: in aristocratic houses, in colleges and inns of court, and in guildhalls and market halls throughout the country. Setting up a stage and playing before an audience gathered indoors within a hall was not specific to the court; the professional players performed under these conditions for both private patrons and paying audiences from an early date, and Shakespeare and his fellow actors continued to do so on annual provincial tours. . . . Staging a play inside a hall was a practice the actors carried out for royal patrons under the lavish conditions at court, but also for demotic paying audiences in towns throughout the country. To that extent, court performances were directly related to the actors' experience and practice during the rest of the working year.[39]

Recent studies have shown that indoor venues were far more commonly used than outdoor; an indoor location would have meant protection from inclem-

[36] McMillin and MacLean, xv.
[37] The same figures are also given for some of the other plays in Table 2, with the largest groups ranging from ten for the most basic of plays (*Knack to Know a Knave*) to twenty-three for the most complex (*The First Part of the Contention*). See McMillin and MacLean, 99–102.
[38] Greenfield, "Touring," 264.
[39] Astington, *English Court Theatre*, 37–38.

ent weather and the ability to ensure that all playgoers paid a fee.[40] Somerset observes that "it is very likely that the company would have a pretty clear idea in advance of the physical conditions of playing in the various households, towns and cities to be visited."[41] Furthermore, as Palmer notes, "Repeatedly the records show professional companies playing in the largest indoor space they are permitted"; "because such spaces as moot halls, schoolhouses, town halls, guildhalls, churches, church houses and household great halls are large, open, and sparsely furnished, they allow large audiences and large-scale blocking."[42]

The question of exactly what kinds of facilities were provided for touring players is impossible to answer in detail or with any real certainty, however, because as the REED volumes show, those who kept accounts for the towns and great houses of early modern England were concerned primarily to record who was paid and how much; details about the kind of entertainment performed are rare. For example, we might find that a troupe of players came to a town and were paid to perform, but we are seldom told *where* they performed, and even less often are we given a description of any preparations required to create a performance space. Sometimes, though, the records do indicate a performance venue; sometimes the building still survives or there are drawings or plans that provide information about layout and size. The studies and accompanying illustrations both of Somerset and of McMillin and MacLean show that many or even most of the known venues would have been large enough to accommodate a stage with an upper level and space behind.[43] As McMillin and MacLean note, however, the spaces where traveling players found themselves performing "were not designed for a uniform purpose," and "given the range of locations involved on a tour, they could not have counted on more than minimal furnishings such as scaffolding, hall benches, forms and trestles at their tour stops."[44] It nevertheless seems reasonable to suppose that if a town or noble wanted to host touring players (and the evidence gathered by Somerset, Palmer, and others indicates that they frequently did), an effort would have been made to accommodate their performance needs.[45]

[40] See Somerset, "'How chances it they travel?'" 54–60, esp. 59; and McMillin and MacLean, 67–83, esp. 67–68. McMillin and MacLean conclude that "performance conditions for the Queen's Men, as for other play troupes on tour, were more congenial than has often been assumed. Many, if not most, of their performances would have been indoors, in halls that may have varied in size but would have been comfortably appointed" (82). The financial advantage of indoor performance is also noted by Palmer, "Early Modern Mobility," 267.

[41] Somerset, "'How chances it they travel?'" 56.

[42] Palmer, "Early Modern Mobility," 284.

[43] Besides the articles by Somerset and MacLean already cited, photographs and/or floor plans of buildings in which traveling players performed (with maps of tour routes) are available at REED's searchable Patrons and Performances web site, http://link.library.utoronto.ca/reed/ (accessed 1 October 2010).

[44] McMillin and MacLean, 82.

[45] For an "imaginary Queen's Men's tour of the northern provinces," including a discussion of

When these plays and their requirements are considered to be representative of what was taken on the road by London companies, they provide substantial justification for arguing that provincial performances were not quite so unsophisticated—and the places where plays were staged not necessarily so primitive—as has often been claimed. The considerable number of discovery scenes in these plays provides support for the belief that a provincial venue would typically have included a stage and tiring house (Quince's "green plot" and "hawthorn-brake"),[46] with provision for hanging curtains. The number of times players appear "above" is sizable, and if a structure had to be built (rather than being a permanent part of a hall), the addition of an upper platform would not have required much labor or materials for the kinds of "spectacle" it would have made possible.

