

The
**Upstart
Crow**
A Shakespeare Journal



SHAKESPEAREAN HEARING

The Upstart Crow: A Shakespeare Journal, Volume XXIX, 2010 is published by Clemson University Digital Press.

© 2011 Clemson University ISSN: 0886-2168



EDITOR

Elizabeth Rivlin

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
DIGITAL PRESS

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Ray Barfield, Wayne Chapman, Jonathan Field, Martin Jacobi, Michael LeMahieu, Chantelle MacPhee, Brian McGrath, Lee Morrissey, and Will Stockton

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

Will Stockton, Clemson University

ADVISORY BOARD

James Berg, Pam Brown, Patricia Cahill, Ann C. Christensen, Katherine Conway, Herbert Coursen, Mary Agnes Edsall, Peter Erickson, John R. Ford, Walter Haden, Chris Hassel, Maurice Hunt, Natasha Korda, Paul Kottman, Richard Levin, Bindu Malieckal, John McDaniel, Ian Frederick Moulton, Peter Pauls, Kaara Peterson, Jeanne Roberts, and Jyotsna Singh

BUSINESS MANAGER

Kristin Sindorf

ACCOUNTING FISCAL ANALYST

Beverly Pressley

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS

Charis Chapman, Christina Cook, Ashley Dannelly, and Antonio Shaw

COVER DESIGN

Charis Chapman

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

Editor, *The Upstart Crow*, Department of English, Clemson University, Strode Tower, Box 340523, Clemson, SC 29634-0523. Tel. (864) 656-3151. Fax (864) 656-1345.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

1-year subscription for individuals (Vol. XXVI): \$17

1-year subscription for institutions (Vol. XXVI): \$22

2-year subscription for individuals (Vols. XXVI-XXVII): \$27

2-year subscription for institutions (Vols. XXVI-XXVII): \$32

3-year subscription for individuals (Vols. XXVI-XXVIII): \$37

3-year subscription for institutions (Vols. XXVI-XXVIII): \$42

Back issues are available at \$17 (includes S&H). Complete sets are for sale at \$300.

The Upstart Crow: A Shakespeare Journal is produced by the Center for Electronic and Digital Publishing for Clemson University Digital Press, using Microsoft® Word and Adobe® Creative Suite 5. *The Upstart Crow* is set in Garamond Pro.

Printed by Standard Register, Columbia, South Carolina.



THE • VPSTART • CROW

Shakespearean Hearing

guest edited by Leslie Dunn and Wes Folkert

Contents

Essays

Leslie Dunn and Wes Folkert ♦ <i>Editors' Introduction to "Shakespearean Hearing"</i> ...	5
Erin Minear ♦ "A Verse to this Note": <i>Shakespeare's Haunted Songs</i>	11
Kurt Schreyer ♦ "Here's a knocking indeed!" <i>Macbeth and the Harrowing of Hell</i> ...	26
Paula Berggren ♦ <i>Shakespeare and the Numbering Clock</i>	44
Allison Kay Deutermann ♦ "Dining on Two Dishes": <i>Shakespeare, Adaptation,</i> <i>and Auditory Reception of Purcell's The Fairy-Queen</i>	57
Michael Witmore ♦ <i>Shakespeare's Inner Music</i>	72

Performance Reviews

Michael W. Shurgot and Peter J. Smith ♦ <i>The 2010 Season at London's Globe</i> <i>Theatre</i>	83
Sara Thompson ♦ <i>The Royal Shakespeare Company 2009: As You Like It</i>	99
Owen E. Brady ♦ <i>The 2009 Stratford Festival: Macbeth and Bartholomew Fair</i> ..	103
Michael W. Shurgot ♦ <i>The 2009 Oregon Shakespeare Festival</i>	111
Bryan Adams Hampton ♦ <i>The 2010 Alabama Shakespeare Festival: Hamlet</i>	128
Cameron Hunt McNabb ♦ <i>Brooklyn Academy of Music: The Tempest (2010)</i> ...	134

Book Reviews

Joseph Ortiz ♦ Carla Mazzio, <i>The Inarticulate Renaissance: Language Trouble</i> <i>in an Age of Eloquence</i>	138
Sarah F. Williams ♦ Keith M. Botelho, <i>Renaissance Earwitnesses: Rumor</i> <i>and Early Modern Masculinity</i>	141

Katherine R. Larson ♦ Gina Bloom, <i>Voice in Motion: Staging Gender, Shaping Sound in Early Modern England</i>	145
Zoltán Márkus ♦ Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper (eds.), <i>Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment</i>	148

Poems

Heather Dubrow ♦ <i>Hippolyta's Wedding Announcement</i>	151
--	-----

List of Illustrations

Cover image: Guillaume Le Lièvre, [Memory, imagination, cognition, and the senses], from *Ars memorativa Gulielmi Leporei Avallionensis* [1520?], I. IV_v.

<i>Henry VIII</i> : Dominic Rowan as the title role in <i>Henry VIII</i> , Globe Season	82
<i>1 Henry IV</i> : Jamie Parker as Prince Hal and Roger Allam as Falstaff, Globe Season	84
<i>1 Henry IV</i> : Roger Allam as Falstaff, Globe Season	86
<i>1 Henry IV</i> : Jamie Parker as Hal and Oliver Cotton as King Henry IV, Globe Season.....	90
<i>Macbeth</i> : Janet Fullerlove, Karen Anderson, and Simone Kirby as the Weird Sisters and Elliot Cowan as Macbeth, Globe Season	93
<i>Macbeth</i> : Elliot Cowan as Macbeth, Globe Season.....	94
<i>Henry VIII</i> : Miranda Raison as Ann Bullen (Anne Boleyn), Globe Season.....	96
<i>Macbeth</i> : Yanna McIntosh as Lady Macbeth, Stratford Season.....	104
<i>Bartholomew Fair</i> : Cliff Saunders as Lantern Leatherhead, Stratford Season.....	107
<i>Bartholomew Fair</i> : Lucy Peacock as Ursula, Tom McCamus as Justice Overdo, and Randy Hughson as Jordan Knockem, Stratford Season.....	108
<i>Much Ado About Nothing</i> : Robynn Rodriguez as Beatrice and David Kelly as Benedict, Oregon Shakespeare Festival.....	112
<i>Henry VIII</i> : Vilma Silva as Queen Katharine, John Pribyl as Campeius, and Anthony Heald as Cardinal Wolsey, Oregon Shakespeare Festival	116
<i>Macbeth</i> : Peter Macon as Macbeth and Robin Goodrin Nordli as Lady Macbeth, Oregon Shakespeare Festival	119
<i>All's Well That Ends Well</i> : Armando Durán as the Clown, Oregon Shakespeare Festival	123
<i>Hamlet</i> : Nathan Hosner as Hamlet and Kelley Curran as Ophelia, Alabama Shakespeare Festival.....	129
<i>The Tempest</i> : Edward Bennett as Ferdinand, Stephen Dillane as Prospero, and Juliet Rylance as Miranda, Brooklyn Academy of Music: <i>The Tempest</i>	135

Let ter fr om the Edit or	4
Call for P apers for <i>THE UPSTART CROW</i> Vol. XXX (2011)	152



We are grateful to our contributors for making every effort to trace all copyright holders, but if any have been inadvertently overlooked, the publisher will be pleased to make the necessary arrangement at the first opportunity. We thank the several festivals and theater companies for their cooperation and assistance in the reproduction of images from recent performances.

Dear Readers,

I am proud to introduce Volume XXIX (2010), “Shakespearean Hearing,” a special issue of *The Upstart Crow* guest edited by Professors Leslie Dunn, Vassar College, and Wes Folkerth, McGill University. This issue explores the cutting-edge topic of aurality in Shakespeare’s works and Shakespearean theater practice. The issue’s premise is that what people heard in the early modern theater was just as, if not more, important than what they saw.

The essays that Professors Dunn and Folkerth have selected forge exciting new approaches to the question of what people heard and hear in Shakespeare. Erin Minear writes on the haunting intertextuality of songs in Shakespeare’s plays, while Michael Witmore focuses on the way that music translates into touch in several filmed adaptations. Allison Deutermann moves forward in time to argue for the development of specialized auditory practices in Purcell’s eighteenth-century opera *The Fairy-Queen*, and Kurt Schreyer move backward to trace the resonance and dissonance between English mystery plays and *Macbeth*. Paula Berggren measures changing concepts of time through the audible effect of Shakespeare’s ticking clocks. Through the auditory, all of the essays make unexpected and rewarding connections—between texts, media, and historical eras. The introduction by Professors Dunn and Folkerth beautifully synthesizes the essays’ varied yet cohesive contributions to a rapidly developing field of study.

The performance reviews and book reviews provide complementary perspectives on “Shakespearean Hearing.” Each performance review pays special attention to the auditory dimensions of productions, which include ones at London’s Globe Theatre, the Royal Shakespeare Company, the Stratford Festival, the Oregon Shakespeare Festival, the Alabama Shakespeare Festival, and Brooklyn Academy of Music. Our book reviews address important recent scholarship on early modern aurality, showing how this field has grown and changed in the past few years. Together, the essays, performance reviews, and book reviews point to new directions for future scholarship on “Shakespearean Hearing.”

I hope that you enjoy the chords that “Shakespearean Hearing” strikes. Stay tuned for our 2011 open issue and for our 2012 issue on “Shakespeare’s Female Icons,” guest edited by Professor Francesca Royster, De Paul University. Thank you for your support.

Elizabeth Rivlin
Editor

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION TO "SHAKESPEAREAN HEARING"

Leslie Dunn, *Vassar College*, and Wes Folkerth, *McGill University*

When the Chorus of *Henry V* entreats the audience "[g]ently to hear, kindly to judge, our play" (1.1.35), he evokes a theatrical experience that was as much aural as visual. The early modern English playhouse, like Caliban's isle, was full of noises—drums, alarums, flourishes, cannon, thunder, bells, knocking, cock-crows—not to mention "many sorts of music" (*TN* 1.2.54) and unscripted noises from the audience.¹ Constructed of wood, plaster, and lath, the playhouses themselves were, in Bruce Smith's words, "instruments for producing, shaping, and propagating sound," the stage a "gigantic sounding board."² Sounds emanated from multiple locations in relation to the stage—"above," "within," "under," "afar off"—animating the dramatic action in the three-dimensional sphere of hearing.³

When plays passed into print, these rich auditory fields of performance left few textual traces. Song lyrics and stage directions tell us frustratingly little about what the early modern audience heard, let alone how they heard it.⁴ Even the plays' words would have sounded differently in early modern ears, not only because English pronunciation has changed since Shakespeare's time, but also because Shakespeare's language, as Patricia Parker has shown, "reflect[ed] the more polyglot resonances of early modern London" and took advantage of the audience's ability to hear word-sounds "simultaneously . . . in multiple linguistic registers," creating a kind of aural wordplay that is virtually inaudible to modern audiences.⁵ The history of Shakespeare in performance is thus one of continuous "re-sounding."

The history of Shakespeare criticism, by contrast, has tended to privilege the visual and textual over the aural, reading over listening (though historical linguists might argue that even silent reading is a form of re-sounding). Because most literary scholars, as Bruce Smith says, are "trained to deal with tangible physical objects in the form of literary texts," to "un-air" the sounds of the past from those texts requires an imaginative re-conceptualization of listening as critical practice.⁶ Smith's *Acoustic World of Early Modern England* set the terms for this project; a pioneering work of "acoustic archeology," it introduced the field of acoustic ecology, together with its keyword "soundscape," into early modern cultural studies.⁷ It has since become a foundational text for studies of early modern aurality.⁸

The term "aurality" is relatively new to academic discourse, though as Mark M. Smith points out, the central ideas and practices suggested by the term—"the essence of sound, how sound is produced and heard, and the actual and metaphorical meanings attributed to hearing"—are very old, having been considered by ancient, medieval, and early modern philosophers.⁹ In contemporary sound studies, aurality signifies a challenge to the "visualist framework" of Western knowledge and to the "assumed supremacy of the 'visual' in accounts of the social."¹⁰ Recent work on aurality in early modern England has tended to focus on the theatre as a site where the social meanings of sound were simultaneously represented and negotiated. These studies thus share with sound studies generally a desire to shift theoretical attention to what

Alan Beck, writing about radio drama, called the “heard-of-ness” of performance and the “listening-to-ness” of reception.¹¹ Gina Bloom’s *Voice in Motion* restores the embodied and material dimensions of sound to the study of vocal performance in the early modern theatre, and directs new attention to early modern theories of listening as constitutive of “aural agency.”¹² Keith M. Botelho’s *Renaissance Earwitnesses: Rumor and Early Modern Masculinity* focuses on the era’s pervasive discourses on the subject of rumor in the context of early modern gendered ideologies of listening and speaking.¹³ Other scholars lend their critical ears to the “original practices” movement, which aims to reconstruct Shakespearean soundscapes in performance by using early modern staging techniques, including period instruments and music.¹⁴

The essays in *Shakespearean Hearing* extend and deepen our understanding of Shakespeare’s aural dramaturgy. Erin Minear’s “‘A Verse to This Note’: Shakespeare’s Haunted Songs” introduces a recurring theme of the collection, namely the capacity of sounds to “haunt” both characters and audience with ghostly resonances from a past that is imperfectly remembered or incompletely suppressed. The snatches of song sung by various Shakespearean characters seem to rise from somewhere deep beneath the surface of the text, as if the old tunes go on somewhere before we ever hear them, and continue even after we have ceased to hear. Because a single tune could be associated with several different, often incompatible sets of words written to its “note,” quoting an old ballad onstage could become an occasion for playing on multiplicities and ambiguities of meaning. Minear argues that Shakespeare uses such songplay—extended musical puns on familiar and frequently adapted tunes—to help generate some of the most characteristic aspects of his plays: their tonal ambiguity and metaphysical uncertainty, their impossibly lyrical irony, and their strangely “deep” characters.

In “‘Here’s a knocking indeed!’: *Macbeth* and the *Harrowing of Hell*,” Kurt Schreyer shows how stage noises, like old ballads, could haunt the performance of an early modern play. Because Shakespeare’s theatre relied upon the same or similar technologies for creating sound effects as the mystery plays of the previous generation, it was possible for them to be “remembered” in the acoustic spaces of early modern theatres. Schreyer argues that the opening thunder and the pounding on the castle door in the Porter scene create an “acoustic link” between *Macbeth* and the *Harrowing of Hell* plays. Past theatrical material is brought into the present as *past material*, creating a temporal doubleness, or ambivalence, and requiring a corresponding “double-hearing” in the audience. In *Macbeth*, this double-hearing registers a potentially subversive soundplay. As the Porter scene “provokes and unprovokes” associations with Christ’s battle with Satan (2.3.27), it exposes the inadequacy of Jacobean political theology and mocks the Puritan anti-theatricalists.

Temporal ambivalence of another kind is the subject of Paula Berggren’s “Shakespeare and the Numbering Clock.” Like Schreyer, she focuses on a cultural moment in which the audible signs of the sacred could still be heard, but with attenuated resonance, as the regular ticking of mechanical clocks and the more “secular, immediate” time they measured supplanted the “sacramental time” marked by church bells.¹⁵ Berggren argues that careful attention to Shakespeare’s references to clocks can help us hear that moment of transition. She identifies several dramatic uses for

the sound of a clock striking, stressing its effectiveness in intensifying awareness of the pressure of time for both the characters and the audience. At the heart of the essay is a Shakespearean character haunted by sound. In Act 5, scene 5 of *Richard II*, music playing somewhere “within” provokes the imprisoned king’s bitter meditation on his own failure to listen to the relentless forward movement of time embodied in Bolingbroke, who by usurping Richard’s throne has reduced him to a piece of the political machinery, the “jack” of Bolingbroke’s “clock” (5.5.60).

Allison Kay Deutermann’s “Dining on Two Dishes: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Auditory Reception of Purcell’s *The Fairy-Queen*” moves forward in time to examine the “listening-to-ness” of Shakespeare in the Restoration theatre. In *The Fairy-Queen* (1692), an adaptation of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, the Shakespearean text itself functions like the “old songs” in Minear’s essay or the knocking in Schreyer’s—an aural remnant of the past on which Purcell’s musical interludes play re-sounding variations. Taking issue with critiques of the semi-opera’s formal hybridity, Deutermann interprets *The Fairy-Queen*’s manuscript, performance, and reception histories as evidence that its failure to conform to a more modern notion of the *Gesamtkunstwerk*, or unified artwork, reflects not its inherent aesthetic flaws, but rather a different aesthetic—one that valorizes both mixed forms and mixed hearing practices. In particular, the accounts of contemporary earwitnesses such as Roger North, Thomas Betterton, and Katherine Booth suggest that the “skilful ear” invoked by Purcell could in fact listen selectively, and therefore differently, according to individual tastes. By placing the listening practices of elite Restoration audiences in their cultural context, Deutermann’s essay furthers another project of contemporary sound studies, which musicologist Shai Burstyn has termed “the historical reconstruction of the period ear.”¹⁶

Finally, Michael Witmore’s essay brings us simultaneously back to Shakespeare’s aural dramaturgy and forward to its re-soundings in contemporary film adaptations. “Shakespeare’s Inner Music” extends the historical perspective of recent scholarship on sound and music in Shakespeare in a phenomenological direction, to explore the dramaturgical possibilities inherent in what Witmore calls the “inner touch” of music. Inner touch is a dramaturgical effect that occurs when a character within a fictional scene starts to “hear” music from a source that is hidden, literally or figuratively, in some offstage location, so that it seems to come out of nowhere to make intimate contact with him or her. Witmore compares several scenes from the late plays which feature such moments of musical awakening or touch, arguing that what is most important for Shakespeare is their emotional impact, since it dramatizes some essential affective connection with the world and the environment that goes beyond the spatial politics of the visual realm. Contemporary film inherits some of these theatrical protocols, or at least does not invent them for itself as an expression of its technological difference. To illustrate this point, Witmore concludes his essay with an analysis of two very successful cinematic renderings of Shakespeare’s plays, Trevor Nunn’s *Twelfth Night* and Baz Lurhmann’s *William Shakespeare’s Romeo + Juliet*. Witmore shows how dramaturgical structures that Shakespeare took advantage of can be adapted and reworked to new ends by film, an adaptation that may itself be one of theatre’s unexpected institutional legacies.

Describing her experience of acting at Shakespeare's Globe, Sonia Ritter commented on the effect of the theatre's resonant acoustics: "Verse, here, compels people to listen. Prose bounces against the air. There is no place that relies so much on the art of the ear."¹⁷ Ritter was speaking of actors' voices, but the same could be said for nonverbal sounds on the Shakespearean stage. Collectively these essays offer us new models, and new critical language, for attending to what Dwight Conquer-good called "the sensuous specificities of performance that overflow verbal content."¹⁸ They provide fresh evidence that sound, like voice, should be considered an integral element of the material conditions of the early modern theatre.¹⁹ They complicate our understanding of Shakespearean intertextuality by positing a parallel "inter-sonority"—the re-membering effect of a nonverbal sound such as a knock, a clock striking, or a fragment of melody. And by emphasizing the role of the listener in constructing meaning, the arguments presented here have potential relevance for broader studies of Shakespearean performance and adaptation. Though used primarily to describe the effects of sound on early modern listeners, concepts like "double-hearing" (Schreyer), "selective listening" (Deutermann), and "inner touch" (Witmore) can also move our thinking about contemporary inter-temporal and inter-cultural resonances of Shakespeare beyond scriptocentrism, into the realm of the embodied auditory. We hope, then, that you will find these essays ear-opening.

The editors gratefully acknowledge a grant from Vassar College's Susan Turner Fund, which helped to support the costs of publishing this special issue. The editors would also like to thank our external reader, Jeremy Lopez, for his acute and generous comments, both on the individual essays and on the conception of the volume as a whole. It would be difficult to overstate how much the edition benefited from his careful attention.

Notes

1. All quotations from Shakespeare's plays are taken from *The Norton Shakespeare*, 2nd edition, ed. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean E. Howard, and Katherine Eisaman Maus (New York: W. W. Norton, 2009).
2. Bruce R. Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 206, 209.
3. See Alan Dessen and Leslie Thompson, *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama, 1580-1642* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
4. Many stage directions that focus on the acoustic aspects of performance first appear in Edward Capell's 1768 edition of the complete works, *Mr. William Shakespeare, his comedies, histories, and tragedies* (London: Tonson). They are largely extrapolations from indications within the plays' language.
5. Patricia Parker, "Shakespeare's Sound Government: Sound Defects, Polyglot Sounds, and Sounding Out," *Oral Tradition* 24 (2009), 365. On the evidence for reconstructing the sound of early modern English (EME), see Andrew Gurr, "Other Accents: Some Problems with Identifying

- Elizabethan Pronunciation,” *Early Modern Literary Studies* 7 (2000), <http://extra.shu.ac.uk/emls/07-1/gurrothe.htm>; and David Crystal, *Pronouncing Shakespeare: The Globe Experiment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 43-95.
6. Bruce R. Smith, “Listening to the Wild Blue Yonder: The Challenges of Acoustic Ecology,” *Hearing Cultures: Essays on Sound, Listening, and Modernity*, ed. Veit Erlmann (Oxford and New York: Berg, 2004), 22. This essay describes the critical project that led to *The Acoustic World*.
 7. The term “soundscape” was coined by Canadian composer and theorist R. Murray Schafer; he was part of the team that created the World Soundscape Project, which launched the field of acoustic ecology in the 1960s. See *The Soundscape: Our Sonic Environment and the Tuning of the World* (Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 1994), originally published as *The Tuning of the World* (New York: Knopf, 1977).
 8. In addition to *Hearing Cultures*, cited above, two other recent anthologies offer excellent introductions to contemporary sound studies: *The Auditory Culture Reader*, ed. Michael Bull and Les Black (Oxford and New York: Berg, 2003) and *Hearing History: A Reader*, ed. Mark M. Smith (Athens and London: University of Georgia Press, 2004).
 9. M. Smith, *Hearing History*, xiv. On early modern philosophies of hearing, see Penelope Gouk, “Some English Theories of Hearing in the Seventeenth Century: Before and After Descartes,” *The Second Sense: Studies in Hearing and Musical Judgment from Antiquity to the Seventeenth Century*, ed. Charles Burnett, Michael Fend, and Penelope Gouk (London: The Warburg Institute, 1991), 95-113; an abridged version of this essay appears in M. Smith, 136-50.
 10. Bull and Black, “Introduction,” 2-3.
 11. Alan Beck, “Aurality as Central to Radio Theory (and Radio Drama Theory): The Ears Have It,” <http://www.savoyhill.co.uk/technique/aurality.html>. Accessed 7/12/10.
 12. Gina Bloom, *Voice in Motion: Staging Gender, Shaping Sound in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007).
 13. Keith M. Botelho, *Renaissance Earwitnesses: Rumor and Early Modern Masculinity* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).
 14. See, for example, Rob Conkie, *The Globe Theatre Project: Shakespeare and Authenticity* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2006); Kelly Jones, “Dis-Playing History: The Case of Shakespeare’s Globe,” “*Divining Thoughts*”: *Future Directions in Shakespeare Studies*, ed. Peter Orford, Michael P. Jones, Lizz Ketterer, and Joshua McEvilla (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2007), 88-97; Jeremy Lopez, “A Partial Theory of Original Practice,” *Shakespeare Survey: An Annual Survey of Shakespeare Studies and Production* 61 (2008): 302-317; Clare Van Kampen, “Music and Aural Texture at Shakespeare’s Globe,” *Shakespeare’s Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, ed. Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 79-89; and David Lindley, “Music, Authenticity, and Audience,” in Carson and Karim-Cooper, 90-100.
 15. The terms “sacramental time” and “secular, immediate time” are those of Robert B. Bennett; see “Four Stages of Time: The Shape of History in Shakespeare’s Second Tetralogy,” *Shakespeare Studies* 19 (1987): 61-85.

10 *The Upstart Crow*

16. Burstyn, "In Quest of the Period Ear," *Early Music* 25 (1997): 697, 695.
17. Quoted in Pauline Kiernan, "Voices in the New Globe," *Shakespeare et la voix*, Actes de colloque 1999 de la Société Française Shakespeare, ed. Patricia Dorval and Jean-Marie Maguin, <http://www.societefrancaiseshakespeare.org/document.php?id=387>, 163. Accessed 9/12/2010.
18. "Performance Studies: Interventions and Radical Research," *TDR / The Drama Review* 46 (2002): 149.
19. For a cogent critique of the restrictive assumptions about "matter" underlying much contemporary scholarship, see Bloom, *Voice in Motion*, 5-12. Bloom's arguments for a "material study of voice," 6, are suggestively analogous to some of the arguments about sound in this volume.

“A VERSE TO THIS NOTE”: SHAKESPEARE’S HAUNTED SONGS

Erin K. Minear, *The College of William and Mary*

In the most famous episode of Rossini’s opera *Otello*, the doomed Desdemona, on the eve of her death, hears the distant singing of a gondolier. He sings a snatch of Dante’s *Divine Comedy*: the words of Francesca in the Circle of Lust, as she commences the story of her adulterous love affair with Paolo, a tale concluding with the deaths of the lovers at the hand of the betrayed husband.

Nessun maggior dolore
Che ricordarsi del tempo felice
Nella miseria.¹

Desdemona finds herself deeply moved by the distant song and wonders over the identity of a singer who so eloquently echoes her own sorrows.² Emilia helpfully explains that the singer is the gondolier who sings to while away the time as he passes over the peaceful water, thinking of his children. “O happy man!” cries Desdemona, envying one who at least can return to his beloved after his work is over.

Rossini’s Desdemona finds the song of the gondolier devastatingly appropriate to her own situation; but when one considers the original context of the lyric fragment, the words could not be more *in*appropriate. The guilty Francesca remembers the beginning of her adulterous affair, while the innocent Desdemona looks back mournfully to the happy time before she was falsely suspected of engaging in such an affair. Desdemona herself seems entirely ignorant of the irony, but Rossini’s audience would have been quite familiar with the source of the famous quotation. The irony becomes more complex as the scene continues. Emilia’s words reveal that the singing gondolier is not expressing a heartfelt anguish like Desdemona’s, but merely passing the time. As Desdemona herself realizes, the gondolier’s transient melancholy is out of proportion both to the song he sings and to her own grief, which he had seemed to echo so perfectly. While this moment is generally celebrated as a high point in a dramatically uneven opera, some critics have found the famous episode incongruous and the Dante quote “utterly out of place,” despite the beauty of the gondolier’s melody.³ Nevertheless, the very incongruity of the gondolier’s song makes this by far the most Shakespearean moment in a most un-Shakespearean opera.⁴ Rossini’s Willow Song is an elaborate if lovely set piece, which Desdemona sings while accompanying herself on a harp. But the gondolier’s snatch of song and the responses of Desdemona and Emilia generate some of the effects of the original Willow Song. Like Shakespeare’s Willow Song, the gondolier’s song is not a whole, but a fragment, at once moving and alienating, appropriate and inappropriate, pathetic and eerie. Both songs initiate the simultaneous overlap and clash of different voices: Francesca, the gondolier, Desdemona; the “poor soul” of the song, Barbary, Desdemona, Emilia.

Shakespeare himself consistently associates music with a lack of proportion, an excess of affect issuing from an uncertain origin. Feste, entering to mock the impris-

oned Malvolio, sings: “Hey, Robin, jolly Robin, / Tell me how thy lady does. . . .” (4.2.65-66).⁵ A reader unacquainted with the music might imagine this song to be a jaunty little affair, but the tune is in fact melancholy and wistful.⁶ The drunken revels of Sir Toby and Sir Andrew are briefly quieted in a moment of “incongruous beauty”⁷ as the Fool sings “Oh Mistress Mine.” Shakespeare’s songs play with an irony that is both undeniable and uncomfortable. The lovely lyric “Who is Sylvia,” set to music by numerous composers including Schubert, is sung by the deceitful Proteus to his best friend’s beloved. The equally lovely “Hark, hark, the lark” is performed at the command of the gross and despicable Cloten to the married women whose rape he will shortly begin to plan. Similarly, Rossini’s innocent Desdemona identifies the gondolier’s song with the voice of her own heart and unknowingly takes on, for a moment, the identity of one of literature’s most famous adulteresses. Yet this irony is partially—even entirely, judging from the responses of most critics—overwhelmed by the haunting melancholy of the tune, sung by a man who seemingly plumbs the depths of a sorrow he does not feel. His song awakens a sense of kinship in the listening woman, a kinship shattered as soon as established. For this one moment, Rossini touches upon the Shakespearean music.

Songs appear in Shakespeare in brief allusions to popular tunes and in full-fledged performances; but perhaps most frequently, they appear in snatches.⁸ Spontaneous Shakespearean singers seem plagued by memories that are simultaneously tenacious and sieve-like. Certain phrases *will* drift into their heads at inopportune moments, but these snatches are seldom complete or even accurate. This representation of song is of course partly mimetic, the dramatization of an experience of incomplete memory no less common now than in the sixteenth century. The problem is inherent in the strophic settings characteristic of popular ballads. Verses get out of order, phrases drift from one half-remembered verse to another. Even seasoned performers, no less than casual hummers, can stumble over this built-in obstacle. If a number of verses are set to the same tune, it becomes extremely difficult to keep track of which verse you happen to be singing at any given moment. The very setness and lack of flexibility of form in strophic song leads to formlessness, to random fragments bobbing up in the mind. A number of different verbal phrases are all shaped to the very same musical phrase, which returns again and again.⁹ Shakespeare demonstrates a powerful interest in this phenomenon, particularly in the figure of Desdemona, who cannot keep the verses of her Willow Song in order—“Nay, that’s not next” (4.3.51); but his interest seems to go beyond the desire to accurately imitate the workings of memory. Shakespeare’s associative use of song helps to generate some of the most characteristic aspects of his work: its tonal ambiguity and metaphysical uncertainty; the curious weightiness of its nonsense and wordplay; its strangely “deep” characters.

I.

In early modern England, the confusion of song verses was exacerbated by the exceedingly common practice of setting multiple ballads to “well-known melodies which wandered from text to text.”¹⁰ Some texts were related by topic; but in other

cases, the choice of a tune seems to have been based more on the tune’s popularity than on its suitability for the new subject matter.¹¹ The tune of “Greensleeves,” for instance, was called into service to accompany “A warning to all false traitors by example of 14 . . . executed . . . August, 1588.” This delightful song opened with an address, not to the beloved, but to “You Traitors all that doo devise.” Another ballad to the same tune was entitled “A most excellent Godly new Ballad . . . abuses of this wicked world.”¹² When the Clown in *The Winter’s Tale* exclaims: “I love a ballad but even too well, if it be doleful matter merrily set down, or a very pleasant thing indeed, and sung lamentably” (4.4.187-189), the lines may indicate more than the character’s incomplete grasp of the English language. Of course, such ballads would be the poorest samples of their kind, with words and music not according—and “lamentably,” of course, suggests poorly sung as well as mournfully rendered. But Shakespeare’s mind lingers over this kind of thing. What is it like to experience “doleful matter merrily set down”?

The issues involved in the substitution of words are religious as well as tonal. In *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, Parson Hugh Evans, singing to quiet his nerves before a duel, gets the words to a metrical version of Psalm 137 hopelessly tangled up with Marlowe’s “Come live with me and be my love”: “Melodious birds sing madrigals— / When as I sat in Pabylon— / And a thousand vagram posies. . . .” (3.3.19-21). The “fragrant posies” of the original become “vagram” (vagrant) posies, and the mistake amusingly reflects the wandering of the parson’s mind. The juxtaposition of the weeping Israelites hanging their harps on trees and praying for the ruin of Babylon with the melodious madrigals of Marlowe’s birds is hilariously inappropriate. Here Babylon (and by extension, Babel) seems to have the upper hand. Winifred Maynard suggests that this verbal humor might have been reinforced by a musical joke in which the parson, reversing the practice of the sacred parody—“edifying words written to popular tunes ‘for auoyding of sin and harlatric’”—sang his confused recollections of the love lyric to the psalm tune.¹³ (Protestant reformers routinely stole tunes from popular songs and applied them to hymns or psalms. Luther used this device frequently—so frequently that it was used against him in a 1530 Italian parody of the “Te deum laudamus,” which became “Te Lutherum damnamus.”¹⁴) In a sacred parody, a new song could become something like the negation of an old one, the edifying words opposing the sinful ones by taking their places. The idea, of course, was to take advantage of the popularity of a catchy tune by giving it new moral or spiritual words. But as Sir Hugh’s muddled singing suggests, the strategy could backfire. Even if the scene did not involve a joke about song parodies, it suggests an interest on Shakespeare’s part in the idea of one song slipping into another song, the idea of certain sets of words as interchangeable, tangled together by musical associations.

The snatch of song sung by Poor Tom and the Fool in *The History of King Lear* provides a powerful example of the almost surreal permutations possible to a song. During the mad Lear’s “trial” of his absent daughters, Poor Tom sings—apropos of nothing in particular—“Come o’er the burn, Bessy, to me.” The Fool then responds with what seems to be his own variation on the old song: “Her boat hath a leak, / And she must not speak / Why she dares not come over to thee” (13.20-23). In

providing new words for the song, the Fool is merely participating in a history of transformations. “Come o’er the burn Bessy” was originally a love song, later converted to a spiritual theme:

Come o’er the burn Bessy,
Thou pretty little Bessy,
Come o’er the burn Bessy to me.

The burn is this world blind,
And Bessy is mankind,
So proper I can none find as she.
She dances and leapes
And Christ stands and clepes.
Come o’er the burn Bessy to me.¹⁵

The singing voice of the song is revealed to be the voice of Christ, calling all men away from the sinful world. In a later version, “Bessy” becomes Queen Elizabeth, summoned over the burn by the adoring population of England.¹⁶ The idea that “the clowning scene and its song provide an oblique comment on the all-powerful emotion of love which ennobles the dying Lear”¹⁷ seems inadequate. The fool’s song provides nothing so simple as a comment, however oblique. Does his version of the ballad mock love? Religion? The authority of the monarch and the love of the people for the monarch? All of these things at once? Yet the words also seem completely random—the results of a fool seizing any chance for an obscene joke—and do not refer definitely to anything at all. The fool’s ditty is itself a “moralization” of a familiar song, a parody that undermines the whole project of setting moralizations to familiar tunes, just as it mocks equally all possible versions of “Bessy.”

In some moralizations, old refrains cling to the old tune—ghostly, meaningless in their new setting, but pointing back towards the former content of the song, for anyone who might remember it. Such is the case with one of the ditties belted out by the drunken Sir Toby in *Twelfth Night*. Toby is not alarmed by Maria’s threat that “my lady” will turn him out of the house. “Am not I consanguineous? Am I not of her blood? Tilly-vally—‘lady’! “There dwelt a man in Babylon, lady, lady” (2.3.69-71). The appeals to the authority of “my lady,” which Sir Toby is finding increasingly monotonous, remind him of the refrain of a popular song telling the story of the constancy of Susanna. The song, of course, has nothing whatsoever to do with the situation at hand, and Toby’s singing is a refusal to engage with Maria’s concerns. Not only does he continue the objectionable caterwauling, but he also responds *associatively*, not rationally, to Maria. He picks up the central word in her speech, mocks its significance, and continues with what the word *reminds* him of.

There dwelt a man in Babylon,
of reputation great by fame;
He took to wife a fair woman,
Susanna she was call’d by name;

A woman fair and virtuous,
lady, lady,
 Why should we not of her learn thus
 To live godly?¹⁸

It is impossible to talk with someone who insists on finding nothing in the words you say but reminiscences of songs. This person is certainly listening to the words, but not listening at all to what you are saying. The words set sonic patterns going in the hearer’s head, dredging up snatches of tune rather than provoking a reasoned response. Toby rings changes on the word as a sound rather than a signifier—as, in this particular song, it really is: ‘lady, lady’ might as well be ‘hey nonny nonny’ as far as content is concerned. Sometimes the word refers to Susanna, but it usually functions as a nonsense word to fill up the tune. “Lady” is left over from a popular song entitled “The Pangs of Love” that was set to this tune, before these words were replaced with the edifying narrative of Susanna. This ballad starts out with a biblical example, but is hardly a religious song.

Was not good King Solomon
 Ravished in sundry wise
 With every lively paragon
 That glistered before his eyes?
 If this be true as true it was,
lady, lady,
 Why should I not serve you alas,
 my dear lady?¹⁹

The song goes on to recall other examples of famous lovers (the usual suspects: Paris, Troilus, Leander, Pyramus, etc.) to excuse the speaker’s love and soften the lady’s heart. In this song, the repeated burden, “lady, lady,” is an address to the imagined beloved. In the Susanna version, this refrain is left over, a ghost of the love song that clings to the tune and cannot be discarded, even if it no longer makes sense. The plea for love (“Why should I not serve you alas, my dear lady?”) has been replaced by an exhortation to godliness, but the original exhortation still echoes in the form, reduced to meaningless “filler.” Sir Toby is hardly represented as thinking of all this—his selection of the song seems entirely random—nor would the audience be expected to remember the origins of the lingering refrain, “lady, lady.” At least, not consciously. Yet on one level the song fits the situation perfectly, as Toby reduces Olivia’s authority to a meaningless chanting.

Nevertheless, song proves an uncomfortable weapon and an undependable vehicle for mockery or satire, partly because of the presence of multiple sets of words and partly because musical parody is never quite stable. Sir Toby makes this discovery when he employs song to mock Malvolio’s threats. His strategy is quite similar to the strategy he used earlier on Maria: Malvolio’s cold remark that Olivia is only too ready to bid Toby farewell, intended as an ultimatum, shrinks to the associations of the final word as the knight responds by singing. Feste joins in, and the two improvise

a spontaneous parody of a fashionable lute song, very recently published.²⁰ The humor comes from the way something so inapplicable is made to apply. The original song represents the lament of a vacillating lover:

Farewell dear love since thou wilt needs be gone,
 Mine eyes do show my life is almost done,
 nay, I will never die
 so long as I can spy,
 there be many mo'
 though that she do go,
 There be many mo' I fear not,
 Why then let her go, I care not.

Farewell, farewell, since this I find is true,
 I will not spend more time in wooing you:
 but I will seek elsewhere
 if I may find her there,
 shall I bid her go,
 what and if I do?
 Shall I bid her go and spare not,
 O no no no no I dare not.²¹

In their version, Sir Toby and Feste do not so much make up new words as collapse the two stanzas quoted above. Sir Toby confuses the verses, or jumps from the first to the second, demonstrating the ease with which verses can be recombined and temporal order jettisoned in strophic song settings. Feste proves—as one might expect—the most adept at this kind of musical “fooling.” He is the master of this and all other songs, and he draws Sir Toby in over his head while seeming to encourage and abet him.

Sir Toby. ‘Farewell, dear heart, since I must needs be gone.’
 Maria. Nay, good Sir Toby.
 Feste. ‘His eyes do show his days are almost done.’
 Malvolio . Is’t even so?
 Sir Toby. ‘But I will never die.’
 Feste. ‘Sir Toby, there you lie.’
 Malvolio . This is much credit to you.
 Sir Toby. ‘Shall I bid him go?’
 Feste. ‘What an if you do?’
 Sir Toby. ‘Shall I bid him go, and spare not?’
 Feste. ‘O, no, no, no, no, you dare not!’ (2.3.91-101)

The song presents two different possibilities to the same musical phrase: “Why then let her go, I care not” and “O no, no, no, no, I dare not.” In the complete original, the change shows the lover’s vacillation from one mood to another; but in the im-

promptu compression of Toby and Feste, the two possible lines overlies one another as alternate possibilities, one voiced and the other not. The song ends up in a rather uncomfortable place for Sir Toby, and he is forced to deny Feste's insinuation and respond directly to Malvolio: "Out o' tune, sir, ye lie. Art any more than a steward?" (2.3.102-103). He takes up the fool's dare; yet there is an uncomfortable truth in the final line of the song. Feste can see where the song is going, and he unerringly draws Sir Toby to the uncompromising conclusion. The song suddenly ceases to be a collaborative effort and becomes a taunt. Toby does not sing again for the rest of the play.

The lover's vacillating lament may be rather absurd, even in the original, but it is still a lament. Toby, crushingly, asks Malvolio: "Dost thou think because thou art virtuous there shall be no more cakes and ale?" (2.3.103-104). This is unanswerable—or at any rate Malvolio seems to find it unanswerable, and he directs his next words to Maria. But one possible answer is buried within the insubordinate song itself, in the one line that is significantly altered from the original: "Sir Toby, there you lie." In the middle of the joke, the reminder of mortality surfaces, the retort that the would-be Puritan Malvolio might have made to Sir Toby's insistence on the permanent ascendance of cakes and ale.²²

Shakespeare repeatedly demonstrates a fascination with the dramatic and tonal possibilities that arise when two different (and completely opposing) sets of words are applied to the same tune. In *As You Like It*, Amiens sings "Under the Greenwood Tree," praising the joys of forest life. Jacques then gives the company "a verse to this note that I made yesterday," mocking the lords' flight to the supposed golden world of the forest: "If it do come to pass / That any man turn ass . . ." (2.5.40, 44-45). He provides a satirical comment on the original song, yet this commentary is superimposed over the song, part of it, inextricable, because sharing the same melody. The intended presentation of Jacques' verse remains unclear. Jacques may sing it, or speak it, or he may hand a written version to Amiens, who then sings the new lines. The first folio suggests the last option by giving the verse to Amiens, and placing it in italics like the rest of the song. David Lindley favors this staging and suggests that song and parody, sung in the same voice, may serve "as a dramatic emblem of the way in which pastoral is the product of a subjective interpretation of circumstance. The original and its opposite become, if Amiens sings both, two sides of the air's coin."²³ In Lindley's reading, the song does as the rest of the play does, in little. I would argue, instead, that the play strives to do what the *song* does—not in presenting two sides of a coin, but in making the celebration of sweet birds and greenwood trees a satirical commentary on the absurdity of the pastoral project—and vice versa. Celebration and satire are not merely juxtaposed in the verses of the song; they are as if set to the same tune; they fall into the same form. Echoes of the celebration haunt the satire and vice versa. If the play ever does achieve harmony, these multiple verses to the same note provide the best model for the harmony that it achieves. What would the song be like if all verses were possible at once? The drama shows us one answer. The idea of replacing one set of words for another with the same tune embodies the irony at the center of Shakespearean music, an irony that eats at everything around it and simultaneously dissolves itself. A similar effect can be found in Desdemona's Willow Song. The mournful but comforting phrase

“the fresh streams ran by her and murmured her moans” occupies the same *musical* phrase as the cynical “if I court more women, you’ll couch with more men.”²⁴ But just as Desdemona cannot work out the order of the verses, so it is impossible to establish which worldview has priority.²⁵

II.

Shakespeare’s fascination with multiple songs set to the same “note” seems to spring from the same source as his idiosyncratic obsession with certain types of word-play. As Sir Toby bellows out his snatch of “There dwelt a man in Babylon,” Feste remarks: “Beshrew me, the knight’s in admirable fooling” (2.3.72). Feste the Fool is both a musician and a “corrupter of words” (3.1.31)—he dallies with them until they turn wanton (3.1.13-14), cease to mean what they should mean, and even skirt the edges of meaninglessness. Most of these verbal games depend upon words that take the same sonic form, but express different semantic content: closely compressed versions of those “ghost lyrics” that Shakespeare explores elsewhere. These multiple messages, expressed in identical tunes, are for Shakespeare long-drawn-out puns, a playing on sound and meaning extended radically in time. These elongated musical puns tap into immense and complicated affective powers unavailable to simple words with double or triple meanings. They unite an intensity of feeling and personal association to a game that could otherwise seem merely clever or cynical in its play of meaning.