A word sometimes found in the records is "scaffold," which Peter Greenfield notes "could mean either a stage or degrees for seating."[47] In his study of the use of this term in the Gloucester records, Greenfield not only shows that there it almost certainly means "stage" but also provides a detailed analysis of how the materials itemized in the accounts would have been used to build that stage. But did such a scaffold typically consist only of a raised platform, or did it also include a frame from which a curtain could be hung? Alternatively, was the raised platform set against a wall with one or more doors, in front of which curtains could be hung, perhaps on a horizontal pole? To my knowledge, curtains are never mentioned in the records relating to provincial performances, probably because they were among the portable items a traveling company would have brought with it from place to place. Support for the idea that even what seems to have been a relatively basic stage was equipped with curtains is a provided by a 1530 lawsuit by John Rastell relating to the "stage" he had constructed on his Finsbury property. Janette Dillon notes that the materials specified in this suit "indicate some kind of permanent structure and not simply removable boards on trestles, but it is unclear whether this might have been a free-standing platform stage or a fitting built inside an existing larger structure."[48] Among the items listed are two curtains of green and yellow sarcenet, valued at fifty shillings. One focus of the suit and subsequent countersuits is the length and condition of these curtains, and consequently their

great hall performance conditions and a survey of the staging requirements and properties used in three of the company's plays, see Barbara D. Palmer, "On the Road and on the Wagon," in *Locating the Queen's Men, 1583–1603*, ed. Helen Ostovich, Holger Schott Syme, and Andrew Griffin (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2009), 27–39, esp. 33.

[46] William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. Harold F. Brooks (London: Methuen, 1983), 3.1.3–4.

[47] Peter Greenfield, "Professional Players at Gloucester: Conditions of Provincial Performing," *Elizabethan Theatre* 10 (1988): 73–92, esp. 85.

[48] Janette Dillon, "John Rastell's Stage," *Medieval English Theatre* 18 (1996): 15–45, esp. 18, and "John Rastell v. Henry Walton," *Leeds Studies in English* n.s. 27 (1997): 57–75.

value.[49] The belief that curtains with an area behind and above them were requirements of even a basic theater is also supported by the illustrations on the (much later) *Roxana* and *Messallina* title pages and *Wits* frontispiece.[50] In addition, the *Wits* illustration shows a face peeking through the curtain opening, an occurrence described by Thomas Nashe in *Pierce Penniless*, referring to an occasion when the Queen's Men were on tour: "Amongst other cholericke wise Iustices, he was one, that hauing a play presented before him and his Towneship, by Tarlton & the rest of his fellowes her Maiesties seruants, and they were now entring into their first merriment (as they call it) the people began exceedingly to laugh, when Tarlton first peept out his head."[51] The same kind of disruption (although not necessarily on tour), is described by Henry Peacham in *Thalia's Banquet*:

> As *Tarlton* when his head was onely seene,
> The Tire-house doore and Tapistrie betweene,
> Set all the mulltitude in such a laughter,
> They could not hold for scarse an houre after.[52]

Doubtless, Tarlton and other clowns would have repeated this unscripted comic business and playgoers would have eagerly anticipated it, wherever a company was performing.

The evidence that traveling players had reason to hope for an approximation of the performance facilities they had left behind in London, and that their provincial sponsors had reason to provide such facilities is admittedly uncertain. But there is more such evidence, in quantity and quality, than Pollard and Wilson or Greg provided to support their conjectures. Indeed, their assumptions about cutting to accommodate a smaller cast and shorter performance time, as well as about the infrequency of touring and the plague as a reason for doing so, have all been countered by subsequent evidence-based studies.[53] If we consider it likely that the range of staging requirements and the consistency of certain kinds of business in the playtexts surveyed here reflect provincial performance conditions, as well as those in London, it should be easier to leave behind the interrelated antiprovincial, antitheatrical assumptions which have been too often accepted without question.

---

[49] Dillon, "John Rastell v. Henry Walton," esp. 64, 65, 67, 68.

[50] For a consideration of the authority of these three illustrations, see John H. Astington, "The Origins of the *Roxana* and *Messallina* Illustrations," *Shakespeare Survey* 43 (1991): 149–69, and "The *Wits* Illustration, 1662," *Theatre Notebook* 47 (1993): 122–40.

[51] *Pierce Penilesse His Svpplication to the Diuell* (London, 1592), 31.

[52] H[enry] P[eacham], *Thalias Banqvet* (London, 1620), epigram 94.

[53] See, among others, Erne; Werstine; Palmer, "Early Modern Mobility"; and Somerset, "'How chances it they travel?'" See also Scott McMillin, "Casting for Pembroke's Men: The *Henry VI* Quartos and *The Taming of a Shrew*," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 23 (1972): 141–59; David Bradley, *From Text to Performance in the Elizabethan Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992); and Laurie E. Maguire, *Shakespearean Suspect Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996).