Shakespeare suggests the closeness of song and excessive punning that tends towards nonsense in *Much Ado About Nothing*. Balthasar rather lamely insists upon his inadequacy as a singer, and in response to Don Pedro’s “if thou wilt hold longer argument, / Do it in notes,” replies, “Note this before my notes: / There’s not a note of mine that’s worth the noting.” “Why,” answers the exasperated Prince, “these are very crotchets that he speaks— / Note notes, forsooth, and nothing!” (2.3.48-52). If the audience by this point has not noted the pun imbedded in the title of the play, they have little excuse. Don Pedro and Balthasar go into a positive fantasia on “note” and “noting,” generating an excess of meanings. Don Pedro gives this play of words a musical term: “these are very crotchets that he speaks.” Crotchets are “whimsical fancies” and “perverse conceits”²⁶ and quarter notes. Balthasar’s clever little explosion of “notes” is whimsical nonsense, and the Prince indicates that these variations on the word “note” ought to be replaced by the actual musical notes for which the speech apologizes. But this spoken bit of nothing already resembles the whimsical noting that follows, the song that exhorts its listeners to take nothing too seriously, ending in the nonsense of “hey nonny nonny.” In its most playful form, word-play is the speaking of crotchets. It shrugs off the responsibility of pointed meanings, and in the process may become infinitely suggestive.²⁷

The pun of “nothing” and “noting” (in its musical sense) proves apt and suggestive in a number of plays. As Anne Barton points out, any single word, when repeated a number of times, takes on “a bizarre, essentially mysterious quality of its own, like a word in some arcane and alien tongue.”²⁸ Barton’s discussion moves directly from repetition to the speaking of nonsense to the singing of snatches of song. Lear, Poor Tom, and the Fool are drawn to “nonsense words: ‘Fie, foh, and

fum’, ‘nonny’, ‘alow’. Non-words of this kind are a familiar feature of ballad refrains and nursery rhymes. Used, however, as a substitute for normal speech, as the place towards which language tends when hard-pressed, they become sinister and disturbing.”²⁹ In *Twelfth Night*, this is the place towards which language tends, almost naturally, in play. It is a place of song, shaped by the unaccountable movements of the mind, evoking a mingled carelessness and eeriness, a place where meanings appear and vanish, replacing but never entirely erasing one another. Laertes responds to the distracted Ophelia with the observation, “This nothing’s more than matter” (4.5.172); and in *Hamlet*, as in *Lear*, song proves anything but playful, its scrambled nonsense always hinting at a weight of meaning that is never quite expressed.

Hamlet is haunted by old songs. Theodore Reik described the compulsive repetition of musical phrases in the mind as “haunting melody,” but more recently, these phenomena have been accorded the charming label “earworms”—a creepily appropriate term in the context of *Hamlet*.³⁰ In addition to Ophelia’s mad music and the gravedigger’s song, the play features several snatches of old tunes quoted by Hamlet himself. Critical accounts of the music of the play largely ignore Hamlet’s ballad fragments, probably because it is generally assumed that these phrases were meant to be spoken rather than sung.³¹ Yet Hamlet’s snatches of unsung song (if they are, in fact, unsung) prove in some ways more disconcerting than Ophelia’s singing because the prince’s interlocutors find it difficult to separate the song from the speech, the ballad logic from the logic of conversation. If certain phrases in a conversation are song rather than discourse, how is it possible to distinguish song from discourse? Simultaneously, the music that goes with the words becomes increasingly ghostly, evoked but never allowed to take shape anywhere but in the minds of the audience. (Try to speak the words of a song you know very well without thinking of the tune. It is almost impossible. The words drag their music with them.)

When Ophelia abandons logical for musical sense, she is doing something that the play as a whole has already done: she makes the shift literal and audible. In a world where time is out of joint, events and connections between events take on the irrational logic of an old ballad. Hamlet imitates this ballad logic in his out-of-frame discourse, most directly in his exchange with Polonius:

Hamlet . O Jephthah, judge of Israel, what a treasure hadst thou!

Pol onius. What a treasure had he, my lord?

Hamlet . Why,

“One fair daughter and no more,

The which he lovéd passing well.”

Pol onius [*aside*]. Still on my daughter.

Hamlet . Am I not i’ th’ right, old Jephthah?

Pol onius. I f you call me Jephthah, my lord, I have a daughter
that I love passing well.

Hamlet . Nay, that follows not.

Pol onius. What follows then, my lord?

Hamlet . Why,

“As by lot, God wot”

and then, you know,

“It came to pass, as most like it was”

The first row of the pious chanson will show you more, for look
where my abridgements come. (2.2.385-404)

Polonius assumes that Hamlet’s quotation from the “pious chanson” must be in some way relevant to the situation at hand, but Hamlet implies that Polonius’ train of reasoning is flawed: “That follows not.” Polonius inevitably falls into the trap and asks what *does* follow, and Hamlet replies with the next lines of the song, cleverly replacing a train of thought with a musical sequence. And of course, as the song in question beautifully demonstrates, the order of events or words in a ballad is often without any apparent logic. In this case, “what follows” are two of the most inane lines in this—and, one is tempted to add, any—song: “As by lot, God wot, / It came to pass, as most like it was.” These lines purport to explain and give the background for a situation while simultaneously refusing to do so. In this passage, Hamlet suggests that a world of orderly and logical causation has given way to a world where one event comes after another for no other reason than that it *does*. In the Prince’s own discourse, logical progression from one thought to another is replaced by a seemingly *illogical* logic of association. This is the logic that Shakespeare associates with the workings of songs in the mind: we remember familiar songs not because of rational connections, but through seemingly random associations: a phrase that sounds similar to another phrase, a memory associated with another memory. Song verses themselves often obey a logic of sound rather than sense: the need to rhyme with “pass” generates “most like it was,” not any narrative pressure.

The associations of the songs of *Hamlet* are, in fact, suggestive: it is tempting to read them as meaningful, tempting to try to decode them. Polonius assumes that Hamlet has finished quoting from the ballad after his reference to Jephthah’s daughter; but not only does the Prince go on with “what follows,” he flippantly encourages Polonius—and the audience—to continue the song mentally while he welcomes the players: “The first row of the pious chanson will show you more.” Hamlet implies that he would have gone on with the ballad, all eight excruciating verses of it, if the players had not interrupted. And though Hamlet’s performance is abridged, the audience would likely have recollected more of the familiar song, as the prince encourages them to do.³² The “first row” to which Hamlet refers Polonius is particularly suggestive:

I read that many years ago,
when Jephthah, Judge of Israel,
Had one fair daughter and no mo’,
whom he beloved passing well
and as by lot, God wot
it came to pass, most like it was,
great wars there should be,
and who should be chief but he, but he.³³

The last lines of this verse, which Hamlet stops short of reciting, recall the murmuring about past and potential wars in the opening scene of the play, and touch on Hamlet's sense of dispossession by Claudius. The song even glances ahead to Hamlet's envy of that consummate war-chieftain, Fortinbras. The following verses continue to suggest, in distorted fashion, future events in the plot. In the third verse of the song, Jephthah's daughter comes running to meet her father, playing tabor and pipe with “notes full high, / for joy that he was so nigh, so nigh,” and when he sees her he tears his clothes and hair and shrieks. The music-making and distracted grief, assigned to two different characters in the song, will be conflated in the single figure of Ophelia, and the song's temporal scheme disjointed in the process. The singing Ophelia cannot meet her father, who is already dead. The song narrative becomes distorted and fragmented as it weaves into the narrative of *Hamlet*, just as Hamlet's rendition of this verse is broken and intruded upon by the prose conversation with Polonius—which in its turn is twisted and disfigured by the intrusion of the song.

The first line of the song—“I read that many years ago”—suggests a new response to Polonius' unanswered question of nearly two hundred lines back: “What do you read, my lord?” (2.2.191). Words, words, words are almost equivalent to an old song in their “repetition and noncommunicating language.”³⁴ Aside from demonstrating the dexterity and complexity of Hamlet's wit and power of allusion, this echo creates the impression that the play is haunted by more than Hamlet Senior. “Jephthah, Judge of Israel” is there too, drifting through and behind the language. The song only surfaces here, when Hamlet begins to quote it, but the familiar ballad seems to have been going on somewhere in the background before Hamlet picked it up. The Prince may be playing on the song before he ever explicitly refers to it. The last word or phrase of each stanza is repeated: “but he, but he;” “again, again;” “for the daughter of Jephthah still, still, still,” a device that recalls Hamlet's repetition of his own words, particularly his response to Polonius' “What do you read, my lord?” Words, words, words; except my life, my life, my life.

III.

The snatches of song voiced by various characters in Shakespeare's plays seem to rise from somewhere deep beneath the surface of the text. It is as if these old tunes are playing before we ever hear them, and continue even after we cease to hear. The Willow Song, for instance, was traditional; it is likely that the audience would have been familiar with it. In describing how the song haunts her, Desdemona emphasizes its prior existence in the world, independent of her own story, and even of Barbary's story: “She had a song of willow. / An old thing 'twas, but it expressed her fortune, / And she died singing it. That song tonight / Will not go from my mind” (4.3.27-30). Desdemona is a character in a drama, with no internal thoughts: nothing that she does not express to the audience exists. Nevertheless, Desdemona's reference to a song that will not go from her head provides her with a new, illusory interiority, as an audience who knows the old tune can hear what is going on in her mind before she sings aloud. As Desdemona begins to sing phrases of the song between interchanges with Emilia, Shakespeare suggests that the song goes on beneath

the surface of the text. When someone sings several verses of a familiar song, it does not easily go away. Emilia enacts this inevitable lingering when she echoes the song in the final scene. The “old thing” breaks down clear divisions between the stage world and the real world, between the characters and the audience, as it reverberates in the heads of the listeners just as it does in the imaginary minds of Desdemona and Emilia.

A number of critics have recently suggested a special connection between sound and the representation and formation of inwardness in early modern theater and culture.³⁵ I would suggest that the sound of song in particular—especially half-heard and fragmented song—provides a new understanding of the representation and evocation of inwardness on the Shakespearean stage. These songs do not and cannot reveal an essential identity, a true self, but they give access to something beneath the surface of what is expressed: inward voices, movements, associations that seem random and chaotic—but which are not the preserve only of the mad. The audience itself is invited to participate in this shifting but quasi-*collective* inwardness, as characters repeatedly dramatize the distorted lingering of familiar songs in the mind.

As Rossini’s Desdemona discovers, songs do not necessarily correspond to the innermost feelings of the heart. Their haunting effect partly rests in the way that they sometimes *seem* to provide a key to the self—but in the end, do not. To equate Desdemona with Barbary or the poor soul of her song, or with Emilia—or with Francesca—would be to fit the song firmly into the frame of the play; the point is that it does not fit. (It follows not, as Hamlet would say.) Relations between song and surrounding material *seem* to exist; they tantalize, but never become clear. A song enters a play at an odd angle, and then slips away before the angle can be measured. The snatch seems to surface from the depths—but what depths? The imaginary minds of Toby, Desdemona, Ophelia, Hamlet, and many others become briefly real, partially realized by the audience, as the listeners find the characters’ words pulling the old familiar tunes up to the surface of their own minds. Shakespeare’s songs create an almost vertiginous impression of depth behind the words and gestures of figures moving on a stage—literally, if momentarily, “sounding” an impossible and illusory interiority into being.

Notes

1. “All quotations from the opera are taken from Gioachino Rossini, *Otello*, Atto Terzo, <http://opera.stanford.edu/iu/libretti/rotello3.html>. “There is no greater sorrow than to recall a happy time in misery.” [translations mine]
2. “Oh come infino al core / Giungon quei dolci accenti! / Chi sei che così canti? . . . Ah, tu rammenti / Lo stato mio crudele!” “Oh, how those sweet words pierce my heart! Who are you who sing so? . . . Ah, you remind me of my wretched state!”
3. Maria Ann Roglieri, *Dante and Music: Musical Adaptations of the “Commedia” from the Sixteenth Century to the Present* (Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2001), 83. For a similar response, see Bernardo Ricci, “Rossini, Dante e il gondoliere: una ‘contaminatio’ impropria?” *Musica/Realtà* 34 (1991): 5-7.

4. Only the final act of Rossini's opera—in which Desdemona is murdered by the jealous Othello—bears any resemblance to the original play.
5. Shakespeare is cited parenthetically from *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt, Walter Cohen, Jean Howard, and Katherine Eisaman Maus (New York: Norton, 1997).
6. See Marcus Cheng Chye Tan, “‘Here I Am . . . Yet Cannot Hold this Visible Shape’: The Music of Gender in Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*,” *Comitatus* 32 (2001): 115-16.
7. Winifred Maynard, *Elizabethan Lyric Poetry and Its Music* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 204. See also David Lindley, *Shakespeare and Music*, Arden Critical Companions (London: Thomson Learning, 2006), 210.
8. Studies of song in Shakespeare include John H. Long, *Shakespeare's Use of Music*, 3 vols. (Gainesville: Univ. of Florida Press, 1955-71); Peter J. Seng, *The Vocal Songs in the Plays of Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1967); and Frederick W. Sternfeld, *Music in Shakespearean Tragedy* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963). Ross Duffin's invaluable *Shakespeare's Songbook* (New York: Norton, 2004) attempts to reconstruct music for all the songs either sung or mentioned in Shakespeare's plays. For an account of the cultural connections between early modern ballads and plays, see Bruce R. Smith, “Reading Lists of Plays, Early Modern, Modernist, Postmodern,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 42 (1991): 138-144; and *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1999), 168-205.
9. For some of the effects of strophic song, see Edward Doughtie, *English Renaissance Song* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1986), 132-33.
10. F. W. Sternfeld, “Music and Ballads,” *Shakespeare Survey* 17 (1964): 220. See also Claude Simpson, *The British Broadside Ballad and Its Music* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1966), ix.
11. See Mark Booth, *The Experience of Songs* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1981), 110.
12. Simpson, 270.
13. Maynard, 181. For a discussion of the possibility of the drinking song in *Antony and Cleopatra* being set to a hymn-tune, see Peter Seng, “Shakespearean Hymn-Parody,” *Renaissance News* 18 (1965): 4-6. Parson Hugh Evans was hardly the first churchman to have experienced such difficulties. In *The Owl and the Nightingale: Musical Life and Ideas in France 1100-1300* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1989), Christopher Page quotes a thirteenth-century friar describing the travails of a contemporary: “Secular songs echoed continuously in his ear and brain . . . and they gave him no pleasure, as they had done before, but rather vexed him a good deal.” Page goes on to relate the story of an unfortunate priest who “inadvertently sang” the contagious refrain of a popular song “to his congregation instead of the customary benediction *Dominus vobiscum*,” 125-26.
14. See *Music in the Western World: A History in Documents*, ed. Piero Weiss and Richard Taruskin (New York: Schirmer Books, 1984), 105-07.
15. Quoted in Sternfeld, *Music in Shakespearean Tragedy*, 168.

24 *The Upstart Crow*

16. See Sternfeld, *Music in Shakespearean Tragedy*, 168-69. The text of the Queen Elizabeth-as-Bessy version, from the broadside registered in 1564, is reproduced in Duffin, 105-07.
17. Sternfeld, *Music in Shakespearean Tragedy*, 170.
18. Quoted in Duffin, 384.
19. Quoted in Duffin, 245.
20. Lindley, 212.
21. Quoted in Duffin, 138-39.
22. Cf. Lindley, 213.
23. Lindley, 194.
24. See Erin Minear, "Music and the Crisis of Meaning in *Othello*," *SEL* 49 (2009): 367.
25. The songs of the owl and the cuckoo at the end of *Love's Labour's Lost* were likely set to the same tune as well. See Duffin, 447.
26. *OED*, 9a.
27. Nonsense refrains like "hey nonny nonny" and "fa la la" were "sometimes used in place of bawdy rhyme-words" (Maynard, 160)—and perhaps inevitably associated with the words that they were meant to replace.
28. Anne Barton, "Shakespeare and the Limits of Language," *Shakespeare Survey* 24 (1971): 26.
29. Barton, 27.
30. Theodor Reik, *The Haunting Melody: Psychoanalytic Experiences in Life and Music* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Young, 1953), 163-68. "Earworm" comes from the German *Ohrwurm*. See Daniel Levitin, *This is Your Brain on Music: The Science of a Human Obsession* (New York: Dutton, 2006), 151.
31. See Lindley: "No editor seems ever to have suggested that [Hamlet] sing [the ballad quotations]," 159. Sternfeld assumes that "as befits his station . . . [Hamlet] speaks rather than sings these lines," *Music in Shakespearean Tragedy*, 129. Long, on the other hand, prefers a singing Hamlet, because this behavior would underline the Prince's assumption of the traditional role of the fool (*Shakespeare's Use of Music: Histories and Tragedies*, 113). For accounts focusing on the gendered treatment of song and on Ophelia as a singer, see Leslie Dunn, "Ophelia's Songs in *Hamlet*: Music, Madness, and the Feminine," *Embodied Voices: Representing Female Vocality in Western Culture*, ed. Leslie Dunn and Nancy Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1994), 50-64; and Jacquelyn Fox-Goode, "Ophelia's Mad Songs: Music, Gender, Power," *Subjects on the World's Stage: Essays on British Literature of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*, ed. David Allen and Robert White (Newark: Univ. of Delaware Press, 1995), 217-38.
32. The tune for this particular ballad has been lost, unfortunately. Hamlet's way of alluding to the

song (“and then, you know . . .”) suggests that it was well-known.

33. Quoted in Duffin, 226.
34. Doughtie, 7. Doughtie is discussing nonsense refrains in folksongs.
35. For the “inwardness” of the sense of hearing, and the connection between sound and subject formation, see Wes Folkerth, *The Sound of Shakespeare* (New York: Routledge, 2002); Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England*, 7-10, 246-384; Kenneth Gross, *Shakespeare’s Noise* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2001), 39; Gina Bloom, *Voice in Motion: Staging Gender, Shaping Sound in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 111-17. For the critical debate on interiority and subjectivity in *Hamlet*—and in the early modern era in general—see Catherine Belsey, *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and Difference in Renaissance Drama* (New York: Methuen, 1985); Francis Barker, *The Tremulous Private Body* (Ann Arbor, MI: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1995); Katharine Eisaman Maus, *Inwardness and Theater in the English Renaissance* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1995); and Margreta de Grazia, “*Hamlet*” without *Hamlet* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2007).

“HERE’S A KNOCKING INDEED!”: *MACBETH* AND THE *HARROWING OF HELL*

Kurt Schreyer, *University of Missouri—St. Louis*

Knock. Knock. Who’s there? In the *Harrowing of Hell* scenes of English mystery plays, the answer to that question was no joke. The *Harrowing* marks the climax of the battle between God and Satan for the fate of humanity. Following the crucifixion, Christ descends into Hell and lays siege to its battlements in order to “harrow,” or plunder, the souls in Limbo.¹ More than forty years ago, Glynn Wickham noted that Shakespeare’s play relies upon his audience’s familiarity with mystery drama and that *Macbeth* draws from the dialogue, action, and setting of *Harrowing of Hell* pageants.² Wickham’s research set an important precedent. Scholars like Michael O’Connell, Helen Cooper, and Beatrice Groves, for example, have made important claims about the histrionic conventions and incarnational aesthetics that Shakespeare inherited from the mystery plays like the *Harrowing*.³

This essay, though clearly indebted to Wickham’s scholarship and sympathetic to O’Connell and others, makes a different claim: I argue that a sound effect borrowed from mystery drama catalyzes dialogue and action in a Shakespeare play. The knocking at the gate of Inverness castle prompts the Porter of *Macbeth* to tell jokes and ask questions in the manner of traditional devil-porter behavior in the mysteries. The re-creation of a sound from an outlawed stage tradition brings the pre-Reformation theatrical past into the present. It is, therefore, not a neutral dramaturgical choice, but a potentially subversive bit of stage business that has two important implications for Shakespeare’s play. First, by inviting but then denying affinities with Christ’s climactic battle with Satan, the Porter scene exposes the inadequacy of Jacobean political theology. When Wickham’s essay was published, it joined John Harcourt’s “I Pray You, Remember the Porter” (1961) in arguing that Shakespeare, pressured by royal patronage, wrote *Macbeth* in support of James’ views on kingship and godly rule.⁴ Much recent scholarship, however, has stressed the play’s potential involvement in resistance theory.⁵ My own contribution to this critical conversation will be to suggest that the Porter scene, once the cornerstone of pro-Jacobean readings of Macbeth’s reign as an “awful parenthesis,” is in fact an elaborate joke that undermines the Crown’s claims to sacred authority. Second, by borrowing from the superseded dramaturgy of the Old Faith’s plays, the Porter scene mocks religious opponents of the London playhouses. At the time that *Macbeth* was being performed, antitheatricalists like the Protestant preacher William Crashaw were calling upon James I to extirpate “the vngodly Playes and Enterludes so rife in this nation.”⁶ Critics of the theater condemned the public stages as the theatrical progeny of popish mystery drama, and I want to suggest that the knocking at the gates provokes and unprovokes such desires to link commercial drama with its Catholic antecedents.

Asserting an acoustic link between Shakespeare and the mysteries is important for broader methodological reasons as well. As Jonathan Gil Harris and Natasha Korda have noted, literary criticism has long positioned Shakespeare as the “peerless representative of a transcendent dramatic literature . . . [that] disdains vulgar physical

accoutrements.⁷ Following their work, as well as the indispensable collection *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture*, I want to argue that we further strive to see Shakespeare as “a *playwright*, a craftsman who, like a shipwright or cartwright, fashions his material for practical use.”⁸ A playwright not only crafts words but also joins them to stage materials: costumes, properties, actors’ bodies and voices—and sound effects. Sounds are not objects in the traditional sense of material culture studies, yet it may be helpful to think about the acoustic affinity between *Macbeth* and the *Harrowing* in terms of material stage properties—as if Shakespeare borrowed an aural prop, rather than a Hell-mouth or devil’s costume, to momentarily suggest the setting of Hell. Shakespeare is also the peerless representative of Renaissance literature. This present study of the knocking in *Macbeth* aims to unsettle that casual periodization—and corresponding assumptions about the relative superiority of the Renaissance author over the medieval object.⁹ That is not to suggest that we read *Macbeth* as a seventeenth-century mystery or morality play for, as we’ll see, the play confounds attempts to do so. Rather, I wish to contribute to a growing body of scholarship that is attempting to address what O’Connell has called the “almost general disinclination” to see the mystery plays as having any relationship to the professional London stage.¹⁰ In doing so, I want to suggest that material pieces from the mystery plays gave shape—and sound—to the joinery of Shakespeare’s theatrical works.

Hearing and Remembering

Bruce Smith’s recent work in *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England* explores how early modern audiences experienced sound—both inside and outside the Globe theater. According to Smith, sound and other extra-verbal aspects of drama require us to adopt a more expansive approach to Shakespeare’s plays than textual study has traditionally permitted. His “historical phenomenology” therefore aims to situate the study of human hearing in the historical context of Elizabethan-Jacobean England.¹¹ How, in other words, did Shakespeare’s audiences experience sound, and how did they understand it? Two aspects of Smith’s study are important for this discussion: first, both sound and memory were viewed as material remnants of past experience, and second, extra-verbal sounds were often crucial to a Globe performance. With regard to the former, late-sixteenth- and early-seventeenth-century studies of the brain’s faculties understood memory as a “densely material” trace of speech. As Smith explains, “early modern physiology invited people to think of their memory as something physical and graphic: a trace of the brain tissues that could practically be seen and touched.”¹² Renaissance theorists of memory drew upon the writings of Plato and Aristotle which compared human memory to wax that retains the impression of a seal or other object no longer present.¹³ According to Smith, this material understanding of memory implies that the brain must re-create the experience of hearing a word when it recalls that word and transforms it into a sound. “Because words have semantic meanings,” he writes, “we forget that they also encode bodily experience—at the very least the expulsion of air, the adjustments of muscle, the shaping of tongue that it takes to pronounce those words.” And so, “memory transforms air waves into embodied action. It remembers sound in vari-

ous parts of the human body: in the other ventricles of the brain, in the ears, in the hands, in the eyes, in the body as a kinaesthetic whole.”¹⁴

Like the human body, the London playhouses were “instruments for producing, shaping, and propagating sound.” Smith’s study notes that the “wooden beams, plaster over lath, and wooden boards over joists” effectively transformed the stage into a “gigantic sounding board.” Far from being acoustically restrictive, the 1599 Globe “offered a volumetric listening space per auditor that actually surpasses that of modern theaters.”¹⁵ Sound effects were therefore often crucial to an early modern audience’s experience of a play. As Smith shows with regard to the thunder heard during the opening scenes of *Macbeth* and *The Tempest*, plays had “soundscapes” or auditory fields that were often purposefully defined at the outset of the play.¹⁶ Yet the Globe, I want to suggest, not only produced, shaped, and propagated sound—it remembered it. The opening peal of thunder “through the fog and filthy air” (1.1.11) surrounding the weird sisters and the hellish pounding din we hear later at the Porter’s “Hell gate” were, as we’ll see, prominent features in the soundscape of *Harrowing of Hell* plays.¹⁷ In fact, the noises produced on or behind the stage were so similar to the older plays—and so familiar to audiences—as to allow the professional theater to play upon the previous significance and context of these sounds. The clown playing the Porter of *Macbeth*’s castle does just that.

A History of Hard Knocks

“Here’s a knocking indeed! If a man were porter of hell-gate, he should have old turning the key” (2.3.1-2). When the actor playing the Porter enters saying these words, he is alone onstage. There is no dialogue that prompts him to compare himself to a devil guarding Hell’s gates. There is only a noise—which the 1623 First Folio records as a stage direction repeated ten times—*Knocke within*.—and which the Porter himself repeatedly mimics.¹⁸ It is that knocking, too, that would have encouraged the audience to play along with his imagination. They have heard, as the Porter has not, *Macbeth*’s final line in the previous scene: “Wake Duncan with thy knocking. I would thou couldst” (2.2.72). After the Reformation, as before, a knock that could wake the dead from their sleep in a dark castle recalled the popular apocryphal legend of Christ’s *Descensus ad Infernos*. Christians in Europe and England had been reading about—and enacting—the legendary knocking of the *Descensus* for centuries. As David Mills explains, the story excerpted from the *Gospel of Nicodemus* came to the pageants of the late medieval mysteries via the “standard lections of the Church,” such as the *Legenda Aurea* and *A Stanzaic Life of Christ*.¹⁹ The *Nicodemus* account, moreover, turns on the famous *Tollite portas* verse from Psalm 23 [AV 24]: “Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of Glory shall come in.”²⁰ The command is spoken with a “hideous” voice like thunder (“A voice spak þan full hydusly, / Als it war thonours blast”), before finally “Ihesus strake so fast, / þe yhates in sonder yhede / And Iren bandes all brast.”²¹

The *Harrowing* plays in York, Chester, Townley, and N-town repeat the *Tollite portas* or similar lines as many as three times, with the gates crashing down on the

final injunction. The gates of Hell cannot prevail and, as Clifford Davidson notes, the knocking of Anima Christi therefore becomes central to the play—because of it, guildsmen were obliged to construct a Hell-mouth with gates that would appear to collapse.²² The Chester Cooks, for example, constructed a huge bestial maw tall enough to contain gates and a “dungeon” emitting smoke and sulphurous stench.²³ Mystery play adaptations of the *Descensus ad Infernos* from the *Gospel of Nicodemus* and other sources also reproduce the hideous “thonours blast” that accompanies Christ’s approach to Hell’s gate. A stage direction in the Chester play calls for great clamor and noise: “*Tunc venit Jesus et fiat clamor, vel sonituous magnus materialis.*”²⁴ The precise meaning of the “material noise” remains a crux for scholars. Wickham interprets this stage direction as “trumpets and knocking.” Mills is less specific in his translation: “Then Jesus shall come, and there shall be a cry, or a great physical din.” Richard Rastall points out that if the word “materialis” is a noun, rather than an adjective, then it’s quite possible that the stage direction is telling the Cooks who are performing the play to make “a great sound of material,” namely by banging together the pots and pans of their trade. This interpretation, says Rastall, activates a medieval conceptualization of Hell that “we understand only imperfectly: the idea of Hell as a kitchen.”²⁵ Whether kitchen or torture chamber, Hell is confusion’s masterpiece, and yet the devils in the *Harrowing of Hell* are, like Macbeth, appalled by noise: “How is’t with me when every noise appalls me?” (2.2.56). They cannot abide either the knocking or the commotion it arouses among their prisoners. In the Chester play, the din at the gates prompts Sathanas to cry, “Owt, alas, what is this?” (161). In York, the pounding precipitates further noises as the devil-porter Rebalde runs to warn Belsabub of the great commotion among the souls in Limbo:

I Diabol us. What, heris thou nouzt þis vggely noyse?
 Pes lurdans [wretches] þat in Lyombo dwelle,
 Pei make menyng of many joies
 And musteres grete mirthe þame emell. (101-04)²⁶

The Wakefield Sathanas, much like Shakespeare’s Porter, mockingly imitates the repeated knocking he hears, commanding his devils not to be abashed (“abaste”) by Christ’s presence and to “ding,” or knock, “that dastard downe!”²⁷ Roaring “Owte, harrowe!” the York demons raise a clamor of their own. Yelling, complaining, and mimicry of the knocking were commonplaces among devils in the *Harrowing*, and so it is fitting that Macbeth’s Porter should act in a similar manner.

In his study of the prolonged stage career of devils before and after the Reformation, John D. Cox explains that “one reason devils endured was that the material base of culture changed very little throughout the time they were popular: the slow pace of economic and technological change meant that costumes and the materials for assembling them remained the same.”²⁸ Shakespeare’s stage, in fact, utilized many of the same technologies as the mysteries, including those used to make thunderous noises. In 1584, a man named “starche” was paid “to make the storme in the pagente” for the Coventry Doomsday and Destruction of the World play. Perhaps Starche made use of the “baryll for the yerthe quake” listed in the records and was aided by

“Christofer Dyglyne . . . [with] hys ij drummes.”²⁹ As for the London playhouses, Andrew Gurr states, “thunder came from the ‘roul’d bullet’ on a sheet of metal, or a ‘tempestuos drum.”³⁰ If the drum or barrel were pounded steadily, rather than “tempestuously,” it might have produced the kind of din that irritates the Porter (“Knock, knock. Never at quiet.” [2.3.15]), not to mention Macbeth (“Whence is that knocking?” [2.2.55])—the noise evidently so loud that he can’t tell where it’s coming from. Indeed, if Smith is correct, the Globe’s architecture and building materials would have propagated the sound all through the theater: “As a twenty-sided polygon, the Globe provided plenty of reflective surfaces.”³¹ Macduff’s response to Macbeth’s prompt entrance (“Our knocking has awaked him” [2.3.38]) would then seem as humorous as it is ironic. Who *wouldn’t* have been awakened?

Remembering and Remembering the Porter

Using similar dramaturgical technologies to create thunderous sound effects, *Macbeth* reproduces the knocking of the *Harrowing of Hell*. What must be emphasized, however, is that Shakespeare adapts and transforms these acoustic sounds without entirely emptying out the knocking of its previous signification.³² Rather, past theatrical material is brought into the present as *past material*. “Sound in early modern theater,” Smith writes, “is important not so much for what it *is* as for what it *signifies*. What audiences actually heard in the theater and what they *imagined* they heard may not always have been the same thing.” Drawing from Stephen Handel’s work on sound perception, he notes three distinct levels of sound experience. The audience would first of all have perceived certain *physical* phenomena (the noise of trumpets, hautboys, and drums, for instance) as well as elusive *perceptual* phenomena conveyed by these physical sounds (“brightness” in the trumpet, for example, or “pointedness” in the hautboys). Most important for our study of the knocking in *Macbeth* is what Smith describes as “certain imaginative phenomena” that a sound effect, musical instrument, or an actor’s speech can “invite” the audience to hear. “By a process of metonymy,” Smith explains, “what the audience hears, in the last analysis, is not just physical properties of sound, nor even psychological effects, but the acoustic equivalent of a visual scene—an ‘aura,’ perhaps.”³³ Brass instruments, he suggests, might aurally create a royal or “power scene” while those same instruments coupled with drums and gunfire might suggest combat. I am suggesting that Hell, too, had an “aural scene” that Shakespeare’s audience would readily have recognized from its experience of provincial mystery drama.³⁴ As Helen Cooper explains, the levels of population migration to London in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries meant that “the dominant living theatrical experience of the childhood and youth of a large number of the playgoers would have been the cycle plays.” “Playgoers who came from anywhere near Coventry,” Cooper further argues, “would have a distinct advantage when it came to recognizing the porter of *Macbeth*” because of their firsthand knowledge of the famous devil-porter in that *Harrowing* play.³⁵ Hamlet’s warning to the players not to overact like the figure of Herod (3.2.12) and the description of Master Slender’s “Cain-coloured beard” in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (1.4.20) are two verbal references to the theatrical prac-

tices of the mysteries that likewise presuppose audience familiarity with this banned dramatic form.³⁶ Applying Smith’s analysis of sound phenomena in the Globe to the knocking at Macbeth’s castle gate, we might say that the acoustics of the Porter scene are temporally ambivalent or double. The audience hears a “perceptual” knocking that it associates with the present action of the play, presumably the arrival of one of the play’s characters at the gate. Simultaneously, they experience an “imaginative” knocking or “acoustic equivalent of a visual scene” that would have resonated with the *Harrowing* plays of the recent past. Thus, as the walls of the Globe and the listeners’ ears and brains remember the physical phenomena of the knocking, they are also remembering the aura of Hell from the mysteries.

The actor playing the Porter further encourages this dramatic remembrance. He opens the gate with the request that Macduff pay him for his services: “I pray you remember the Porter” (2.3.20). The line is often delivered so as to amuse the audience with the clown’s sudden politeness and propriety. I’d like to consider the possibility that the Porter addresses this line to the audience. Certainly it was not unusual for stage devils to interrupt the action of the play—particularly at crucial moments—to ask for money from the audience.³⁷ But what if the Porter is not begging but simply putting the question to them: “Do you remember the porter?,” that is, “Do you recall the devil-porters of the Old Faith plays whom I have just imitated?” Wickham first explored this possibility by noting that the Porter’s request “is in two worlds at once; that of Macbeth’s castle and that of another scene from another play [namely, the *Harrowing of Hell*] which has just been recalled for the audience and which the author wants them to remember.”³⁸ The Porter scene derives much of its power—and its comedy—from its temporal ambivalence. As Harris notes regarding the sulphurous squibs used in the play, “*Macbeth* is temporally double, evoking a past-in-the-present.”³⁹ Cued by the sound of knocking, the Porter performs a bit of old devil-porter behavior from the mysteries. He doesn’t simply answer the gate, he “devil-porters” the gate by telling jokes at the expense of Hell’s inhabitants and repeatedly asking “who’s there?” in the manner of the *Tollite portas* rituals. The devils of the *Harrowing* are made present again through the performance of the actor playing the Porter.

Yet they are not fully present for, like Iago, the gatekeeper wears no cloven feet; he is not really a devil, but a clown pretending to be a devil.⁴⁰ In *Macbeth*, devilish behavior has become a dramatic custom—a stylized role that can be remembered, performed, and then discarded: “I’ll devil-porter it no further” (2.3.16).⁴¹ The Porter scene is a moment in which the Shakespearean stage borrows acoustic stage properties and customary practices from the mysteries, disowns them as not really relevant (“this place is too cold for hell” [2.3.15-6]), and then asks the audience if they recall the old plays. In Smith’s terms, the *Harrowing* plays are remembered and remembered. First, they are made theatrically present again—remembered—as the thunderous knocks reverberate throughout the Globe and the gatekeeper enunciates the traditional speech of stage devils. But then Shakespeare’s play treats the mystery plays as a thing of the past; they are superseded insofar as the actor playing the Porter can ask his audience if they remember them. And, in a play where even the slightest imagined hum triggers subsequent dramatic action—

Ere to black Hecate's summons
 The shard-borne beetle with his drowsy hums
 Hath rung night's yawning peal, there shall be done
 A deed of dreadful note. (3.2.42-45)

—it is a sound, a *Knocke within*, that prompts the remembering / remembering of mystery drama.

Sound and Fury

An early modern audience's kinesthetic experience of thunder and knocking in the "volumetric listening space" of the Globe would have been profound, and hearing an actor describe sounds through linguistic "imagery" is substantially different from hearing those noises emanate from the "hut" above the canopied roof or "heavens." Yet the language of Shakespeare's play also contributes significantly to the aura of Hell—just as the repeated intonation of the *Tollite portas* verses did in the *Harrowing*. After all, without the Porter's verbal commentary, the knocking at the gate may be reminiscent of *Harrowing* plays but would not necessarily signify Hell. A bell "invites" Macbeth to commit the murder, and he imagines that it is Duncan's death knell, summoning him "to heaven or to hell" (2.1.62-4). While "he is about it" (2.2.4), Lady Macbeth imagines an owl shriek as if it were a funeral bell tolling: "Hark, peace!— / It was the owl that shrieked, the fatal bellman / Which gives the stern'st good-night" (2.2.2-4). "Hark!" she cries again a few lines later (2.2.11). Following the murder, the pair again hears noises:

Macbeth. I have done the deed. Didst thou not hear a noise?
 Lady Macbeth. I heard the owl scream and the crickets cry.
 Did not you speak?
 Macbeth. When?
 Lady Macbeth. Now.
 Macbeth. As I descended?
 Lady Macbeth. Ay.
 Macbeth. Hark!— (2.2.14-16)

They volley words in rapid succession—an aural ping-pong match of monosyllables. But the Macbeths are not the only ones hearing strange sounds: Lennox later tells Macbeth of "Lamentings heard i'th' air, strange screams of death, / And prophesying with accents terrible" (2.3.52-53). The clamor in nature that he describes is soon matched by the confused cries of Duncan's subjects as Macduff returns from the chamber and compares the scene to the Final Doom. "Awake, awake! / Ring the alarum bell," he cries, adding: "Up, up, and see / The great doom's image. Malcolm, Banquo, / As from your graves rise up, and walk like sprites / To countenance this horror" (2.3.70-71, 74-77). In *Last Judgment* pageants, where "the great doom's image" was performed, there was an earthquake as the angels blew their trumpets to awake the dead. Macbeth is reminded of it when he feels his reign circumscribed by

the never-ending line of Banquo’s issue: “What, will the line stretch out to th’ crack of doom?” he asks the witches (4.1.133). As the *OED* explains, the word “crack” refers to the blaring trumpets of the angels sent by God to summon the dead: “A sudden sharp and loud noise as of something breaking or bursting” including the “thunder-peal” or “archangel’s trump” on the Day of Judgment. Macbeth’s use of the term in Act 4 underscores the broader linguistic and extra-verbal soundscape of the play. It anticipates his impending doom, when Macduff will command: “Make all our trumpets speak, give them all breath, / Those clamorous harbingers of blood and death” (5.6.9-10). “Crack” also reminds the audience of the play’s opening: “*Thunder and Lightning. Enter three Witches*” (1.1.1, s.d.).⁴² Macbeth himself, when struggling to carry out Duncan’s murder, had compared the death of the king to apocalyptic “blasts” and “trumpet-tongued” angels (1.7.18-25). The thunderous knocking of the Porter scene thus resonates with the many cracks, blasts, trumpets, bells, howls, and shrieks of the play’s hellish cacophony of sound and fury. When we last see Lady Macbeth, she is still haunted by the *Knock* at the gate, and her final monosyllabic words are a repetitious staccato reminiscent of the knocking she still fears: “No more o’ that, my lord, no more o’ that . . . To bed, to bed. There’s knocking at the gate. Come, come, come, come, give me your hand. What’s done cannot be undone. To bed, to bed, to bed” (5.1.37-38, 56-58).

Giving Them the Lie

Having argued that both the sound of knocking in *Macbeth* and its dramatic provenance are significant, I would now like to suggest that the Porter scene is a knock-knock joke at the expense of both Shakespeare’s royal patron and the religious opponents of the theaters.⁴³ A knock-knock joke, after all, is a homonymic equivocation that plays upon what Smith calls the “perceptual” and “imaginative” hearing of the audience. For the joke to work, there must be a double hearing: the listener must initially “misidentify” the sound of the knocker’s name until the punch line reveals the “mistake.” But in fact it is the joke teller (Shakespeare in this case) who punningly misuses sound. He playfully encourages the audience to “hear” Christ at the gate before opening the door to two Scottish lords.

Recent criticism on *Macbeth* has been marked by considerable dispute as to the play’s views on Jacobean ideologies and mythologies of kingship. Arguably the most important contribution to this debate has been Rebecca Lemon’s study of the sociopolitical impact of English treason legislation up to and beyond the 1605 Gunpowder Plot. According to Lemon, *Macbeth* proves “more complicated in its responses to the treason” than has traditionally been allowed by critics who believe Shakespeare was courting favor with his royal patron. It is the representation of Malcolm, she argues, through which the play challenges the rhetoric of divine right kingship. Malcolm “represents the negotiable model of kingship” whereby “verbal duplicity, typical of traitors, proves necessary in sustaining Scotland’s monarchs as well.” Thus, “while the rhetoric of scaffold speeches and post-Gunpowder Plot accounts of the treason resound with triumphalism,” Lemon argues, “Shakespeare’s play simultaneously replicates such rhetoric by initially opposing the demonic Mac-

beths with sanctified kingship and exposes its fictional nature by later drawing not only the audience but also the future king into league with the traitor.”⁴⁴ In no scene of the Scottish Play are the “demonic Macbeths” more at odds with “sanctified kingship” than when the gate of their castle is imagined as a Hell-mouth. And yet the Porter scene has been largely overlooked in this recent critical debate. If the scene is mentioned, it is usually for its topical reference to the infamous equivocating Jesuit in the Gunpowder Plot, Father Henry Garnet. According to Alvin Kernan, the Porter’s joke—“an equivocator that could swear in both the scales against either scale, who committed treason enough for God’s sake, yet could not equivocate to heaven” (2.3.8-10)—is a “grim and unsympathetic” jest for the simple reason that “pity for the king’s enemies is not wise in his friends.” Garnet’s equivocation and other topical matters are therefore “handled in the play in a way to please the king.”⁴⁵

Perhaps another reason that the Porter scene is now overlooked when arguing for the play’s engagement with resistance theory is that, for nearly two hundred years, it has served to underwrite the opposing view—namely, that Shakespeare’s play endorses the rhetoric of sacred kingship. The eighteenth century found the Porter too bawdy for “our Poet” and marginalized the scene in print and cut it from performance.⁴⁶ In the nineteenth century, however, the Porter scene underwent a stunning reevaluation. No longer superfluous, it became the linchpin of the play’s tragic action. Thomas De Quincey’s famous essay “On the Knocking at the Gate in *Macbeth*” (1823) is largely responsible for this critical reconsideration. In De Quincey’s account, the knocking in the Porter scene closes an “awful parenthesis” of demonic evil following the murder of Duncan. The regicide performed, Macbeth and Lady Macbeth are, he says, “transfigured: Lady Macbeth is ‘unsexed’; Macbeth has forgot that he was born of woman; both are conformed to the image of devils; and the world of devils is suddenly revealed.” But then comes that “*Knocke within.*” and, De Quincey explains, “when the deed is done, when the work of darkness is perfect, then the world of darkness passes away like a pageantry in the clouds: the knocking at the gate is heard, and it makes known audibly that the reaction has commenced; the human has made its reflux upon the fiendish.”⁴⁷ De Quincey’s reading of the knocking in *Macbeth* as a kind of apotropaic ritual is seductive, particularly in that, like Shakespeare’s play itself, it compares Macbeth and Lady Macbeth to hellish fiends.⁴⁸

When, more than a century later, Wickham argued for the scene’s indebtedness to medieval *Harrowing* pageants and liturgies, he left De Quincey’s “awful parenthesis” largely intact. Although he claims there was “no attempt” by Shakespeare to write *Macbeth* as a “direct parallel” of the *Harrowing*, Wickham nevertheless contends: “Thunder, cacophony, screams and groans were the audible emblems of Lucifer and hell on the medieval stage [and] their relevance to the moral meaning of [*Macbeth*] could scarcely have escaped the notice of its first audiences.”⁴⁹ For Wickham, as for De Quincey, *Macbeth* is the beneficiary of the *Harrowing*’s black-and-white moral universe such that, by Act 5: “Scotland has been purged of a devil who, like Lucifer, aspired to a throne that was not his . . . and was finally crushed within the refuge of his own castle by a saviour-avenger accompanied by armed archangels. Hell has been harrowed: ‘the time is free.’”⁵⁰ According to Wickham, therefore, the play didactically

replicates the moral absolutes of the *Harrowing*. Macbeth and his queen are demonic fiends; Macduff and Malcolm are agents of divine recompense; Inverness represents Hell Castle; fair is fair and foul is foul.

Not surprisingly, therefore, the import of the line “I pray you remember the Porter” (2.3.20) for Wickham is not its retrospection on the *Harrowing* plays *per se*, but its foreshadowing. If we interpret the request to “remember the porter” as referring to the devil-porters of mystery drama then, he says, “we recollect that it was Jesus who with a loud knocking entered Hell-castle in search of Satan.” Wickham then argues, “At this point in *Macbeth* Shakespeare has not yet informed us that Macduff is destined to avenge Duncan’s murder, but in his use of the porter he gives us a clear hint of what to expect.”⁵¹

The Porter scene in Wickham’s account anticipates, as in De Quincey, the conclusion of the play when good triumphs over evil and “the time is free” (5.11.21). Whereas Wickham reads the Porter scene (not to mention the play as a whole) as an earnest endorsement of Jacobean claims to sacred authority, I believe that it is an elaborate knock-knock joke. The Porter scene first offers a tantalizingly straightforward reading of history in which a “saviour-avenger accompanied by armed arch-angels” rescues and guards the Scottish crown. But this is like the first response to “Who’s there?” in a knock-knock joke. A double-hearing is required. Shakespeare’s audience is invited to hear not only the past context of the knocking, but also its present significance. If they listen carefully, in fact, they hear the Porter overturn the association with the *Harrowing*: “this place is too cold for hell” (2.3.15-16). And the aura of the *Harrowing* is shattered when the flawed Macduff knocks and enters, not the Christ-like Malcolm—and certainly not James’ ancestor, the “true, worthy Banquo” (1.4.54). Contrary to Wickham’s account, the conspicuous absence of a Christ-like savior reemerges at the conclusion of the play, which brings not the utter defeat of evil and the establishment of godly rule but moral and political uncertainty. “Why,” asks Stephen Orgel, “in a play so clearly organized around ideas of good and evil, is it not Malcolm who defeats Macbeth? . . . What happens next, with a saintly king of Scotland, and an ambitious soldier as his right-hand man, and those threatening offspring, the heirs of Banquo, still waiting in the wings?”⁵²

Scotland is not Hell, and the murky chronicle histories of its kings are not quite so fair or foul as James would have them. As with the punning use of sound in a knock-knock joke, Shakespeare’s mocking of Jacobean political theology relies on an acoustic gap or distance between *Macbeth* and the mysteries as much as on their aural resonance. I am not making an argument for Shakespearean sophistication at the expense of medieval simplicity for, as scholars have shown, stage devilry in the mysteries was itself highly nuanced and politically subversive. According to Cox, a “political pattern” runs throughout all of the major mystery play cycles: “This pattern identifies pride and rebellion against God with nearly everyone in the stories who possesses wealth, social prestige, and political power.”⁵³ Responding to Cox’s “feudal reading,” Robert Barrett suggests that the Chester *Fall of Lucifer* is less “a palace revolt” than it is a “self-consciously urban performance” that engages the city’s “oligarchic ideologies and institutions.” Lucifer thus leapfrogs “his way up the heavenly (and, by analogy again, the civic) hierarchy to seize God’s position at the

top.”⁵⁴ These brief examples of the politics of demonic performance further illustrate why Shakespeare may have borrowed from the mysteries in order to engage in resistance theory—namely, by the time *Macbeth* was written, devils had long been used to stage “abuses of power by the powerful.”⁵⁵

Only if the remembered knocking brings the theatrical past into the imaginative present can the play provoke and unprovoke the king’s fantasy of godly rule. Once we appreciate the scene’s moral—and temporal—ambivalence, the Porter’s assertion, “But this place is too cold for hell” (2.3.15-6), does more than simply mark the transition from comedy back to tragedy: it becomes an ideological refutation of James’ *Basilikon Doron* insofar as it denies that “this place”—Scotland—is a place where “the trew difference betwixt a lawfull, good King and a usurping Tyrant” can be so easily delineated.⁵⁶ That is not to deny the “structural antithesis” which, as Peter Stallybrass argues, so strikingly distinguishes Shakespeare’s play from Holinshed’s account.⁵⁷ It is to note, in fact, that the knocking-at-the-gate scene is an important source of antithesis. And secondly, it is to suggest that the play may structure itself antithetically but still expose the untenability of moral and political absolutism. *Macbeth*, as Lemon explains, initially opposes “the demonic Macbeths with sanctified kingship” but subsequently exposes the fiction of such triumphalist narratives by “later drawing not only the audience but also the future king into league with the traitor” Macduff.⁵⁸

Popish Progeny

Aside from these political considerations, Shakespeare may have had more self-interested reasons for first recalling then disavowing the *Harrowing*. If we recollect the manner in which antitheatricalists repeatedly compare the London stages to popery and popish drama, then perhaps the Porter scene is a knock-knock joke at their expense as well. In his 1607 sermon, Crashaw offers a genealogy of the English stage in which the pre-Reformation mysteries, the popish progeny of ancient heathen theater, are seen as direct conduits of the ungodly errors put on display in London’s public playhouses: “The vngodly Playes and Enterludes so rife in this nation; what are they but a *Bastard of Babylon*, a daughter of error and confusion, a hellish deuce . . . deliuered to the *Heathen*, from them to the *Papists*, and from them to vs?”⁵⁹ Reminding King James that the primitive Church had condemned plays, Crashaw calls for the destruction of this “tower of Babel” as part of a larger program of religious reformation. Decades before Crashaw, Stephen Gosson in his *Playes Confuted in Five Actions* (1582) admits that “It cannot bee denied that Gregory Naziancen one of the fathers of the Church, wrote a Playe of Christe.” Yet Gosson then claims that Naziancen wrote an edifying closet drama rather than a blasphemous stage production: “For Naziancen detesting the corruption of the Corpus Christi Playes that were set out by the Papistes, and inueighing against them, thought it better to write the passion of Christ in numbers himselfe, that all such as delight in numerositie of speach might reade it, not beholde it vpon the Stage, where some base fellowe that plaide Christe, should bring the person of Christ into contempt.”⁶⁰ What is significant here is not Gosson’s anachronistic projection of Corpus Christi

drama back to the fourth century, but rather that he makes no effort to distinguish between ancient and modern, pagan and papist theatrical forms. To the contrary, he eagerly yokes them together on account of their fleshly idolatry—all are the “pompe, the plaies, the inuitions of the Diuell”—in order to call for the utter eradication of contemporary English theater: “Haue we sinned with the Gentiles in representinge of their Playes? Let vs learne with true Christians to abolish them.”⁶¹ Gosson and Crashaw’s historical accounts of English theater were commonplace, as Cooper notes regarding the polemics of John Northbrooke and Henry Crosse, who also make “no distinction between the acting of divine mysteries, and stage performance of any kind.”⁶² Thomas Heywood’s 1612 *Apology for Actors* is sensitive to this widespread claim that the public stages descended from Catholic drama. Embracing theater’s pagan origins, Heywood is careful to exclude popish forms of play: “I omit the shewes and ceremonies euen in these times generally vsed amongst the Catholikes, in which by the Churchmen & most religious, diuerse pageants, as of the Natiuity, Passion, and Ascention, with other Historically places of the Bible, are at diuerse times & seasons of the year vsually celebrated.”⁶³ According to Crashaw and Gosson, the theater persists in a continuous history of corruption and heathen degeneracy. In Heywood’s narrative, on the other hand, commercial theater has disclaimed a dark age of Catholic drama in order to recuperate respectable pagan virtues.

Shakespeare’s *Macbeth* does not share Heywood’s sensitivity but rather seems to enjoy titillating antitheatricalist desires to tie the public playhouses to the drama of the old religion. In fact, with its comic transformation of the *Harrowing* into a series of jokes about drunkenness and lechery, the Porter scene seems guilty of the charge leveled at the theater in Philip Stubbes’ *Anatomie of Abuses* (1583): “they [are] most intollerable, or rather Sacrilegious, for . . . the price of Christ his bloud, & the merits of his passion, were not giuen, to be derided, and iested at as they be in these filthy playes and enterluds.”⁶⁴ The Porter scene is no ordinary jest but, as we noted with regard to the Jacobean politics of the play, a homonymic pun which toys with the audience’s interpretation of the knocking. When the “*Knocke within*.” is first heard at 2.2.54, the Macbeths are still onstage, and the audience naturally assumes that one of the play’s characters is at the gate. But as the Porter enters and says, “If a man were porter of hell-gate . . .” the knocking and the action of devil-portering begin to confirm the worst fears of the theater’s religious opponents by suggesting that the mystery plays are not, in fact, superseded after all. Like the two role-players in a knock-knock joke, the Porter and the audience are, in Wickham’s words, “in two worlds at once; that of Macbeth’s castle and that of another scene from another play [the *Harrowing*].” 2.3.20 (“remember the Porter”) is the punch line, for as he says these words, the Porter opens the gate and Macduff and Lennox enter. The temporal ambivalence catalyzed by the remembered sound reverberating around the Globe now ends, and as the noise fades, the audience gets the joke: “Who did you think it was—Christ?” Whereas Heywood’s *Apology* is at pains to distance professional theater from pre-Reformation religious drama, the anticlimactic entrance of Macduff and Lennox laughs off the dangerous proximity of *Macbeth* to the mystery plays. Shakespeare lets his audience believe what they want about the relationship between

the two forms of drama as the scene knavishly makes and mars the polemical narratives of the theater's most vituperative enemies. From this perspective it becomes clear that pre-Reformation dramatic material was not entirely feared or spurned, but rather quite attractive to theater companies always eager for new material. True, they were prohibited from staging some volatile religious topics, yet the iconoclasm and censorship introduced by the Reformation were in some ways a boon for the London playhouses. Beyond the liturgies and dogmas that, according to Greenblatt, were "emptied out" and re-imagined for commercial theater, religious upheaval led to the prohibition of mystery drama and thus to the provision of more direct—and more material—dramatic resources. As a craftsman of plays, the playwright Shakespeare could cannibalize the stage properties, costumes, and sound effects of the mystery play pageant wagons and refashion them to suit his purposes.

Conclusion

Critical discussion of the Porter scene in *Macbeth* has been Janus-faced: either the scene is significant for its topical allusions to Garner's equivocation, or else the medieval antecedent of the *Harrowing of Hell* is discussed. This essay has argued for the polychronicity of the knocking at the gate in order to suggest that the play exploits the past to gain present political leverage.⁶⁵ The knocking of the Porter scene is also significant because it raises questions about the traditional privileging of the Renaissance authorial subject over the medieval dramatic object—Shakespearean authorship over what E. K. Chambers once called the "dry bones" of the mysteries.⁶⁶ Now, more than a half-century after O. B. Hardison refuted Chamber's secularization thesis, both medievalists and early modern scholars are rightly skeptical of teleological narratives that value late medieval drama only for its anticipation of Shakespeare. However, the echoes of the *Harrowing of Hell* in *Macbeth* suggest that this critical awareness is not enough, and that perhaps we need to be bolder in our assertions about the material significance of the mystery plays for the professional theaters that emerged in London in the late sixteenth century. Far from being dead, superseded precursors, the stage properties of the mystery plays were sources of dramatic inspiration long after their prohibition. Once we appreciate the ongoing agency of supposedly outmoded theatrical objects, we may be in a better position to move away from narratives about Shakespeare's creative autonomy over the plays we attribute to him. It then becomes possible to consider that, like the sound of knocking at the gates of Hell, some of the remarkable remnants of the mysteries must have demanded a dramatic rebirth—or remembering—when professional acting companies encountered them: Hell-mouths belching sulphurous smoke, the understage space of Purgatory, tombs and sepulchers from which the dead arise, empty thrones which tempt usurpers, Balaam's talking ass. These dramatic properties were not "dry bones" awaiting the breath of Shakespearean genius. Quite the opposite. Exerting their material agency on the stage of the Globe, they were actors in plays that we all too casually label as "Renaissance" or "Shakespearean" drama.

Notes

1. *OED*, entry for “harrow, v.²,” b. The Wakefield *Harrowing of Hell* refers to this episode as the “Extractio Animarum”—the Extraction or Deliverance of Souls—which, like the English word “harrow” conveys not just an attack on Hell, but the plunder of its souls.
2. Wickham, “Hell-Castle and its Door-Keeper,” *Shakespeare Survey* 19 (1966), 68. See also his *Shakespeare’s Dramatic Heritage: Essays in Medieval, Tudor, and Jacobean Drama* (London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1969), 214-24.
3. O’Connell, *The Idolatrous Eye: Iconoclasm and Theater in Early-Modern England* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2000) as well as his “Vital Cultural Practices: Shakespeare and the Mysteries,” *JMEMS* 29 (1999): 149-168; Cooper, “Shakespeare and the Mystery Plays,” *Shakespeare and Elizabethan Popular Culture*, ed. Stuart Gillespie and Neil Rhodes (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006), 18-41; Groves, *Texts and Traditions: Religion in Shakespeare, 1592-1604*, esp. ch. 2: “Shakespeare’s Incarnational Aesthetic: The Mystery Plays and Catholicism,” 26-59.
4. Harcourt, “I Pray You, Remember the Porter,” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 12 (1961): 393-402.
5. Rebecca Lemon, “Scaffolds of Treason in Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*,” *Treason by Words: Literature, Law, and Rebellion in Shakespeare’s England* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 2006), 79-106; Arthur Kinney, *Lies Like Truth: Shakespeare, “Macbeth,” and the Cultural Moment* (Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 2001), 86-102; Steven Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1988). Yet Grace Tiffany has argued that *Macbeth* upholds the myth of James’ paternal kingship in “*Macbeth*, Paternity, and the Anglicization of James I,” *Studies in the Humanities* 23 (1996): 148-62.
6. William Crashaw, *The sermon preached at the Crosse* (London, 1607), sig. Z1^r.
7. Jonathan Gil Harris and Natasha Korda, “Towards a Materialist Account of Stage Properties,” *Staged Properties in Early Modern English Drama*, ed. Harris and Korda (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002), 13.
8. Margreta de Grazia, Maureen Quilligan, and Peter Stallybrass, “Introduction,” *Subject and Object in Renaissance Culture*, ed. de Grazia, Quilligan, and Stallybrass (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996), 6.
9. I use the terms “Renaissance” and “medieval” here in order to challenge these all too familiar periodizing terms. As the work of Theresa Coletti, Richard Emmerson, and Lawrence Clopper has shown, mystery pageants like the *Harrowing of Hell*, though traditionally labeled as “medieval” by Wickham and others, survive to us in sixteenth-century manuscripts often concurrent with Shakespeare’s works. See Coletti, “The Chester Cycle in Sixteenth-Century Religious Culture,” *JMEMS* 37 (2007): 531-547; Emmerson, “Dramatic History: On the Diachronic and Synchronic in the Study of Early English Drama,” *JMEMS* 35 (2005): 39-66; Clopper, “The History and Development of the Chester Cycle,” *Modern Philology* 75 (1978): 219-46.
10. O’Connell, “Vital Cultural Practices,” 152.

40 *The Upstart Crow*

11. Bruce R. Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1999), 12-29.
12. Smith, 107, 108-09.
13. For a discussion of Platonic and Aristotelean theories of memory available in the Renaissance, see Stephen Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2001), 214-15.
14. Smith, 114, 108-09.
15. Smith, 206, 209, 210.
16. However, Smith does not discuss the knocking of the Porter scene.
17. All citations of Shakespeare's plays are from *The Norton Shakespeare*, ed. Stephen Greenblatt (New York: W. W. Norton, 1997).
18. *Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies; A Facsimile of the First Folio, 1623*, prepared and introduced by Doug Moston (New York: Routledge, 1998), folio page 137, sig. mm₃.
19. See David Mills, *The Chester Mystery Cycle: A New Edition with Modernised Spelling*, ed. Mills (East Lansing, MI: Colleagues Press, 1992), 302.
20. Ps. 23 [AV 24]: 7 KJV.
21. *The Middle-English Harrowing Of Hell and Gospel Of Nicodemus*, ed. William H. Hulme, The Early English Text Society (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1907), 110.
22. Clifford Davidson, *Technology, Guilds, and Early English Drama*, Early Drama, Art, and Music Monograph Series 23 (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Press, 1996), 84. Also see *The Iconography of Hell*, Early Drama, Art, and Music Monograph Series 17, ed. Davidson and Thomas H. Seiler (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 1992).
23. Mills, 302-03. Jonathan Gil Harris argues that the scent of gunpowder may have encouraged Shakespeare's audiences to recall medieval stage devilry. "The Smell of Gunpowder: *Macbeth* and the Palimpsests of Olfaction," *Untimely Matter in the Time of Shakespeare* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 119-39. The author is deeply grateful to Gil Harris for sharing his inspiring work prior to publication.
24. *The Chester Mystery Cycle*, vol. 1, ed. R. M. Lumianski and David Mills, The Early English Text Society (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1974), 331. As this edition explains, there are variations in the surviving manuscripts of this text, with the Harley 2124 (1607) reading "materialis magnus" rather than "magnus materialis," 331, n. to line 151.
25. Wickham, "Hell-Castle and its Door-Keeper," 73; Mills, 308; Richard Rastall, "The Sounds of Hell," Davidson and Seiler, 112 and n. 27.
26. *The Harrowing of Hell, The York Plays*, ed. Richard Beadle (London: Edward Arnold, 1982), 184.

27. Wakefield *Harrowing of Hell*, lines 180, 183. Cited from *Medieval Drama*, ed. David Bevington (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975), 600.
28. Cox, *The Devil and the Sacred in English Drama: 1350-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000), 5.
29. *Records of Early English Drama: Coventry*, ed. R. W. Ingram (Buffalo: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1981), 308, 474.
30. Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992), 186.
31. Smith, 211.
32. The Porter scene, in other words, does not quite fit Stephen Greenblatt’s powerful thesis about how the Reformation made Catholic liturgy and dogma available to the commercial playhouses by transforming sacred signifiers into theatrical representations. *Shakespearean Negotiations* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1988), 119.
33. Smith, 242-43.
34. As Wickham states, “thunder, cacophony, screams and groans were the audible emblems of Lucifer and Hell on the medieval stage,” *Shakespeare’s Dramatic Heritage*, 224.
35. Cooper, 24, 32. The Coventry devil-porter had been made famous by John Heywood’s allusion to him in his play *The Foure PP* (c. 1543). See also Groves, 36.
36. See O’Connell, “Vital Cultural Practices,” 157.
37. See Robert Weimann, *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theater: Studies in the Social Dimension of Dramatic Form and Function*, ed. Robert Schwartz (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1978), 114-15.
38. Wickham, “Hell-Castle and its Door-Keeper,” 72.
39. Harris, *Untimely Matter*, 137-38.
40. *Othello*, 5.2.292-93. As Cox says, in *Macbeth* “literal stage devils” are eschewed, 176.
41. As Weimann states regarding the recollection of the Vice tradition (particularly in 3.1.279 of *Two Gentlemen of Verona* [“Your old vice still”]), “The Vice was the *old* Vice, but *still* he could be used or referred to; and the words “old” and “still” indicate the dialectic of innovation and tradition by which Shakespeare’s wordplay actually thrived,” 151.
42. *First Folio, 1623*, folio page 131, sig. ll₆.
43. I am neither claiming that knock-knock jokes were told in the seventeenth century nor that Shakespeare invents them in this scene. Rather, I draw a parallel between Shakespeare’s play and this popular form of homonym in order to make the salient point that to “get the joke” of the Porter scene a double hearing of the sound of knocking is required.

42 *The Upstart Crow*

44. Lemon, 21, 87, 86.
45. Kernan goes on to claim that Shakespeare adapted Holinshed “to fit his patron’s political myth” regarding his divinely ordained prerogative. *Shakespeare, the King’s Playwright: Theater in the Stuart Court, 1603-1613* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1995), 76, 78.
46. Harcourt, 393.
47. De Quincey, “On the Knocking at the Gate in *Macbeth*,” *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, 6th ed., vol. 2, ed. M. H. Abrams (New York: W. W. Norton, 1993), 462.
48. Regarding various apotropaic rituals like the *Ordo Dedicacionis Ecclesiae* performed to exorcise the devil, see Cox, 16-17.
49. Wickham, “Hell-Castle and its Door-Keeper,” 70, 73.
50. Wickham, “Hell-Castle and its Door-Keeper,” 74.
51. Wickham, *Shakespeare’s Dramatic Heritage*, 222.
52. Stephen Orgel, “Introduction,” *Macbeth*, ed. Orgel, The Pelican Shakespeare Series (New York: Penguin Books, 2000), xliii.
53. Cox, 23.
54. Robert Barrett, *Against All England: Regional Identity and Cheshire Writing, 1195-1656* (Notre Dame, IN: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 2009), 80-82.
55. Cox, 22.
56. *Basilikon Doron, The Political Works of James I*, ed. Charles H. McIlwain, Harvard Political Classics (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 1918), 18-19.
57. Stallybrass, “*Macbeth* and Witchcraft,” *Focus on Macbeth*, ed. John Russell Brown (New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982), 189-209.
58. Lemon, 86.
59. Crashaw, sig. Z1^r.
60. Gosson, *Playes Confuted in Five Actions* (London, 1582), sig. E5^v-E6^r.
61. Gosson, sig. E6^v, E8^r.
62. Cooper, 22.
63. Thomas Heywood, *Apology for Actors* (London, 1612), sig. E4^r.
64. Stubbes, *Anatomie of Abuses* (London, 1583), sig. L5^{r-v}.

65. The term “polychronicity” is borrowed from Harris, who uses it to describe how certain objects “collate diverse moments in time,” *Untimely Matter*, 4.
66. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage*, vol. 2 (New York: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1903), 225.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE NUMBERING CLOCK

Paula S. Berggren, *Baruch College of The City University of New York*

During Shakespeare's lifetime, a momentous change in the soundscape of early modern England was in progress. Somewhere in the middle of the sixteenth century, domestic timepieces that more or less reliably indicated hours and minutes became increasingly available, at least to the wealthy. A new industry was about to be born from the successful miniaturization of the escapement, "the part which controls the speed at which the wheels turn, when a weight or spring is applied to them."¹ This one of many "revolutions in time," to borrow the title of David S. Landes's magisterial survey *Clocks and the Making of the Modern World*, had begun less than three centuries earlier, when the great town clocks of Western Europe were mechanized.

By the end of the thirteenth century, England could boast two clock towers in London, in St. Paul's Cathedral (1286) and Westminster (1288).² Chaucer's Nun's Priest's praise of Chauntecleer the cock marks the transition from those bell-ringing towers to the truer timekeepers that were just emerging at the end of the fourteenth century, when *The Canterbury Tales* were written:

His vois was murier than the murie orgon
 On messe-dayes that in the chirche gon.
 Wel sikerer was his crowyng in his logge
 Than is a clokke or an abbeye orlogge.³

The optional nomenclature captures a transitional moment. "In the Middle Ages, 'clock' / 'horologium' was a generic term for all devices and aids of time-reckoning and time-indication," as Gerhard Dohrn-van Rossum notes in charting the development of the "mechanical clock."⁴ The *horologe*, as the word's etymology announces, rang the hours. It originally served the monastic orders, as Chaucer implies and Landes explains, operating on the principle of the egg timer.⁵ Rather than mark continuous time, the early medieval bell towers measured the progress of the chores and obligations that organized communal life. The *clock*, both a noun and a verb derived from the Middle Dutch word for bell, eventually moved beyond the canonical hours, whose import did not depend on absolute regularity. A noun and a verb, it imposed the work regimens of the town populace. A clock's "beat is regular and it marks its beat."⁶

A close reading of—and a careful listening to—Shakespeare's references to clocks suggests a complicated fascination with the new timepieces that were becoming more and more familiar in the early modern era. In his superb account, Bruce R. Smith discusses the politics of audition in royal spaces and in passing mentions "the peculiarly English custom of strewing the floor with loose straw," along with mats, tapestries, and velvet covers used for noise control. Isolating "the keynote sounds . . . in the soundscape of the court," he specifies "running water, birds, striking clocks."⁷

Rather than mute the ambient sound as court decorators did, playwrights and poets exploit it. Water and birds have always been with us; striking clocks were new, and, to Shakespeare's ear, it seems to me, the more regular their beat, the more threatening their presence.

Although the association with the bell endures in *clock*, as more and more individuals could afford their own small clocks, during the early seventeenth century the bell was being superseded by the new technology. Wes Folkerth has noted that Henry VIII's desecration of the monasteries reduced the dominance of England's bells: "Some went to civic organizations; others were scrapped to make cannon. . . . Bells that had for centuries provided entire populations with information about religious celebrations and events were now used for more secular purposes, or were simply bells no more."⁸ Citing the testimony of foreign travelers, Smith refers to the lower decibels of the church bells that were "rung to summon people to services—but with ostentatiously Protestant restraint."⁹

To be sure, the great bells of English church towers continue to ring to this day. David Cressy writes of the centrality of bell-ringing to the public celebrations that have persisted through the centuries, often to the annoyance of officials who might have liked to mute them with rushes and velvet.¹⁰ He also, significantly, emphasizes the way in which "a new calendar of secular, dynastic and patriotic anniversaries" appropriated the aural trappings of the sacred.¹¹ The sounds that once announced the sacred were being devalued; the modern world, less attuned to church time and more to "time management," marches to a different drummer. Many commentators have noted that the internalizing of the mechanical clock's percussive insistence on the inexorable elapsing of time, minute by minute, second by second, profoundly changed human experience.¹² I would like to suggest that Shakespeare helps us hear this moment of transition. Even in the two comedies that observe the classical unity of time (*The Comedy of Errors* and *The Tempest*) and most certainly in the history plays, different temporal registers co-exist. When the rhythms of a pulsing clock insistently assault the ear, we have crossed the Rubicon into a harsher, less forgiving time.

Time and its passing, it need hardly be said, transfix all the writers of the English Renaissance. Few passages in dramatic literature surpass the agonized countdown of the final hour in the last scene of *Doctor Faustus* as the clock strikes 11:00, 11:30, and then 12:00; and few bells resonate more than the funeral (rather than time-marking) bells of John Donne's *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions*. Yet on the whole it is surprising that so few writers of the period mention clocks as explicitly or as often as Shakespeare. In the entire *Faerie Queene*, leading up as it does to the Mutabilitie Cantos (and indeed, in his complete works, according to Charles Grosvenor Osgood's *Concordance*),¹³ Spenser never used the word "clock," and of the five references to bells counted by the concordance, most involve the aphoristic "bearing the bell away." By contrast, Shakespeare's plays and sonnets include 33 explicit references to clocks; more traditional emblems of mutability, like scythes and dials, which operate in relative silence, occur much less frequently.¹⁴ Attending to Shakespeare's clocks and the sensory terms of their representation tunes our ears and sharpens our eyes. While we can never recover what their acoustical surroundings meant to

the audiences of London's playhouses, we can get some sense of the impact of the proliferating clocks that increasingly measured their lives.

To some degree, of course, clocks and bells work together. The ringing of the hour that gives us the term "o'clock" reverberates in half of the 33 references to clocks. Actual offstage bells punctuate several of the speeches and initiate uses of the word. In *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, the sound galvanizes Ford as he works himself up to halt a supposedly adulterous tryst before it happens: "The clock gives me my cue, and my assurance bids me search" (3.2.40-41).¹⁵ In *The Comedy of Errors*, although the two Dromios nervously react to the advancing of the hour as a deadline looms over the action (the end of the day appointed for Egeus's trial runs parallel to the First Merchant's setting "five o'clock" [2.1.26] for his reunion with the brother he takes to be the Ephesian Antipholus), no bell need ring. But later in the play Ephesus begins to look (and sound) more and more like Elizabethan London. Dromio of Syracuse expresses horror at the leather-clad constable who has arrested Antipholus of Ephesus and desperately petitions Adriana for the money to pay her husband's debt, convinced that the bell is not only chiming, but as frightened as he is by the sergeant, going backward: "It was two ere I left him, and now the clock strikes one . . . 'a turns back for very fear" (4.2.54, 56). In *The Tempest*, which grafts a multi-generational Renaissance narrative onto a Roman comic template, Prospero and the bo'sun measure time with hourglasses (1.2.241, 5.1.225) while the cynical Antonio and Sebastian speak with Machiavellian time-consciousness of clocks and watches. Thus Sebastian in anticipation of an utterance from Gonzalo mutters, "Look, he's winding up the watch of his wit; by and by it will strike" (2.1.14-15), and when Gonzalo does speak, he sarcastically counts the hour: "One. Tell" (17). Moments later, while planning to murder Alonso and Gonzalo, Antonio remarks that it will not be necessary to kill any of the others in the royal party: "They'll tell the clock to any business that / We say befits the hour" (2.1.291-92).

Even in plays with more forgiving time schemes than *The Comedy of Errors* or *The Tempest*, clocks bespeak a nervous preoccupation with deadlines and commitments. The most ominous is set for the execution of Claudio "by four of the clock" in *Measure for Measure* (4.2.121-22). Bassanio, in his impatience to court Portia at Belmont, sets an early hour for supper "by five of the clock" (2.2.109). Juliet frets at the length of time it takes the nurse to return from Romeo, since she sent her early in the day, when "The clock struck nine" (2.5.1). *Twelfth Night's* Olivia, in love with a page, loses dignity when she hears the clock strike while she and Viola converse: "The clock upbraids me with the waste of time" (3.2.130).

Two more dramatic moments hinge on hearing the bell: the famously anachronistic stage direction *Clock strikes* that interrupts the conversation of the conspirators in *Julius Caesar* (2.1.193-94) and the chiming hours that drive Iachimo back into his trunk in *Cymbeline* (2.2.51). All these instances should engender in the audience the same anxiety about the pressures of time that fuels the stage action. In ancient Rome, in antique Britain, in Windsor, Illyria, Venice, Verona, or Vienna, these striking clocks echo or anticipate those of the contemporary urban world.

Other references to clocks emphasize some incongruity in the perception of time, reminding us that early modern clocks had not yet acquired a reputation for orderly

predictability. Human impositions on the natural world, they could not always be believed. In *Macbeth*, before Duncan's murder, fear registers in the failure of Fleance and Banquo to have noted the call of the midnight clock (2.1.1-3), and after the murder, Ross comments on the preternatural darkness: "by th' clock 'tis day. / And yet dark night strangles the traveling lamp" (2.4.6-7). Another offstage sound leads Richard III to comment on a similar phenomenon as he anticipates his final battle: "Tell the clock there. Give me a calendar. / Who saw the sun today?" (5.3.276-77).

Elsewhere, clocks unheeded reflect lovers' arbitrary relation to time. The imaginary clock not to be found in the Forest of Arden provides the occasion for Rosalind to challenge Orlando's pretensions, for "there is no true lover in the forest, else sighing every minute and groaning every hour would detect the lazy foot of Time as well as a clock" (3.2.298-300). Rosalind then launches into one of the witty catalogues that the civilized visitors to the forest employ in the pastoral celebration that is *As You Like It*, listing the variable attributes that "divers persons" find in Time (304). At this point in the play, Touchstone has already parodied the penchant for lists that Jaques demonstrates in the play's best-known speech on the Ages of Man (2.7.138-65). In the initial encounter of the fool with the melancholy man, Touchstone had taken his measure. Jaques does not recognize that the motley fool is laughing at his self-satisfied interlocutor when he mocks a stately courtier's ostentatious flourishing of his doubtless very valuable pocket watch.

And then he drew a dial from his poke
 And, looking on with lackluster eye,
 Says very wisely, "It is ten o'clock.
 Thus we may see," quoth he, "how the world wags." (2.7.20-23)

Although portable dials did exist,¹⁶ one likes to think that only fools carried sundials in their pockets. In this reference to one of the oldest time-telling devices, *As You Like It* reinforces its treatment of time as solipsistic and subjective.

Clocks intensify the pressures of time in *Othello* and *Cymbeline*, in which supposed adultery for which there would have been no opportunity tortures a newly wed husband too soon separated from his wife. Iago notes that Othello has taken Desdemona to bed early, while "'tis not yet ten o' th' clock" (2.3.13-14), in order to consummate their marriage. For the unhappy Imogen, distant from her credulous husband, sleep proves elusive, heightening her consciousness of time. On the night of Iachimo's intrusion, she asks her maid to wake her by "four o' th' clock" (2.2.6), although there is no sign that this happens. When she learns (falsely) that Posthumus awaits her at Milford Haven, she wants to move quickly. Frustrated by the cautious pace recommended to her by her servant Pisanio, she recalls the hourglass, an earlier mode of marking time:

Why one that rode to 's execution, man,
 Could never go so slow. I have heard of riding wagers
 Where horses have been nimbler than the sands
 That run i'th' clock's behalf. (3.2.70-73)

When Pisanio duly escorts her to Milford Haven, only to report Posthumus's command that she be killed, Imogen erupts:

False to his bed? What is it to be false?
 To lie in watch there and to think on him?
 To weep twixt clock and clock? (3.4.40-42)

Anyone who has ever spent a sleepless night listening to bells ring the hours can empathize with Imogen's fury. For these unhappy lovers, the clock both sounds and shows the passing hours that it so palpably announces. For the solitary watcher of audible time, the problem is not mutability but its opposite: the clock moves on, but nothing changes.

The picture of the wife awake, lying "in watch" while the clock strikes the hour, puns on the name of the newest of the devices with which Shakespeare's world measured time. The old, familiar time-tellers (including sundial, hourglass, and bell) engage human perception of the temporal with a degree of sensory richness that the newfangled ones diminish. Sands moving through an hourglass call upon many senses: a close listener may hear the sifting of the sands funneling down; the sands themselves have tactile properties; and staring at the movement through the hourglass is a visual experience. Bells and dials have aesthetically appealing shapes. The words *clock* and *watch*, which I am associating with a modern sense of expediency, focus in a more limited way on audition and vision. *Clock*, as mentioned above, is a late medieval form rooted in the sense of hearing, according to the *OED*. *Watch*, which combines the physical tedium that accompanies the monitoring of a period of duration while we wait for something with the visual acuity that attends watching, is of more recent coinage. The *OED* cites 1588 as the first available example of this definition of a complex word: "A small time-piece with a spring-driven movement, and of a size to be carried in the pocket." Experts at the British Museum and the Metropolitan Museum of Art trace the advent of watches, which were at first more ornamental than practical timekeepers, to "late fifteenth-century Italy."¹⁷

It took at least another hundred years to perfect the general manufacture of these devices. The crucial breakthrough came when "the Dutch astronomer and mathematician Christian Huygens van Zulichem (1629-1695) first successfully applied the pendulum to clockwork."¹⁸ Indeed, most of the clockmakers of London were immigrants, Dutch, German, and Huguenot, and Landes remarks that "a disproportionate share of the leading watchmakers of the sixteenth and seventeenth century were Protestants" (93), invoking in the spirit of Max Weber the dictum that time is money. "Calvin himself, so impatient of ornament and distraction, accepted the watch as a useful instrument and thereby enabled the jewelry trade of Geneva to save itself by reconversion" (92).

In *Love's Labor's Lost*, set in Navarre, Berowne, acknowledging that he is in love, marvels at his desire to marry:

What? I love, I sue, I seek a wife?
 A woman, that is like a German clock,

Still a-repairing, ever out of frame,
 And never going aright, being a watch,
 But being watched that it may still go right? (3.1.187- 91)¹⁹

Typically, a Frenchman ascribes inadequacy to a German object; a man can't count on his timepiece, even as a man can't count on a woman. In *All's Well That Ends Well*, another comedy in which a French king takes a part, *clock*, by contrast, signifies exactitude and accuracy. Praising Bertram's father, the King of France sets a model that the immature aristocrat, who will deny Helen's suit, must learn to match:

So like a courtier, contempt nor bitterness
 Were in his pride or sharpness; if they were,
 His equal had awaked them, and his honor,
 Clock to itself, knew the true minute when
 Exception bid him speak, and at this time
 His tongue obeyed his hand. (1.2.36-41)

However unreliable these new small time-pieces may have been, they were in vogue. Often decorated by the skilled miniature painters of the era,²⁰ pendant watches in particular enchanted the members of the Elizabethan court. Elizabeth owned many richly decorated watches, most of which struck the hours.²¹ The doomed Mary Queen of Scots "was the possessor of a skull-shaped watch."²² According to Landes, Elizabeth I also had a "finger ring . . . that not only told the time but served as an alarm: a small prong came out and gently scratched her finger" (87).

This intense time-consciousness so viscerally manifest is shared by Shakespeare's dramatic rulers as well. References to time centrally define the so-called *Henriad*, or Second Tetralogy, the plays from *Richard II* through *Henry V*. To an extent that is endlessly debated, the plays seem to show England moving from the medieval to the modern world.²³ Probably the most thorough critic of the nature of time in these plays is Robert B. Bennett, who charts a circular rather than a linear pattern in the *Henriad*, ascribing the historical crisis in each to distinct "stages of time." Thus, *Richard II* "commences in sacramental time," the two *Henry IV* plays unfold in "secular, or immediate time" (70), and *Henry V* returns to sacramental time, in "harmony with natural order" (78).²⁴ As I have been suggesting in this essay, my sense is that "immediate time" in Shakespeare tends to be broken down systematically into days, hours, and minutes. Had there been a mechanism capable of reliably calculating seconds in the early modern world, doubtless they would figure here as well; Landes notes that not until the 1690s were dials with second hands devised (129).

Different ways of telling time in the Second Tetralogy separate the sacramental from the secular and the communal from the private. In *1 Henry IV*, old times and new are variously embodied, but most complexly in the juxtaposition of Falstaff and Hal. Their opening scene begins with Falstaff's first words, "Now Hal, what time of day is it, lad?" (1.2.1). This query provokes the Prince's brilliant challenge to the old knight's pretended interest in temporal concerns: "What a devil hast thou to do with the time of the day?" (5-6). If Falstaff does not really care about time, Hal

does; in the unsettling soliloquy that concludes this scene, of course, he promises to simultaneously manage and redeem time, making the sacramental instrumental to his own purposes (211). The play more or less ends on the battlefield, where Falstaff seems to cheat time by returning from the dead and Hal fulfills his promise to his father, Henry IV, to “redeem [his failures] on Percy’s head / . . . in the closing of some glorious day” (3.2.132-33) by killing Hotspur, Henry Percy, thus claiming his rival’s honor for himself. Falstaff preempts this claim, outrageously asserting that he and Hotspur had “fought a long hour by Shrewsbury clock” (5.4.146), and Hal magnanimously cedes to him credit for the victory, at least for the moment.

It is worth looking at the way in which Falstaff’s invented recollection harkens back to the medieval world and its faulty time-keeping. How can an hour be long? In medieval monasteries, in fact, an hour did not necessarily equal sixty minutes, but simply marked “the duration of some of the offices.”²⁵ And as Ganymede saucily informs Orlando, time is almost entirely subjective, traveling “in divers paces with diverse persons” (*AYL*, 3.2.303-04). How accurately would a great town clock have measured the time? According to Landes, even when mechanical turret clocks were introduced, flexible “nonclock standards” lingered on (76). Synchronization of time lay far in the future in 1403, the year of the Battle of Shrewsbury. More to the point, perhaps, Shakespeare’s original audience, watching this scene in 1597, might very well have heard of the great Shrewsbury Clock “facing the Square in front of the Market Hall, built in 1595.”²⁶ This reference reminds us of the special kind of “double time” at work in these plays, which attribute to the ascent of Bolingbroke many practices more truly embodied by the court of Elizabeth. Falstaff’s knowing joke about the clock that did not yet stand in Shrewsbury prefigures Orlando’s naive demurral about clocks in forests in *As You Like It*. In both cases, the clock stands as a marker of unrelenting temporal forces that the older golden world, and “merrie olde England,” seemed not to have to face.

The first play of the group that examines the consequences of Bolingbroke’s seizing of his cousin’s crown, *Richard II* dramatizes them through two different understandings of time. Hal inherits precision in timekeeping from his father; throughout the tetralogy, Henry IV and his son set appointments, most often, it would appear, on a Wednesday (see, for example, *1 HIV* 1.1.102, 3.2.173). While Bolingbroke reigns in London, the dethroned Richard II languishes in the dungeon of Pomfret Castle, the site of his only soliloquy in the play. Loss of title and place throw Richard into desperate introspection as he finally comes to acknowledge, however fleetingly, his own responsibility for that loss: “I wasted time, and now doth time waste me” (5.5.49). This famous speech, much of which I will quote here for ease of reference, begins with the perplexed king’s effort to find a metaphor capable of reflecting his new situation.

I have been studying how I may compare
 This prison where I live unto the world;
 And, for because the world is populous,
 And here is not a creature but myself,
 I cannot do it. Yet I’ll hammer it out. (5.4.1-5)

In fact, he cannot do it. The sound of music playing somewhere in the castle mercifully interrupts his tortured quest for meaning and offers him a metaphor that he does understand and can use. When a discordant tone breaks the spell, Richard can apply this accident to himself:

So is it in the music of men's lives.
 And here have I the daintiness of ear
 To check time broke in a disordered string,
 But for the concord of my state and time
 Had not an ear to hear my true time broke. (44-48)

The solipsistic king has failed to hear what others warned him of, has failed to listen well. Admitting this neglect, he moves to contemplate the other form of measured sound that becomes the symbol of his changed universe.

For now hath Time made me his numb'ring clock.
 My thoughts are minutes, and with sighs they jar
 Their watches on unto mine eyes, the outward watch
 Whereto my finger, like a dial's point,
 Is pointing still in cleansing them from tears. (50-54)

In his influential, if now largely discredited, account of *Shakespeare's History Plays*, E. M. W. Tillyard calls Richard's soliloquy a parade of familiar "cosmic references" that constitute the Elizabethan World Order as it moves from the effort to make the "microcosm correspond with the orders of the body politic" through the reference to "the universe as a musical harmony; then the fantasy of his own griefs arranged in a pattern like the working of a clock, symbol of regularity opposed to discord."²⁷ These lines, however, are anything but regular. Richard's habitually elegant verse collapses with line 52, where the multiple meanings of "watches" stretch out into an awkward Alexandrine.

Pace Tillyard, I take the significance of the "numb'ring clock" to be not its regularity but rather its strangely grotesque representation. Specifying "numb'ring" suggests that dial faces so delineated are unusual enough to need this adjectival addition. Landes notes that early medieval turret clocks probably did not have dials (77). Richard seems offended by this imaginary symbol of the world in which he now is but a subject. Sound and sight conspire to humiliate him. In a surreal touch, his eyes become watch faces and his finger becomes a dial's point. Minutes, small units of time that newfangled numb'ring clocks make prominent, are heard as sighs that jar. The very idea of jarring sighs seems almost oxymoronic; the soft evanescence one might ordinarily associate with sighing is transformed into a discordant sound.

Of eight uses of *jar* in Shakespeare's work, most refer to civil conflict, sometimes in terms of music. In the second play bearing his name, Henry VI begs his noblemen to cooperate with each other: "When such strings jar, what hope of harmony?" (2.1.55). In *Troilus and Cressida*, Ulysses, in his great speech on order, refers to the untuning of the string and follows with instances of discord, summing up: "Force

should be right; or rather, right and wrong, / Between whose endless jar justice resides, / Should lose their names" (1.3.116-18). Early in *The Winter's Tale*, when Hermione flirtatiously assures her husband of her devotion, she uses the word in the sense most pertinent to Richard's: "Yet, good deed, Leontes, / I love thee not a jar o' th' clock behind / What lady she her lord" (1.2.42-44). The jarring of a clock is its ticking, a sound that was still novel in Shakespeare's world and not yet heard in Richard's. "Tick" in this sense ("the sound produced by the alternate check and release of the train in the escapement of a watch or clock") is a post-Shakespearean coinage, according to the *OED*. Hermione, the denizen of an elegant court, might be presumed to have a tiny jeweled watch like Elizabeth's; the ticking of such a time-piece was especially jarring, since "a small movement requires a small balance at the end of the train, and a small balance tends to tick faster."²⁸

As Richard continues his strained analogy, he implies that modern time pieces intrude on the acoustical environment:

Now sir, the sounds that tell what hour it is
 Are clamorous groans that strike upon my heart,
 Which is the bell. So sighs and tears and groans
 Show minutes, hours, and times. But my time
 Runs posting on in Bolingbroke's proud joy,
 While I stand fooling here, his jack of the clock. (55-60)

The clock he has in mind is now a great tower clock and Bolingbroke, the master of Machiavellian expediency, has reduced his rival to an insignificant piece of the machinery, the jack, from "*Jaccomarchiadus*, the Latin term for 'a man in a suit of armor—for these jacks were always represented as being clothed in a suit of mail.'"²⁹ Jacks struck the bells of the old clocks with hammers. From the very start of his soliloquy, Richard has been playing the jack, trying to hammer out the comparisons that will establish his place in the world. The juggernaut of King Henry IV has undermined Richard's versifying, a collapse that the broken music sounding somewhere in the castle echoes and reinforces.