Table 1: Plays with certain or probable company provenance, 1586–94[1]

Play	Company	Above	Descent/ ascent from/ to above	Trap	Curtains/ discovery	Chair/ throne	Bed	Chariot	Tomb	Total
					Type of staging and text citation (page or line)					
Alphonsus, King of Aragon	Qu?	2–3, 2109–10*	2–3, 2109–10*	951, 970,	1246–47	501, 842, 1051, 1833, 2019*				5
Battle of Alcazar (play only)	Ad					39	26, 38	212		3
Comedy of Errors	St?									0
Doctor Faustus	St			1507*	30, 437, 628					1/2*
Edward II	Pb				2449*					0/1*
Fair Em	St									0
Famous Victories of Henry V	Qu				C3v, D1r	C3v				2
First Part of the Contention	Pb	B4v, G1v	B4v	C1r	E2r, E3r, F1v	C2r	E2r, E3r, F1v			6
Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay	Qu				1561					1
George a Greene	Su	299								1
1 Henry VI	St	487, 639, 1451, 1472, 1952, 2570	720			1069, 1469–70				3
James IV	Qu?	2128	2128		724–25*				2, 676	3/4*
Jew of Malta	St	D2r, F1v, K1r	K2r		B1v, K2r					3
John of Bordeaux	St									0
King Leir	Qu									0
Knack to Know a Knave	St									0
Knack to Know an Honest Man	Ad									0
Locrine	Qu			E3r, H4r, K4r		A3v, G4r				2
Looking Glass for London and England	St?	159–60	159–60	522–23, 1230–31	511, 552–53	159–60				5

Table 1 (continued)

Play	Company	Type of staging and text citation (page or line)								Total
		Above	Descent/ ascent from/ to above	Trap	Curtains/ discovery	Chair/ throne	Bed	Chariot	Tomb	
Massacre at Paris	St				436		300, 356			2
Old Wives' Tale	Qu			D4v, E1r, E4r	C2r, D4v, F1v					2
Orlando Furioso	St?									0
Richard III	St?	H1v				H4v				2
Selimus	Qu	1165–66, 2361–62	1200		865–66	1256				4
Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes	Qu	1549	1549, 1565							2
Spanish Tragedy	St	773, 1680			2647, 2780					2
1 Tamburlaine	Ad									0
2 Tamburlaine	Ad	G5v, I1r	I1v		F7v–F8r, H2v		F7v– F8r	H6v– H7r		5
Taming of A Shrew	Pb									0
Three Lords and Three Ladies of London	Qu									0
Titus Andronicus	Su	A3r, B3v, I3r*, K3r*	A4r, I4v*, K3r*, K4r*	D4r, E1r, E1v					A4v, B1v, C1r	4
Troublesome Reign of King John	Qu	C3v								1
True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York	Pb	E1r				E7r				2
True Tragedy of Richard III	Qu						192			1
Wounds of Civil War	Ad	1, 2072–73, 2132–33	258			1485, 2229		1070–76		4
Total no. of plays in which staging or property seems certain		16	11	6	12	11	5	3	2	

[1] Plays and occurrences: 0 (10/11?), 1 (5/6?), 2 (8/9?), 3 (3/4?), 4 (3/5?), 5 (3), 6 (1). Admiral's Men = Ad (5); Pembroke's Men = Pb (4); Queen's Men = Qu (12); Strange's Men = St (2). In Tables 1 and 2, question marks indicate that the association of company or play is less than certain; asterisks (*) indicate the probability that a particular element is signaled by a stage direction or dialogue.

Table 2: Plays sorted by company[1]

Company and play	Above	Descent/ ascent from/ to above	Trap	Curtains/ discovery	Chair/ throne	Bed	Chariot	Tomb	Total
Admiral's Men									
Battle of Alcazar (play only)					39	26, 38	212		3
Knack to Know an Honest Man									0
1 Tamburlaine									0
2 Tamburlaine	G5v, I1r	I1v		F7v–F8r, H2v		F7v– F8r	H6v– H7r		5
Wounds of Civil War	1, 2072–73, 2132–33	258			1485, 2229		1070–76		4
Pembroke's Men									
Edward II				2449*		E2r, E3r, F1v			0/1*
First Part of the Contention	B4v, G1v	B4v	C1r	E2r, E3r, F1v	C2r				6
Taming of A Shrew									0
True Tragedy of Richard Duke of York	E1r				E7r				2
Queen's Men									
Famous Victories of Henry V	1165–66, 2361–62			C3v, D1r	C3v				2
Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay				1561					1
King Leir									0
Old Wives' Tale			D4v, E1r, E4r	C2r, D4v, F1v					2
Selimus		1200		865–66	1256				4
Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes	1549	1549, 1565							2
Three Lords and Three Ladies of London									0
Troublesome Reign of King John	C3v								1
True Tragedy of Richard III						192			1
Alphonsus, King of Aragon (?)	2–3, 2109–10*	2–3, 2109–10*	951, 970	1246–47	501, 842, 1051, 1833				5
James IV (?)								2, 676	3/4*
Locrine (?)	2128	2128	E3r, H4r, K4r	724–25*	A3v, G4r				2