Tellingly, in *Richard III*, a play that was written earlier than *Richard II* but set in a later time, Richard also reflects on the indignity embodied in the stiff time-announcing marionettes. Having had himself crowned, he still needs to eliminate the little princes in the tower and turns for assistance to the suddenly reluctant Buckingham, who retreats to consider his proposal. Looking beyond the threat posed by the children of his brother, the Yorkist Edward IV, Richard fears his true nemesis, Henry, Earl of Richmond, who is, of course, the founder of the Tudor dynasty. When Buckingham returns, determined to get from Richard what he has been promised, Richard disconcerts him by inquiring, "what's o'clock?" (4.2.109), bids the clock strike, and rejects Buckingham's request:

Because that, like a jack, thou keep'st the stroke
 Betwixt thy begging and my meditation.
 I am not in the giving vein today. (116-18)

On the battlefield, Richmond and Richard prepare to fight; the stage direction reads, *The clock striketh*, and a sunless day dawns. Although the play celebrates the victory of the man who will become Henry VII, it also ushers in a new, more urgent time, marked by the sound of the clock.

Shakespeare's flexible sense of chronology, it should be stressed, allows him to locate the onset of expedient time in different worlds and moments as it suits individual characterizations and plays. Thus Prospero and Antonio co-exist in a Renaissance frame that comprises both the hourglass of the old world and the ticking watch of the new. The history plays reenact the shift from sacred to immediate time in the era of Richard II and then again of Richard III; indeed, the same character may be associated with different temporal modes as the context demands. To Richard II, Bolingbroke represents the soulless force that turns an anointed king into a mechanized jack of the clock. Yet that shrewd time manager falls prey to the temporal pressure that he himself so skillfully wielded on his way to power. Like so many of Shakespeare's guilt-ridden monarchs, Henry IV suffers from insomnia and ages rapidly once he becomes king. In his poignant apostrophe to Sleep, he envies the ease with which his "poorest subjects" (2 *HIV* 3.1.4) fall asleep while he agonizes:

O thou dull god, why liest thou with the vile
In loathsome beds, and leavest the kingly couch
A watch-case or a common 'larum bell? (3.1.15-17)

The most scrupulous editors offer two glosses for that extraordinary metaphor: either Henry imagines himself as a tense watchman standing on duty in the sentry-box, or, as seems to me more likely, he envisages his body in bed as "the mechanism of a watch in its precious case sounding alarms like a bell."³⁰ The irony of the latter reading links Henry's suffering to his dehumanizing assault on his cousin Richard. Ultimately, both of them are wasted by time.

The depredations of time, it has long been noted, particularly preoccupy the speaker of Shakespeare's sonnets, who often listens to it passing. Michel Grivelet, for one, quoting Sonnet 8, "Music to hear, why hear'st thou music sadly?" has suggested that Richard II resembles "the fair youth of the Sonnets who, like him, is taught in vain a lesson in music."³¹ In addition, I would point to the haunting opening of Sonnet 12, with its perfect, monotonous syllables: "When I do count the clock that tells the time," the speaker begins. Most editors linger over this line because modern readers do not recognize how strange this declaration seems, yet their glosses do not agree. Two sources of sound require explanation—counting and telling. In the current Arden edition of the sonnets, the editor comments, "hear, and count, the chimes made by the clock";³² that reading associates a bell with the clock. Stephen Booth emphasizes a harder, more mercantile sound, explaining "count the strokes of," which might be dial strokes rather than chimes, and offering two meanings for "*tells*: (1) utters; (2) counts out (as in Modern English 'bank teller')."³³ In her discussion of the poem, Helen Vendler speaks not of chimes but of "the poem's aurally and visually ticking clock," which represents one model of time in opposition to the second, "the aggressive emblem-figure of Time with his scythe." She sees these

alternatives as “two models of death—an intransitive one in which things, as the clock ticks, all by themselves sink . . . and a transitive one in which Time the reaper actively cuts them down and takes them away.”³⁴

Different readers have many choices, then, because Shakespeare’s numbering clocks are ambiguous time tellers. Is the clock a gracious-sounding chiming instrument, or a harshly ticking one, evocative of the accountant’s ledger? Is it from the golden world, or from the fallen age of bronze? Hammering is an ancient craft associated with the ornament of the former or the weaponry of the latter. In his recent edition of *Richard II*, Charles R. Forker, in a footnote to 5.5.5, notes that it is “a metaphor from the forge.”³⁵ It may also be the humiliating rote chore performed by the jack of the clock. And in either case, as Vendler speculates, it could evoke the ticking of a domestic time piece suited to the meditative world of the sonnets. The intimate awareness of time’s passing in the sonnet, like the temporal measurement of affection in Hermione’s thrown-away reference to Leontes, implicates the time piece itself as a source of tension. Shakespeare’s clocks take us from the grand medieval town centers to the early morning vigil, from public ceremony to private anxiety. The jar of the clock sounds the inner note of the modern world. With the passing of the monastery bells and the coming of the Protestant era, communal order yielded to self-monitoring. Time was acquiring a quieter but more troubling sound, and Shakespeare heard it.

Notes

1. George White, *The Clockmakers of London* (London: Midas, 1998), 4.
2. Harry C. Brearley, *Time Telling Through the Ages* (New York: Doubleday, Page, 1919), 77.
3. Geoffrey Chaucer, *The Nun’s Priest’s Tale, The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, 2nd ed. F. N. Robinson (Boston: Houghton, 1957), 2850-54.
4. Gerhard Dohrn-van Rossum, *History of the Hour: Clocks and Modern Temporal Orders*, trans. Thomas Dunlap (Chicago & London: U of Chicago P, 1996), 53.
5. David Landes, *Revolution in Time: Clocks and the Making of the Modern World* (Cambridge: Belknap–Harvard UP, 1983), 67.
6. Landes, 76. Subsequent references are provided parenthetically in the text.
7. Bruce R. Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor* (Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1999), 90-91.
8. Wes Folkerth, *The Sound of Shakespeare* (London: Routledge, 2002), 48.
9. Smith, 53.
10. David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989), 68-69.

11. Cressy, 69-70.
12. See, for example, R. Murray Schafer, *The Tuning of the World* (New York: Knopf, 1977), 56.
13. Charles Grosvenor Osgood, *A Concordance to the Poems of Edmund Spenser* (The Carnegie Institute of Washington, 1915).
14. *Shakespeare Concordance. OpenSourceShakespeare*. Accessed February 28, 2007. <http://www.opensource-shakespeare.org/concordance>.
15. All quotations from Shakespeare's plays are from *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, 5th ed., ed. David Bevington (New York: Pearson Longman 2004).
16. Brearley, 94.
17. J. H. Leopold and Clare Vincent emphasize the beauty of the earliest models in "An Extravagant Jewel: The George Watch," *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 35 (2000): 137-49.
18. White, 14.
19. This linking of women and watches was obviously commonplace. See the musings of Sir Penitent Brothel in Thomas Middleton's *A Mad World, My Masters*, as cited in *A Mad World, My Masters And Other Plays*, ed. Michael Taylor, Oxford World's Classics (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995).

What is she took asunder from her clothes?
 Being ready, she consists of a hundred pieces,
 Much like your German clock, and near allied:
 Both are so nice they cannot go for pride,
 Beside a greater fault, but too well known,
 They'll strike to ten when they should stop at one (4.1.19-24)

In this same play, attempted robbery is thwarted when a striking watch rings the alarm in the pocket of Follywit, who has helped himself to the contents of his uncle's casket (5.2.225ff.). In the sordid world of citizen comedy, the connection between time and money is often made manifest in timepieces.

20. Brearley, 103-04.
21. See Leopold and Vincent, 137, n. 5.
22. "Clocks and Watches," rev. of F. J. Britten, *Old Clocks and Watches and Their Makers*, 2nd ed. *New York Times* 17 Sept. 1904. Accessed July 29, 2009. <http://nytimes.com>.
23. See, for example, Alvin B. Kernan, "The Henriad: Shakespeare's Major History Plays," *Modern Shakespearean Criticism: Essays on Style, Dramaturgy, and the Major Plays* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1970), 245-46, and James L. Calderwood, "Richard II to Henry IV: Variations on the Fall," *Metadrama in Shakespeare's Henriad*. 1979; rptd. in *William Shakespeare's Richard II: Modern Critical Interpretations*, ed. Harold Bloom (New York: Chelsea House, 1988), 67-74.
24. Robert B. Bennett, "Four Stages of Time: The Shape of History in Shakespeare's Second Tetral-

56 *The Upstart Crow*

ogy,” *Shakespeare Studies* 19 (1987): 68, 70, 78.

25. Dohrn-van Rossum, 67.
26. John Bavington Jones, “Shrewsbury Clock: ‘Point of War,’” *Notes and Queries* S10-VIII (1907): 96.
27. E. M. W. Tillyard, *Shakespeare’s History Plays* (1944; New York: Collier, 1962), 283.
28. Leopold and Vincent, 144.
29. William Wooding Starmer, “The Clock Jacks of England,” *Proceedings of the Musical Association*, 44th Sess. (1917-1918): 2.
30. *The Second Part of King Henry IV*, ed. Giorgio Melchiori, 1989, *The New Cambridge Shakespeare* (Cambridge, Eng.: Cambridge UP, 2007), n. to 14; see also the gloss offered by *Henry IV, Part 2*, ed. Rene Weis, *The Oxford Shakespeare* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
31. Michel Grivelet, “Shakespeare’s ‘War with Time’: The Sonnets and ‘Richard II,’” *Shakespeare Survey* 23 (1970): 75.
32. *Shakespeare’s Sonnets*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones, *Arden Shakespeare Third Series* (London: Thomson, 1997), 134.
33. *Shakespeare’s Sonnets*, ed. Stephen Booth (New Haven: Yale UP, 1977), 151.
34. Helen Vendler, *The Art of Shakespeare’s Sonnets* (Belknap–Harvard UP, 1997), 97.
35. *King Richard II*, ed. Charles R. Forker, *Arden Shakespeare Third Series* (London: Thomson, 2002), 461.

“DINING ON TWO DISHES”: SHAKESPEARE, ADAPTATION, AND AUDITORY RECEPTION OF PURCELL’S *THE FAIRY-QUEEN*

Allison Kay Deutermann, *Baruch College of The City University of New York*

In 1701, six years after the death of composer Henry Purcell, the managers of the Theatre Royal placed the following advertisement in *The Flying Post*:

The Score of Musick for the Fairy-Queen, set by the late Mr. Henry Purcel, and belonging to the Patentees of the Theatre-Royal in Cove[n]t-Garden, London, being lost upon his Death: Whoever shall bring the said Score, or a true Copy thereof, first to Mr. Zachary Baggs, Treasurer of the said Theatre, shall have twenty Guinea’s [sic] for the same.¹

Despite this plaintive plea, the missing score did not materialize until 1900, when it was discovered in the Royal Academy of Music’s library.² This does not mean that Purcell’s music went unperformed or unheard during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Pieces of the dramatic opera were already available in print and had been, in fact, since 1692, when they were first sold in the shops of John Carr and Henry Playford as well as at “the Theatre in *Dorset-Garden*.”³ The printed play-book, which included descriptions of the masques but not the music itself, was sold the week the *Fairy-Queen* premiered, and an updated version “With Alterations, Additions, and several new SONGS” appeared in 1693.⁴ Once Purcell’s score was lost, these descriptions and select pieces of music were all that were available to the public until the beginning of the twentieth century.

Taking the unusual fate of Purcell’s missing manuscript as its inspiration, this essay asks how *The Fairy-Queen* was heard by its Restoration audiences, arguing that it invites a kind of piecemeal, creatively destructive reception. This is partly a function of its form. An adaptation of Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* that combines spoken dialogue with elaborate new masques, *The Fairy-Queen* is an example of what the seventeenth-century music theorist Roger North derisively termed “semi-opera.”⁵ Performed only rarely today compared to other kinds of music-drama, these hybrid entertainments were faulted by the beginning of the eighteenth century for their supposedly awkward marriage of theatrical forms. Such complaints, which have had a long critical history, have been challenged more recently by musicologists attentive to the aesthetic value of these productions and to the subtle ways in which their musical scenes comment on the theatrical action.⁶ Rather than dismissing these critiques, however, I want to investigate the reasons for their emergence. North’s and others’ attacks on “semi-opera” participate in a contest between holistic and partial modes of reception, as well as between rival conceptualizations of the theatrical product itself—as an integral, indivisible whole, or as something that can and should be open to creative refashioning.

The following pages draw on recent work in the fields of musicology and philosophy as well as literary studies.⁷ Musicologist Shai Burstyn has argued for the need to produce “a historical reconstruction of the period ear,” a scholarly project which he describes as “an exercise in musical-historical imagination.”⁸ Listening, like music, has a history, one that we can begin to piece together by examining the practice within its cultural context. Burstyn’s claim is based in part on Lydia Goehr’s influential study of the work-concept.⁹ According to Goehr, since roughly 1800 the idea of the musical composition as a “work” has regulated the reception as well as the composition, performance, and critical analysis of classical music. It structures, for example, the assumptions that a pianist will not improvise while playing “serious” music in a concert hall and that his or her audience will listen in silence.¹⁰ Written and performed before the work-concept became regulative, *The Fairy-Queen* participates in a different musical-historical moment and is designed for a different “period ear.” It is not a musical work in the sense described by Goehr, but a collaboratively produced, creative jumble of operatic, instrumental, and non-musical scenes performed within the relatively bright and noisy space of the Restoration theater.¹¹ Combining disparate parts into a not necessarily integrated whole, *The Fairy-Queen* offers a sampling of auditory and visual delights from which audience members are invited to choose. This practice is in fact crucial to the composition of *The Fairy-Queen* itself, a theatrical product created out of the raw material of Shakespeare’s comedy. Ultimately, Purcell’s missing score performs on a material level the process through which early modern entertainments could be picked apart and even repackaged for personal use by theatergoers, readers, and adapters alike, as they chose which pieces to hear and remember and which to disregard as unimportant or uninteresting.

I. Sampling Sweet Harmonious Sounds

Any attempt to describe how Restoration audiences heard *The Fairy-Queen* must, of course, be speculative, but the opera itself provides insight into how (and by whom) Purcell and his collaborator expected it to be consumed.¹² *The Fairy-Queen* anticipates a talented, experienced auditory, one that would be capable of appreciating dazzling aural as well as visual effects. Full appreciation of these aural effects, I will show, depends upon hearing the individual parts out of which Purcell’s music is composed.

One of the most striking of the opera’s additions is its final masque, which is staged against “a transparent prospect of a Chinese Garden.”¹³ Songs are performed by Chinese men and women while large “Pedestals of China-work rise from under the Stage” containing “six China-Orange-trees”; all this is followed by a dance of six monkeys.¹⁴ As spectacular as these visual embellishments are, similarly “spectacular” aural ones are included as well.¹⁵ According to Mark A. Radice, composers regularly made creative use of the Dorset-Garden Theatre’s architecture, arranging singers and instrumentalists in different spaces to produce complicated effects.¹⁶ Performers could be placed in the music room, which was located above the proscenium arch; in the space between the stage and the pit; in the balconies over the stage; in the cellarge, the space below the stage; on the machines that held aloft the gods;

and, finally, on the stage itself. This onstage space could be further subdivided using shutters, which were key to the perspective scenery of Restoration theater; standing in different parts of the stage, actors would seem to be placed at different points within a vanishing landscape. Purcell’s vocal parts, which often echo one another or are written as a sort of call-and-response with a single instrument or instruments, might have been placed in different sections of the stage or even above or below it.

Evidence for such performance practices can be found in the spoken dialogue as well as in Purcell’s score. Titania introduces the piece “Come all ye songsters of the sky” with the following command: “Let Eccho’s plac’d in every Grot, / Catch, and repeat each Dying Note” (2.467-68). Written for alto, tenor, and bass, the song begins with a solo male voice which is then joined by a chorus of men:¹⁷

May the God of Wit inspire,
The Sacred Nine to bear a part;
And the Blessed Heavenly Quire,
Shew the utmost of their Art.
While Eccho shall in sounds remote,
Repeat each Note,
Each Note, each Note. (2.475-81)

The echoes are built into the score, as musical phrases are repeated at “While Echo,” “sounds remote,” and “Repeat each Note” by members of the chorus and then again by the brass.¹⁸ Titania’s earlier command—“Let Eccho’s plac’d in every Grot, / Catch, and repeat each / Dying Note”—suggests that these parts would have been performed from different corners of the stage (different “grots,” or grottos). This staging would produce an appropriately echoic, but also potentially disorienting, effect, as musical phrases performed in quick succession from different spaces attracted the ear before the eye could follow.

That challenging auditors is part of *The Fairy-Queen*’s project is supported by Titania’s earlier lines:

Let your Revels now begin,
Some shall Dance, and some shall Sing,
All Delights this Place surround,
Every sweet Harmonious Sound,
That e’re Charm’d a *skilful Ear*,
Meet, and Entertain us here. (2.461-66, italics added)

The ears that have been “charmed” by these “Harmonious Sound[s]” are pointedly “skilful”—a word that implies formal musical training or, at the very least, the ability to appreciate harmonies others cannot. These charming sounds will now be introduced to new ears, including not only Titania’s, but also those of Purcell’s audience. Such “skilful ears” would presumably possess certain talents: an ability to focus, and to shift that focus rapidly from one section of the stage to another; a familiarity with a range of sounds, “every” one of which Titania promises will now be presented

together for the listeners' delight; and finally, perhaps, the ability to recognize how the fairies' harmonies are created. To possess these talents would signal one's membership within music and theater publics that were beginning to develop in England at the end of the seventeenth century.¹⁹ "Come all ye songsters" presents itself, then, as a song for a socially privileged community of listeners with informal and perhaps also a technical knowledge of music. Since appreciation of this song's "wit" requires "catch[ing] . . . each note," its listeners are encouraged to hear flexibly—attending to the individual echoes in the music as well as to the interaction between them.

At least one early listener describes having heard *The Fairy-Queen* in this fashion. Roger North, whose brother Francis was lord keeper of the king's seal from 1682-85, was a talented amateur musician who wrote extensively about music and music theory.²⁰ He would therefore seem to belong to the socially privileged community of listeners imagined in "Come all ye songsters." In 1728, he recalled that in *The Fairy-Queen's* "Hush, no more, be silent all":

there is a passage where in the midst of a full chorus, a rurall deity enters, and with a loud bass voice, sings Peace. And then all the musique stopt all at once, and after a time the musick being resumed, he sang Silence, and was obeyed, a majesty in musick I have not observed in any I ever met with and even that silence kept the time.²¹

For North, what makes this passage memorable is the way in which the music complements the meaning of the words, which are in turn suited to the dramatic action. He is so impressed by this particular effect as to remember it vividly decades later, although he misattributes the passage to *King Arthur*, which he further misremembers as *Prince Arthur*. Despite this confusion, or perhaps because of it, North's description is striking for its attention to detail. He is able to focus on (and, later, to recall) a brief moment in the bass aria of the second-act masque. Written some thirty years after the fact, the quote is less a description of North's hearing than an account of what he remembers having heard; still, it suggests an ability to focus on specific musical parts, including the number of beats allotted to a given rest. He notes how the bass, the answering instruments, and even the silence that falls between them function independently and fit together.

This auditory process may have been modeled by the composer himself. According to North, Purcell would sometimes sample his own compositions, performing parts for his friends rather than entire pieces. Doing so seems to have been key to the development of a critical apparatus: "Mr. Purcell used to mark what did not take for the best musick, it being his constant observation that what took least, was really best, and his friends would desire him to touch those passages by that character."²² Shared only with a limited number of "friends," Purcell's enthusiasm for that which "took least" and "was really best" establishes the composer's social as well as his musical distinction, aligning him with a community of skillful, musically knowledgeable, and critical listeners. Even more importantly, the anecdote seems to privilege the musical part over the whole. Purcell is imagined not as playing entire songs for his friends, but "passages"—pieces of music as short as a few notes,

perhaps. Like quotations, these passages are removed from their original context and pieced together into a kind of aural collage. Purcell’s audience is then invited to focus on the individual echoes—difficult passages that are worthy of attention in their own right—out of which those songs are composed.

II. A Thousand Ways to Win Ye

Such audition seems ideally suited not just to certain of *The Fairy-Queen’s* songs, but also to the opera as a whole, which is comprised of different parts loosely joined together. As Daniel Albright has argued, “It is hard to imagine any sort of music-drama that more flagrantly flouts the Wagnerian principle of *Gesamtkunstwerk*.”²³ Different casts would have performed the spoken and musical roles, and the masques do little to advance the plot. This is not to say that the musical and theatrical scenes are entirely unrelated; rather, as Roger Savage and Curtis Price have shown, the music often comments or elaborates on themes that the dialogue has introduced.²⁴ Yet these components nonetheless remain distinct from one another. This seems to be the point. Celebrating its hybridity, Purcell’s dramatic opera presents itself as the necessary alternative to the less varied, and therefore impoverished, forms of entertainment on the Restoration stage. Its blend of spoken theater, opera, and instrumental music is introduced as a desirable form of generic mixing.

In its desirability, this formal hybridity is to be distinguished from the mishmash of comedy and tragedy performed by the rude mechanicals, which is ridiculed both in Shakespeare’s original and in its adaptation. Like *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, *The Fairy-Queen* includes a play-within-a-play that invites reflection on theatrical performance and reception. But there are important differences in how these inset productions function, both structurally and thematically. Rather than appearing at the end of the play, as it does in Shakespeare’s text, the rude mechanicals’ performance of *Pyramus and Thisbe* is combined with the rehearsal that takes place in Act 3. It is seen and heard not by Theseus, Hippolyta, and the four lovers, but by Robin Goodfellow, who is given much of the courtly characters’ running commentary. Because their play is never performed onstage for an elite audience, it remains, as Philostrate warns in *Midsummer*, “not for you”—a pronoun that now seems to apply prophetically to the future theatergoers of Dorset Garden, as well as to Theseus himself (5.1.77). What is “not for” these elite audiences is, as in Shakespeare’s play, outmoded and mingled theater, as well as tear-throat pronunciation. Preserved from *Midsummer* are Bottom’s pastiche of old-fashioned forms (“The raging Rocks, and shivering Shocks, shall break the Locks of Prison-Gates”; “*Thisbe, Thisbe; ah! Pyramus, my Lover dear, and Thisbe dear, and Lady dear*”) and Peter Quince’s jumbled title: “most lamentable Comedy, and cruel Death of *Pyramus and Thisbe*” (1.1.26-27, 13-14).²⁵

This critique of outmoded and jumbled theatrical forms is extended in the 1693 text to include any form of poetry unadorned with music or spectacle. Two revisions effect this change. The first is the removal of the scene that opens Shakespeare’s play. *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* begins with Egeus petitioning Theseus to enforce Hermia’s marriage to Demetrius, and with Hermia begging her father and the duke for per-

mission to marry Lysander. While the 1692 *Fairy-Queen* opens with a shortened and modernized version of this same scene, the 1693 text begins with the rude mechanicals distributing the parts for their play. By placing these metatheatrical jokes in the opening scene, rather than withholding them until later, *The Fairy-Queen's* adapter establishes an immediate dichotomy between two kinds of theatrical productions: those that the Restoration audience has come to hear and see, and the unsophisticated spoken drama of Bottom and his companions. The second of these two edits is the addition of the stuttering Drunken Poet. Stumbling upon the sleeping Titania and her train, he is pinched repeatedly for his “Crimes, His Nonsense, and his Dogrel Rhymes” and forced to confess both his poverty and his predilection for penning sonnets (189). Appearing shortly after the rude mechanicals’ opening scene, the ridicule of the Drunken Poet links bumbling actors and besotted scribes in the joint production of unsophisticated entertainment.²⁶

Opposed to the scenes with the rude mechanicals and the Drunken Poet is the masque with Titania and her train, which is new to the 1693 version. As the laborers exit, Titania enters accompanied by her Indian Boy and attending fairies:

Now we glide from our abodes,
 To Sing, and Revel in these Woods . . .
 ’Tis well, if any Mortal dare
 Approach this spot of Fairy-Ground,
 Blind the Wretch, then turn him round.
 Three times turn, and bring him in;
 About him Gambol, Dance, and Sing.
 Pinch his Arms, his Thighs, and Shins;
 Pinch, till he confess his Sins.
 Now my Fairy Coire, appear:
 Sing and entertain my Dear. (1.1.136-55)

The song that follows, coupled with these lines, establishes the fairy world as distinct from the mortal realm and as decidedly musical. It not only sounds different from the earlier scene with the rude mechanicals but is also aggressively defended against the mortals’ anticipated intrusion. When the poets trespass into this space, the separateness of the two spheres (mortal and fairy, dramatic and musical) is rigidly reinforced by the fairy choir that pinches as well as sings. And yet, the musical fairy world is entirely dependent for its entertainment—and, of course, for its verse—on such poets. For all their talk of keeping out intruders, the fairies actually bring the poets onto the stage, deepening their trespass into “this spot of Fairy-Ground.” And the fairies’ rhyming lines are similar to those of the Drunken Poet—whose singing links him, in turn, to the fairy choir.

The 1693 *Fairy-Queen* therefore establishes from the outset an artificial division between spoken theater and music, as well as between mortals and fairies, that must be bridged if the production is to transcend the limitations of either art form. This formal union is achieved at different points throughout the performance, but like the romantic unions of Lysander and Hermia and Demetrius and Helena,

it is perfected during the final masque. Whereas Shakespeare’s play ends with the mortals and fairies retreating to their separate spheres, *The Fairy-Queen* ends with them interacting together onstage. The entire cast is treated to a spectacular, and spectacularly varied, production that combines a range of different kinds of music with lines recited by Oberon. In this theatrical tour de force, all the divided “parts” of *The Fairy Queen* are brought triumphantly together; spoken dialogue, music, and elaborate new theatrical technologies are combined with pieces of Shakespeare’s original verse. The music is itself greatly varied, including both the Plaint (“O let me weep”)—a long, slow lament—and the bright, triumphant “Thus the gloomy World / At first began to shine” (5.1549-50). At the same time, this idealized union is far from seamless. The heavily chromatic, minor Plaint seems ill-suited to the characters’ wedding feast; musically, it is of a completely different style than the jauntier pieces that precede and follow it. There is a strong possibility that the Plaint was inserted into *The Fairy-Queen* after its initial performances, but even without this strikingly inappropriate song, the final masque seems to be built out of what Price calls “a hotch-potch of various pieces.”²⁷ It is episodic, and its delights are presented in potentially jarring succession. This final proliferation of musical styles is crucial to the production’s celebration of variety. As the Epilogue points out, by the end of the opera, the *Fairy-Queen’s* performers have “[tried] a Thousand charming Ways to win ye. / If all this will not do, the Devil’s in ye” (5.1666-67).

III. Dining on Two Dishes

Not all dramatic operas are as resolutely “hotch-potch” as *The Fairy-Queen*, but all of them share something of its hybrid structure. The difference is one of degree. *The Fairy-Queen* foregrounds and celebrates its disjointedness. As successful as the form was with Restoration theatergoers, not all listeners approved.²⁸ North famously insisted that “singing and speaking doe not agree in an opera,” a claim he based on problems of reception: “I challenge anyone that hath attended [dramatic operas], to say, if their favourite party were not reigning upon the stage, they were not uneasy, or rather impatient till the other was done.”²⁹ For North, the problem is not generic hybridity *per se*, but the physical and psychological effects it produces on its audiences. He assumes that *all* listeners will inevitably prefer one form to the other, leaving them irritable and uncomfortable for at least half of the performance. North’s stance runs counter to that of Thomas Betterton, who may have had a hand in adapting *The Fairy-Queen* and who certainly had a role in its production. According to North, upon complaining to the theater impresario of dramatic opera’s formal mishmash, Betterton “answered I was for dining on one dish rather than [sic] two, and so answered me with a simile.”³⁰ For both men, it is dramatic opera’s formal variety that distinguishes it from other theatrical products. But whereas North finds this mingling physically unpleasant, Betterton finds it satisfying. Overindulgence in any one form is prevented through the quick succession of different, even competing, kinds.

I suggest that the two reactions to dramatic opera described by North—that is, Betterton’s and his own—represent the collision of competing modes of audition.

These are tied, in turn, to different ways of thinking about theatrical entertainments. North's complaints reflect holistic listening and a preference for productions composed of individual, yet mutually dependent and integrated, parts. Betterton's rejoinder, on the other hand, celebrates the very disjointedness and auditory variety that leave North so squeamish. North, unlike Betterton, prefers all-sung operas, which he describes as:

an assemblage of every kind that is good in musick, voices, action, instruments of all kinds, performers, compositions, and what not in perfection . . . The orchestre . . . with such a clangor as sublimes the most vulgar ayre into transcendent harmony: what in a chamber would be dull is there all spirit; such is the vertue of magnificence even of sounds, to which must be added that of the apparatus, decoration and illumination of a spacious theater, which with the splendor of the company, must needs affect the spirits of the auditory with soveraigne pleasure.³¹

North rhapsodizes over the combined effect produced by a talented orchestra, gifted singers, and elaborate staging; the architectural space in which these operas are performed is every bit as crucial to their success as the score or the musicians' skill. What is most striking about this passage is its emphasis on the totality of the production, on the one hand, and the aurality of its consumption on the other. The "decorations and illumination" of the theater, as much as the music, provide "soveraigne pleasure" to the "*auditory*"—not the spectator. There is a synaesthetic quality to North's description, in other words, as the total production, in all its visual and auditory splendor, is to be enjoyed by the ear. This sensory stimuli, both visual and aural, is joined together to form a cohesive, uniform theatrical entertainment—an opera, rather than an opera that is also part-play. The finished product is then heard, North imagines, with ecstatic delight.

North's and Betterton's reactions reveal two different "period ears" belonging to men who nonetheless moved within similar social and musical circles. As a result, they serve as an important reminder that hearing could be conceptualized differently even within the relatively limited group of "skilful" listeners discussed above. An individual might also choose between these approaches, applying different modes of hearing in different situations. North's description of "Hush, no more, be silent all," coupled with his anecdotal evidence of Purcell's private concerts, suggests an ability to hear songs in parts—even if his complaints about "semi-opera" betray a distaste for the pieced-together productions that celebrate partial hearing on a larger scale.

For a creator and producer of Shakespearean adaptations, Betterton's auditory approach—the "two-dish" approach—makes sense. The kind of sampling encouraged by *The Fairy-Queen* is necessary to the creation of *The Fairy-Queen* itself, which plucks pieces from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and refashions them into a new theatrical product. Adaptation entails thoughtful, creative destruction, rewriting a play to suit current theatrical, cultural, and political needs. *The Fairy-Queen's* anticipated mode of reception, then, seems to mirror the process of its composition. In the remaining pages, I return to Purcell's missing score, examining its disappearance in

light of late-seventeenth-century thinking about Shakespearean adaptation. Doing so requires shifting focus from performance to print and considering other, not necessarily aural, forms of partial consumption.

IV. “Made out of an old play of Shakespeare’s”: Partial Consumption, Adaptation, and Composition

As Michael Dobson has shown, the first Restoration adapters treated Shakespeare’s plays “as a source of natural raw materials, a larder of ingredients” out of which new productions could be formed.³² This approach is echoed, interestingly, in a seventeenth-century theatergoer’s account of Purcell’s opera. In May of 1692, Katharine Booth wrote in a letter to her mother, “Lady Radnor treated me with the new Opera. It was the finest sight that ever I saw. It was called the Fairy Queen. It is made out of an old play of Shackspear’s.”³³ Booth’s reference is significant for two reasons. First, it emphasizes the visual over the aural, offering an important reminder that *The Fairy-Queen* was to be consumed by the eye as well as by the ear. Second, it highlights the creatively destructive quality of adaptation. Booth’s letter seems to acknowledge and even to replicate the work Shakespearean adaptation entailed—specifically, the selection and reassembly of the parts out of which “old play[s]” are formed. To pick up on Betteron’s simile, I would argue that Booth is able to taste in Purcell’s finished product the various ingredients that were used to “make” it. There is no reference to *Midsummer* on the title pages of *The Fairy-Queen*’s earliest editions, and although the connection is mentioned in the 1691 Stationer’s Register entry (“The Fayery Queene, or, Midsomers Nights Dreame”), there is no evidence the production was ever advertised as such.³⁴ Booth may therefore have been a more thoughtful and attentive listener than her emphasis on the visual implies, hearing the Shakespearean original embedded within.

In print, consumers were encouraged to treat *The Fairy-Queen* much as its adapters treated Shakespeare’s *Midsummer*: as raw material that could be disassembled and refashioned into something new. In 1692, individuals could purchase the playbook for the *Fairy-Queen* or a number of its songs, which were printed separately. Since music books tended to be produced by specialized shops, this division of labor is unsurprising; more puzzling is the fact that the music itself was published in pieces.³⁵ *Some Select Songs As they are Sung in the Fairy-Queen* (London, 1692) was published with Purcell’s approval (“by J. Heptinstall, for the Author”) and “Sold by John Carr, at the Inner-Temple Gate near Temple-Barr, by Henry Playford at his Shop in the Temple, and at the Theatre in Dorset-Garden.” The songbook introduces each piece with the name of the singer who performed it (although several of the pieces included would have been sung by more than one voice) and often includes only excerpts of a particular masque.³⁶ Whether purchased as souvenirs, as aides to audition, or as guides for mounting future amateur performances, these books do not present *The Fairy-Queen* as an integral whole but break it into discrete parts that could then be imaginatively reassembled. Booth participated in this process. Towards the end of her letter, she adds, “I have sent Mrs. Elvy Evans a new song out of the Opera.”³⁷ By purchasing a single song rather than a collection of musical

pieces or the accompanying playbook, Booth engages in a kind of sampling.³⁸ She describes herself as choosing the part over the whole, reducing Purcell's opera into a single piece of music for Mrs. Elvy Evans's consumption. Booth's reception of *The Fairy-Queen*, I suggest, mirrors the process of its composition: both entail creatively destructive engagement with theatrical raw material. As readers and as theatergoers alike, audiences were encouraged to consume *The Fairy-Queen* in pieces, replicating in the process something like the adapters' experience.

Ultimately, this process seems to have reshaped *The Fairy-Queen* itself. Shortly after the advertisement quoted at the beginning of this essay appeared, a similar notice ran in the *London Gazette*, with one important addition:

The Score of Musick for the Fairy-Queen, Set by the Late Mr. Henry Purcell, and belonging to the Patentees of the Theater-Royal in Covent-Garden, London, being lost by his death: Whoever first brings the said Score, or a true Copy thereof, to Mr. Zachary Baggs, Treasurer of the said Theater, shall have 20 Guineas Reward, or proportionable for any Act or Acts thereof.³⁹

Apparently despairing of ever again getting their hands on Purcell's complete score, the managers of the Theatre Royal amended their advertisement accordingly. Pieces of the score would also be welcome, and anyone able to supply one or more acts' worth of music would receive a "proportionable" sum. The strategy must have worked, since a single act of the opera was performed in 1703 at Drury Lane.⁴⁰ Roughly a decade after *The Fairy-Queen*'s premiere, with books of select songs and anthologies containing pieces from the opera already in circulation, Londoners were invited to attend a new version of this creative reproduction—this time paired with a trimmed version of Dryden's *Marriage A-la-Mode*. *The Fairy-Queen* was thus adapted to suit a new theatrical audience, its fate fittingly parallel to that of the "old play of Shackspear's" out of which it was made.

Given the disappearance of Purcell's score, it would be easy to emphasize the destructive, rather than the creative, qualities of partial consumption, both in performance and in print. And until fairly recently, scholarly opinion of *The Fairy-Queen* reflected such thinking—at least, that is, with regard to its use of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Edward Dent derided Purcell's opera as "a barbarously mutilated version" of Shakespeare's comedy.⁴¹ J. A. Westrup wrote that it "is simply a succession of masques, which have so little connection with the play that no one who merely heard the music would have the remotest suspicion that it was an adaptation of Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream*."⁴² Stretching from the close of the eighteenth century through the middle of the twentieth, the introduction of this "orthodoxy of distaste for *The Fairy-Queen*," as Roger Savage has termed it, coincides with the growing popularity of all-sung opera on the London stage.⁴³ It also dovetails with a developing sense of Shakespeare's dramatic output as "works"—an ideological as well as semantic transformation, and one that is tied to the creation of a canon of time-tested and eternal English literary artifacts with which no one must meddle.⁴⁴ Like the museum of musical works described by Goehr, this literary canon and the conceptualization of the theatrical "work" it engenders was by no means

dominant when Purcell and his collaborator created *The Fairy-Queen*. But traces of it can perhaps already be seen forming in complaints about semi-opera, and in calls for entertainments that will resist being broken into parts. North betrays no interest whatsoever in preserving Shakespeare’s plays, but his rejection of “semi-opera” suggests a related distaste for formal hybridity, as well as for productions that invite disassembly.

The Fairy-Queen neither reflects nor encourages such thinking. A product of selective reception, the dramatic opera refashions *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* into a new theatrical product and, at the same time, invites its own creative destruction. Its partial revival in the early eighteenth century is therefore fitting—both for dramatic opera in general, and more specifically for the proudly diverse and episodic *Fairy-Queen*. Like the individual songs out of which *The Fairy-Queen’s* score is composed, which invite listeners to focus on specific passages as well as on the song as a whole, Purcell’s opera offers itself up for partial consumption. Its far from seamless blend of music and speech, spectacular effects, and Shakespearean poetry invites the selective reception encouraged by Betterton and practiced, according to North, by the composer himself. This partial hearing seems to complement dramatic opera’s two-dish form, which giddily makes the most of the Restoration theater’s resources. If North and other, later listeners have found this form unappealing, even alien, contemporary audiences may hear it with different ears. How Purcell’s dramatic opera will sound to these and future listeners is a question I will resist trying to answer and, as Theseus suggests, let my epilogue alone.

Notes

1. *The Flying Post or The Post Master* (London, England), Thursday, October 9, 1701. Nearly identical advertisements ran in the *Post Boy* and the *London Gazette*.
2. See Curtis Price, “The Fairy Queen,” *Henry Purcell and the London Stage* (New York, Cambridge UP, 1984), 331.
3. The quote appears on the title page of *Some Select Songs as they are Sung in the Fairy-Queen* (London, 1692). The simultaneity of print and performance is further suggested by the present-tense title.
4. See the advertisement in the *London Gazette*, May 5-9, 1692.
5. Roger North, *The Musickall Grammarian, 1728*, ed. Mary Chan and Jamie C. Kassler (Cambridge UP, 1990), 215.
6. Roger Savage and Curtis Price have provided much-needed recuperative readings of the dramatic opera form and of *The Fairy-Queen* in particular. See Savage, “The Shakespeare-Purcell *Fairy Queen*: A Defence and Recommendation,” *Early Music* 1 (1973): 201-221; and Price, *Henry Purcell*.
7. Literary scholars’ work on the subjects of sound and its reception has crucially shaped my thinking. See Bruce R. Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor* (Chicago:

U of Chicago P, 1999); Gina Bloom, *Voice in Motion: Staging Gender, Shaping Sound* (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2007); Wes Folkherth, *The Sound of Shakespeare* (New York: Routledge, 2002); and *Embodied Voices: Representing Female Vocality in Western Culture*, ed. Nancy Jones and Leslie Dunn (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994).

8. Burstyn, "In Quest of the Period Ear," *Early Music* 25 (1997): 697, 695.
9. Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music* (New York: Oxford UP, 2002).
10. This is not to say that prior to 1800, composers did not produce works, or that since the nineteenth century all musical works have been produced, received, and criticized the same way; rather, it is to argue that musicians, composers, and others "did not function under the regulation of the work-concept" until a specific point in time. Goehr, 115.
11. Goehr's focus is on symphonic instrumental music, not opera, and certainly not dramatic opera. Both formally and temporally, then, *The Fairy-Queen* would seem to fall outside the scope of the work-concept.
12. Elkanah Settle had been considered the updater of Shakespeare's text since F. C. Brown identified him as such in 1910; more recently, Thomas Betterton has become the leading candidate. See F. C. Brown, *Elkanah Settle: His Life and Works* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1910) and Robert D. Hume and Judith Milhous, "Attribution Problems in English Drama, 1660-1700," *Harvard Literary Bulletin* 31 (1983): 5-39. Grove Music Online's entry for *The Fairy-Queen* lists Betterton as the author. See Price, "Fairy-Queen, The," *The New Grove Dictionary of Opera*, ed. Stanley Sadie, *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. Accessed 05, 2010. <http://grovemusic.com>
13. Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the *Fairy-Queen* are taken from Roger Savage, "*The Fairy-Queen: an Opera* (1693)," *Henry Purcell's Operas: The Complete Texts*, ed. Michael Burden (New York: Oxford UP, 2000), 337-408. Savage uses the 1693 text, which he, following Bruce Wood and Andrew Pinnock, argues "corresponds pretty closely with *The Fairy-Queen* as it was first publicly performed in 1692, the script in the earlier states of the playbook being a *semi-final* text which [Jacob] Tonson obtained from the United Company during rehearsals and which he put into type so that a playbook of some sort could be ready for the day of the première," 343.
14. According to Frans and Julie Muller, these baroque touches gesture to William and Mary. The oranges celebrate the House of Orange and the *chinoiserie* suggests Queen Mary's own collection of Chinese porcelain, which had recently been displayed to the public. See Frans and Julie Muller, "Completing the Picture: The Importance of Reconstructing Early Opera," *Early Music* 33 (2005): 667-681. Leslie C. Dunn argues for an allegorical reading of Titania as Mary, pointing to evidence within the dramatic opera as well as to Purcell's earlier birthday odes for the monarch. See Dunn, "Re-Sounding Elizabeth in Seventeenth-Century Music: Morley to Purcell," in *Resurrecting Elizabeth I in Seventeenth-Century England*, ed. Katherine Conway and Betty Hagemann (Fairleigh-Dickinson UP, 2007), 239-260.
15. On the dramatic opera of the late seventeenth century as a "multimedia spectacular," see Judith Milhous, "The Multimedia Spectacular on the Restoration Stage," *British Theatre and the Other Arts, 1660-1800*, ed. Shirley Strum Kenny (Washington: The Folger Shakespeare Library, 1984), 41-66.

16. See Mark A. Radice, “Sites for Music in Purcell’s Dorset Garden Theatre,” *The Musical Quarterly* 81 (1997): 430-48.
17. This voicing applies only to the Royal Academy of Music score. See Price, “The Fairy-Queen,” 332.
18. The 2010 production of *The Fairy-Queen* at the Brooklyn Academy of Music—directed by Jonathan Kent, conducted by William Christie, and featuring Les Arts Florissants—divided its male chorus into groups of three echoing one another from different corners of the stage. The echo’s occasional reluctance to repeat “each note” was played to great comic effect. Noting that the score is marked “loud, soft, and softer” in this place, and that the three voices for which the music is composed are far short of the nine muses mentioned, Radice has suggested that two other groups of three singers each could have been placed at different stage depths, 444.
19. Since 1672, when John Bannister opened his home to the daily performance of music by “excellent masters” for paying visitors, London had become a site for secular music concerts (albeit on a very small scale). By the eighteenth century, spaces would be set aside as permanent concert venues, but even by the 1690s, enthusiasts could attend regular performances in the Great Room at York Buildings. See Richard A. Carlton, “The Public Marketing of Music,” *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* 26 (1995): 129. Harold Love has argued that these concerts played an early role in forming a British music public—a social group that identified itself as such and that, along with other shifting, overlapping communities, contributed to the development of a public sphere in England. “How Music Created a Public,” *Criticism* 46 (2004): 257-71.
20. Roger and Francis North’s biographies are discussed in the introduction to *The Beginnings of the Modern Philosophy of Music in England: Francis North’s A Philosophical Essay of Musick (1677) with comments of Isaac Newton, Roger North and the Philosophical Transactions*, ed. Jamie C. Kassler (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004).
21. See North, *The Musickall Grammarian*, 201. The passage is also quoted by Michael Burden, who points out North’s mistaken attribution. See Burden, “Casting Issues in the Original Production of Purcell’s Opera ‘The Fairy-Queen,’” *Music & Letters* (2003): 596, n. 1.
22. Qtd. in “Introduction: In Search of Purcell’s Character,” in *Purcell Studies*, ed. Curtis Alexander Price (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995), 4. The possibly apocryphal anecdote nonetheless provides important insight into North’s understanding of audition. In addition to demonstrating North’s focus on musical passages, it reveals an ability to focus on other kinds of sounds. An auditor’s choices need not be restricted to the composition itself. “Mark” could mean to write—marking the score, perhaps—but it could also mean to notice or observe. North is therefore describing the process through which a skilful listener like Purcell might attend not only to the music, but also to *others’* auditory choices, as their applause, whistles, groans, and side-conversations provide evidence of their reception.
23. See *Musicking Shakespeare: A Conflict of Theatres* (Rochester: U of Rochester P, 2007), 241.
24. See Savage, “The Shakespeare-Purcell *Fairy Queen*: A Defence and Recommendation,” and Price, *Henry Purcell*, both cited above.
25. Cf. *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*: “The raging rocks, / And shivering shocks, / Shall break the locks / Of prison-gates”; “‘Thisne, Thisne!’—‘Ah, Pyramus, my lover dear! thy Thisbe dear, and

70 *The Upstart Crow*

lady dear!"; "The most lamentable comedy, and most cruel death of Pyramus and Thisbe" (1.2.27-30, 48-50, 11-12). The citation is to the Arden 3 edition, ed. Harold F. Brooks (London: Cengage Learning, 2007).

26. If, as scholars have argued, the Drunken Poet is a teasing reference to the real-life stutterers Thomas Durfey or Elkanah Settle, then the association is stronger still. In the 2010 production of *The Fairy-Queen* cited above, this association was emphasized by featuring the same actor in the role of Bottom and the Drunken Poet.
27. The Complaint does not appear in the Royal Academy of Music score. This has led Price and others to suggest that it was inserted into the *Fairy-Queen* at a later date. See Price, "The Fairy Queen," *Henry Purcell*, 354. Regardless of how, or under whose direction, the lament was incorporated into the *Fairy-Queen*, its eventual inclusion is significant as it suggests the piece's thematic and musical unsuitability were thought unimportant.
28. On the popularity of the form, and of the Dorset Garden Theatre spectaculars specifically, see Milhous, "The Multimedia Spectacular," cited above.
29. *Roger North's Cursory Notes of Musicke (c. 1698-1703): A Physical, Psychological and Critical Theory* (Kensington, Australia: Unisearch, 1986), 230-31.
30. Chan and Kassler, 216, n. 319.
31. Chan and Kassler, 214-15.
32. Dobson is describing a contemporary complaint about *The Law Against Lovers*, which combines *Much Ado about Nothing* and *Measure for Measure* into a new production. See Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660-1769* (New York: Oxford UP, 1992), 32.
33. The letter is transcribed by Mary Arnold-Forster, along with a number of other letters and a brief autobiography penned by Booth, in *Basset Down: An Old Country House* (London: Country Life Limited, 1949), 116-17. The relevant passage is worth quoting in its entirety: "I received my sister Mary's letter yesterday at the Playhouse. Lady Radnor treated me with the new Opera. It was the finest sight that ever I saw. It is called the Fairy Queen. It is made out of an old play of Shackspear's: the Fairy King and the Queen which are little children of about 8 or 9 years of age act the prettiest that can be imagined and most delicately fine dressed. They say this opera lies them in two thousand pounds: the boxes are eight shillings and so all places are double," 116. Michael Burden discusses the implications of Booth's claim for thinking about the casting of Oberon and Titania in "Casting Issues in the Original Production of Purcell's Opera 'The Fairy-Queen,'" *Music & Letters* 84 (2003): 596-607.
34. The Stationer's Register entry is quoted in Savage's introduction to *The Fairy-Queen in Henry Purcell's Operas*, 349.
35. While *Dioclesian*, Purcell's dramatic opera of 1691, was published with a complete score, *The Fairy-Queen* was not. According to Ricard Luckett, the score did not sell well, which may have prompted the more piecemeal publication of the music for *The Fairy-Queen*. See Luckett, "The Playfords and the Purcells," *Music and the Book Trade from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, ed. Robin Myers, Michael Harris, and Giles Mandelbrote (New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 2008), 45-67.

36. For example, the 1692 edition of the *Fairy-Queen* lists as part of “the First Song” all of the following: “Come all ye Songsters of the Sky,” “May the God of Wit inspire,” “Now joyn your Warbling Voices all,” and “Sing while we trip it.” Of these, only “Sing while we trip it” appears in *Some Select Songs* as the “First Song sung in the second Act, by Mrs. Aliff”—a title which indicates the double duty these music books performed as scores and mementoes. Similarly, Night’s “See, even Night” is omitted from the second song of Act 2, as is Sleep’s “Hush, no more, be silent all”; only Mystery’s “I am come to lock all fast” and Secrecie’s “One charming Night” are included.
37. Qtd. in Forster, 117.
38. This is probably a matter of cost. A single song would be less expensive than a songbook or play-book, and Booth’s income was limited: in May of 1692, she was living apart from her parents in London, taking dancing lessons from the famous Mr. Isaac and hoping to secure a position as one of the Queen’s maids of honor. Still, the story suggests a larger cultural practice of selecting songs “out of the Opera” to share with friends and family, and regardless of Booth’s motivations, it serves as an example of selective reception.
39. *London Gazette* (London, England), Thursday, October 16, 1701, italics added.
40. Price, *Henry Purcell and the London Stage*, 329.
41. Dent, *Foundations of English Opera: A Study of Musical Drama in England During the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1928), 216.
42. Westrup, *Purcell* (New York: Oxford UP, 1995), 137.
43. Savage, “The Shakespeare-Purcell ‘Fairy Queen,’” 203.
44. On the shift from “plays” to “works,” particularly with regard to Shakespeare, see Dobson, cited above. See also Jonathan Brody Kramnick, “The Making of the English Canon,” *PMLA* 112 (1997): 1087-1101. An early example of the term’s application to drama is the title of Ben Jonson’s 1616 folio, *The Works of Benjamin Jonson*.

SHAKESPEARE'S INNER MUSIC

Michael Witmore, *University of Wisconsin-Madison*

Early modern theories of musical affection tended to describe it as a remote capacity for touch: music was a refined substance or subtle vibration that penetrated the senses and moved directly to affect the animal spirits or soul.¹ Francis Bacon, for example, employs a rhetoric of palpation in his *Sylva Sylvarum* (1628, 1658). He refers to both ancient authority and empirical observation when he holds:

It hath beene anciently held, and observed, that the Sense of Hearing and the Kindes of Musicke, have most Operation on manners . . . The Cause is, for the Sense of Hearing striketh the Spirits more immediately than the other Senses and more corporeally than Smelling; for the Sight, Taste, and Feeling, have their Organs, not of so present and immediate Access to the Spirites, as the hearing hath . . . but Harmony, entering easily and mingling not at all, and Coming with a manifest Motion: doth by custome of often Affecting the Spirits, and Putting them into one kind of Posture, alter not a little the Nature of the Spirits even when the Object is removed.²

On Bacon's interpretation, the "manifest Motion" of the affective force of sound is imparted more immediately and more corporeally than that of the other senses, for example that of vision or smell. These latter senses do not strike the body quite the same way, mingling as they do with the organs of sense themselves. The formal qualities of harmony, on the other hand, its ability to structure differences of pitch in elegant proportions, allows music to pass along the sensory conduits to the animal spirits with ease. In essence, Bacon is describing a world in which individuals are surrounded by a continuous envelope of air, stretching like a tympanum between possible sources of sound and their eventual receptors deep within.

From a certain perspective, not much has changed since Bacon speculated on the mechanism of musical affection in the early seventeenth century. We still believe that music is a kind of vibration which ultimately moves or touches the individual in some way, although the mechanism is understood to be set of bones connected to the brain rather than a chain of sensory transactions linked to the animal spirits, passions, or soul. Music itself, however, must compete with images in our visual environment in ways that diminish the music's affective priority as it is understood by Bacon.³ As Martin Jay has argued, vision becomes a primary object of critique in twentieth-century French thought, in part because of the pervasive role played by images in contemporary life.⁴ If we think only about treatments of film from that period, there is now an entire branch of film theory dealing with the primacy of vision as part of the larger "apparatus" in which the individual film viewer participates.⁵ But if music no longer dominates the byways of psychic and affective life in the way it once might have done, we still talk about it in terms of its capacity to

move or strike a listener. We still, that is, think of music's power in haptic or palpative terms.

Such terms are important because they shift discussion away from sensory mechanisms toward an analysis of the dramatic or poetic medium. What would it mean, for example, to think about a *fictional* power of musical touch, one that carries across the warm night air of created theatrical space? If a poetic creation is, as Marianne Moore once claimed, an "imaginary garden," is music yet another one of the real things in that garden (like the toad in her example), or is it, too, unreal?⁶ In what way might the unreality or ontological incompleteness of music actually allow for the kind of contact effects we associate with moving emotional drama? In this essay, I want to propose a number of ideas about how song and character interact in Shakespeare's plays, not in order to explore some underlying physiology or cultural history of sound, but in order to see how the dramaturgy of Shakespeare's plays encourages forms of intimate contact mediated by song.⁷ The possibility that music might touch a listener onstage (or indirectly, in the audience) is a particularly powerful one in the examples I examine below, which are taken from both film and theater. These examples illustrate the formal and emotional possibilities that arise when music becomes part of the built environment of a play—when it is both *of* the fictional world as well as *in* it. As I examine scenes from Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* (1609–10), from Baz Luhrmann's *William Shakespeare's Romeo + Juliet* (1996) and from Trevor Nunn's *Twelfth Night* (1996), I will be arguing that some of the most profound theatrical and emotional effects in renderings of Shakespeare's plays are brought about when music becomes a *mode of address*, awakening individuals to some occulted source of sound that is only implied in the physical scene they confront in the theater.

Theater is different from film, of course, and it is important to recognize that each medium furnishes its own distinct structural resources and conventions to playwrights, companies and directors looking to create intelligible narratives. Because playing occurred in the open air during daylight hours, the stage at the Globe, for example, did not support lighting effects that might focus audience attention on particular areas of the stage. The camera conventions of Hollywood film, on the other hand, assume that a spectator's consciousness can be channeled through particular points of view during the course of the narrative, encouraging spectators to identify with a character (usually male) by suggesting that the camera itself (the apparatus of film) is structurally aligned with that character's point of view.⁸ Conversely, the very presence of the filmic image implies the absence of a phenomenal actor and thus character, denying film the opportunity to tailor a particular performance to the mood or reactions of audience members. Such differences are by now well-known and are perhaps particularly conspicuous to critics familiar with film adaptations of stage plays.

Such differences between the two media, however, should not obscure other important qualities that they share. Particularly with respect to noises and music, both film and theater incorporate sounds into performances whose source is not visible within the spectacle. In cinema, for example, extra-diegetic music—which is to say, music that is not being presented by a performer or sound source that really

exists within the narrative (e.g., a radio in the corner of the frame)—is conventionally understood to stand outside or alongside the action depicted. The soundtrack has an ambiguous relationship to the cinematic experience, possessed of a being that is simultaneously part of the universe being depicted but also present throughout the whole of the cinematic universe in a way that particular characters, in their spatial and numerical punctuality, are not. Sometimes characters onscreen produce music that is augmented by the soundtrack—as we will see in the final song of Feste in Trevor Nunn’s *Twelfth Night* (1996), which is gradually taken over by the soundtrack in a closing merger of intra- and extra-diegetic musics—and sometimes they are sequestered from it (characters in the shipwreck scene from the same film are swept up in the waves but deaf to the booming swells of the soundtrack). Such “partitioning” and “merging” is also possible on the theatrical stage. As Mary Chan has argued with respect to music in the Renaissance children’s theater companies, it is possible to distinguish between “expressive music” which addresses the audience directly and whose source is not “in” the illusory world of the drama, and “affective music,” which is interior to the dramatic illusion and interacts with (or is produced by) the characters.⁹ Chan’s notion of address is important, since it implies that in certain circumstances, music (like a glance or a linguistic call) has an awakening and directional appeal: it has the ability to rouse its addressee with the sense that he or she is somehow *meant* to hear what is hanging in the air.

Given the ability of both stage and screen to partition music’s address and locate its source within or outside the world of the story, it should not be surprising that both media occasionally stage “awakening” moments in which a music not visibly sourced seems to become audible within the world of the fiction. The magical revival of Thaisa in scene 12 of *Pericles*, for example, could have been staged so that hidden musicians played the enlivening music “within” (77) that brings her back to life.¹⁰ In *The Winter’s Tale*, too, hidden music could have been used to create an audible “push” that sets the music-box figure of Hermione into animated motion. The haptic rhetoric surrounding this moment of revival is unmistakable in Paulina’s command: “Music; awake her; strike!” (5.3.98). Stage historians Andrew Gurr and Mariko Ichikawa point out that the stages of both the Globe and Blackfriars theaters allowed for a “hidden” source of music by assembling musicians in a curtained music room atop the balcony.¹¹ David Lindley, moreover, has argued that the “impersonal” music issuing from this curtained “music room” would have been associated with “magic and the unworldly.”¹² While there is clearly someone onstage directing this music with audible cues in these scenes (Cerimon, Paulina), the theatrical effect is premised on the notion that something apparently disembodied—music wafting out and over the performance space—can be all the more magical for its apparent “invisibility.”¹³

Indeed, while Shakespeare is recognized as being sensitive to probability in sourcing the music that characters recognize, he seems nevertheless to want to hide that source from the characters who are most intimately touched by it. As Ferdinand emerges from the sea in *The Tempest*, for example, he is “drawn” on by a strange music that is—from the vantage point of Prospero, Miranda and the audience—visibly produced by Ariel, who is himself (according to the Folio stage direction) “invisible, playing and singing.” Yet as John Long points out, Ariel’s lute music was most likely

augmented “in the great hall” by instrumental support, since the lute may not have been loud enough to carry off the almost metaphysical action assigned to it.¹⁴ The result would have been a striking series of divergent music partitions, with Ferdinand hearing both Ariel and accompanying musicians but seeing neither; Prospero and Miranda looking on at Ariel’s punctually sourced music with perhaps little curiosity about its source; and the audience seeing and hearing Ariel, but also noticing the presumably hidden music of the consort that Ferdinand directs their attention to when he says, “I hear it [the song] now above me” (1.2.411). Like Ferdinand, the audience too is touched by a music that is neither “i’th’ air or th’earth” (2.1.391): the “inner” music he hears is thus structurally similar to the music drawing the audience into the illusion of Prospero’s contrived world.

Such drawings or awakenings resemble what Louis Althusser called an “interpellation”—an address from an uncertain source of sound (the authority who calls out “Hey, you there!” from behind the individual) which awakens some latent receptivity-to-address in the one who acknowledges the call.¹⁵ The voice of music, that is, could be the mode by which the theatrical world as a whole or its ambiguous forces interrupt thought or awaken action from *within* the individual, precisely because its moment of address is somehow occulted or buried in the authority of the drama itself—the apparatus of its made world. While I don’t think that the state has a monopoly on interpellating power, as Althusser suggests in his analysis, I do believe the inner obligating structure of the interpellating call and response are quite useful for understanding the function of music in Shakespeare’s productions. We see this awakening mechanism at work explicitly in *Cymbeline*, first in the scene of “solemn music” that recalls Belarius and Guiderius from their pastoral outing (reminding them of the universal laws of burial and hospitality) and second—and here much more powerfully—in the musical address to Posthumous from his family and Jupiter. Both moments call attention quite precisely to the uncertain place of music in the theatrical universe and, consequently, the ways in which this ambiguity can work to arrest or take hold of a character who swims in the ambient soundscape of the dramatist’s created world.

It is an “ingenious instrument” that calls Belarius and Guiderius back to their dwelling (4.2.187), a refocusing of attention that precedes Arviragus’ arrival with the apparently dead body of Innogen. The Arden editor notes that the “ingenious instrument”—perhaps a mechanical device that spontaneously produces a song—is associated with the previous death of the boys’ (assumed) mother, Euriphile. The quickly sketched possibility of such a device represents Shakespeare’s nod to the laws of probability: how else is he to account for elaborate music sprouting up in the outlands of Wales?¹⁶ Such devices for the production of “automated music” were known and praised in the period, a particularly elaborate one having been created by Thomas Dallum for the Sultan of Turkey during Elizabeth’s reign. The musical contraptions and automata of civic pageantry (Lord Mayors’ shows, Coronation Entries into the City of London) regularly involved mechanical figures that simulated “spontaneous” music which was actually produced from musicians in a hidden location.¹⁷ The “solemn music” in this scene is not so much automatic as self-creating: whatever the fictional device that produces it, it has been set into mo-

tion by the touch of Arviragus who then enters the scene accompanied by the grim soundtrack, Innogen limp in his arms. Innogen, of course, does not hear this music; nor does she hear the voices of her brothers or the dirge that is eventually sung over her body at burial. But in the music that precedes the appearance of Innogen as “corpse,” the audience is actually playing catch-up with Guiderius and Belarius where the source of the music is concerned. They have never seen this contraption; it is a fiction of the fiction. The call of that instrument, then, serves to solemnize the entrance of Arviragus with the body while alerting the audience to the fact that a mysterious transaction has just occurred within the plot. No single character could have willed the overdetermined series of events which brought Innogen to drink a false restorative poison in Milford-haven, just as no character could have “willed” the hyperbolic coincidence of Cloten’s encounter with his killer while wearing the clothes of Posthumous. One cannot account for the source of such confluences; it is as mysterious as the harmony that emanates from Belarius’ hidden device. The sound of that device, then, recalls spectators to the overwhelming artifice of the play itself and the occulted source of its strange, pervasively operative self-reordering.

A more dramatic effect occurs, again with the aid of “solemn music,” when Posthumous encounters his relatives and the god Jupiter as he lies sleeping in jail (5.5.123). Here again, music most likely begins offstage—from that non-place in the theater where sleep or fantasy dwells?—as Posthumous’ father, mother, and brothers circle him while narrating his trials in the quaint fourteeners that were by this time a deliberate archaism. The mix of these speeches, punctually delivered from characters onstage, has merged with the ambient call of the offstage music to summon Jupiter from the heavens. Having been roused to “ope” his “crystal window” (5.5.175), Jupiter—who presumably hears everything everywhere—descends on a mechanical device with the crack of a thunderbolt, shifting the rhetorical tone of the scene as he begins speaking again in blank verse. The end result? Posthumous is recalled both to his absent family and to a more conscientious resolve, one that springs from the “golden chance” (5.5.226) of the dream and the prophecy that appears on his chest. The most dramatic moment of the scene, perhaps, is the one that occurs when the music of sleep quiets and the hero wakes up having “heard” what was intended for him. If we were to think of this music, albeit anachronistically, as the swelling soundtrack of Shakespeare’s play, it has clearly reached even the hearing of the hero, who is also in some sense now a “hear-o.”¹⁸

For the sake of contrast, we can now turn to a moment where a character literally interacts with the soundtrack: the final song by Feste in Trevor Nunn’s *Twelfth Night*.¹⁹ Nunn’s film has received substantial critical approval and rarely escapes comment in anthologies treating film adaptations of Shakespeare’s plays (unlike Luhrmann’s film treated below). Nunn’s film regularly weaves together intra- and extra-diegetic music in ways that confuse what might be inside and outside the space of the story. As men walk jauntily toward Olivia’s estate, for example, their movements are glossed by an ambient organ music which, after a quick cut to the exterior of the building, is revealed to be organ music playing within Olivia’s chapel. In the opening scenes, moreover, an almost continuous musical score serves as the aural equivalent of a long cinematic tracking shot, following the story as it unfolds

with patient, almost intelligent “eyes” as each change of fortune is registered in the string section of Shaun Davey’s score. When the film opens, it presents spectators with a black screen and the voice of Feste singing “When that I was and a little tiny boy,” the song that Shakespeare wrote for the ending of the play. Wherever that voice comes from—eventually we will surmise that it belongs to Feste, who is seen sitting on the rocks humming this tune as the survivors dredge themselves onto land—it seems to originate in the same place as the cinematic image does.²⁰ This “point of enunciation” will be illuminated and occluded in various ways as the film continues, a dynamic that is most fully exploited in the final scene of the film.

Feste begins singing after Malvolio’s humiliation, just as the soundtrack has begun to sound the opening bars of his song in muted strings. The camera cuts to an exterior shot as Sir Andrew leaves Olivia’s estate by carriage; meanwhile a bodhran (a celtic hand drum) enters the composition as support, driving this “summing up” visual sequence as the film prepares to detach its own fictional world from the viewers’ own. Carrying his lute off into the hills, Feste sings louder and louder while, inside the estate, the wedding feast begins. Characters are returned to their original gender roles, dancing to the music as credits roll; the scene shifts to Feste sitting atop the shore of Illyria now, looking away from the camera as he sings his song over the soundtrack: “that’s all one, my tale is done and I’ll strive to please you every day.” Slowly his eyes turn to meet the gaze of the camera, he sings the last line again, then in a speaking voice he repeats “every day” as the soundtrack takes over once and for all. Feste walks into the hills and the credits resume. Here the superiority of Feste as onlooker and quasi-musical narrator of the film has aroused his interest in the camera and brought him face to face with the spectator. We thought we were “listening in” on the soundtrack, but now that he has been hailed by the camera, we too are placed in Feste’s position. Shakespeare’s inner music has been heard twice, first by the clown, and then by the audience who is itself exiting the film.

A final comparison will show just how powerful this dynamic of “awakening” to hidden music can be, albeit in reverse. One of the most powerful uses of exit music in recent filmmaking occurs at the end of Luhrmann’s *William Shakespeare’s Romeo + Juliet*. Radiohead’s “Exit Music (For a Film)” was written by the group’s singer Thom Yorke after he was shown the final half hour of the film.²¹ As the film rolls toward its conclusion, Romeo and Juliet are now dead and the epilogue has been delivered in the person of a newscaster, whose speaking image has given way to white noise / snow on a television screen that slowly recedes into blackness. There is nothing left to say, and possibly no one around to hear it. Reverb-treated chords of an acoustic guitar begin and Yorke’s voice floats on top of the credits rolling on the empty screen:

Wake, from your sleep
The drying of your tears.
Today we escape, we escape.

Pack and get dressed
Before your father hears us.
Before all hell breaks loose. . . .

The song is jarring because it is very clearly delivered in the form of an interpellating address or command—“Wake, from your sleep”—while its obvious auditors (Romeo and Juliet, now lifeless in the church) are unable to hear it. The absence of the apparent auditor is crucial for the emotional effect of the credits, because the second and third stanzas of Yorke’s composition are offered as an intervention in some alternative *Romeo and Juliet* in which the two flee Verona Beach after falling in love. This is the song Jupiter would have sung to the sleeping lovers had he descended from the heavens in act 3, providing a divine, romance intervention into a plot that otherwise surges toward disaster. But now it is the departed Romeo who seems to be singing, not a Roman god, since the singing voice wants to leave “before your father hears us.” By the time the fourth stanza arrives, the lovers are already dead (in a “chill”) and so listening for something that will sustain them—perhaps the song that is being sung for the spectators as the credits continue to roll. The song climaxes on “now we are one” (perhaps the one voice that is singing), ending with a flat recrimination:

Sing us a song, a song to keep us warm.
There’s such a chill, such a chill. . . .

And now we are one
in everlasting peace,

we hope that you choke, that you choke,
we hope that you choke, that you choke,
we hope that you choke, that you choke.

The cinematic power of “Exit Music” is that it doesn’t speak to anyone: its origin and addressee are dead, but *the hearing* of this disembodied music is nevertheless implied. Something like an ontological leveling has taken place here between the film itself and the audience attending to it. Listening to that music, the audience may recognize that it now occupies the counterfactual space from which the music—the soundtrack with no singer—emanates, a form of co-habitation that makes it available for that music’s indirect form of touch or awakening. A new creature has arrived in the imaginary garden.

As film theorist Jean-Louis Baudry once noted, the ideological function of cinema is to substitute the apparatus of film (the camera, projector, microphones, speakers) for the sense organs that are somehow exhausted by the task of fully assembling a world in narrative form. The fiction of cinema, that is, involves the “preservat[ion] at any cost [of] the synthetic unity of the locus where meaning originates [the subject]—the constituting transcendental function to which narrative continuity points back as its natural secretion.”²² Shakespeare’s audience in the theater or cinema is similarly addressed by an orienting “inner music”: when they recognize that call or touch, they are often occupying an intermediary space (a dream?) where all of the sonic partitions at work in plays and film are conspicuous—the sonic and visual vantage point of synthesis. We can agree with Baudry, I

think, that such a vantage point and the synthesis it implies is a trick of art, not a privilege of nature. Both Shakespeare and his cinematic interpreters have made use of such arts, and the effects or conventions that have resulted are a matter of history, not transcendental psychology. The specific wonder of this music, however, lies not in its ability to create and pass through spaces that structure his narrative fictions. It is rather the synaesthetic mode implied by those structures, a mode of apprehension and receptivity that is specifically indebted to sound and its roving, ambiguous origins. Whether exhorting or rueful, the inner music of Shakespeare's theatrical or cinematic universe must ultimately be heard unseen.

Notes

1. The underpinnings of such theories could be either neo-Platonic or materialist, or a mixture of both. See Linda Austern, *Music and English Children's Drama of the Later Renaissance* (Philadelphia: Gordon and Breach, 1992), 167-71 and ch. 8; and John H. Long, *Shakespeare's Use of Music: A Study of the Music and its Performance in the Original Production of Seven Comedies* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1961), 25-33. On the material status of sound (for example, in the spoken word), see Gina Bloom, *Voice in Motion: Staging Gender, Shaping Sound in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), ch. 1.
2. Francis Bacon, *Sylva sylvarum, or, a natural history in ten centuries* (London: Thomas Williams, 1658), 31-32.
3. On the place of sound in the history of the senses, see Jonathan Sterne, *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 2-3.
4. Martin Jay, *Downcast Eyes: On the Denigration of Vision in Twentieth-Century French Thought* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).
5. The classic account of visual identification with apparatus in Hollywood cinema is that of Laura Mulvey in her "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema," *Screen* 16 (1975): 6-18. Attempts have been made to mediate between this primarily visual account of the film apparatus (articulated alongside a psychic one) and the sound regime of cinema, for example, Kaja Silverman's *The Acoustic Mirror: The Female Voice in Psychoanalysis and Cinema* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1988).
6. Marianne Moore, "Poetry," *Complete Poems* (New York: Penguin, 1994), 36.
7. Elsewhere I explore the haptic reach of sound—its function as a "pervasive form of theatrical touch"—in *Shakespearean Metaphysics* (London: Continuum, 2008), ch. 4.
8. Mulvey's article lays out the formal workings of this regime, although its psychoanalytic underpinnings have certainly been challenged.
9. Mary Chan, *Music in the Theatre of Ben Jonson* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), 37-38.
10. William Shakespeare, *The Norton Shakespeare*, 3rd ed., ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: Norton, 2008). Unless otherwise noted, all subsequent references to Shakespeare are to this edition.

80 *The Upstart Crow*

11. Andrew Gurr and Mariko Ichikawa, *Staging in Shakespeare's Theatres* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
12. David Lindley, *Shakespeare and Music* (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006), 228. On the logistics of cuing musicians in the “music room,” see Long, *Shakespeare's Use of Music: A Study of the Music and its Performance in the Original Production of Seven Comedies*, 42. Long points out here that when Shakespeare did place the source of music onstage, he was “careful to identify the musicians through the lips of the characters and to inform his audience why they were present.”
13. This “striking up” or animation effect was also present in early modern civic pageantry, which paired music with automated motion to suggest that the civic world had become an artfully contrived universe. See Michael Witmore, *Pretty Creatures: Children and Fiction in the English Renaissance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007), ch. 2.
14. John H. Long, *Shakespeare's Use of Music: The Final Comedies* (New York: Da Capo, 1977), 114.
15. Another word for that receptivity is subjectivity. Louis Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, trans. B. Brewster (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971), 170-77. Althusser says that the examples in this groundbreaking essay occur in a theoretical “theater.” One wonders how theoretically neutral the acoustic / theatrical assumptions involved in his “mise en scène,” 177, of interpellation really are: couldn't it be the implied sonic practices of theater itself that transform sensation (the call) into a politically subjugating form of address in such a theory?
16. William Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*, ed. Roger Warren (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), Appendix B.2.
17. See Witmore, *Pretty Creatures*, chs. 2 and 4.
18. One thinks, of course, of Bruce Smith's contention that sound, and particularly the letter “O,” is a sonic intersection where various self-calibrating systems—language, the social world, the drama—are synchronized. See Bruce R. Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).
19. *Twelfth Night*, directed by Trevor Nunn (1996).
20. In the terms used by film theorists, the narrating vocal performance here (which subsequently is shown to originate with a character) is aligned with the cinematic apparatus or discursive origin. According to Silverman, 51-52, this “exterior” point of enunciation is usually coded male in classic Hollywood cinema, and gains increased authority when it is discursive (the voice-over). The theatrical corollary of this type of visual partitioning of space in the service of gender differentiation would be the theater's attempt to manage hearing and non-hearing, the gender significance of which Bloom (ch. 3) has elegantly demonstrated.
21. Radiohead, “Exit Music (For a Film),” *OK Computer* (Capitol, 1997). For lyrics, see <http://www.greenplastic.com/lyrics/exitmusic.php>, accessed November 4, 2010.
22. Jean-Louis Baudry, “Ideological Effects of the Basic Apparatus,” *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology*, ed. Philip Rosen (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 293.



PERFORMANCE REVIEWS





Dominic Rowan as the title role in *Henry VIII* at Shakespeare's Globe. Photograph by John Tramper.



THE 2010 SEASON AT LONDON'S GLOBE THEATRE

Michael W. Shurgot, *Seattle, WA*
Peter J. Smith, *Nottingham Trent University*

This review presents an experiment, an essay written jointly by two authors on four Shakespeare plays from the 2010 London Globe season. While in previous years, each of us has reviewed the entire Globe season, scheduling difficulties required us to share the reviewing assignment this year; Michael reviewed *2 Henry IV* and *Henry VIII*, while Peter reviewed *1 Henry IV* and *Macbeth*. Rather than seeing this arrangement as a difficulty, we believe that it has produced an intriguing essay.

Our combined review offers disparate yet informed and cogent responses to individual productions and also addresses the disadvantage of the usual single-authored format, which enforces perhaps too much uniformity of perspective from production to production, season to season. Each of us reviews productions from his own critical perspective, especially regarding the use of the Globe stage, and each of us emphasizes different elements of these productions; nonetheless, we saw the productions at the same theatre with many of the same actors, all working under Artistic Director Dominic Dromgoole. Our essay therefore examines from two vantage points the work of one company in one season that Dromgoole entitled “Kings & Rogues.” Each of us had a share of both kings and rogues, especially in the *Henry IV* plays. Our hope is that readers will find in this essay informed reviews that, while written independently, provide a balanced approach to the productions and perhaps a broader sense of both the strengths and weakness of the 2010 Globe season than might appear in a single individual’s review. The order of the discussion of plays—*1 Henry IV*, *2 Henry IV*, *Macbeth*, *Henry VIII*—will allow readers to contrast our critical perspectives as they read.

1 Henry IV (Peter J. Smith)

Given the fact that most English schoolchildren have studied *Hamlet* or *Romeo and Juliet*, my own undergraduate syllabus considers history plays and comedies. While one might confidently assume that the *Henry IV* plays could be included in the former group, this Globe production insisted that they might more profitably be read in comic terms. It is not that these categories are exclusive of each other, merely that the Globe’s tendency towards populism demanded and got, in the shape of Roger Allam’s Falstaff, an abiding comic presence which seemed quite to outweigh the plays’ more serious questions to do with the nature of political power, the ethics or otherwise of rebellion, or the early modern obsession with good counsel. All of these topics are conspicuous in the text but Dromgoole chose rather to have them take a backseat while Allam’s Falstaff deftly took the wheel of this potentially unwieldy theatrical juggernaut.

In his effort to prioritize the comic aspects of the plays, Dromgoole made certain decisions which, of necessity, deformed their dramatic balance. Perhaps most obvi-

ously he prefixed to each part a crude mummers' play, staged on a narrow platform which had been built in the middle of the pit. This platform was not used in the course of the main plays and so served to emphasize the extrinsic nature of the mumming. Indeed, given the brilliance of the opening of *2 HIV* with Rumor's nefarious whispers, the mumming seemed wholly intrusive and irrelevant. The same could be said of the opening of *1 HIV*: Henry's tortured speech racked by the guilt of Richard's usurpation, which we have witnessed towards the end of *Richard II*, needs no prologue. But Dromgoole, perhaps assuming that his audience knows little or nothing of the previous story, felt that beginning *in medias res* might be confusing, though the textual openings were both retained, each following the respective mummers' play that preceded it.



***1 Henry IV*: Jamie Parker as Prince Hal and Roger Allam as Falstaff. Photo by John Haynes.**

In both cases the mummers' plays rehearsed standard slapstick stuff: sexuality, drunkenness, and cuckoldry. They added little except to register the medieval inheritance of Shakespeare's *Henry IVs* and, in so doing, to emphasize the role of the Vice that is Falstaff, even before he had appeared. The addition of the mummers' plays thus worked on two levels: tonally it defined the world of the plays as a comical, farcical place, and so reduced the significance of the court scenes. Structurally it underlined the centrality of Falstaff as a Vice figure and so announced Dromgoole's intention to treat the epic as little more than horseplay. In making Falstaff the pro-

ductions' presiding deity, Dromgoole was putting *Henry IV's* eggs into a single comic basket. This is certainly a feasible option and, given the uniquely heterogeneous audience at the Globe, an understandable one. But it flattens the complexities of the plays and, in spite of the brilliance of Allam, there was a sense that much of their intricate political texture had been ironed out.

One of the casualties of the "comedy-before-all-else" approach in *1 HIV* was the characterization of Hal, played by David Cameron look-alike, Jamie Parker. His first entrance was preceded by a whore rubbing herself between the legs. He followed her up onto the stage out of the trap, his gaskins around his ankles and smiling lasciviously. Repeatedly, the complexity of the Prince's Machiavellian dissimulations was simplified in order to render him Falstaff's comic sidekick. During the profoundly awkward 3.2 in which Hal is upbraided by his father for his dissolute behavior, the Prince sat hunched in a chair, his legs and arms folded, and shrugging with boredom like a grounded teenager. There was a sense that his comic spirit was misunderstood by the King and his adolescent petulance was unequal to his imminent assumption of royal power. This made the sudden clasp and embrace at "I am your son" (3.2.134) oddly out of kilter with his prevailing characterization.¹ His polished martial discipline in the latter half of the play seemed entirely to belong to a different personality.

Hal's mighty opposite, Hotspur, was another casualty of the production's comic fixation. Hotspur does have some funny moments, not least when winding Glendower up about his magical powers, but he also represents chivalric nobility which even his enemies respect and defer to. Sam Crane played him as a Puck-like imp, jumping about the stage and rolling his eyes, as if he had overdosed on the production's comic potion. In the case of Hotspur this imposition of levity was even more of a problem than with Hal. As the character enters at the top of 2.4 he is reading a conspirator's cowardly letter withdrawing from the planned rebellion. Hotspur is furious but resolves to carry on without him. Unaccountably this moment of high politics was completely colonized by the production's slapstick: as Hotspur pondered the letter, his groom entered carrying a saddle. As the groom walked over the stage, Hotspur chased him in order to kick him up the arse. The groom exited in a hurry. What was the point of this except to lighten up a scene of serious politics and show Hotspur to be not a rebelling aristocrat but a madcap joker?

The Welsh scene contains a woeful pathos in the inability of Mortimer (played here by Daon Broni) to converse with his wife (Jade Williams): "This is the deadly spite that angers me: / My wife can speak no English, I no Welsh" (3.1.188-89). But unsurprisingly, the production took the comic way out—the line raised a huge audience laugh. Hotspur's banter with Lady Percy (Lorna Stuart) was spoken over the top of the Welsh singing rather than allowing it to create any feeling of its own. As a consequence of the investment in comedy, the court scenes felt oddly out of place. At the opening even the King himself was singing and clapping before the tone suddenly shifted to "So shaken as we are, so wan with care" (1.1.1). Oliver Cotton did his best to register the fading potency of the once mighty Bolingbroke; for instance, as he listed Hotspur's prisoners he needed to be nudged to remember their names: "Murray, Angus and [long pause before one of his courtier's stage whispers] Monte-

ith” (1.1.73). And as his fury took over in response to Hotspur’s refusal to surrender his prisoners, he coughed and spluttered and supported himself by grasping the throne. It was as though the production was alert to these political dimensions but had decided, in the main, to avoid their protracted interrogation.

The prioritization of comedy reached its apotheosis in Roger Allam’s Falstaff: the entire production was designed to hinge on his superb performance. In places



Roger Allam as Falstaff. Photo by John Haynes.

the humor was base: as he climbed up onto the stage, his bum level with the face of one of the groundlings, he spoke of his need to “break my wind” (2.2.14) which he then did and wafted the fart with his cloak to huge audience groans of approval. Later he used his dagger to pick his nose and, as if it were a great delicacy, licked the offending snot off the dagger’s tip. But these cheap pranks belied the brilliance of Allam’s deft performance. Falstaff’s role is full of weird and ridiculous insults or challenges—“if I fought not with fifty of them, I am a bunch of radish” (2.5.187) or “you bull’s pizzle, you stock-fish” (249). In Allam’s dark and fruity voice, and preceded by the tiniest of pauses, these ingenious imprecations felt new-minted and came across as side-splittingly funny. But Allam was also able to capture the sophistication of his now dilapidated knight. When he

spoke to the Prince of their being “Diana’s foresters, gentlemen of the shade, minions of the moon” (1.2.26), there was an epic, albeit faded, grandeur to his stance and his voice. This was no one-dimensional comic turn. His hyperbole and hypocrisy during the account of the Gads Hill robbery were the perfect vehicle for Allam’s skillful, protean performance—a master class in comic wiliness. Addressing what appears to be Falstaff’s body, the Prince talks of having it “Embowed” (5.4.108). Allam waited patiently before rising with an outraged “EMBOWELLED?!” which raised probably the biggest laugh of the evening. It was a real joy to see Shakespeare’s comic scenarios delivered with such aplomb. Right at the production’s close, Falstaff crept back onstage. The spectators began their riotous applause. He held his hands out and appealed for silence as though he had another speech to give. The audience, eating out of his hand, went perfectly quiet. Throwing his arms above his head and laughing, he gestured for applause: his control of the enraptured audience was total. Not since Mark Rylance has the Globe found an actor who is able to control the space in such a superlative manner.

The way Dromgoole has constructed the shows around this single performance may be a simplification of their intricacies but it is one which, given the Globe's unique audience demographic, works here. Of course, in light of the centrality of Allam's performance, its true test might be to run with the understudy in the role of Falstaff. Let's just hope Allam stays healthy for the duration of the season.

2 *Henry IV* (Michael W. Shurgot)

For the *Henry IV* plays Dromgoole wanted spectators to know that his plays were going to transform the theatre into the setting for crucial events in English history. Round the façade of the balcony, as around the circumference of the world, were tacked numerous emblems of royal English families connected to the time of Henry IV. Well enough; the Globe as England. But like Mark Rosenblatt, the director of *Henry VIII* (more anon), Dromgoole could not leave the Globe stage well enough alone. As he did for *1 HIV*, designer Jonathan Fensom erected for *2 HIV* a huge, two-level scaffolding of 4 x 4 timbers, about ten feet deep and flush with the stage façade, that reached from the floor up to the musicians' room. As this scaffolding was used infrequently during *2 HIV*, I do not understand why it was constructed at all. Hanging from this scaffold as the play began was a large, dirty, tattered banner bearing royal crests, including the Three Lions, full of holes and obviously symbolizing the state of England under Henry IV. While the scaffold provided a place to hang the large banner, it could also have hung from the upper stage. Dromgoole seemed unable to imagine staging his play without altering in some ways the Globe's perfectly adequate stage.

Once the mummers' play had finished, one of the mummers (Barbara Marten, who also played Mistress Quickly) transformed into Rumor, keeping the same Elizabethan motley, goblin nose, and protruding codpiece. Rumor's Prologue was split among the former mummers, suggesting the potency of rumors that were spoken by many voices, none of them true, scattered around the stage. Christopher Godwin as a tall, slender Northumberland, "crafty-sick" and all in black, stumbled about the stage as if not knowing where to stand or what to do after hearing the truth from Morton about Harry Monmouth's victory. No such uncertainty plagued Sir John Falstaff. From his first entrance in 1.2, Roger Allam played Falstaff as a man utterly bemused by his own exaggerated self-confidence. In dashing red cloak and hose and shiny black boots, his brave new livery since Shrewsbury, absolutely nothing would hinder his *joie de vivre* or his march to the seat of English power that he was sure the passage of time would bring. He entered eating off a plate full of cakes, some of which he threw at the groundlings stage left, commenting, as if emphasizing his ready wit, that food from the stage was the "only thing that is free around here." Having ingratiated himself with the groundlings, he proceeded to vanquish the Lord Chief Justice with his plea of deafness and then deliberately talked past what the Justice was saying while calling him "My good lord" and "your lordship" as if respecting his authority. Patrick Brennan as the Chief Justice left the stage utterly flummoxed, and Allam's strong voice and obvious self-confidence established the stage as his improvisational territory, much as did his dramatic antecedent the Vice in earlier morality plays.

Given Allam's dominating stage presence, York and his fellow conspirators, though essential to the plot, were far less engaging than Falstaff and his grubby minions in Eastcheap. Paul Rider as Archbishop York, who in an intriguing choice doubled as Bardolph, and Daon Broni as Hastings, conveyed forcefully their fellow conspirators' sincere belief in their mission, convinced that the "divisions" lingering in the kingdom after Shrewsbury warranted their ultimate success. As Hastings asserts, "So is the unfirm King / In three divided, and his coffers sound / With hollow poverty and emptiness" (1.3. 73-75). Divisions multiplied with Mistress Quickly's ranting against Falstaff. She chased him around the stage and only the entrance of the Lord Chief Justice saved Falstaff from a thrashing. Yet Falstaff's charm silenced her as his wit had overborne the Justice earlier. Allam's portrayal of Falstaff's jovial self-confidence throughout the play created moments of marvelous hilarity, but ironically set up the fat knight for a painful fall in Act 5 at the end of his midnight ride.