Table 2 (continued)

Company and play	Type of staging and text citation (page or line)								
	Above	**Descent/ ascent from/ to above**	**Trap**	**Curtains/ discovery**	**Chair/ throne**	**Bed**	**Chariot**	**Tomb**	**Total**
Strange's Men									
Doctor Faustus			1507*	30, 437, 628					1/2*
Fair Em									0
1 Henry VI	487, 639, 1451, 1472, 1952, 2570	720			1069, 1469–70				3
Jew of Malta	D2r, F1v, K1r	K2r		B1v, K2r					3
John of Bordeaux									0
Knack to Know a Knave									0
Massacre at Paris				436		300, 356			2
Spanish Tragedy	773, 1680		2647, 2780						2
Comedy of Errors (?)									0
Richard III (?)	H1v				H4v				2
Looking Glass for London and England (?)	159–60	159–60	522–23, 1230–31	511, 552–53					5
Orlando Furioso (?)									0
Sussex's Men									
George a Greene	299								1
Titus Andronicus	A3r, B3v, I3r*, K3r*	A4r, I4v*, K3r*, K4r*	D4r, E1r, E1v					A4v, B1v, C1r	4

Appendix: Editions Cited in Tables

Anonymous. *The famous victories of Henry the fifth containing the honourable Battell of Agin-court: as it was plaide by thc [sic] Queenes Maiesties Players*. London, 1598. *Early English Books Online* (accessed 12 June 2009).

—. *The Firft part of the Tragicall raigne of Selimus fometime Emperour of the Turkes, and grandfather to him that now raigneth. Wherein is fhowne how hee moft vnnaturally raifed warres againfht his owne father Baiazet and preuailing therein, in the end caufed him to be poyfoned: Alfo with the murthering of his two brethren, Corcuty and Acomat*. London, 1594. Edited by W. Bang. London: Malone Society, 1908.

—. *The historie of the tvvo valiant knights, Syr Clyomon Knight of the Golden Sheeld, sonne to the King of Denmarke: and Clamydes the white Knight, sonne to the King of Suauia*. London, 1599. Edited by W. W. Greg. London: Malone Society, 1913.

—. *John of Bordeaux or The Second Part of Friar Bacon*. Undated manuscript. Edited by William Lindsay Renwick. London: Malone Society, 1935 (1936).

—. *The lamentable tragedie of Locrine, the eldest sonne of King Brutus discoursing the warres of the Britaines, and Hunnes, with their discomfiture: the Britaines victorie with their accidents, and the death of Albanact*. London, 1595. *Early English Books Online* (accessed 12 June 2009).

—. *A most pleasant and merie nevv comedie, intituled, A knacke to knowe a knaue*. London, 1594. Edited by G. R. Proudfoot. London: Malone Society, 1963 (1964).

—. *A pleasant commodie, of faire Em the Millers daughter of Manchester vvith the loue of William the Conqueror*. London, n.d. Edited by W. W. Greg. London: Malone Society, 1927.

—. *A pleasant conceited comedie, called, A knacke to know an honest man*. London, 1596. Edited by H. de Vocht. London: Malone Society, 1910.

—. *A pleasant conceited historie, called The taming of a shrew*. London, 1594. London: Malone Society, 1998.

—. *A pleasant conceyted comedie of George a Greene, the pinner of VVakefield*. London, 1599. Edited by F. W. Clarke. London: Malone Society, 1911.

—. *[The] troublesome raigne of Iohn King of England with the discouerie of King Richard Cordelions base sonne vulgarly named, the bastard Fawconbridge : also the death of King Iohn at Swinstead Abbey*. London, 1591. *Early English Books Online* (accessed 13 June 2009).

—. *The true chronicle history of King Leir, and his three daughters, Gonorill, Ragan, and Cordella*. London, 1605. Edited by W. W. Greg. London: Malone Society, 1907.

—. *The true tragedie of Richard the third wherein is showne the death of Edward the fourth, with the smothering of the two yoong princes in the Tower: with a lamentable ende of Shores wife, an example for all wicked women. And lastly, the coniunction and ioyning of the two noble houses, Lancaster and Yorke*. London, 1594. Edited by W. W. Greg. London: Malone Society, 1929.