2 HIV, like *1 HIV*, focuses on the triangular relationships among Hal and his two "fathers," the King and Falstaff, each old, each a thief, and each wishing Hal were more loyal to him than he appears to be. In 2.2 Jamie Parker as Hal, dressed in green jacket and white ruff, appeared at the top of the scaffold with Poin, standing symbolically *above* the space that would be both the Boar's Head and the King's court. Hal lowered onto a table a hook at the end of a long rope with which he snared a cup, presumably for sack, a trick Falstaff taught him. Back downstage Hal was both sufficiently sad about his father's sickness and sufficiently depressed at his continued association with such "vile company" (2.2.46) as Poin. Yet he was deeply moved by Poin's assertion that Hal has been a hypocrite because he has been "so lewd and so much engrafted to Falstaff" (58-59). Bardolph was a ragged drunk, a symbol of the lewdness of the tavern, and his scripted presence here as Falstaff's filthy messenger certainly reified Hal's growing discontent with the Boar's Head and its denizens. Parker expressed clearly the essential dichotomy of Hal's character at this moment and thus played Hal's plot to catch Falstaff "in his true colors" (162) as a necessary act of "purpose" rather than "folly" (168).

Gender relationships in this production told us much about the exercise of power. In contrast to Mistress Quickly and her comic railing against Falstaff, Lady Percy (Lorna Stuart), draped in black, was deadly serious in her brief appearance. With bitter anger she accused Northumberland of having abandoned Hotspur, and urged him to cease the wars that so delight the men in Shakespeare's history plays and that had taken her husband's life. In the following tavern scene, Dromgoole created hilarious contrasts that delighted spectators but also drowned the truth of Lady Percy's words. Mistress Quickly and Doll Tearsheet bolted from the back to the front of the stage where Doll vomited several times. After puking all over the groundlings, Doll's response to Quickly's query about her health—"Better than I was. Hem!" (2.4.29)—was hilarious. During Doll's banter with Falstaff, she rolled over, faced him, pulled up her skirts, and then spread her legs. She was indeed Falstaff's girl. The fight following Pistol's swaggering was loud and violent, with knives and swords brandished at throats, cups and plates hurled about, and furniture overturned. Dromgoole's staging emphasized the huge difference between this tavern scene and that of *1 HIV*, which climaxes not with violence but with play. Here, Hal

saw and heard Falstaff in an unguarded moment. Falstaff's insistence that he had dispraised Hal "before the wicked" (318) was a witty riposte, and he damned the lot of them with the same vocal energy he had used earlier, suggesting his continued vitality despite the scene's having revealed just the opposite. The knocking on the doors, as in 2.4 of *I HIV*, summoned Hal back to the wars and Falstaff to the court accompanied by some "dozen captains" (372). Doll blubbered when she said goodbye to her old lover, and again as she ran to him for the last time.

The autumnal cast of the second half of the play was superbly nuanced and sharply contrasted with Falstaff's last hurrahs. Oliver Cotton as King Henry IV, demure and sickly in 3.1, lamented to us, as his subjects, his inability to sleep. Warwick's famous speech about the "history in all men's lives," and his insistence that "a man may prophesy, / With a near aim, of the main chance of things / As yet not come to life" (3.1.80, 82-84), placed in the middle of the play, looks back upon the deeds of Henry, Hal, and Falstaff that have led them to this point in their comingled history and also forecasts their final days. The "hatch and brood of time" (3.1.86) was tenderly evident in Falstaff's visit to Justices Shallow and Silence, who moved slowly if at all and lamented the loss of their lusty youth in slow, scratchy sentences mixed with feeble laughter. Their "soldiers" were predictably ragged, scared, pathetic, and loath to leave their wives who, like Lady Percy, could be widowed by these wars. Allam spoke Falstaff's long soliloquy, wherein he speaks of "fetch[ing] off" (3.2.300) the justices and laments old men's habit of lying, with his customary vigor yet with no trace of recognizing the same habit in himself. Even though by 3.1 the fortunes of others in the play are falling, from the rebels to the tottering old justices and the ladies of the tavern, Allam asserted Falstaff's constant verbal energy and his ability to entertain himself. Yet he ended 3.2 in subdued tones as he acknowledged the power of time to "shape" and "there an end" (331).

Archbishop York spoke dejectedly of the rebels being "all diseased" (4.1.54) by their past and their present quarrels, and the extent of the malady that has befallen Henry's kingdom emerged in Prince John's gleeful but uncivil tricking of the rebel leaders (young men, too, can be given to lying), and in Colville's absurd surrender to the "famous" Sir John Falstaff. As the king lay sick and the rebels were dispatched, Allam proudly promulgated Falstaff's bombastic sermon on the merits of drinking sack from downstage center to a multitude convinced of his creed. Again, Dromgoole's staging and Allam's acting combined to create an entertaining scene that endeared Falstaff to theatre patrons out for a night in London where the local pubs offer a near Boar's Head experience. (Especially afterwards at The Anchor pub: a mashed-up mob!) Yet Falstaff minimized the one melancholy note in his speech: he has no sons, nor is likely to; he cannot spit white, and his girl is a whore. Falstaff dashed gleefully offstage, convinced once again of his invincible wit and his unassailable capacity to entertain himself and others; yet the more entertaining Falstaff seemed to himself, and to us, the harder we all knew he would fall at play's end. Dromgoole and Allam thus conspired to make the scene we don't want to see, but must, as painful as possible. Yet in that success lies the germ of their convincing production of this play.

The long delayed meeting of Hal and his father was genuinely wrenching for both characters. King Henry lay on a pine bed and soft music played as Warwick

placed the crown on the King's pillow. As Hal saw the crown, he at first feared to touch it, as if it were poisoned. Jamie Parker then spoke Hal's lines with increasing confidence that the "imperial crown" was indeed his due from his father, and here the growing assurance of Parker's speech heralded Falstaff's doom. Though Henry had been weary in 3.1 when he lamented his insomnia, here when he awoke he rose on one elbow and lacerated his son with visions of England returning to a "wilderness again" (4.5.135) once Hal had, like his father in *Richard II*, seized the crown. Hal's regret was as severe as his father's anger, and both Cotton and Parker conveyed intense emotional pain in their final dialogue. There was nothing glib or flippant in this genuinely difficult scene; each actor dealt superbly with the underlying Oedipal tensions, and each reacted to the emotional depth of the other with equal intensity.

This beautifully performed scene was the final antidote to Falstaff's presumed self-sufficiency. Hal's deeply felt guilt and his honesty in this scene almost—al-



Jamie Parker as Hal and Oliver Cotton as King Henry IV. Photo by John Haynes.

most—made Hal's denial of Falstaff anticlimactic.² If finally he must be dismissed, let it be done by a man who can feel deeply with and for others, for that is precisely what Falstaff cannot do. As Peter remarks in his review of *1 HIV*, the comic emphasis of that production flattened much of that play's "intricate political texture." That observation also applies to much of *2 HIV* up to 4.5; Allam dominated both productions, creating a larger-than-life Falstaff who denied death in *1 HIV* and steamrolled the stage in *2 HIV*. But after 4.5 one sensed a more powerful *theatrical*

presence in Prince Hal. The arrest of the Eastcheap irregulars in 5.4, roped together and rushed offstage, seemed finally necessary and just.

Shallow's "By cock and pie, sir, you shall not away / tonight.—What, Davy, I say" (5.1.1-2) heralded the invitation to dinner that Falstaff has been seeking since his twice "entreat[ing]" Master Gower to sup with him in 2.1 (181, 186). Shallow knows that Falstaff's men are "arrant knaves" who "will backbite" (5.1.31-32), yet he also knows that "A friend i' the / court is better than a penny in your purse" (29-30). Shallow and Silence, vestiges of the old king's reign who do not know that he, and thus their hopes, are dead, prepared an ironic feast on the eve of inevitable change. Allam laughed himself through Falstaff's final soliloquy, thoroughly amused at how he would "use" Master Shallow to "keep Prince Harry in continual laughter the wearing out of six fashions . . . and a' shall laugh without intervallums" (77-80). In contrast to Allam's giddy self-assurance, Hal and the Lord Chief Justice solemnly faced each other. As they gradually moved together across the stage, they claimed between them the space that had been Falstaff's raucous tavern in both plays. Hal's literally walking *towards* justice, in his "new and gorgeous garment, majesty" (5.2.44) and his humbly calling Lord Chief Justice "father," who "shall have foremost hand" (5.2.139-40) heightened the sadness of the meal spread stage left on blankets in 5.3. As daylight faded around the Globe, the old men enjoyed their last supper in Shallow's orchard and Falstaff, still believing that he was master of the theatre, shared victuals with the groundlings. One last time iconic knocking disrupted Falstaff's midnight jollity and Pistol's news from the court ignited Falstaff's final eruption. He thundered that the laws of England were at his command and littered the stage with food and drink.

As courtiers unfurled a new banner from the scaffold, Falstaff stumbled on stage right and set up an enlarged painting of himself against the pillar; he had prepared carefully for this moment. Trailed by his ragged entourage, he moved to stage left as Henry and his royal train entered stage right and then strode to center. Falstaff bowed obsequiously, and as he straightened, Hal, speaking slowly and assuredly, denied him. Whereas previously Falstaff's booming voice had filled the theatre, suddenly his silence did. Leaning on Bardolph, Falstaff tried vainly to convince us that he would be sent for at night. But as we drifted into twilight, we knew 'twas not to be. Bardolph's "everlasting bonfire light" (*1 HIV*, 3.3.41) will lead them all to prison, and there an end.

As if to emphasize the finality of this moment, Dromgoole cut the Epilogue. No more need be said.

Macbeth (Peter J. Smith)

When a theatre review starts by talking about the set, you know you're in trouble. The function of theatre design ought surely to be to serve the production rather than dictate to it. Yet, in the case of *Macbeth*, designed by Katrina Lindsay, aesthetic choices were not merely conspicuous but overwhelming, and one's attention (or mine anyway) wandered too frequently from the story of the play towards pondering the visual and even engineering aspects of the set. Lucy Bailey's *Macbeth*

represented, depending on your perspective, either the triumph or the tyranny of “Designer’s Theatre.”

Reproduced in the program is Gustave Doré’s image of Virgil and Dante in Hell, walking across a frozen lake, their feet level with the heads of sinners encased entirely in ice: “Each kept his face bent down; by the mouth the cold and by the eyes the misery of the heart finds evidence among them.”³ Lindsay’s less agonizing equivalent was to set a black cloth across the pit at shoulder height. The cloth was perforated with holes so that the groundlings took up their positions by crawling under the cloth and poking their heads up through a hole. The effect, sitting behind them, was of so many disembodied heads gazing up at the stage as though one were looking at the aftermath of a battlefield with severed heads strewn the ground—a nice adumbration of Macduff’s final ceremonial entry: “Behold where stands / Th’usurper’s cursèd head” (5.7.84-85). But there were problems with this mass cloaking of the groundlings. The communal drape was unfortunately reminiscent of a “Snuggie,” beloved of couch potatoes on both sides of the Atlantic, a blanket with a pair of voluminous sleeves attached to it, enabling its occupant to drink beer and nibble snacks while remaining dextrously in charge of the remote control. But it also looked like a human version of the Cornish delicacy, Stargazy Pie—from the crust of which the heads of the fish (the main ingredient) are left to stare accusingly at the unfortunate eater. There was, then, something faintly ridiculous about this shroud.

Other problems were more practical. Since the holes were fixed at particular points, the freedom with which the Globe’s groundlings can usually peregrinate was denied here. If you wanted to move, you had to abandon your peephole and, since all the others appeared to be occupied, the chances of shifting your viewpoint were small indeed: the usually fluid audience was rooted to the spot for the whole play. A related problem had to do with the limited number of peepholes. Since they were spread out across the pit this meant that the usual crush of groundlings towards the downstage edge of the stage did not occur, since each person was separated from the next. As a result, the majority of the groundlings were forced into a C-shaped section of the pit that was left between the edge of the Snuggie furthest from the stage and the walls of the lower gallery. Such uncovered spectators were doubly disadvantaged since they were also most densely packed together. Finally the propensity of audience members to pass out—and the summer performances at the Globe are punctuated by the regular thud of another groundling hitting the deck—is going to make this blanketed pit a real health hazard. Who knows precisely what is going on under there? This was a question triumphantly answered as one of the witches held up a wallet she had lifted from a shrouded groundling unable to keep an eye on his rucksack! The fact that all these problems were running through my mind meant that I missed a good deal of the first few scenes.

Almost as distracting was the aerial component of the design. Rigged from the timbers of the theatre as well as the stage roof were two enormous concentric curtain tracks, not dissimilar (but on a much grander scale) to a 360° rail that supports a shower curtain. Related to the play’s obsession with circularity—“When shall we three meet again?” (1.1.1); “the charm’s wound up” (1.3.37); “the golden round” (1.5.27); “Round about the cauldron go” (4.1.4)—the tracks may have been

intended as the visual correlative of this imagery. They functioned as a means to suspend a black diaphanous curtain, several vertical lengths of chain, and at one point, three burning cauldrons which were run out over the pit. But the massiveness of their scale and the complexity of their anchoring were disproportionate to their use. Indeed it seems likely that they had been conceived to do a much greater job than they actually ended up performing.

Other aspects of the design were less innovative and less intrusive. The theatre pillars and upstage wall were shrouded in black, and regular puffs of dry ice created a wholly unsurprising setting of medieval brutality which owed more than a little to the prevailing tones of Roman Polanski's 1971 film version. Lady Macbeth (Laura Rogers) wore



***Macbeth*: Janet Fullerlove, Karen Anderson, and Simone Kirby as the Weird Sisters and Elliot Cowan as Macbeth. Photo by Ellie Kurtz.**

a grey knitted garment which resembled chain-mail, so that the savagery was seen to be not exclusively masculine. Frequently, as at the opening, the bloodlust of this kingdom was visualized by having the naked torsos of actors, drenched in blood, surface from under the stage or from holes in the pit shroud, and writhe in apparent agony. Various grappling hands and arms would offer Satanic ingredients to the witches.

With so much going on visually and with so many design distractions pulling focus from the play itself, it is testament to the quality of a number of the performances that they aroused any interest at all. In fact, one wished one could have seen Elliot Cowan play Macbeth in a less cluttered production. For in spite of the design's insistence on crudely spelling out the psychological agonies of the story, Cowan's performance managed to convey the self-disgust, fear, and virulence of the character: "O, full of scorpions is my mind, dear wife" (3.2.39). But rather than complement his trauma with a sympathetic design, it seemed as if the actor had to play that quality in spite of rather than assisted by it. For instance, when Macbeth thinks he sees Banquo's ghost at the banquet, he staggered back from a huge platter set with a joint of meat and other medieval fare because an arm had emerged from the feast and had started waving at him. Not only was the moment overly literal but it typified the tendency of the production to divert our attention away from the character towards some outlandish stage effect. The dismembered and waving arm was also unfortunately comical—a parody of the closing sequence in the film of Stephen King's *Carrie*—and so the moment of Macbeth's tortured conscience was diluted by our shocked amusement.

When the production let Cowan get on with acting—as at “If it were done when ’tis done” (1.7.1)—he demonstrated a real authority over the role. Moreover, this was a compelling quality which he communicated to and shared with other actors. Later in the same scene as his wife goads him to “Be so much more the man” (51), the two of them tumbled in a fond embrace. As she challenged his virility, he crudely shoved his hand up her dress and groped her shockingly between the legs as though to insist on his dominance, sexual and political, over her. It was much to the production’s loss that such thoughtful moments were so few and far between.

Several of the supporting performances are worthy of mention. James Clyde played a virile Duncan, neither aged nor decrepit. Intriguingly, he was also cast as Seyton so there was a neat paradox about his playing Macbeth’s first victim and his later confidant. Keith Dunphy as Macduff and Julius D’Silva as Ross were both clear and strong performances (both actors were in Michael Boyd’s *Histories Cycle* at the RSC three years ago). But the Weird Sisters (Janet Fullerlove, Simone Kirby and Karen Anderson) were little more than cackling crones who, like the design itself, kept intruding to spell out the stage action. Typically, for instance, they lurked



Elliot Cowan as Macbeth. Photo by Ellie Kurtz.

behind the curtain as Lady Macbeth unsexed herself and they stood like a row of dominoes to offer Macbeth a real as opposed to an “air-drawn dagger” (3.4.62), just in case we were not sure he was hallucinating.

Although unfunny (no attempt had been made to abridge or render intelligible his long account of equivocation), Frank Scantori did his best with the Porter’s speech. The knocking interrupted him as he was urinating into a tin bucket upstage and so we got to enjoy him staggering around, his trousers round his ankles, with a bucket half-full of piss with which he threatened various sections of the audience. Eventually, and almost by accident, he threw the contents over the groundlings. Perhaps that was the real reason for their shroud after all.

Henry VIII (Michael W. Shurgot)

For *Henry VIII*, as for several plays I saw in 2007 and 2005 at the Globe and reviewed for *The Upstart Crow*, a wide rectangular platform, level with the front of the stage, jutted three-quarters of the way into the yard. This platform significantly expanded the playing area, and it was used frequently throughout the production, especially for entrances and exits by several sets of characters. I object to these platforms because they indicate that recent Artistic Directors, Mark Rylance and now Dominic Dromgoole, the company's actors, and perhaps especially their designers consider the Globe's nearly 1,000 square foot stage inadequate. Rubbish! If The Globe is truly a "model" of original (i.e., English Renaissance) stage practice, as its defenders vehemently insist, why do the directors and actors need extra space? Are they and their scenic designers—Angela Davies for *Henry VIII*—so enamored of their craft that when they come to The Globe from The National Theatre, the RSC in Stratford, The Old Vic, or Donmar Warehouse they cannot restrain themselves when they see the large open space of this amphitheatre? Are the Globe's theatre professionals so determined to elicit the attention of the boisterous groundlings that they believe that the action must be thrust into the midst of this multitude or their play will not be preferred? We have no evidence whatsoever—written or visual—that any such platforms were ever used at Globe One or Two, or in any other Elizabethan or Jacobean theatre; therefore, why is this intrusive platform being used now? These structures disrupt the symmetry of the stage and the circle of the theatre itself, often sit unused for most of a play, and actually *impede* what can otherwise be effective entrances and exits. If the "professionals" at The Globe cannot work with its bounteous stage, they should either cease pretending to be following "original practices" or direct, perform, and design elsewhere.

Gorgeous costumes, lavish scenes of pageantry and ceremony, the sounds of organ, bells, and trumpets, and strong incense carried spectators into the sensuous Renaissance court of Henry VIII. The Chorus, standing center stage in Elizabethan garb under golden banners hung from the upper stage, urged our imaginative leap into the scenes to be played before us. During the Prologue a procession of nobles clad in red and gold capes and carrying figures of monkeys, eagles, bears, and horses on long poles over their heads mounted the platform at the back of the theatre and walked towards the stage. With their poles they "staged" the extravagant scenes enacted upon the Field of the Cloth of Gold and narrated by Norfolk to Anthony Howell's lean, fiery Buckingham. To symbolize visually the initial conflict of the play, director Mark Rosenblatt cast the rotund, many-joweled Ian McNeice as Wolsey, who lumbered in his cardinal's cumbersome red robes upstage right and hid behind the post, listening to and plotting against his enemy whom he would soon dispatch.

Dominic Rowan was a tall, stately Henry at once scheming and efficacious in his doublet, hose, and capes of royal red, purple, and gold, and playful and sensuous before Anne Boleyn at Wolsey's feast. Like Howell, Rowan spoke clearly and distinctly, creating a sense of power and authority. Such was not the case with Rosenblatt's choice of Kate Duchêne, who though born in England spent her first three years in France and then for several years in the 1980s taught English in Spain.



Henry VIII: Miranda Raison as Ann Bullen (Anne Boleyn). Photo by John Tramper.

Raison as a charming, soft-spoken Anne Boleyn. Although Raison conveyed superbly Boleyn's reluctance to being wooed by Henry in 2.3 ("By my troth and maidenhead, / I would not be a queen"; "Would I had no being, / If this [Henry's advances] salute my blood a jot. It faints me / To think what follows." [23-24; 103-05]), she nonetheless knew that her youth and beauty could elevate her to a far higher social status than she ever imagined. When Henry kissed and wooed her in 1.4, she was obviously flattered, and from the Third Gentleman's report in 4.1, "Believe me, sir, she is the goodliest woman / That ever lay by man; which when the people / Had the full view of, such a noise arose / As the shrouds made at sea in a stiff tempest, / As loud, and to as many tunes" (69-73), one sensed that this charming young woman was a highly desirable antidote to Katherine for more than the members of Henry's court.

Duchêne's performance also complicated spectators' efforts to sympathize with her. In her scenes with her adversaries Campeius, Wolsey, and especially Henry, Duchêne did give Katherine a commanding physical presence. As she spoke she faced downstage at Henry who, with his back to spectators, sat ensconced in his royal chair. With the rest of the ecclesiastical court behind her upstage, as if supporting her, Katherine spoke as if in a position of power. But while there is undeniable and justifiable anger in Katherine's "Now, the Lord help! / They vex me past

Presumably to create a sense of historical authenticity for his production, Rosenblatt directed her to play Katherine with a pronounced Spanish accent. Further, Duchêne played Katherine as vividly angry with Henry during all their scenes, and her high-pitched, unrelenting screaming at Henry in her heavy Spanish accent gradually became difficult not only to understand but also to tolerate. The result was a Katherine who became one-dimensional, a kind of inarticulate harpy in place of what ought to be the most complex character in the play. One sensed that finally Henry simply could not tolerate being anywhere near his queen; she came to embody Benedick's view of Beatrice's tongue: "so indeed all disquiet, horror, and perturbation follows her" (*Ado* 2.1.248-49). Thus, Katherine's status as a victim of Henry's ruthlessness was lessened.⁴

Rosenblatt compounded Katherine's plight by casting Miranda

my patience" (127-28), seizing on these lines to motivate her performance during the entire scene again denied spectators a more emotionally complex scene and flattened Katherine's character. In performance, Katherine's long speech ought to engender strong emotions in Henry as he narrates his "doubts," but here Henry's excuses seemed more like a release from the queen's scolding. In sharp contrast to her shrillness in 2.4, Duchêne was quite subdued in her brief meeting with Caputius in 4.2, especially after her vision, which included a male child as well as the ghosts of Buckingham and Wolsey. Had Duchêne and Rosenblatt somewhat mollified Katherine's livid tone in earlier scenes, the political and religious contest between her and Henry could have created far more intriguing theatre.

As the play moved towards Henry's desired marriage to Anne Boleyn and his hope for a male heir, Rosenblatt employed in several scenes a child-sized puppet of a boy that was held by a court attendant. Given the birth of Elizabeth at play's end, the puppet as a symbol of Henry's wish to control even the gender of his children became increasingly ironic. The puppet also symbolized the precarious state of women in Henry's court; not even the beautiful Queen Anne could give the increasingly tyrannical Henry what he demanded.

Buckingham and Wolsey each experienced a different theatrical demise. Howell, as Buckingham, entered 2.1 bound by ropes and wearing a dirty torn smock and torn hose; his appearance suggested that he had been tortured. He was eloquent in his final speeches, turning often to the spectators as he passionately defended his family and his history and ultimately forgave his enemies. Whereas Howell inhabited Buckingham's final words, McNeice as Wolsey simply narrated his soliloquies and especially his parting speech to Cromwell in 3.2. While one might argue that McNeice played Wolsey as stunned by the suddenness of his fall from favor, or as simply resigned to the inevitable turn of Fortune's wheel, nonetheless McNeice's flat delivery suggested an actor who did not grasp the emotional subtext of his lines and so robbed the production of what should have been one of its most powerful scenes. While the historical Wolsey was, like McNeice, rotund, nonetheless seeking historical veracity in the visual representation of an important character should not mean sacrificing that character's verbal power onstage.

Rosenblatt used the large platform to stage what the three gentlemen narrate in 4.1. Accompanied by bells, incense, trumpets, and the singing of *Te Deum*, Henry and his queen, dressed in red and golden splendor and ermine-trimmed capes, strode majestically across the platform under a golden canopy held aloft by four boys. This most lavish scene of the production was narrated by the gentlemen from the front of the stage proper, as if looking out on the grand event. But the scene could easily have been staged without the intrusive platform by simply following the Folio's stage directions: "Exeunt, first passing over the stage in order and state, and then a great flourish of trumpets" (s.d., 4.1.36ff). In fact, had the lavish procession simply crossed over the Globe stage, the whole ceremony could have been symbolically powerful: in the theatrical space—i.e., the court—of Henry's earlier dismissal of Katherine and the fall of Buckingham and Wolsey now occurs a royal procession symbolic of Henry's egoism that is so elaborate that his court can hardly contain it. Using the platform ironically distanced this gorgeous spectacle from its origin.

98 *The Upstart Crow*

The future Queen Elizabeth was carried across the platform towards the stage in one final lavish procession. Everyone was in red or gold or purple, and all bowed as first Archbishop Cranmer and then King Henry prophesized the coming glory of Elizabeth's reign. As if to remind us of the fate of another woman at the hands of this king, Queen Katherine, returned from the grave, spoke the Epilogue.

Notes

1. All textual references are to *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, 4th ed., ed. David Bevington (New York: Harper Collins, 1992).
2. On this element of the Hal-Falstaff relationship, see especially Jonas A. Barish's splendid essay "The Turning Away of Prince Hal," *Shakespeare Studies* 1 (1965): 9-17. Still relevant also is A. C. Bradley, "The Rejection of Falstaff," *Oxford Lectures On Poetry*, ed. M. R. Ridley (1909; rpt. London: Macmillan & Co, 1965), 247-63, esp. 254-55.
3. Dante, *The Divine Comedy: Inferno*, tr. John D. Sinclair (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961), 397.
4. For a contrast in performance choices, see my review of the Oregon Shakespeare Festival's 2009 production of *Henry VIII* in *The Upstart Crow* 29 (2010): 111-27.

THE ROYAL SHAKESPEARE COMPANY 2009: *AS YOU LIKE IT*
 “REVIEWING SHAKESPEAREAN THEATRE: THE STATE OF THE ART,”
 SEPTEMBER 5–6, 2009, SHAKESPEARE CENTRE, STRATFORD-UPON-AVON

Sara Thompson, *University of Maryland*

Any gathering of approximately seventy theatre lovers for a discussion of a production the previous night could quickly devolve into chaos. But as the attendees of the “Reviewing Shakespearean Theatre: The State of the Art” conference at the Shakespeare Centre were grouped first into pairs, then into four, then eight, an open dialogue emerged. This dialogue put a different spin on the idea of “Shakespearean Hearing,” with the sounds being heard here the voices of Shakespearean spectators rather than actors. By the time the whole group convened to discuss the RSC’s latest production of *As You Like It*, the conversation proved varied, with insightful constructive criticism and praise for a production that deserved both.

Staged in the Courtyard Theatre, Michael Boyd’s *As You Like It* focused on the melancholic tone of the play and peppered the text with music, often performed by the actors onstage strumming guitars like folk musicians (Jacques, Orlando, Silvius). These musical interludes helped to distinguish the two worlds of the play, the court and the forest, in lieu of particularly significant visual clues that might otherwise make the transition clear. The production began in the stifling, rigid court of Duke Frederick, with the thrust stage’s shallow proscenium masked by a white-washed wall, its wooden slats creating a subtle geometric design. The members of the court sported tight Elizabethan ruffs and white makeup, bearing a passing resemblance to some of the costume designs in Boyd’s *Richard II*, part of last year’s Histories Cycle. This court was simple and plain, with its white backdrop and floors and black and white costumes, but also reflected an opulence that was not entirely undesirable. One understood that banishment from its comforts was not a welcome sentence, as some productions have portrayed it. The difficulties of life in the Forest of Arden were also made clear, its rusticity perhaps most effectively epitomized by Geoffrey Freshwater’s delightfully grumpy Corin, who skinned an actual rabbit onstage during the interval, much to the horror of many audience members. Arden was indicated by a minimal visual shift into a farm scene, with various doors in the white wall opening to reveal wooden beams with hay and other pastoral touches, a sort of cross between an advent calendar and a barn. The sound design focused on gentle reminders of the rural setting, with the occasional quiet birdsong or rustling of leaves in the distance. These touches were so subtle that they acted on a subconscious level to remind the audience of the location, rather than distracting from the events onstage. Orlando sat dangling a leg out of one of the barn doors, playing a guitar and singing about Rosalind, while his poetry, meant to pepper the trees of Arden after the interval, instead dotted the auditorium, the foyer, and bar area of the theatre. As audience members made their way home at the end of the play, the

bushes and fence posts down the street in front of the building also bore the poems. This lovely touch would have been more magical, however, if the production had achieved some of the character relationships necessary to make *As You Like It* a truly moving play.

Katy Stephens is what one might call “a safe pair of hands.” An actress of undeniable talent and charisma, she always delivers believable, heartfelt characters, and her ability to play strong women was proven when she took on Margaret in the Histories Cycle. But while her Rosalind was competent, it could hardly be accused of being inspired. Once she entered the woods, too much of Stephens’s own sex appeal took over, so that Rosalind came across as having a worldly knowledge that seemed out of place. Rosalind’s relationship with Mariah Gale’s Celia was underdeveloped, the two women so different in personality (and age) that it seemed hard to imagine Celia’s declaration that the pair “learned, played, ate together, / And whereso’er we went, like Juno’s swans, / Still we went coupled and inseparable” (1.3.72-73).¹ Gale has garnered much praise for her quirky take on characters like Miranda and Ophelia at the RSC in recent years, and the idiosyncratic line delivery and mannerisms appear in her Celia as well. Many viewers think her charming, but I find that the schtick wears thin, and I cannot imagine it working when she branches out beyond ingénue roles.

Jonjo O’Neill’s Orlando was handsome and strong, but his interaction with Rosalind lacked the necessary spark to make it believable that he would spend his days writing poetry about her. As Oliver, Charles Aitken failed to be threatening, never making the audience fear that he might actually harm his brother. An interesting and inspired casting choice was to conflate the roles of Amiens and Jacques, so that the songs were given to the musically brilliant Forbes Masson. Jacques’s first entrance, with wild hair and eyeliner, strumming a guitar as he sang “Under the greenwood tree” (2.5), immediately cast him as some sort of aging emo rocker, milking applause from the audience and basking in their praise, but doubtless shrugging it off backstage as a downside of the job. After all, Jacques wouldn’t “sell out” for the love of adoring fans. Richard Katz played a mildly funny Touchstone, a not unimpressive feat considering the character’s usual painful presence. His wild hair and long thin clown shoes drew a visual similarity to Krusty the Clown of *The Simpsons*, perhaps an attempt to make the character accessible for younger audience members.

With the exception of Freshwater’s lovely Corin, the other rustics fell flat, with their portrayals often happy to play them as idiots, rather than fully realized human beings. Christine Entwisle, a comedienne by trade, went against type by making Phoebe boring and not at all funny, an obstacle as staunch as the back wall for James Tucker’s sweet and well-rounded Sylvius to bounce off. Sylvius often had his Elizabethan-style ukulele in tow to sing love songs to her, a funny touch which generally involved him repeating her name endlessly as he banged away on the strings. Audrey, played by Sophie Russell, was reduced to a stereotype of an “Essex girl” (imagine an English version of one of the impressive young ladies from MTV’s *Jersey Shore*) for her wedding, tottering slapstick-style on four-inch white heels. And James Traherne played Sir Oliver Martext in easily the most bizarre interpretation one could imagine. He entered the stage holding a flaming cross and clutching a

Bible, his hair slicked down as he leered maniacally at the audience, a completely unexplained and out-of-place evangelical preacher from the American South. Epitomizing the sort of idea that might get played around with in rehearsal as a joke and then immediately dropped, his performance was painful to watch.

Overall, the production was acceptable, but not noteworthy. Katy Stephens's *Rosalind* is perhaps a perfect analogy for the effort as a whole: proficient but not revelatory. The average audience member seemed to enjoy it, which truly should be the goal for the RSC at the moment, when only one open theatre means that the seats need to be filled, even if it means relatively "safe" productions. Boyd's *As You Like It* served this purpose, and it was, perhaps, mostly in the harsh focus of a reviewing conference audience that many of its greatest flaws became so clear.

A joint venture hosted by the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, Nottingham Trent University, the Society for Renaissance Studies, and the University of Warwick, the gathering aimed to examine closely the activity of reviewing, by both newspaper and scholarly writers, with an eye to identifying the function that reviewing serves for various enclaves of society: for the public choosing whether or not to see a production, theatre practitioners developing new work, and academics preserving an account of a production for posterity. The conference operated with an extremely varied spectrum of attendees, from theatre enthusiasts and graduate students to professional reviewers and distinguished professors, with a delegation of high school students thrown into the mix for good measure. What resulted was a rather democratic feel, appropriate for discussions that often focused on the egalitarian nature of reviewing. A panel seminar, modeled after the Shakespeare Association of America conference's arrangement (delegates on the panel circulate papers beforehand and then auditors are invited to sit in on the session), also contributed to this feeling of inclusion, with graduate students, university lecturers, and reviewing hobbyists taking part in an open discussion about their individual philosophies on theatre reviews.

The conference boasted an impressive line-up of speakers: Michael Billington, arguably the most accomplished and well-known newspaper reviewer operating in the UK today, and Peter Holland, a renowned academic reviewer, provided the plenary lectures. A panel also featured, with Michael Coveney (reviewer), Andrew Dickson (reviewer), Carol Chillington Rutter (academic), Tim Supple (director), and Janet Suzman (actor), and chaired by Stanley Wells. The most memorable part of the discussion (and indeed, a recurring theme throughout the conference) was a general feeling of worry for the future of the theatre review. Newspaper reviewers feared shrinking word limits and the irrelevance of reviews when a headlining star has guaranteed that a run is sold out before it opens. Academics worried about the purpose of scholarly reviews, which (like this one) appear after the production has already closed. And practitioners complained about the pressures of the theatre and the frustrations of being judged on a single performance which changes dramatically over the course of the play's run. Everyone seemed to reserve a snide comment or two for the phenomenon of blogging, an as yet unproven reviewing medium that had the newspaper reviewers, in particular, concerned about the chattering multitudes splattering their proletariat opinions on the Web (for FREE, no less!).

But in the face of the question “Can you name any promising young reviewers under the age of 35?,” while the panel struggled to identify them, the names that popped into the heads of my graduate student colleagues and I were (you guessed it) bloggers. The general conclusion reached by the end of the conference was helpful and enlightening, despite being relatively uncertain in itself: theatre reviewing needs further exploration to ensure it retains its relevance, and, whether we like it or not, the internet might be the best weapon in the battle to ensure that this art, this expression of the way that Shakespeare is “heard” by the audience, survives.

Notes

1. *The Riverside Shakespeare*, 2nd ed., ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997).

THE 2009 STRATFORD FESTIVAL: *MACBETH* AND *BARTHOLOMEW FAIR*

Owen E. Brady, *Clarkson University*

The Stratford Festival's *Macbeth* and *Bartholomew Fair* were both full of sound and fury. But the noise in director Des McAnuff's *Macbeth* signified an experiment in contemporary relevance that ultimately failed to harmonize the play's political and psychological action. On the other hand, the noise in director Antoni Cimolino's *Bartholomew Fair* delighted as it created a complex yet unified image of humanity's running battle between desire and restraint. In the process the production evoked a full range of that characteristically human noise—laughter.

This *Macbeth* decentered the play's psychological and moral action, emphasizing instead the political, as if McAnuff would have preferred to produce *Richard III*. This decentering may account for setting the play in Africa as it emerges from its colonial past; the violence and political instability marked by the rise of military strongmen seems to be the world the production wanted to evoke. But Africa is no more than an allusion here, with a finger piano played before the action begins, a character periodically appearing in a flowing tie-dyed costume, or the machetes in the concluding duel between Macbeth and Macduff. Casting black actors in many roles, including Lady Macbeth and Macduff, also suggests an African milieu. The allusions to post-colonial African strife give McAnuff the opportunity to create on the Festival Theatre's Shakespearean stage some whiz-bang special battle effects, reminiscent of Ian McKellen's film version of *Richard III*. War for political power is the recurring constant in the production, more the determinant of destiny than were the weakly played weird sisters. The play opens with startling explosions and machine gun fire, reminding us, before the bloody Captain does, that a brutal civil war rages. In the final battle, Malcolm and the English storm Dunsinane to the deafening sound of swooping jets and hovering helicopters; suddenly, amid more flashing explosions, a jeep crashes onto the stage, its driver dead, while Special Ops slide down ropes. As a consequence of the emphasis on political warfare and the pyrotechnics that go along with it, Colm Feore's attempt to create a complex, morally fraught Macbeth seems at odds with McAnuff's intent.

Noises calculated to appall fill Shakespeare's text: crickets cry, owls scream, wolves howl, knocks thunder, humans shriek; however, in this production, the noises of modern warfare, broadcast media, and electronic music replace the sounds of nature. Rather than appall, they annoy, adding merely melodramatic effects. The almost continuous background of vibrating musical chords, like an effect out of a Hitchcock thriller, attempts to evoke suspense and create a sense of fatality but merely disturbs. For example, a quavering, electronic chord supports Feore's coolly delivered soliloquy "If it were done" (1.7.1) as if director McAnuff realized that he had underdone the play's psychological and moral struggle.¹ Thus, this production's noises smother the noise of conscience, the inner voice that chants "Sleep no more, / Macbeth doth murder sleep" (2.2.33-34). The battle noises and electronic music

support McAnuff's political intentions but push Macbeth's internal moral battle into a mere sidebar. And the tragedy veers toward melodrama.

Throughout the production, Feore delivers his lines intelligently, even subtly, but early on his ambition seems to lack spurs and later his moral struggle lacks sweating passion. In the dagger speech, he seems awkward, looking for a stage trick to make the vision seem palpable. The result is a belly-flopping dive onto a table in his attempt to seize the dudgeon. His "Tomorrow" soliloquy, however, stands out and prepares us for the resigned and resolved Macbeth of the final duel. Feore's Macbeth, his castle beset by the portentous moving wood of Birnam, delivers the speech standing downstage center on the Festival Theatre's thrust, almost at attention. Stoically, clearly, only his head moving slightly, his chin tilting up, Feore's Macbeth realizes that he is "but a walking shadow, a poor player" (5.5.23), but he is not bowed.

The duel between Macbeth and Macduff, fought with machetes, seems, however, tame, stagy choreography rather than vengeful and desperate action. Feore's "Before my body / I throw my warlike shield" (5.10.32-33) lacks force, especially as he stands holding only a machete in his hand. Perhaps to redeem the scene with some emotional content, the production emphasizes Macduff's revenge. To suggest his personal rage at the slaughter of his family, the production plays an interesting change on the traditional triumph over Macbeth. Rather than skewering the tyrant on a blade, Macduff throws Macbeth across the hood of a disabled jeep. Bending the usurper's head back into the driver's compartment, Macduff strangles him with a strand of material torn from his wounds. Then, he beheads him, repeatedly thrusting down with a foxhole shovel, suggesting that his passion for revenge overwhelms his humanity.

While Feore's Macbeth lacks gravity and passion, Yanna McIntosh's Lady Macbeth, tall and athletically graceful, moves powerfully through the production; her colorful flowing gowns suggest stateliness and an African origin. Her opening speech on ambition, accompanied by outstretched arms and splayed fingers, portrays a woman eager and able to embrace a large destiny and power. As she prepares herself for the monstrous regicide, her hands literally unsex her as she rubs them roughly over her pelvic bones, then clutches her breasts as if she would rip away the visible signs of her womanhood. In the midnight encounter with her husband



***Macbeth*: Yanna McIntosh as Lady Macbeth. Photo by David Hou.**

as he wanders in with the bloody daggers, she clearly dominates Feore's thin, slouching Macbeth, stopping only briefly as she exits up a stage right ramp to tell him matter of factly—rather than with moral trepidation—that she would have done the deed but that Duncan reminded her of her father as he slept. Her sleepwalking scene is among the best I have seen. Hair now streaked with gray, she enters running to wash her hands, rubbing them with such power that one could feel them chafing. Exiting quickly, she suddenly stops stage right. Bending at the waist, holding her hands out and down, she scrapes one hand repeatedly along her whole forearm as if to peel off the flesh. Even in the moments before her self-destruction, McIntosh's Lady Macbeth exudes her power and determination. On the other hand, there are softer moments when she conjures a feeling of marital affection and support as she tries to console Macbeth for entering a sleepless hell of their own making. After his decision to kill Banquo, they sit side by side on the edge of their bed, slumped forward, heads down, talking about the dreams that shake him nightly. Later, after the banquet scene, she sits beside him again at the empty table as he wearily laments: "I am in blood / Stepped in so far that, should I wade no more, / Returning were as tedious as go o'er" (3.4.135-7).

Although McIntosh and Feore create a few tender moments, the set design reinforces the cold, high-tech world that abets those who grasp for political power without regard for humanity. Two towers made of black girders guard either side of the central entrance of the bare, black thrust stage. For the most part, furnishings are out of the low-end offerings of an office furniture catalogue, simple steel chairs and tables. Overhead, a square grid of black girders lined with lights looms over center stage. When Macbeth awaits the final battle, the grid descends and frames him; its lights intensify, illuminating an imprisoned, isolated man. The production uses media to create the sense of state oppression and fatality. When Macbeth has established his oppressive rule, the towers serve as watch stations, manned by uniformed guards with spotlights. Mounted on the towers' lower portions, television screens monitor the entrances to Dunsinane. Later the television screens project the prophetic illusions the weird sisters call up at Macbeth's demand to see into the seeds of time. As he peers into a stage pit swirling with iridescent colors and images, the faces of the apparitions register on the screens, suggesting both their unreality as well as the mediated reality that dominates our lives.

The use of media also undercuts Malcolm's triumph as the signal for a bright new future. Reiterating the play's earlier scene when Macbeth announced his kingship in front of microphones, the ending presents Malcolm, too, taking power in front of microphones and television cameras. A James Bond-like theme playing, the weird sisters looking on from the audience, and Macbeth's face momentarily projected on the towers' TV screens suggest that Malcolm, too, may be a dissimulator, a political monster in the making. After the curtain calls, as we were exiting, pop music reinforced the idea that post-colonial politics is nothing but a dreary round of revolution and bullying strongmen. The action movie music died abruptly, replaced by another song, a late 60s anthem associated with the Vietnam War, Jimi Hendrix's "All Along the Watchtower." Malcolm's seemingly redemptive triumph, then, becomes a harbinger of more horror to come. The musical shift jars, intentionally, I think, to provoke thought. And it works.

In making its political statement, however, the production strips Macbeth—and perhaps all political leaders—of any heroism. Macbeth is not an exceptional individual but only another in a line of meager men motivated to seize power in the developing world, and Malcolm is not a new colossus but merely another Mugabe.

While *Macbeth's* noises represent with mixed success a modern political world, *Bartholomew Fair's* noise is a Falstaffian celebration of human needs, desires, and foibles. While Stratford's production cut the play's long Induction, director Antoni Cimolino's staging of this rarely played satire is "as full of noise as sport" (Induction, 82-83) as Ben Jonson promised his Jacobean audience in 1614.² The raucous production gives the contemporary audience "the Fair and all the drums and rattles in't" (1.5.86) as well as characters drawn from all London's social classes, magnetically attracted by Smithfield's annual celebration of life.

The noise ranges across life's cacophonous spectrum, full of excited voices and music: hawker's cries, angry quarrels, ninnies' laughter, religious harangues, ballads, jigs, guitars, drums, tambourines. At this noisy Fair, no appetite or bodily need goes unfulfilled as long as there is cash. While there are many and varied sounds, often loud, one of the subtle sounds that pervades the production is the periodic clink of coins as some trinket or drink or body is paid for. Full of scatological and bawdy words and gestures played broadly, the production causes the audience to wince even while laughing. Ale, whores, and pork offer the fairgoers pleasures that religion, law, and class have put out of bounds. Scenes in which people enter the Fairgrounds are accompanied by ballad singing, stilt-walking, vociferous conversation, laughter, and the aggressive, almost angry hawking of hobbyhorses and trinkets, especially by Cliff Saunders's Lantern Leatherhead. He delivers his "What do you lack?" (2.2.29) almost snarling while waving a hobbyhorse in the twitching faces of would-be buyers, a revelation of the subtle class warfare lurking beneath carnival surfaces.

The literal noise of the Fair is reiterated metaphorically in the acting. The actors are the visible counterpart to the "drums and rattles" that addle the difference between restraint and excess in human brains. The Fair pulls into its orbit the gulls and roarers as well as the hypocrites and the killjoys, who think that there should be no more cakes and ale. In the latter category, the religious zealot and the man of law often literally stand center stage or prowl through the audience, entering and exiting through the steeply banked seats of the Tom Patterson Theatre. Zeal-of-the-Land Busy, a baker turned Puritan sage, is a character who does due diligence by equivocating to bring his appetites into conformity with Puritan dictates. Juan Chioran plays the puritanical Busy as a pompous, self-righteous prig. Tall and spindly, he walks forward, Bible clutched to his chest like a plate of armor, chin up as if sampling the Promised Land; but spider-like his long, black stockinged legs precede him, as if his body will carry him toward Ursula's pork fest despite his spiritual striving. His equivocations about eating pork in order to satisfy his fleshly hunger are preceded by flatulence and accompanied by lip-smacking moral bromides, as he announces his decision to go to the Fair where "I will eat exceedingly, and prophesy!" (1.6.91-2). Meanwhile, the disguised Justice Overdo commits himself to finding out the Fair's "yearly enormities" (2.1.42) and bringing them within the law's compass. Tom McCamus's Overdo is somber and even quietly outraged. Barrel-chested

and deep-voiced, McCamus uses his physical gifts to create an Overdo who is comic because he is so serious in his foolish hope to expunge human vices. Center stage, spotlighted, he soliloquizes about the nobility of his law enforcement in the name of justice and the King, even as he strips off his magistrate's robe and wig and dons his disguise, an extravagant jester's cap and bells.



***Bartholomew Fair:* Cliff Saunders as Lantern Leatherhead. Photo by David Hou.**

Both the zealot and the enforcer suffer a kind of madness in their efforts to impose virtue and law on the Fair and humanity; and, of course, both are undone in the end by engaging in the play's final bit of foolery: a hilarious puppet-play-within-a-play depicting a bawdy Bankside version of Hero and Leander conjoined to a brawling version of Damon and Pythias. Cliff Saunders's Lantern Leatherhead, hawker and puppeteer, mounted on a small upstage wagon-stage, gives an engaging, virtuoso performance. Changing voices deftly, first high, then low, he engages in

brisk dialogue with the puppet lovers who play out their *amour* drunk in a tavern and the mythical friends who rail and brawl—the very images of the human doings at the Fair. Amid this raucous ribaldry, Busy enters from the audience and squares himself center stage in direct puritanical opposition to the puppet Dionysius. Busy ludicrously debates Dionysius, pressing his charge of lewdness against the play by referring to the gender-bending of Jacobean theater. To refute him, the puppet suddenly raises its gown to reveal triumphantly that puppets can bear no guilt because they are anatomically challenged, lacking either male or female sex organs. In good comic fashion, Busy is “converted” by laughter and joins the playgoers, borne aloft by the onstage audience to a seat among them. At this moment, as the theatrical enormities are about to resume, the undercover Justice Overdo hushes the puppets and the crowd’s fun. During the performance, he entered the acting space in a new clownish costume reminiscent of *Pagliacci* to foreshadow the discovery of his own wife’s drunken infidelity at the Fair. As Overdo confronts the human fairgoers, he



***Bartholomew Fair*: Lucy Peacock as Ursula, Tom McCamus as Justice Overdo, and Randy Hughson as Jordan Knockem. Photo by David Hou.**

doffs his clownish gear to reveal his wig and a somber black justice’s gown blazoned with gold frogging. Cimolino emphasizes the foolishness of Overdo’s indictments, and perhaps his own inhumanity, when puppet Dionysius reappears like his comic double in an identical outfit. McCamus’s Overdo becomes suddenly chastened. Seeing his wife drunk and ill, he shifts vocally from his denunciatory mode to one powerful but muted with sadness and self-recognition as he acknowledges his own foolishness in ferreting out the enormities of others. In the end, he too rejoins society in an open-hearted gesture inviting all—high and low—to dine at his home.

In *Bartholomew Fair*, Jonson unified the many characters and multiple plots

through the central tension posed by the opposition of the killjoys and the pleasure seekers. Cimolino's staging artfully clarifies this axial tension, especially through his reiteration of a strong center stage position for the chief representatives of the tension: the puritanical Busy, Justice Overdo, and the gargantuan figure of Ursula the pig woman. Ursula's Falstaffian presence is the play's libidinal sun. All the characters and action revolve around her, and her tent's huge flaps form the upstage entrance. Played in a preposterously bloated prosthetic costume, Lucy Peacock sweats and swears, wonderfully vulgar as purveyor to humankind's pleasures and vices. Peacock, physically slender and often a romantic lead, obviously relished this uncharacteristic role. Her first entrance establishes Ursula's rule. Swaggering, mopping her sweaty neck with a dirty linen, she enters through the upstage flap in a billow of smoke and a flare of fire. The tent becomes both a life-sustaining roast house and a palpable image of the medieval hell's mouth. But the laughter that accompanies her sweating, swearing, pratfalling, and lewd hip-grinding leavens any moral judgment against what she represents—a raw life force uncontainable by man-made restraints, whether religion or law.

Apart from Busy, Overdo, and Ursula, the production is full of wonderfully realized humor characters in main and supporting roles. Cimolino's direction created an ensemble effect, essential to making this complexly plotted cornucopia of human folly comprehensible and entertaining. Bartholomew Cokes is played winningly by the golden-haired, perpetually smiling Trent Pardy. Clothed and cloaked in gold satin with an oversized phallic codpiece in which he secrets his purse of gold, Pardy's guileless Cokes plays the conspicuous consumer of the Fair's baubles with naïve gusto, inane grins, and squealing laughter. Every carnival lure—hobby horses, musical instruments, sausages—provokes idiotic delight. His fascination with music provides occasion for his gulling. Mesmerized by the ballad singer's song warning of cutpurses and the crowd's rollicking instrumental and choral accompaniment, Cokes sings along while Edgeworth the cutpurse deftly relieves him of his purse full of gold. He suffers other losses as well; and Pardy's round, glowing face goes from an infantile smiling at the Fair's fascinating toys to childish frowning and whining when he discovers each loss: purse, hat, cloak, sword, and finally fiancée.

Cokes's servant Humphrey Wasp guards his gullible master's purse and virtue, in a variant on the killjoys Busy and Overdo. Played cantankerously by Brian Tree dressed in black doublet and pantaloons striped with gold, a visual reminder of his particular humor, Wasp rants irascibly, stinging people with criticism until he is first put in the stocks and later gets drunk on Ursula's beer.

Matt Steinberg's John Littlewit, a would-be Puritan and puppet playwright, is admirably silly, an obvious gull from the moment we meet him. Eager to prove himself a wit, his narcissism ultimately leads to his own cuckolding at the Fair. Watching his puppet play, he fails to notice his wife being introduced to drinking and sex. Steinberg plays Littlewit as a man giddily in love with the image of himself as a man of the town. He vibrates when describing the pleasure of seeing his play performed; he jigs and bends at the waist, holding his side at his own paltry attempts at wit. He minces, prances, then stalks his winsome wife, Win, like Groucho Marx. As a fool, he is a delight.

The Tom Patterson Theatre's long thrust stage seemed a perfect venue for the fluidity of action that this parade of humanity demands. The Fair was established quickly with the erection of a few long poles strung with pennants to frame the swirling action. The open staging allowed actors to enter through the audience and even sit among us, which made us close kin to the human pageant onstage, reminding us to be wary of excess but to tilt toward tolerance in judging others' foibles. Stratford's *Bartholomew Fair* made laughter the noise necessary for self-knowledge.

Notes

1. All references to *Macbeth* are from *The Norton Shakespeare*, 2nd ed., ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al (New York: W. W. Norton, 2008).
2. All references to *Bartholomew Fair* are from the Regents Renaissance Drama Series ed., ed. Edward B. Partridge (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1964).

THE 2009 OREGON SHAKESPEARE FESTIVAL

Michael W. Shurgot, *Seattle, WA*

As Bill Rauch, Artistic Director, and Paul Nicholson, Executive Director of the Oregon Shakespeare Festival, note in their introduction to the Festival's *Souvenir Program*, 2009 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the current Elizabethan Stage and the fifty-third season for Richard L. Hay, the Festival's principal scenic and theatre designer. Mr. Hay designed the Elizabethan Theatre, the Angus Bowmer Theatre, and the New Theatre that replaced the Black Swan in 2002. He has also designed two hundred twenty productions at OSF, and Rauch and Nicholson have dedicated the OSF 2009 season to this remarkable theatre artist. Jerry Turner, OSF Artistic Director from 1971–1991, said of Hay that he is a designer “whose work serves the play and the production.”¹ Given the diverse scenic elements of the four Shakespeare plays in the 2009 season—*Much Ado About Nothing*, *Henry VIII*, *Macbeth*, and *All's Well That Ends Well*—Mr. Hay's artistic legacy provides a fulcrum for reviewing this season's productions.

Equally compelling were several auditory features of the four productions. *Much Ado* features several scenes of “over-hearing,” one of which (2.3) director Kate Buckley ensured would make quite a splash. As befitting its pageantry, palaces, and cathedrals, *Henry VIII* featured numerous musical riffs of organ, bells, trumpets, and drums. Crackling thunder during the witches' scenes and electronic screeches—a thousand finger nails on blackboards—during the gruesome battle scenes assaulted spectators' ears in *Macbeth*. Conversely, in *All's Well* a compelling silence was crucial to many lovely scenes. The visual and auditory features were integral to all four productions, although they varied in subtlety and effectiveness.

Buckley set her *Much Ado* in Messina in 1945. She notes that after Italy's armistice in 1943 Italian citizens fought the Fascist forces until their fall in 1945, and her production “celebrates this time.”² The setting, presumably the garden of Leonato's villa, also resembled a festive café: an elegant stone façade, metal chairs, tables inlaid with brightly colored tiles, chandeliers dangling from the posts and upper staircases, and multi-colored awnings adorning the windows on the second and third levels of the stage. Upstage right was a phonograph on which characters played 40s big band hits. Downstage center was a large, rectangular reflecting / wading pool, and on the back edge of the pool was a typewriter that Beatrice and Benedick used for writing their love poems. Assuming that this setting was part of Leonato's estate—perhaps a garden café?—the pool still seemed a gimmick; it was there because obviously someone—Benedick? Beatrice?—was going to fall into it. One wondered why Buckley and scenic designer Todd Rosenthal did not just hang a sign high above the set proclaiming: “Watch how cleverly we use this pool. . . .” Thus were spectators banged over the head.

Buckley cast Beatrice (Robynn Rodriguez) and Benedick (David Kelly) as mid-life former lovers too proud to admit that they still loved each other. Wearing his pressed and pleated khaki dress uniform, holster, and high black boots—he had seen little actual combat, as Beatrice suspects—Benedick pranced around the edge

of the pool in 1.1, telegraphing to spectators that his romantic fate might require swimming lessons, while Beatrice, in a classy bright green dress, stalked him around the pool pretending not to mark him. Her stinging “You always end with a jade’s trick. I know you of old”³ was an angry riposte; she grabbed his uniform and shook him. She was sick of his evasions, and angry that she had spoken first to him *again!* Benedick affirmed in his dialogue with Claudio that he was a genuinely “professed tyrant” (1.1.162) to the female sex, thus establishing clearly just how far both he and Beatrice would have to fall by the end of Act 4.



***Much Ado About Nothing*: Robynn Rodriguez as Beatrice and David Kelly as Benedict. Photo by David Cooper.**

Claudio, the handsome Juan Rivera LeBron, and Hero, the lovely Sarah Rutan, were much younger than Benedick and Beatrice, thus creating generational as well as procedural differences between the play’s romantic couples. Claudio’s agreeing to allow Don Pedro to woo for him seemed odd in a play set in 1945, but presumably Leonato wanted to follow Italian traditions regarding the wooing and marriage of his only child. Claudio was only too pleased to hear that Leonato had no son; like Petruchio, he hoped to wive it wealthy and thus happily.

In 2.1 Buckley and Rodriguez made several strong choices. Beatrice showed a hint of melancholy as she narrated her destined place in heaven with the bachelors, living “as merry as the day is long,” yet she performed deliberately the three dances of “wooing, wedding, and repenting” (46, 68). The cinquepace was frantic, as if Beatrice were exorcising any lingering desire for Benedick, especially after her fierce response to his “jade’s trick” (1.1.139). Here was a resolute, yet lonely woman,

perhaps wishing she could ignore rather than mark Signor Benedick. In the masked ball, after Benedick and Beatrice danced downstage and sat on the front edge of the pool, Beatrice removed her mask but Benedick did not, so that he knew that she was the one calling him the “Prince’s jester” (2.1.131), but one could not say whether or not she recognized him as the target for her jests. (I suspect we were meant to think that she did, especially given the vehemence of her jibes; she enjoyed the cover of the mask.) Thus when Benedick sat on the front edge of the pool speaking to Don Pedro (229–49), Benedick believed that she would lambaste him to anybody and that she really did detest him. This choice also reinforced Benedick’s professed distaste for women and marriage; why pursue a woman who will ridicule him to (supposed) strangers on a dance floor? For this he came home from the wars? Kelly’s high-pitched voice rose in a hilarious crescendo until he spat out “so indeed all disquiet, horror, and perturbation follows her” (2.1.248–49). Buckley thus set up cleverly the fall that Benedick and Beatrice were about to take.

Benedick entered 2.3 in casual clothes and sat on the downstage side of the pool. The boy left to get Benedick’s book, and then Benedick decried Claudio’s sorry metamorphosis into a lover, in a rant that morphs into his own ironic blazon about the qualities in one woman that just might convince him to marry. As he concluded “and her hair shall be of what color it please God” (33), Don Pedro, Leonato, and Claudio entered, and Benedick hid by lying down in front of the pool, facing the audience. As Balthasar began singing, the boy reentered, looked around for Benedick, and spotting him prone in front of the pool, handed him the book. Although the boy’s re-entrance is not scripted, here it created a hilarious moment that blew Benedick’s cover completely. Realizing this, he raised the book high above the rim of the pool as if he were absorbed in reading and not listening to the conspirators. Wanting to hear more and searching for cover, Benedick then crawled from behind the pool and darted upstage left, hiding first behind the pillar and then the phonograph. He circled back stage left as the men briefly looked upstage, and on Don Pedro’s “He doth indeed show some sparks that are like wit” (185–86) Benedick crouched at the front edge of the pool, vainly wanting now to hear more. Then with brilliant timing, on Claudio’s “And I take him to be valiant” (188), the men turned in unison downstage and Benedick, bereft of cover, plunged into the pool, book and all, splashing water all over spectators in the front rows. Although everyone in the theatre knew this dunk was coming, nonetheless Buckley’s comic blend of visual and auditory features was absolutely hilarious.

While spectators roared, Benedick lay still in the pool, suggesting that he was drowning because he was afraid to lift his head. The longer Benedick lay in the pool the more difficult it was for the other actors to refrain from laughing. This was one of those wonderfully pregnant silences that one imagines could last many seconds on those nights when spectators truly appreciate the acting and the timing they are seeing. Don Pedro’s “As Hector, I assure you” (189) was a hilarious anti-climax.

As the men left for dinner, Benedick, like a creature from the black lagoon, slowly curled his right hand over the edge of the pool, and then cautiously—as if from the dead—raised his head. For several seconds he stared blankly at the howling multitude, stunned, one assumes, that he had made himself “such a fool” (2.3.25).

Sitting there in the pool, sopping wet, his “This can be no trick” (217) was hysterical. As one listened to him renouncing his pride—chief of the seven deadly sins and a sworn enemy to love—and pledging to be “horribly” in love with Beatrice, one realized that his plunge into the pool had been a symbolic baptism and that now he really *could* spy “some marks of love” (241) in Beatrice. To appear nonchalant as she entered, he sat back in the pool “reading” his drowned book. Beatrice *really* did not like having been “sent” to call him for dinner, and so Benedick’s insistence on a “double meaning” (2.3.253) in her speech was preposterous. As he rose from his bath and sloshed offstage to get her picture, spectators applauded the metamorphosis that love had wrought in poor Benedick.

Beatrice’s fall from pride to love was neither so dramatic nor so funny. Wearing sunglasses—a deliberately feeble disguise?—she overheard Hero and company from the upper stage, and then disappeared as very loud stomping filled the theatre. These were Beatrice’s footsteps as she entered stage left dashing for cover behind the post. While the ladies schemed center stage Beatrice stood behind them stuffing her mouth with grapes, here a harbinger not only of wine but also of fertility. Beatrice was discovering late in her life the fruits of love in this “pleached bower” where honeysuckles “advance their pride / Against the power that bred it” (3.1.10–11).

In his red-trimmed blue pants and waist coat, white epaulets and sash, and red-feathered hat, Tony DeBruno’s Dogberry was sufficiently over-dressed, and Verges, Hugh Oatcake, and George Seacole sufficiently under-qualified, to emphasize that Don John’s plot was not dangerous. Never before in all of Italy have such auspicious persons and their lechery been so easily comprehended. In the marriage scene Buckley again made several notable choices. Claudio’s “Beauty is a witch” (2.1.173) was vehement, suggesting a young man all too ready to believe his mates, and at the wedding Benedick, Claudio, Don Pedro, and Don John wore their military uniforms. Thus did Mars enter the temple of Venus. This surprising clothing choice signaled that Claudio was not yet ready for wedding rites and that, like Benedick, he required further cleansing. Bill Geisslinger as Leonato was initially furious at Hero and had to be restrained by Antonio, Balthasar, and Friar Francis. However, as befitting the play’s setting in 1945, not 1595, after hearing the Friar’s plan Leonato embraced Hero, who was sprawled on the floor being comforted by Beatrice. Thus Buckley acknowledged the play’s patriarchal heritage while softening Leonato’s anger towards, let us recall, his only child. Leonato’s embrace of the shaken Hero signaled his willingness to trust her word and to hope for renewal.

Beatrice sat center stage playing with the discarded flowers when Benedick saw her and turned back. Their words of love were soft, their embrace tender, and Beatrice’s “Kill Claudio” (4.1.288) a thunderbolt. Benedick reeled; one recalled that earlier Beatrice had promised to eat all that he had killed, so presumably, despite her promise to requite his love, Beatrice did not expect Benedick to carry out her order. While Beatrice railed at men’s perfidy Benedick knelt and then crawled on his knees trying to keep up with her. Benedick’s puttering around the stage in his military uniform was funny and also symbolized visually not only his begging her to believe him but also his subservience to her will. In 5.2 Beatrice was not about to kiss Benedick if only “foul words” (48) had passed between him and Claudio.

In 5.3 Buckley's concessions to her 1945 setting were again clear. Bells tolled on the darkened stage as Claudio, Balthasar, Don Pedro and others gathered around Hero's tomb. As Claudio knelt before the pool where Benedick had been "cleansed" of his pride, Benedick, Leonato, Antonio, and others hid behind a screen to sing Balthasar's song. Above stage left, both literally and symbolically, stood Hero, as if she had been sent there by Leonato to observe Claudio's penitence. Her presence at this cleansing ritual, in which Claudio reads from a scroll that has presumably been prepared by Leonato and / or the Friar, thus provided some motivation for Hero's acceptance of Claudio as her husband at the second wedding where "wonder seem[s] familiar" (5.4.69). Further, in marrying him she now appeared more self-motivated and less a puppet handed over to Claudio to preserve her father's honor and the patriarchal rituals of the late Renaissance. As all of the women entered the church wearing white veils, and Leonato emphatically refused Claudio's request to see his new wife's face before he wed her, one sensed in Claudio's acquiescence at this strange ritual a willingness, like Leonato in 4.1, to embrace hope.

Sitting—where else?—at the edge of the pool after their ceremony, Claudio and Hero handed to Beatrice and Benedick the notes that the two reluctant lovers had typed earlier. Beatrice was thoroughly amused by Benedick's rhyme "baby," and one sensed that after all these many years they wouldn't waste time chatting. Sitting alone at the edge of the pool was Don Pedro, the outsider in this otherwise joyous comedy, who had earnestly proposed to Beatrice earlier and been genuinely hurt by her rejection. Attired, like the other men, in his military uniform, he was for the wars, not for dancing measures.

Henry VIII was a grand spectacle of sight and sound on the Elizabethan Stage. Despite major cuts, including the Prologue and several characters, director John Sipes staged one of the last works on which Shakespeare collaborated (with John Fletcher) as both a celebration of the dawn of the Elizabethan era and a *de casibus* treatise on the fall of illustrious men and women. Lighting designer Alexander Nichols turned the façade and windows of the Elizabethan stage into the interiors of Henry's palace and medieval cathedrals. Attired in sumptuous Renaissance clothing, the men and women of Henry's reign strode across the outdoor stage amid pageants that dazzled the eye and trumpeted the work of scenic designer Michael Ganio and costume designer Susan E. Mickey. Along with appropriate musical accompaniment, here was theatre design work that served both the play and the production.

In place of the Prologue and Norfolk's description of the Field of the Cloth of Gold, Elijah Alexander as Henry entered standing in the stirrups of a large plaster horse decked in gold and red that moved briskly on a platform to downstage center. Henry wore a gold helmet with a large golden plume, gold breastplate, and gold leggings with gold boots in gold stirrups. Accompanying him were numerous fairies in bright red, waving green dragons over their heads. Behind and to either side stood lords and ladies of the realm, chanting his name as an organ and church bells pealed through the night. It was a picture worth a thousand words, whether Shakespeare's or Fletcher's, and an appropriate start to Sipes's staging of this play.

Given the play's inconsistencies and a structure that does not always follow historical events, Sipes chose to frame his production with spectacle and to empha-

size the fall of its three protagonists: Buckingham, Queen Katharine, and Cardinal Wolsey. Many of the cuts were designed to focus this voluminous play, and excellent casting choices enabled Buckingham, Wolsey, and especially Queen Katharine to emerge clearly from the play's setting. As Henry's narcissistic pageant withdrew, Michael Elich as Buckingham pulled down the long golden banner that hung from the third level of the stage. Elich railed against Wolsey and angrily refused Norfolk's offered advice to "read / The Cardinal's malice and his potency / Together" (1.1.104–06). He and Anthony Heald, as the stately Wolsey in Cardinal's red, leered at each other as Wolsey exited. Moments later, hurried by more cuts in Buckingham's dialogue with Norfolk, Elich spoke bitterly of the net that had fallen on him and would soon fall on others. During Buckingham's first monologue in 2.1, "All good people" (55–78), Elich, an accomplished actor in a minor role, spoke directly and passionately to spectators about his own "conscience" and the perils of political power in terms eerily resonant with our times. His reference to his father's fate in the service of Richard III only reified the power of kings over men's (and women's) lives.



***Henry VIII*: Vilma Silva as Queen Katharine, John Pribyl (left) as Campeius, and Anthony Heald (right) as Cardinal Wolsey. Photo by Jenny Graham.**

As Queen Katharine, Vilma Silva was magnificent. Though soliciting Henry in her initial appearance in 1.2, where Henry entered practicing his sword play, Silva nonetheless spoke firmly and confidently in his presence. Until her final, grieving moments onstage Silva maintained a regal, statuary dignity. Attired in a formal, but subdued white, black, and gray gown, white ruff, and black headdress, Katharine's clothing contrasted sharply with Henry's gold and red, and in their scenes together Silva's voice filled the distance between them. During Henry's and Wolsey's trial of Buckingham, Katharine stood stage right, obviously distraught by the accusers' words, and her "God mend all" (1.2.201) was a plea to the only power she now realized could save Buckingham's life. To stress Katharine's growing isolation within the court, Sipes placed her above stage left—where Hero had watched Claudio's memorial rite—while Henry, playfully costumed like a youthful, comedic lover, wooed and kissed Anne Bullen at the masked ball in 1.4.

Sipes included in 2.2 the Lord Chamberlain's complaints, spoken eloquently by Derrick Lee Weeden, thus suggesting Henry's growing tyranny. Henry's enthusiastic embrace of Campeius signaled his welcome of the Pope's commission. Christine Albright as Anne Bullen, like Henry dressed mostly in red and gold and thus also in stark contrast to Katharine's darker grays and black, was genuinely distraught by her own conscience, and her "Would I had no being, if this salute my blood a jot" (2.3.103–04) resonated boldly, especially coming just seconds before the red-clad army of Archbishops strode center stage to banish Queen Katharine.

2.4 and 3.1 were the play's most compelling scenes. Amid resounding drums and trumpets Henry entered 2.4 wearing a black and gold embroidered cloak. Whereas the text calls for Katharine to "[come] to the King, and [kneel] at his feet" (s.d.), Katharine knelt center stage while Henry sat as far away from her as the Elizabethan Stage allowed: on the top edge of the covered stage-left vomitorium. This blocking indicated Henry's fear of Katharine's rectitude. Silva knelt during all of her long speeches in 2.4, and turned stage left to face Henry, who sat with his head resting on his right fist, an ironic replica of Rodin's *Le Penseur*. Never in her long speech "Sir, I desire you do me right and justice" (11ff) did Silva waver in her rigid posture or the strength of her voice, even when she wept. Indeed, on Wolsey's "Be patient yet" (71) Silva became stronger and more resolute, her voice filling the outdoor stage. Her "My lord, my lord, I am a simple woman, much too weak / T' oppose your cunning" (103–05) countered with crisp diction and precise rhythm Wolsey's insistence that she had ever "displayed th' effects / Of disposition gentle and of wisdom / O'ertopping woman's pow'r" (84–86). Henry's "Call her again" (123), though made from afar by a king who had wanted to minimize the power and justice of her plea, suggested the dilemma that Katharine had created for him. Her firm response, "What need you note it? Pray you, keep your way. / . . . / I will not tarry" (126; 129) elicited spectators' spontaneous, sustained applause as she strode off stage right. Henry reached center stage before the applause had ended, and he had to wait before he could say "Go thy ways, Kate. / That man i' the world who shall report he has / A better wife, let him in naught be trusted / For speaking false in that" (131–34). Thus did spectators control the stage. Katharine's performance before the court and the bishops deeply affected Henry. Even as he spoke of his daughter's "legitimacy" and of proving his marriage "lawful," Henry choked on his words. At this moment he truly believed her to be "the primest creature / That's paragoned o' the world" (2.4.227–28). In a play replete with men's vicious and greedy exercise of power the voice of a self-proclaimed "simple woman" triumphed royally.

Silva was equally compelling in 3.1. Despite, or perhaps because of, her fury, Wolsey and John Pribyl as Cardinal Campeius showed real tenderness towards her. Given Wolsey's sincere efforts to comfort Katharine, his sudden fall from Henry's favor elicited some sympathy for his character. In 3.2.228ff, as Norfolk, Suffolk, Surrey, and especially Derrick Lee Weeden as Lord Chamberlain crowded around Wolsey, he suddenly seemed small indeed, shrunken like his power. Wolsey spoke his soliloquy "So farewell to the little good you bear me" (351–73) center stage under a glaring spotlight that emphasized his isolation on the otherwise darkened stage. He was indeed naked to his enemies.

Anne wore a royal bride's elegant white gown and was crowned on the upper stage, accompanied by ringing bells, the Court, and bishops. After the ceremony Katharine, now in a white smock and pale green robe, struggled onto the lower stage, then slept stage right from where she had delivered her magnificent speech to Henry in 2.4. During her vision the dancers placed garland crowns on her head, and though she left the stage uncrowned, Silva's command of Katharine's final speeches sealed for spectators the most compelling performance of this production.

Following Cranmer's "trial" and Henry's subsequent support of the man who voided Henry's marriage to Katharine, the birth of Elizabeth was royally celebrated. A font rose over the spot where Henry's horse had stood in the opening pageant, and Henry appeared most gaudily attired in an ermine-trimmed, gold and red brocade cape. As streamers fell from the upper stage, bells rang, and a white banner unfurled from above, Henry, surrounded by his full court and applauding bishops, proclaimed the Elizabethan era. As the child was held aloft by her father, who would soon behead her mother, one perhaps forgot amid the scenic splendor the precarious position of women in Henry's England.

For their production of *Macbeth*, Director Gale Edwards, Sound Designer Todd Barton, Lighting Designer Mark McCullough, and Scenic Director Scott Bradley employed the full technological wizardry of the Angus Bowmer Theatre.⁴ Sound Designer Todd Barton created several compelling auditory effects: ominous rumbling greeted spectators as they took their seats; screeching, unnerving electronic sound accompanied the battle scenes; and crackling thunder heralded the witches. Blue strobe lights danced eerily around the fiends and their font in 4.1 boiled ominously while fog, seemingly from everywhere, shrouded their scenes. Macduff's thunderous pounding at Macbeth's castle in 2.3 also enveloped the entire theatre, as if spectators too slept in Macbeth's murderous chambers. Edwards and her production team thus created a sensuous production that thoroughly engaged spectators' eyes and ears, but at times the rich poetry of the play seemed less important than the designers' abilities to maximize the visual and audible equivalents of the terror that resides within that poetry. The very complexity and power of these production features ironically emphasized the principal weakness of this production: Peter Macdon's physically powerful but vocally monochromatic portrayal of Macbeth. Unfortunately, the production's technology did not compensate for its poetic weakness.

Scott Bradley's complex set had two principal features. At the back of the stage was a long steel staircase that rose steeply from stage left to stage right. The railings were bent, and hanging from the bottom were twisted steel rods. Beneath and behind the rods were piled several large, jagged concrete blocks. Edwards explains in her introductory note that this set was meant to suggest a bombed building in a ruined city (she mentioned Sarajevo, Bosnia, Baghdad), and that the play—which moved from soldiers in medieval armor butchering each other in 1.1 to officers in the coats of World War II Fascists and then back to hand-to-hand combat in Act 5—is Shakespeare's essay on recurring human barbarity.⁵ Blending time periods is used frequently in staging Shakespeare's plays, especially the tragedies, and seeing this approach again may strike some reviewers as unoriginal, perhaps even stunted. Yet as Edwards says about *Macbeth*: "If theatre holds a mirror up to life, then this

is indeed a play for our times.⁷⁶ Fair enough; but one wonders if a play with such astonishing poetry, especially Macbeth's soliloquies, is well served by so large and obtrusive a set design.

However, given Edwards's approach, Bradley's set served well as the locale for several actions. Lady Macbeth walked down the staircase in 1.5 reading Macbeth's letter and Duncan walked up the stairs to his deathbed. After Macbeth's beheading, Malcolm walked down the staircase to proclaim his kingdom, thus repeating



***Macbeth*: Peter Macon as Macbeth and Robin Goodriid Nordli as Lady Macbeth. Photo by Jenny Graham.**

the steps taken first by Lady Macbeth and then by Macbeth after he killed Duncan, suggesting a murderous cycle. Beneath the concrete slabs a reddish glow emerged from a cave. From here troglodytic soldiers emerged to fight, as if from hell.

Scattered downstage were bronzed casts of numerous dead bodies, some of them children and some missing body parts. Here was a horrid image of the costs of war, from Troy to Scotland to Bosnia to Baghdad: a battlefield of bones.⁷⁷ Again, Bradley's set evoked the barbarism of the production, especially given the butchering of Macduff's family—one of the murderers poured gasoline down Lady Macduff's throat and then ignited his lighter—and the beheading of a soldier in 1.1 and then finally of Macbeth. While some might consider the dead bodies overdone, one can argue that they externalized not only Macbeth's

slaughter of the innocents but also Lady Macbeth's threat to bash the brains of her suckling child. There were six witches, not three—each of them had a young apprentice—and they were omnipresent. They dressed variously in dark blue coats and grey rags, with long entangled snake-like hair, and their constant presence, spying on all the principal characters, suggested the ubiquity of evil in the play. Peter Macon's Macbeth, who was immensely bloody in 1.3, started suddenly at the witches' calling him

Cawdor and then King, indicating clearly that his murderous thoughts preceded the witches' initial appearance. When Duncan established his state upon Malcolm, Macbeth angrily turned away for his aside, and after his final lines in 1.4 raced towards his castle.

As Lady Macbeth, Robin Goodrin Nordli was superb. She descended the staircase in 1.5 wearing a sleek, backless red gown. (One of my students, Molly Pritchard, observed that Nordli's red gowns "married stylish elegance with bloodiness.") She thrilled at Macbeth's promotions, and, as a genuinely beautiful woman, her fierce plea to the witches to unsex her became ironic. Nordli pulled Macon to her and kissed him hard on "Leave all the rest to me" (73) as she moved his hands to her naked back, thus persuading with the sexuality that she has urged the spirits to take. She fingered gently the necklace that Duncan gave her, and laughed as she and he exited hand-in-hand.

The sequence from 1.7, Macbeth's soliloquy, through 2.2, the knocking that wakes the Porter, was genuinely compelling. However, Macon regrettably spoke Macbeth's first soliloquy in 1.7 quickly and ignored its complex, interwoven images, a performance choice that robbed spectators of grasping how Macbeth's imagination rouses his fear. Surely such profound poetry deserves more effort from an actor.⁸ Nordli immediately increased the tension; she was furious that Macbeth had left the chamber, and she delivered Lady Macbeth's image of killing a child with fierce conviction and full awareness of its terrifying power. Like the broken children scattered downstage, her suckling child was but a trifling obstacle to power. Caressing Macon's face, wearing another low-cut, sparkling red evening gown, Nordli's overt sensuality convinced Macbeth to but mock the time. What man would not clutch her; not believe her that killing a sleeping king would be a simple deed?

Macon was far more convincing with Macbeth's soliloquy in 2.1. After Banquo's wary exit, the witches surrounded Macbeth center stage as he spoke and offered him several daggers. Macon was indeed shaken by the "gouts of blood" that his imagination conjured at 1.47ff, and he showed a more profound understanding of how Macbeth's fervid imagination was beginning to affect him. Macon's physical shock and his stumbling delivery conveyed far more emotional depth than at any previous moment in the production.

Both Macon and Nordli were superb in 2.2, among the most genuinely terrifying enactments of this sequence I have ever seen. Nordli was already unnerved by the ringing bellman, and shrieked "Who's there? What ho?" (8) loudly enough to wake the dead. Although Lady Macbeth had carefully drugged the grooms and "lai[n] their daggers ready" (11), in the stichomythia that ensued after Macbeth descended the stairs with the bloody daggers their mutual fear exploded. Lady Macbeth was utterly furious at Macbeth, her anger masking more fear of their deed than I have ever seen at this moment. (Nordli's performance made perfect sense of her line "Th' attempt and not the deed / Confounds us" [10–11]). She shook with rage as she screamed at Macbeth, who at "There's one did laugh in 's sleep, and cried 'Murder'" (26) stood paralyzed, glaring at the blood dripping from his sleeves onto his hands; he had plunged the knives deeply into Duncan. Unable to look again at what he had done, Macbeth seemed possessed by the nightmare vision he had con-

jured. Lady Macbeth yelled “Infirm of purpose” (56) and grabbed the daggers, only to be suddenly appalled as blood now covered her hands as well. The loudly amplified knocking that suggested an invasion of their castle terrified them, and as Lady Macbeth led Macbeth offstage to get a little water, Nordli’s frantic speech conveyed vividly their mutual panic.

Josiah Phillips as the Porter in his striped jacket, black pants, spats, and top hat provided some comic relief, suggesting a modern vaudeville entertainer. Macbeth descended from the upper chamber covered in blood, as did Malcolm and Donalbain at the end of 2.3. Macbeth’s measured “Who can be wise, amazed, temp’rate and furious” (110–20) indicated a return to composure, but Lady Macbeth’s sudden fainting conveyed overwhelming terror at Macbeth’s having killed the grooms. These two murders were not in their (i.e., *her*) plans, and Nordli’s crumbling at the bottom of the fatal stairs complemented her fury at Macbeth’s earlier indecision. From one who feared to kill, Macbeth had become one who killed too rashly. Dressed in floor-length black capes with red trim, Macbeth as king and his queen also descended from this upper chamber in 3.1. Bradley’s set thus came to symbolize the origin of Macbeth’s kingship in a place of slaughter.

Presumably playing Macbeth as descending into madness, Macon resorted in Acts 3 and 4 to loud declarations often delivered more to the audience than to other characters, including Lady Macbeth. This feature of his performance became not just annoying but also silly; why would Macbeth yell at spectators instead of at characters in the play? In 3.2 Macbeth spoke feverishly of the scorched snake and the need for sleep, frightening Lady Macbeth who tried vainly to calm him, suggesting her fears that her sensual appeal to his “manhood” had become ineffectual. In the banquet scene Macbeth was unhinged. The three adult witches, who apparently were not seen by anyone onstage, moved a long ceremonial table to center stage, as if this gathering of the new king’s guests were their doing. (And in a sense, it is.) They remained throughout the scene, and at times took seats around the table, including Macbeth’s when Banquo’s ghost had temporarily left. A bowl of red roses decorated the table as the guests took their seats. Banquo’s extremely bloodied ghost, with forty mortal gashes, entered first from stage right and took Macbeth’s seat at the head of the table stage left. During his visions of the ghost, which left and then reentered from different parts of the stage, Macbeth became increasingly violent, spilling wine and hurling chairs as he screamed and tried to vanquish the apparition. With each successive vision isolated in glaring red spotlights, Macon’s rage increased, until screaming madly he climbed onto the table to challenge the ghost, as if trying to resurrect the furious butcher of Act 1 and the manhood that Lady Macbeth had extolled. It was a thrilling sequence, as it established the pattern that Macbeth would follow for the rest of the play. So shattered was he that his assertion “Why, so; being gone I am a man again” (3.4.108–09) was comical. Macbeth’s many images of blood at the end of the scene became the ranting of a mind terrified by what he had done and had feared to look at. As the guests left, Lady Macbeth collapsed at the foot of the stairs. Nordli’s frantic efforts to maintain calm and order during the scene and her screaming at the knights to “Stand not upon the order of your going” (120) brilliantly evoked Lady Macbeth’s crumbling mind.

The apparitions in 4.1 were children with hideously bloated heads, and the line of kings was composed of similarly tortured figures. As the macabre children climbed up from the bubbling cauldron, Hecate tied a necklace of teeth—human, animal?—around Macbeth's neck, an ironic reversal of the diamond-studded necklace that Duncan had placed around Lady Macbeth's neck in 1.6 and another visual reminder of the broken bones littering the proscenium. Macbeth fell to his knees and crawled to a small pool where he sipped water, perhaps now symbolizing the unnatural, subhuman creature he had become. As he knelt the witches painted his face with white streaks that suggested animal markings, perhaps a tiger's. Looking into the glass at what he had become, Macbeth resolved to surprise Macduff's castle, where his butchers strangled Macduff's daughter and then incinerated his wife.

Wearing a ragged, bloodied white gown, her beautiful blonde hair now tangled like the witches', Lady Macbeth descended from the upper level into complete madness. Bradley's set again became highly symbolic, for the place of the murder, to which Lady Macbeth returns with the bloody daggers in 2.2, now became the source of her madness. The three young witches, here images of Macduff's slaughtered "pretty ones" as well as of the suckling child that Lady Macbeth had sworn to kill, surrounded her center stage as she frantically wiped her hands. While one could not tell if she was supposed to see them, as one could not tell if Macbeth had seen the witches at the banquet, the constant appearance of the adult and young witches throughout the play emphasized their role as, at least, tempters of the murderous king and queen. Sending the young witches to claim Lady Macbeth was visually stunning.

Macbeth raged wildly at Seyton about his armor, and after Seyton pulled it off Macbeth stood bare-chested to face his enemies. The trees of Birnam Wood were green phosphorous lights that soldiers carried from the hell-mouth center stage, as if nature were trampling diabolical evil. When Seyton announced the queen's death, Macon froze. As he spoke Macbeth's final, agonizing soliloquy he slowly crumbled to the ground, exactly over the spot where the witches' cauldron had poured forth its distorted children. Macon here evoked superbly the dreadful emptiness of Macbeth's images; would that he had taken equal care with all of Macbeth's soliloquies. Macduff raced down the staircase to face Macbeth, and their long, *mano a mano* combat, which evoked the earlier medieval setting, was brilliantly choreographed. At one point Macbeth disarmed Macduff and held two swords to Macduff's head but then released him rather than cut his throat. Given Macbeth's earlier butchery this was an odd choice but perhaps was meant to suggest Macbeth's fatalism. Moments later Macduff held the dead butcher as other soldiers, repeating the opening battle scene, decapitated him.

As Macbeth's head was held aloft, Malcolm descended from the upper chamber to proclaim his kingship. Fleance, whose reappearance here is unscripted, stood silently downstage holding a sword. The witches had apparently brought him back, and one of the apprentices offered him her hand. As in Roman Polanski's 1971 film version, here the cycle of violence seemed doomed to continue.

For *All's Well That Ends Well* in the intimate New Theatre, director Amanda Dehnert and scenic designer Christopher Acebo reached back to Shakespeare's source in Boccaccio's *Decameron*, to Shakespeare's sonnets, to Renaissance theat-

rical traditions, to American vaudeville conventions, possibly to Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot*, and to the home movies of the early twentieth century to create a charming and inventive production. Acebo's three-sided stage was a series of long planks of varying lengths with an uneven border downstage; while upstage, behind a naked tree, were a wooden fence also of uneven boards; a cruciform grave marker; and a swinging gate, the planks curled upwards, suggesting perhaps the rough-hewn, ad-hoc stages that traveling Renaissance theatre companies might have constructed or found in a small town. Given the First Lord's remark in 4.3, "The web of our life is of a mingled yarn, / good and ill together. Our virtues would be proud if / our faults whipped them not, and our crimes would / despair if they were not cherished by our virtues" (70–73), the large, naked tree suggested the Biblical Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil and / or the barren tree of Beckett's *Godot*: "A country road. A tree." It was also just a tree with a ladder at the back and a swing where young Helena played while still at Rossillion. To the left of the tree was a rod tied at one end to a tree limb and at the other to a steel pole that stood further stage left. Suspended from the rod was a curtain which became the screen for the movie intervals that Armando Durán's character the Clown used frequently during the performance to narrate his story to his twenty-first century spectators.



All's Well That Ends Well: Armando Durán as the Clown. Photo by Jenny Graham.

Two large trunks, one upstage center-right and the other downstage left, contained costumes and paraphernalia that the various characters used throughout the play. Given the overtly theatrical nature of Dehnert's production, the two trunks certainly recalled Elizabethan traveling companies.⁹ Dehnert also re-created Boccaccio's narrator, or as she calls him, "storyteller," in the figure of the Clown, played brilliantly by Durán, an amazingly versatile actor. Wearing black shoes, baggy pants, a white shirt, black tie, vest, loose-fitting jacket, and cone-shaped hat, he suggested at once Harlequin of the *commedia dell'arte* (minus the mask), the improvising Elizabethan clowns Richard Tarlton and Will Kempe, the conventional vaudeville clown of early twentieth-century America, Charlie Chaplin's enduring clown, and Vladimir in *Godot*. As the Clown, Durán moved about the stage constantly, often playing different characters and pulling different costumes out of one of the trunks or out of the suitcase he carried with him, suggesting also the lone, itinerant player making his living on the road.¹⁰ As Dee Maaske, who played the Countess, explained in a discussion with my students, Durán was supposed to be invisible when as the storyteller he wore his hat.

In a silent prologue recalling an Elizabethan dumb show, Durán walked onto the stage through the gate carrying his suitcase, from which he took a roll of film that he inserted into an old movie projector that was set into the floor downstage right. He then walked upstage, pulled the curtain across, walked back to the projector, and turned it on. Projected onto the screen, in the large script of older films, were the words "All's Well That Ends Well." Thus did the play begin with its imaginative combination of medieval, Renaissance, and modern narrative forms, aided by the Clown as both a Renaissance storyteller and a twentieth-century home movie maker. Throughout the play Durán would stop the action momentarily to show "film clips" explaining the location of the action or providing spectators with some necessary information from the omitted scenes. As we were to learn at play's end, the Clown had good reasons for wanting to tell (t)his story and show (t)his movie.