G[reene], R. *The comicall historie of Alphonsus, King of Aragon*. London, 1599. Edited by W. W. Greg. London: Malone Society, 1926.

[Greene, Robert]. *The historie of Orlando Furioso, one of the twelue pieres of France*. London, 1594. Edited by W. W. Greg. London: Malone Society, 1907.

Greene, Robert. *The honorable historie of frier Bacon, and frier Bongay*. London, 1594. Edited by W. W. Greg. London: Malone Society, 1926.

Greene, Robert. *The Scottish historie of Iames the fourth, slaine at Flodden Entermixed with a pleasant comedie, presented by Oboram King of Fayeries*. London, 1598. Edited by A. E. H. Swaen. London: Malone Society, 1921.

[Kyd, Thomas]. *The Spanish tragedie containing the lamentable end of Don Horatio, and Bel-imperia: with the pittifull death of olde Hieronimo*. London, [1592]. Edited by W. W. Greg and D. Nichol Smith. London: Malone Society, 1948 (1949).

Lodge, Thomas. *The vvounds of ciuill vvar Liuely set forth in the true tragedies of Marius and Scilla*. London, 1594. Edited by J. Dover Wilson. London: Malone Society, 1910.

Lodge, Thomas, and Robert Greene. *A looking glasse for London and England*. London, 1594. Edited by W. W. Greg. London: Malone Society, 1932.

Marlowe, Christopher. *The famous tragedy of the rich Ievv of Malta*. London, 1633. *Early English Books Online*. Accessed 13 June 2009.

Marlowe, Christopher. *The massacre at Paris with the death of the Duke of Guise*. London, 1594? Edited by W. W. Greg. London: Malone Society, 1928.

Marlowe, Christopher. *Tamburlaine the Great Who, from a Scythian shephearde, by his rare and woonderfull conquests, became a most puissant and mightye monarque. And for his tyranny, and terrour in warre was tearmed, the scourge of God. Deuided into two tragicall discourses*. London, 1590. *Early English Books Online* (accessed 13 June 2009).

Marlowe, Christopher. *The tragicall history of D. Faustus*. London, 1604. Doctor Faustus, 1604–1616. Edited by W.W. Greg. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950.

Marlowe, Christopher. *The troublesome raigne and lamentable death of Edward the second, King of England with the tragicall fall of proud Mortimer*. London, 1594. Edited by W. W. Greg. London: Malone Society, 1925.

[Peele, George]. *The battell of Alcazar fought in Barbarie, betweene Sebastian king of Portugall, and Abdelmelec king of Marocco. With the death of Captaine Stukeley*. London, 1594. Edited by W. W. Greg. London: Malone Society, 1907.

Peele, George. *The old wiues tale A pleasant conceited comedie*. London, 1595. *Early English Books Online* (accessed 13 June 2009).

Shakespeare, William. *The Comedie of Errors*. London, 1623. *The First Folio of Shakespeare*. Prepared by Charlton Hinman. Second edition, with a new introduction by Peter W. M. Blayney. New York: W. W. Norton, 1996.

Shakespeare, William. *The first Part of Henry the sixt*. London, 1623. In *The First Folio of Shakespeare*.

Shakespeare, William. *The first part of the contention betwixt the two famous houses of Yorke and Lancaster with the death of the good Duke Humphrey: and the banishment and death of the Duke of Suffolke, and the tragicall end of the proud Cardinall of VVinchester, vvith the notable rebellion of Iacke Cade: and the Duke of Yorkes first claime vnto the crowne*. London, 1594. *Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto*. Edited by Michael J. B. Allen and Kenneth Muir. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

Shakespeare, William. *The most lamentable Romaine tragedie of Titus Andronicus*. London, 1594. *Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto*.

Shakespeare, William. *The tragedy of King Richard the third Containing, his treacherous plots against his brother Clarence: the pittiefull murther of his iunocent [sic] nephewes: his tyrannicall vsurpation: with the whole course of his detested life, and most deserued death.* London, 1597. *Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto*.

Shakespeare, William. *The true tragedie of Richard Duke of York and the death of good King Henrie the Sixt, with the whole contention betweene the two houses Lancaster and Yorke.* London, 1595. *Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto*.

W[ilson], R[obert]. *The pleasant and stately morall, of the three lordes and three ladies of London With the great ioy and pompe, solempnized at their mariages: commically interlaced with much honest mirth, for pleasure and recreation, among many morall obseruations and other important matters of due regard.* London, 1590. *Early English Books Online* (accessed 12 June 2009).