In another nod to the Shakespearean stage, Dehnert employed inventive doubling. As dramaturge Lezlie Cross explained in a note to me, Durán is a "mash-up of Rinaldo, Lavatch, servants and lords of the French court, one of the Lords Dumaine and the stranger [Shakespeare's 'A Gentleman']." G. Valmont Thomas, a robust actor with marvelous comic timing, played Lafew and the other Lord Dumaine. Given these actors' rapid assumption of different characters, the action moved seamlessly among its many locales. Every element of the set blended effortlessly with the telling of Shakespeare's story, not only because of Durán's and Thomas's fluid movements among their several characters, but also because the conventions of storytelling as both literary narration and as home movie freed the actors to maximize the charming theatricality of their production.

After a few seconds of showing the play's title on his impromptu screen, Durán stopped the projector, closed his movie screen, walked backstage, and then re-emerged carrying one of his many suitcases. He opened the suitcase center stage and plastic flowers popped up, a visual hint of springtime and renewal. Then, as he often did, the Clown stood backstage and watched intently as the play proper began, as if he were watching his own story unfold. Danforth Comins was a handsome Bertram

that any young woman might fancy, especially in his full-dress military uniform, while Kjerstine Rose Anderson, as Helena, was dressed initially in dull peasant garb. By contrast Dee Maaske appeared initially as the stately Countess in a royal red gown, while John Tufts as Parolles dressed in the dark suit, white shirt, and striped tie commonly associated with the English public schools. After Bertram left court, Helena climbed the tree to discuss virginity with Parolles, suggesting a young Eve wanting to know how women may barricade their virginity against its enemy: man.

Anderson played Helena as a marvelously self-confident and energetic young woman. Kneeling before James Edmondson as the King of France, who wore a white gown that resembled a shroud as Lafew pushed him onstage in a wooden wheelchair, Helena pleaded earnestly while opening another of the set's many suitcases. Inside were the medical instruments she would use to cure him, and in her pilgrim's cloak and hat she suggested a peddler selling wares on a country road. Streamlining Shakespeare's script, Dehnert had the King rise immediately after drinking Helena's magical potion, thus emphasizing the play's fairy-tale element. Bertram initially laughed off Helena's choice, and left the stage utterly dejected as he took Helena's hand. Lafew's belittling of the much smaller Parolles, who created his own mismatched soldier's uniform with far too many of his public school ties wound around his sleeves and ankles, comically set up the ridicule of Parolles that the French soldiers later staged for Bertram. As he exited 2.5, Bertram gave Helena a peck on her cheek as, with Parolles's ironic *coraggio*, he set off eagerly for the Italian wars, thus abandoning Venus for Mars. Carrying another small suitcase from which popped up a pen with a red flower tied to its top, Durán took down the Countess's letter in 3.4 that is intended to tell Bertram of his wife's pilgrimage and to pry him from Parolles's juvenile influence.

The scenes in Italy were wonderfully theatrical. Kate Mulligan as the Widow and Emily Sophia Knapp as her daughter were classic 1950s American tourists. The Widow, chewing gum incessantly and speaking with a Jersey accent, wore a wide brim red hat, sunglasses, a red halter top, white polka-dot dress, and six inch heels! Her daughter, a carefully coiffed blonde, sported red shoes, white slacks, and a red blouse. They were silly military groupies who squealed as the soldiers passed by. The "soldiers" were brightly painted wooden figures strung on a long rope that Durán and Thomas carried horizontally across the stage, perhaps suggesting the uniformity of soldiers while comically "playing" at war upon a stage. Dehnert's mixing of eras and her total embrace of her theatrical medium, including the frequent use of film, challenged spectators to accept the improbability of the multimedia fairy tale her actors were staging. This approach enabled Dehnert to glide over the infamous bed trick; if one could believe that the wooden puppets were soldiers marching in full-dress parade, one could believe that the Widow and her daughter could buy a pilgrim's story that she was Bertram's true wife who could—as if magically—both guard the daughter's virtue and enlarge their coffers.

The unmasking of Parolles was hysterical. Bound with his own school ties to a chair and blindfolded, he trembled as Durán and Thomas stood upon chairs and shouted the gobbledy gook that terrifies him. Bertram was deeply hurt and angry as he moved away from Parolles's infantile praise of war towards Helena's forgiveness in

Act 5. Once the blindfold was removed, but with his hat still over his eyes, Parolles in his disgust ran furiously around the stage and twice ran smack into the tree where earlier he had ridiculed virginity. The moment served as a comic metaphor for the exorcism of Bertram's puerile, misdirected nature.

In 5.1 Durán was a runner in a marathon, his uniform #21, who promised to deliver Helena's petition to the French King. Here Durán's "character" neatly symbolized the various journeys that other characters had taken in the play. Parolles entered in muddy rags, and Lafew's "Though you are a knave and a fool, you shall eat" (5.2.55) prepared spectators for the larger images of forgiveness and acceptance. Amid the formality of the Court, the riddle of the rings resolved in a simple, extremely moving tableau. Helena, again in her bride's white gown and quite pregnant, approached Bertram; he, afraid to look at her, moved backward as his entire body shrank and finally crumbled to the floor. Helena knelt before him, and as the King concluded the scene, Bertram gently stroked Helena's stomach, simultaneously caressing both his wife and his child. After Bertram's final words, "If she, my liege, can make me know this clearly, / I'll love her dearly, ever, ever dearly" (16–17), the Countess spoke a line from Sonnet 96: "Thou mak'st faults graces that to thee resort" (4). While the end of this play remains difficult to accept, especially for contemporary women, Comins's ability to portray extreme guilt and humility in just a few seconds suggested a man now worthy of forgiveness. Lafew's "Mine eyes smell opinions; I shall weep anon" (5.3.321) spoke for spectators throughout the theatre. It was a wonderfully powerful moment of that "rarer action" that fairy tales—and theatre—re-create for us.

During her post-play discussion Dee Maaske stated that Amanda Dehnert was a "complete romantic" in her approach to this play. That is, for Dehnert, despite its difficulties and its reputation as a "problem play," *All's Well* had to end happily. Thus in place of the King's epilogue, after the other actors had left the stage, Durán spoke from upstage center Sonnet 17, which ends: "But were some child of yours alive that time, / You should live twice, in it and in my rhyme." Durán then showed his last home movie, featuring Bertram and Helena as a happy young couple with their child. As the movie progressed and the child in later frames grew, one realized that the child was the Clown in his younger years: his story—this play / film—is the story of his parents. In the final frames we see the young man at his parents' gravesite; they have died young, and we see him place flowers at their graves. Hence the cruciform marker on stage. Finally, we see the Clown leaving home carrying the suitcase full of props that he will use to tell his parents' story to different people in the theatre every night. In the end is his beginning. Thus the play / film artifact, while including death, has a happy ending, and we know why the Clown travels about telling (t)his story: he wants us to know that despite his father's initial refusal of his saintly mother, his parents were happy and their story deserves to be told.¹¹

Notes

1. Oregon Shakespeare Festival 2009, *Souvenir Program*, 49.
2. Oregon Shakespeare Festival 2009, *Playbill*, 44.

3. 2.1.46. All textual references are to *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. David Bevington (New York: Harper Collins, 1992).
4. I suspect that Edwards's production of *Macbeth* will be hotly debated among reviewers. While all reviewers strive to be fair and objective, nonetheless a personal element is always present. See Peter Holland's incisive "It's all about me. Deal with it," in *Shakespeare Bulletin* 25 (2007): 27–39. Given some conversations with my Ashland students and email exchanges with colleagues, I suspect that I may be more generally fond of this production than other reviewers.
5. Gale Edwards's notes about her production are available from Amy Richards of the OSF publicity department and in a book on the play in the members' lounge in Ashland.
6. *Playbill*, 8.
7. The mutilated bodies reminded me of Mark Twain's "The War Prayer," available online and in *Mark Twain on the Damned Human Race*, ed. Janet Smith (New York: Hill and Wang, 1962), 64–68, esp. 67.
8. On the poetic richness of Macbeth's soliloquies, see especially Lawrence Danson, *Tragic Alphabet: Shakespeare's Drama of Language* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 122–41; and Frank Kermode, *Shakespeare's Language* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 2000), 201–16.
9. Recall the print in *The Riverside Shakespeare*, 1st ed, from *Scarron's Comical Romance of a Company of Stage Players* (plate 14 between 494 and 495) that includes trunks in which traveling Renaissance players carried their costumes and props. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974).
10. Given the extensive use of film, Durán's Clown also recalled both Fellini's *La Strada* and Bergman's *The Seventh Seal*. In both films wandering entertainers, one on a motorcycle and the other in a horse-drawn wagon, eke out a living performing at improvised venues in the countryside.
11. Taken together, Dehnert's production choices evoked brilliantly the salient features of what Peter Brook calls "The Rough Theatre." Brook writes: "The Rough Theatre has apparently no style, no conventions, no limitations—in practice, it has all three," 71. The rough, or popular theatre, ". . . freed of unity of style, actually speaks a very sophisticated and stylish language: a popular audience usually has no difficulty in accepting inconsistencies of accent and dress, or in darting between mime and dialogue, realism and suggestion," 67. Even given the generally sophisticated theatrical tastes of most OSF spectators, Dehnert's production relied on her spectators' ability to become Brook's popular audience. Judging by their sustained applause at play's end, audience members certainly grasped how well the disparate elements of the production told its story. See Peter Brook, *The Empty Space* (New York: Atheneum, 1978).

THE 2010 ALABAMA SHAKESPEARE FESTIVAL: *HAMLET*

Bryan Adams Hampton, *University of Tennessee at Chattanooga*

Traveling north on Interstate 65, away from Montgomery, one happens upon an undersized off-white billboard rising on short stilts from a farmer's field; emblazoned there is a horned devil in red silhouette holding a pitchfork and ominously gesturing towards crimson letters that read "Go To Church or the Devil Will Get You." The billboard's message resonated in my mind as a fitting emblem during my evening drive back to Chattanooga from the Alabama Shakespeare Festival's 2010 production of *Hamlet*, directed by Geoffrey Sherman. On a visceral level, the emblem was appropriate because it was as if the red devil himself were the passenger in my lusterless car, which baked for an afternoon in the flames of the Alabama sun, and which has had no air conditioning for three summers. One may query why I have failed to get the air compressor fixed, but like the ghost of Hamlet's father, perhaps I drive it *in situ* "Till the foul crimes done in my days of nature / Are burnt and purged away" (1.4.13-14).¹ On a spiritual level, the emblem was a fitting foil for Shakespeare's great tragedy, which the eminent critic A. C. Bradley a century ago asserted was the closest that Shakespeare approached to a "religious drama."² The play voices the early modern era's belief in the danger of evil spirits that might draw a person to "the dreadful summit of the cliff / . . . / And there assume some other horrible form" (1.4.70-72) to lead one to madness, destruction, and damnation. But the tragedy also evades the hermeneutical confidence and metaphysical certainty the Alabama farmer's sign registers. Uttered by a spooked Bernardo, the first line of the play, "Who's there?" (1.1.1), initiates the audience into the uncertainties of appearances and realities woven throughout the play.

Sherman's production captures the play's motif of indecipherability with fair success. Composer James Conely's buoyant bursts of trumpet fanfare at the beginning of the play serve as a contrast to the gloom and billowing fog. Brilliantly designed by Peter Hicks, the set evokes the columns, arches, and stairways in M. C. Escher's 1958 lithograph *Belvedere*, whose skewed angles challenge our perceptions about the integrity of the structure; one might imagine Hamlet, or the audience, in the figure of the seated man contemplating the illusions and impossibilities of a Necker Cube. Two massive blue-gray columns organize the central space of the stage and extend up well beyond the audience's field of vision. A balcony serves alternately as the ramparts of Elsinore castle, the place of spying, and the exalted seats from which Claudius and Gertrude watch *The Mousetrap*; actors enter and exit the balcony from one direction, and on the other side they descend the stairs, first to a landing with yet another exit, or to more stairs that lead to the main stage below. Under the balcony and partially obscured is a truncated stairway that leads to no perceivable place, and a colonnade disappears at an angle to the back of the stage, creating a murky middle ground where Nathan Hosner's capable Hamlet strolls or peeps about the columns in the shadows. Hosner drifts into the scene in 1.2, under the colonnade, and he is like one of those shadowy columns straining to hold the

weight above. He demonstrates Hamlet's isolation and vulnerability by tightly hugging himself—a posture repeated throughout the performance, though mostly during the soliloquies. The visual effect is, at times, startling, as the audience is immediately confronted with a protagonist simultaneously given to breaching a keen and reeling mind that reveals its inner workings, and to buttressing a body that is closed off and conceals its cracks. It is no wonder, then, that Polonius, Gertrude, Claudius, Rosencrantz, and Guildenstern have trouble comprehending his melancholy and his wit. Hosner's Hamlet is contradictory and indecipherable from the start.

In his classic 1904 lecture on *Hamlet*, Bradley claims that “in Hamlet's absence, the remaining characters could not yield a Shakespearean tragedy at all” because without its dominant character the story would be merely sensational.³ Hosner, the tallest of the troupe, certainly dominates the physical space in his “nighted color”

(1.2.68) in the same way that Hamlet's character dominates the intellectual space he shares with his interlocutors, and with the same result: he masters everyone. He is head and shoulders above the two fops, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, fawningly played by Jordan Coughtry and Michael Pesoli, respectively (both of whom have other roles in the production). The two plaster sickening smiles onto their faces and lick Claudius' boots, yielding their services as the Crown's spies at the beginning of 2.2 with a synchronized step and bow. When the pair is sent to fetch Hamlet to Gertrude's chamber in 3.2, following the play-within-a-play, Hamlet forces a recorder into the hands of Guildenstern, who protests his lack of skill. Hosner's height serves his advantage here: he grabs the slight Pesoli, abruptly spins him round, bear hugs him from behind, shoves the recorder into his mouth, and



***Hamlet:* Nathan Hosner as Hamlet and Kelley Curran as Ophelia. Photo by Stephen Poff.**

performs several Heimlich maneuvers as Guildenstern blows broken notes and becomes Hamlet's instrument. The staging reinforces the many instances of manipu-

lation in the play as well as Hamlet's angry words: "You would play upon me. . . . 'Sblood do you think I am easier to be played on than a pipe? Call me what instrument you will, though you can fret me, you cannot play upon me" (3.2.363; 368-71). We are glad when the two friends from Wittenberg get what they deserve.

Anthony Cochrane, who admirably captures King Claudius' self-aggrandizing tendencies, is Hosner's opposite: shorter, built like a bulldog, and lavishly dressed in the rich, red and gold Jacobean period costumes designed by well-seasoned veteran Elizabeth Novak. Cochrane's baritone British accent naturally commands attention, especially from a southern American audience not accustomed to its crisp enunciation and aristocratic flair. This stout Claudius seems always moving greedily toward the center of the stage to attract the gaze of all present, jockeying only with Hamlet for position with his rapier remark that Hamlet's persistent melancholy is "unmanly grief" (1.2.94). In the *Mousetrap* scene (3.2) Cochrane's Claudius self-importantly watches from the balcony above, surrounded by his courtiers, but he entirely misses the "dumb show" that precedes the lengthier reenactment of *The Murder of Gonzalo*—his attention is consumed by a messenger who enters and hands him a paper detailing some unknown issue. Meanwhile, Horatio, blandly portrayed by Matt D'Amico, sits on the edge of the stage reading the acting troupe's foul papers, eyes the king's reactions, and registers his initial skepticism until after the dumb show. During the murder scene of the Player King, Claudius' eyes look furtively left and right as he tries to sink into his chair; when he cannot hide, Claudius aggressively rises and marches across the balcony without a backward glance, in an apparent ploy to communicate his royal disappointment with the performance rather than his guilt. In the following scene, Cochrane's Claudius becomes a figure of pathos, even if fleetingly. On his way to Gertrude's chamber, Hamlet spies him from the balcony; Claudius has removed his crown and crimson robe of state, and Cochrane splits his attention between addressing heaven and playing to the audience with a conspiratorial wink. In Hamlet's moment of deliberation, Cochrane's figure is highlighted in a single spotlight from above as his hands are pressed together in the attitude of prayer, but the spotlight enhances the glow of his red vestments, rendering him much like that red devil in the farmer's field. The split impulse of the poetic line, "My words fly up, my thoughts remain below" (3.3.97-98), is subtly undergirded in Cochrane's gesture: when Hamlet exits above, Claudius begins to cross himself, but never completes the sacred ritual. He gazes forlornly for a moment at the heavens, but they will not open themselves to this "bosom black as death" that desires pardon but willfully "retain[s] th'offense" (3.3.67; 56).

Curiously absent from our gaze is the physical presence of the ghost, who in the play-text technically appears four times: mutely to Horatio and the watch in 1.1 on the castle ramparts; mutely to Horatio, the watch, and Hamlet in 1.4, as the protagonist fearfully but resignedly follows him; in 1.5 with Hamlet alone hearing the tale of murder; and, finally, in 3.4 as Hamlet accosts Gertrude in her bedchamber. In the first three, the ghost is clad from head to foot in his armor, with the beaver up to reveal his face; in the last, many modern editors follow the lead of Q1 (1603), the so-called "Bad Quarto," which directs "*Enter the ghost in his night gowne,*" a detail not preserved in Q2 (1604-05) or the Folio. Instead, Geoffrey Sherman has

chosen to represent the ghost with a sickly, pale green light into which the actors stare or follow, while the ghost's lines are recited in a voiceover accompanied by an ominous thrumming bass note. The strength of this production choice, as the director communicated with me post-production, is that it avoids the earthly clunkiness of a fully armored actor onstage and allows the ghostly presence to be staged at times other than when the play-text indicates, as for instance during the duel or at the death of Claudius. When the ghost first appears to the watch, the light shines upon the balcony/ramparts; Hamlet enters the scene, and the light representing the ghost emanates from different sections of the stage. When Hamlet is alone with the ghost, the green light glows from the two sets of entrance/exit stairs which emerge from tunnels and dressing rooms underneath the audience and ascend/descend at the front of the main stage. The flexibility of the sickly light registers well Hamlet's initial dilemma of the origins of the ghost ("Be thou a spirit of health or goblin damned, / Bring with thee airs from heaven or blasts from hell" [1.4.40-41]), since this ghost can in one moment blend with the sky at dawn and in the next moment emanate from the abyss below.⁴ With the flexibility gained through this approach, however, there is also sacrifice, and I confess my disappointment with this point of the production. One might argue that the ghost is the fulcrum upon which the action of the entire play rests, and his physical bearing and attire (whether armor or nightgown) have compelling implications for how Hamlet interacts with his departed father and Gertrude, as well as for establishing the tone of the particular scene. His appearance thus enhances both the dread and pathos of his doom. If the ghost is dressed in armor, the audience and Hamlet perceive him in his hardened authority, a fallen warrior-king murdered by a treasonous subject; if the ghost is dressed in his nightgown, the audience and Hamlet perceive him in his utter vulnerability, a cuckolded house husband betrayed by lust. Marjorie Garber surmises that the ghost is "both the shade of Hamlet's father . . . and also a kind of superego, a conscience-prodder, inseparable from Hamlet himself."⁵ Without his physical presence onstage, one wonders if Hamlet can be fully present.

Fully present, however, are three actors whose performances upstage Hosner when he shares a scene with them: veteran ASF actor Rodney Clark who plays Polonius, Kelley Curran who portrays Ophelia, and Paul Hopper who plays the gravedigger (and who voices the ghost). Clark's Polonius is the best I have seen onstage, and he deftly renders Polonius at once sychophantic and self-absorbed, lost in the folds of his courtly outer garment as much as in his own platitudes. When the audience is introduced to the subplot in 1.3, it is clear that Polonius has interrupted a tender leave-taking between brother and sister. Laertes (a mixed performance from Matthew Baldiga) and Ophelia treat their father with outward respect but look for every opportunity to short circuit his orations and escape his presence. Comically, Laertes attempts to make a swift exit on his way back to France, but when Polonius begins giving advice he resignedly drops his shoulder bag to the floor, crosses his arms, rolls his eyes, and grins. Even Claudius and Gertrude, the latter disappointingly played without distinction by Greta Lambert, smile but barely tolerate his presence. Curran is a wisp of a woman, but her more mature Ophelia has a regal bearing and exudes charisma—which only intensifies the shock we experience when

she appears in a soiled white shift during her later scenes of madness, flitting about the stage alternately crying and laughing through the tuneless lyrics she sings. Hopper's gravedigger, half-visible from a lowered central platform on the main stage, looks like a hoary "redneck" from the Alabama woods or a refugee from a ZZ Top concert as he digs up bones and swills what is certainly Danish moonshine. When he recovers a skull and jawbone, the clown manipulates the blanched pair like a ventriloquist, which drew laughter from the audience. As the gravedigger, Hopper exaggerates a deep southern drawl even as he brilliantly matches wits, unwittingly, with Hamlet's quick mind. Throughout the exchange, however, one gets the feeling that it is Hosner, and not just Hamlet, who admires the performance of this "absolute . . . knave" (5.1.137).

When the funeral train arrives bearing Ophelia's body, Hopper and his assistant are deferential and quick to get out of the way, exchanging knowing glances from bowed heads as Laertes questions the priest, "What ceremony else? / . . . / Must there no more be done?" (5.1.225, 235). Matthew Baldiga's performance as Laertes is lacking here as he is not able to summon Laertes' pride and anger that seethe beneath his grief; for the rest of the play, Baldiga's Laertes pouts rather than pounces, which results in a duel scene that cannot muster the necessary energy. The swordplay is well-choreographed by Professor Bill Engel, an accomplished fencer and the dramaturge for the play, but without Laertes' fuel for vengeance there is no combustion. Consequently, the final gesture towards reconciliation between Laertes and Hamlet ("Exchange forgiveness with me, noble Hamlet" [5.2.331]), both broken sons grieving lost fathers, falls flat.

Following the performance, Hosner, Curran, and D'Amico addressed questions from the audience about the performance and the play. I do not know if this practice is traditional with ASF productions, as this is only the second year that I have attended; if it is not, it should become one of its trademarks. The lively discussions and teaching points about role preparation, paring lines in particular scenes or exchanges, and actor's gaffes perfectly capped an afternoon that began with an energetic mini-lecture, on *Hamlet* and the genre of revenge tragedy in the early modern period, by Professor Susan Willis, who has served as the principle ASF dramaturge for many years. Like early modern playgoers, and Fortinbras at the end of the tragedy, we find ourselves captive hearers

Of carnal, bloody, and unnatural acts,
Of accidental judgments, casual slaughters,
Of deaths put on by cunning and forced cause,
And, in this upshot, purposes mistook
Fall'n on the inventors' heads. (5.2.383-87)

And while Horatio promises "All this can I / Truly deliver" (387-88), Sherman's production of *Hamlet* delivers, sporadically, "A touch, a touch, I confess 't" and then "A hit, a very palpable hit" (5.2.288; 282).

Notes

1. All citations of the play text are from *Hamlet*, ed. David Bevington (New York: Bantam Books, 1988).
2. A. C. Bradley, *Shakespearean Tragedy* (New York: Penguin, 1991), 166.
3. Bradley, 94.
4. For the wide array of opinions on the ghost's origins, see Miriam Joseph, "Discerning the Ghost in *Hamlet*," *PMLA* 76 (1961): 493-502; Ivor Morris, *Shakespeare's God: The Role of Religion in the Tragedies* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1972); Eleanor Prosser, *Hamlet and Revenge*, 2nd ed. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1971); and Stephen Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).
5. Marjorie Garber, *Shakespeare After All* (New York: Anchor Books, 2004), 469.

BROOKLYN ACADEMY OF MUSIC: *THE TEMPEST* (2010)

Cameron Hunt McNabb, *University of South Florida*

The Harvey Theatre, one of the Brooklyn Academy of Music's playing spaces, strikes one as particularly appropriate for Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. The theatre, itself a bit shipwrecked, shows its age in its scuffed arches; but as *The Tempest* teaches us, being shipwrecked can have a certain charm. And charm is something this theatre does not lack.

The stage design was certainly the most striking aspect of the visual presentation. The back half of the playing space was flooded with an inch or so of water and served as the main method of entrance and exit. O brave new stage! Alonso and his crew do indeed arrive from the sea. The side spaces held the musical instruments and Prospero's cave, appropriately fitted with books. Then, sitting in the center of the stage like a beige bull's-eye was a circle of sand, which functioned as the "shore" to the "sea" behind it. The entire play would be set in this playing space.

The production did not begin with the usual conventions of theatre—no reminder about cell phone ringers nor any dimming of the lights. Rather, Prospero (Stephen Dillane) simply donned his tattered coat, picked up a bucket of water, and sprinkled it around the sandy ring. From then on, he never left the stage: Prospero would begin this production, and Prospero would end it.

And he would literally, physically circumscribe the action. The opening tempest scene established these power dynamics. While the boatswain and noblemen narrated the action, Ariel silently manipulated them; meanwhile, Prospero circled outside the sandy ring, watching his production, a pattern he would repeat frequently. All of the play's action took place within the shore's circumference, with characters called forth and dismissed from it. Even if they tried to move beyond the sandy circle, they were invisibly reined back in. Only Ariel and Prospero freely walked beyond its bounds.

The tempest scene also stressed the auralty of the performance. The scene placed the boatswain, the noblemen, and silent Ariel in the circle, with Ariel's staff as the only prop, which alternated as the ship mast or side railing. Despite the sea in the rear of the stage, the tempest existed only in description. The point was significant: the *words* would show us the storm; the *words* would bring us to the island; the *words* would speak for themselves. Shakespeare's language would not be usurped by stage spectacle—it would create it. For the rest of the production, the props within the circle remained simple and warranted by the text, such as a truck of royal clothes, two logs for Ferdinand, and a game of chess. Shakespeare's language took center stage.

Prospero's persistent stage presence was matched only by Ariel (Christian Camargo), a character whose description in the play leads to a wide variety of interpretations. Sam Mendes' production emphasized the sprite's ambivalent gender, as Ariel appeared in a metrosexual suit in the opening scene, in an evening gown in the next, and later as a somewhat ominous harpy with mechanical wings. Just when I became accustomed to Ariel, I was unsettled by the next costume change.

Caliban (Ron Cephas Jones) is also an open character to stage, with his various animal features and yet starkly human presence. The play's most spectacular moment came at his entrance. The audience's anticipation of this production's Caliban was clear—as Prospero called repeatedly to him, the audience fell hushed and eyes darted from stage right to stage left and back again. In its silence, the audience called



Edward Bennett as Ferdinand, Stephen Dillane as Prospero, and Juliet Rylance as Miranda. Photo by Joan Marcus.

Caliban forth, too. And then, shockingly, a black hand shot up from beneath the sand. Startled, both the audience and the characters gasped, as Caliban clawed his way out of the sand pit. What an entrance! As the noblemen came from the sea, so Caliban came from the sand. Caliban's "earthiness" was further developed in his clothing, more casual, ragged, and scant than Prospero's weathered suit. He was also played by the only African-American cast member, highlighting the play's postcolonial possibilities. This racial dynamic reinforced Prospero's role as master and raised questions about where audience sympathy might lie; it also cast Caliban's otherness in terms of race, rather than of kind as his animalistic descriptions might suggest. The production's Caliban was fully human, fully oppressed, and fully sympathetic.

Ferdinand (Edward Bennett) and Miranda's (Juliet Rylance) romance plot provided fodder for much of the play's humor, as Miranda's wide-eyed naïvety and Ferdinand's lusty ambitions came across more as unrealistic romantic conventions than as a serious love interest; but their relationship turned earnest in Act 4, when, in their preparation for marriage, Prospero projected a modern-day slideshow of

Miranda in her youth, followed closely by the wedding masque. The humor faded and the devotion of the lovers grew as the production moved towards the climax. The couple appeared ultimately in the concluding scene, two pawns at a game of chess, winning in spite of themselves.

The other main source of humor was the low comedy of Trinculo (Anthony O'Donnell) and Stephano (Thomas Sadoski). Their drunken revelries garnered more laughs than any other scenes, and their call-and-response repartee, a scene tedious on the page, was highly entertaining, primarily due to O'Donnell's intoxicated verbal bombast matched by his physical cowardice.

The play concluded with Prospero's dramatic tossing of his pages into the "sea" behind him; he then moved into his own sandy sphere of power for the Epilogue, where he requested his own "release." In this moment, I realized how problematic that epilogue can be for modern audiences. The monologue implicitly calls for the audience's endorsement of Prospero, but the production made no apologies for his tyranny over Caliban and Ariel. While Jacobean audiences might have been more sympathetic to the rogue Duke, at least some in this modern audience showed less clemency—they gasped at Prospero's abuse of Caliban, while Ariel's release garnered intense applause. Dillane earned my endorsement in his opening three lines, but Prospero the character did not. So for whom do I clap—actor or character? The line was murkier than I would have liked.

But our good hands and gentle breath did release Prospero (and Dillane), and the theatrical shroud lifted. The production's seamless combination of modern theatrical spectacle and unadorned presentation had cast its own spell on the audience, reminding us all that theatre leaves no man his own. We were all Mirandas, left in wonder.



BOOK REVIEWS



Carla Mazzio, *The Inarticulate Renaissance: Language Trouble in an Age of Eloquence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009. Pp. 349.

Reviewed by Joseph M. Ortiz, *SUNY Brockport*.

In the interests of full disclosure, I should begin by admitting that, before reading Carla Mazzio's insightful and provocative new book, *The Inarticulate Renaissance*, I first learned of it from reading the "Letters to the Editor" section of the *Times Literary Supplement*. Here, spread across three issues of the journal (May 29, June 19, June 26, 2009), a heated debate had erupted over a review of the book by Brian Vickers, who claimed that Mazzio was "misguided" in looking for linguistic "ruptures and discontinuities" in a culture that supposedly valued eloquence over all other forms of power and influence. Whatever the merits of Vickers's critique, the debate gave palpable force to the question that Mazzio poses at the outset: "What place could the inarticulate possibly have had in a period of English literary history so long defined by the humanist revival of classical eloquence?" (1). Indeed, as Mazzio shows in her opening pages, the idea of an *eloquent* Renaissance has historically been hard to shake, both for modern literary critics and for their early modern forebearers. Mazzio admirably attempts to unsettle this commonplace, arguing instead that there exists an "alternative history" of speech forms and textual production in the Renaissance that, because they have routinely been branded as incidents of mere "inarticulateness," have generally been ignored or suppressed.

Given the iconoclastic nature of its argument, it seems to me that the book invites two related, but distinct, questions from any would-be challengers of an alternative history of Renaissance eloquence. First, what would have been the value or desirability of inarticulateness in the Renaissance, especially when everyone—at least according to Vickers—seemed to be striving for rhetorical mastery above all else? Second, what *is* the value or desirability of studying the inarticulate in the Renaissance, not merely as a foil to eloquence but as a category that is itself culturally and socially constructed? *The Inarticulate Renaissance* offers many possible answers to both questions, though it gives more attention overall to the latter. Despite its associations with ineffectiveness and a lack of learning, inarticulateness could serve many purposes. It could unify an audience of listeners by creating "a comedy of sonic errors" (76), as in a theatrical performance, or it could mute the public expression of politically sensitive knowledge by giving it a "double sense" (84). Inarticulateness could also serve as a marker of marginalized thought and expression, especially as definitions of inarticulateness change throughout the period. In this respect, Mazzio admirably attempts to "expose the exclusionary logic integral to established communities of linguistic exchange" (9). The book's five main chapters unpack this "exclusionary logic," noting its importance for understanding the ideological dimensions of Renaissance humanism, theology, vernacularism, nationalism, law, print culture, and theories of emotion.

Chapter 1, "The Renaissance of Mumbling," examines the prominence given to ideas about inarticulateness in Reformation polemic. Writers like William Tyndale and Thomas Wilson frequently drew upon the notion of inarticulateness, often

expressed as “mumbling,” to paint a picture of “Catholic bibliomarginality” (37), while simultaneously bolstering the reputation of Protestantism as religion by the book. At the same time, while reformers used inarticulateness to characterize Catholic Latinity, Mazzio shows how ideas of inarticulateness also informed anxieties about English itself as a suitable vehicle for the liturgy, since English dialects created plenty of opportunities for unintelligibility between English-speaking subjects. Chapter 2, “From Fault to Figure,” further explores the perils of English vernacularism, focusing in particular on Nicholas Udall’s *Ralph Roister Doister*, a play originally composed in the early 1550s for Udall’s grammar school students. Here, Mazzio argues that the play, which engages heavily with the Roman comedy of Plautus and Terence, reformulates ideas about humanist education into a broader examination of the “credibility of diverse vernacular language practices” themselves (63). Despite efforts by English Reformers to portray vernacular language as the guarantor of linguistic community and textual stability, Udall’s play offers instead “a portrait of dysfunctional authority grounded in the failure to acknowledge internal limitations in speech, writing, and social jurisdiction” (91). Chapter 3, “Disarticulating Community,” offers a fresh reading of Thomas Kyd’s *The Spanish Tragedy* as a “productive model of inarticulate theater” (12). In particular, Mazzio focuses on Hieronimo’s staging of *Soliman and Perseda*, the play-within-a-play that—if Hieronimo’s words are to be believed—is performed in Latin, Greek, Italian, and French. This polyglot mess becomes a negative emblem of Kyd’s own drama, which mixes classical Senecan tragedy with contemporary political subtext, as well as of the English language itself, which, as the schoolmaster Richard Mulcaster complained in 1582, “boroweth daielie from foren tungs . . . *Latin* and *Greke* . . . but mostwhat thorough the *Italian*, *French*, and *Spanish*” (98).

The book’s final two chapters deal less directly with Renaissance conceptions of inarticulateness, focusing instead on the related topics of print culture and the relationship between theater and sensory perception. Chapter 4, “Acting in the Passive Voice,” argues that Shakespeare’s *Love’s Labour’s Lost* exposes the limitations imposed on subjective expression by the rise of “textbooks, dictionaries, bilingual guides to translation, and [textual] models for love lyrics” (12). Although Mazzio is certainly not the first to point out the “bookishness” of the play’s characters (particularly Holofernes), her onomastic reading of the character Moth as both a book-eating insect and a “mouth” renders especially vivid the play’s dramatization of “textual indigestion” (164). Chapter 5, “Feeling Inarticulate,” begins by tackling T. S. Eliot’s famous dictum that Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* is an “artistic failure” because it fails to articulate the basis of Hamlet’s grief. Rather than dismissing Eliot’s claim, Mazzio inverts it, suggesting that the play “attempts to express the horrors of inexpressibility” rather than “attempt[ing] to express the inexpressibly horrible” (213). This sprawling chapter, which touches on nearly all of the topics raised earlier in the book, offers many insightful observations about the play; I was especially struck by Mazzio’s demonstration of the pervasiveness of “touch,” in both its physical and emotional senses, in the play’s pivotal scenes.

One of the few limitations of *The Inarticulate Renaissance* is its narrow scope, which, despite the book’s expansive title, is generally restricted to a fairly small set

of Renaissance English plays (none of them written after 1602). There is no mention of Spenser in the book's nearly 300 pages, even though *The Faerie Queene* would seem to have much to offer on the relationship between Protestant theology and inarticulateness. (Spenser's description of Archimago as one who "could file his tongue as smooth as glas" [I.i.35] immediately comes to mind.) Likewise, given the book's emphasis on Reformist thought and humanism, it is surprising to find not a single reference to Milton. Even a brief discussion of Milton's attitude toward language would have been enough to demolish the idea—apparently still held by some critics—that Renaissance poets saw language as an unproblematic medium between thought and expression. These are understandable, if unfortunate, omissions. More disappointing, however, is the absence of almost any substantive discussion of music in the book, which I believe to be an exclusion that matters for two reasons. First, as Bruce R. Smith (who is cited several times in the book) has shown, music figures importantly in the early modern experience of the unstable relationship between text, sound, and communication. Some attention to music would have given more specificity and concreteness to Mazzi's insistence on the affective and variable effects of inarticulate "noise." Second, a conspicuously large number of the passages that Mazzi analyzes—both polemical and dramatic—are directly concerned with music, though their musical dimensions are never explored. To give only one of several examples: in the book's longest quotation from *Ralph Roister Doister*, the character Dobinet delivers an elaborate account of his earlier musical performances, first describing *what* he has done ("up to our lute at midnight") and then verbally rendering the musical sound itself ("anon to our gitterne, thrompledumthrumpledum thrum, / Thrumpledum, thrumpledum, thrumpledum, thrumpledum thrum") (87). This is a truly remarkable example of musical transcription in early English drama, one which begs the question of whether sonic experience can be transformed into text—yet Mazzi characterizes it simply as an example of "sonic foolery" (87).

These missed opportunities aside, *The Inarticulate Renaissance* offers many new ways to think about the importance placed on rhetoric and articulateness in the Renaissance, well beyond monolithic formulations of an "age of eloquence." The readings of *Ralph Roister Doister* and *The Spanish Tragedy* are among the best I have read of either play, and Mazzi shows herself to have an impressively sensitive ear for the manifold noises, mumblings, and verbal misfires that pervade early English drama. In the end, Mazzi shows that there is still much to be said about the inarticulate in the Renaissance.



Keith M. Botelho. *Renaissance Earwitnesses: Rumor and Early Modern Masculinity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Pp. xvi + 199.

Reviewed by Sarah F. Williams, *University of South Carolina*.

The popular binary of the loose-tongued woman and the discerning ear of male authority forms a cultural stereotype long observed in early modern England, as well as twentieth- and twenty-first century scholarship on the era. Scholars such as Frances Dolan, Carla Mazzio, Linda Austern, and Sandra Clark have written about the figure of the nagging wife, domestic scold, dangerous siren, cackling hen, and blaspheming witch for decades, yet studies on the male anxieties produced by this gendered binary are only beginning to emerge. Keith Botelho's new book on Renaissance "earwitnessing"—or the ability to distill truth from various sources of information—draws into question the popular notion that women spread gossip and rumor while it was up to the "judicious listening" of men to distinguish truth from fiction.

Since the publication of Bruce Smith's influential work *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England* (University of Chicago Press, 1999), cultural studies, literature, history, and musicology scholars have been fascinated with excavating the aural landscape of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England—from the din of the public theaters to the relative quietude of the countryside—using the vehicles of theater, street literature, broadside balladry, and music. Botelho's book, like this volume of *The Upstart Crow*, takes its place in this lineage by exploring how the early modern ear received and processed information, as well as male anxieties about the presence of rumor as represented on the theatrical stage. Through close readings of the dramatic works of Shakespeare, Marlowe, Cary, and Jonson, as well as through methodologies employed in acoustic environment studies by scholars such as Wes Folkerth, Bruce Smith, Gina Bloom, and Kenneth Gross, Botelho raises several provocative questions that are sure to engage the interest of academics from various humanities-based disciplines: What could the early modern man or woman accept as "true" information? Is the ability to "hear" with authority gendered? Is the transmission of information gendered? Could masculine anxieties about women's loose tongues be, in fact, misplaced concerns about male rumor-mongering?

Botelho begins by parsing out the differences between the gendered terms of gossip and rumor. Traditionally gendered female, gossip is the domain of loose-tongued women, moral reputation, and trivial details, while rumor, gendered masculine, is unverified and ambiguous speech oriented around large social groups. Rumor confuses truth and lies, and can even go as far as to threaten the authority of the printed word. (According to Francis Bacon, rumor erodes any simple binaries between truth and falsehood because it throws into question the very distinctions between the two concepts.) What Botelho calls "earwitnessing"—also gendered masculine because the stifling and distilling of information involves an alert, discerning, and authoritative ear—could guard against infectious rumors. The term "rumor," in its modern definition, was widely used in the sixteenth century, but was derived from the fourteenth-century understanding of the term meaning clamor or

noise. Botelho's work offers a unique take on sound studies by uniting these issues of hearing, perception, gender, power, and the transmission of information to challenge the notion of female gossip destabilizing male authority. Botelho close reads early modern English theatrical performances as loci of early modern discourses on gender, class, politics, history, and current events. In doing so, he turns the gendered binary of hearing on its head to posit that *male* rumor challenges masculine authority. Maintaining masculinity onstage, Botelho asserts, is contingent upon earwitnessing.

To understand earwitnessing one must first understand the gendered and dual nature of rumor. The classical, ambiguously gendered figure of Rumor or Fama was often depicted with ears and tongues covering its body or clothing. Representations of Fama, or Fame, from the era also present "Fama Chaira" or good fame, as well as bad fame or the destructive force of rumor, often ambiguously gendered. Botelho stresses that there was a "mutually constitutive relationship between speaking rumors and earwitnessing," and that this relationship between gender and hearing is predicated on representations of Rumor and Fama (3). The complication of a female authority figure controlling information and rumor (Elizabeth I was once depicted in a portrait wearing a robe covered in eyes and ears) problematized the notion of transgressive female speech in sixteenth-century England. Botelho focuses on male anxiety over controlling the tongue. He claims that male chatter has just as deleterious an effect as the perceived threat of the female tongue.

Botelho begins his examination of the practice of earwitnessing with Christopher Marlowe's humanist education at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. In a convincing exegesis, the author argues that Marlowe's training in the university curriculum of "disputations" and debate was the kind of education designed to produce earwitnesses. Students were not only asked to present arguments, but also to discern false statements and faulty logic. Using the writings of Vives and Ascham—crucial authors in the sixteenth-century English university curriculum—on the importance of being instructed by hearing, Botelho offers close readings of *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, *The Massacre at Paris*, and *Edward II*, and positions Marlowe's own loose tongue and rumor-filled life against the transgressive male talk in his plays.

In his second chapter, Botelho uses sixteenth-century war treatises, Shakespeare's second tetralogy, and Thomas Sackville and Thomas Norton's 1562 play *Gorboduc* to compare the effects of rumor, war, counsel, and "fearless speakers" on the English monarchy. Just as rumor could have malicious consequences for the untrained ear, it could also function as a wartime stratagem. Early modern war treatises such as Barnabe Rich's *A Path-Way to Military Practise* and Sir Walter Raleigh's *The Cabinet-Council* outline how war could be fought out in the realm of hearing and speaking. By using the tongue on the offensive, rumor could be a powerful weapon in Elizabethan warfare. Using the Greek concept of "free or fearless speech," or *parrhesia*, Botelho demonstrates that the *Henriad* makes a case for the necessity of kings to hear all forms of counsel, even if they speak from rumors. Through this process, the king gains training as an earwitness and becomes adept at sifting through information, thus ensuring his success as a monarch. *Gorboduc* differs from Shakespeare's plays in that good counsel goes unheard, and the powers of earwitnessing fall

to the king's counselors instead of the royal family. Eventually performed for Elizabeth I at Whitehall, *Gorboduc*, through its depiction of a king's failure to discern truth from rumor that ultimately results in civil war, represents the dangers of failed counsel and the necessity of maintaining a clear line of succession to the throne. This performance, or more accurately this didactic advice, was most surely received by the Queen, a monarch without an heir who was often identified with the classical depictions of Rumor and Fame.

In perhaps the most direct rebuttal of the conception of women as shrews, scolds, and loose-tongued gossips, Botelho's third chapter employs anthropological theories to analyze female aural resistance—that is, disobedient ears—in Shakespeare's *King Lear*, *Measure for Measure*, *Othello*, *The Winter's Tale*, *Cymbeline*, and *All's Well That Ends Well*. The author argues that Shakespeare's women “comprise dissident auditory communities” that can undermine male authority by refusing to speak or listen (24). Botelho here makes use of the work of anthropologist James C. Scott as a lens through which to view dominant and subordinate groups in society. The hidden transcript—that is, speeches, gestures, and practices that comment upon the ruling power—created by a subordinate group is a locus for critiques of the dominant power's public transcript. The hidden transcript is “a weapon of the weak, one that undermines authority and grants the subordinates who speak a measure of authority in this sequestered site” (87-88). In Shakespeare's plays, this hidden transcript is the defiance women exhibit against male control by denying men “aural access” (91). Their hushed whispers, out of earshot, create tension for male characters—for example, the anxiety Othello feels when Emilia is unable to relate the whispered conversation she witnesses between Desdemona and Cassio, or Leontes' nervousness in equating the very act of Hermione's whispering to adultery. Likewise, female characters refuse to listen: Helena refuses to hear Bertram's demands, and Innogen carefully contemplates Giacomo's possibly slanderous reports about Posthumus. As any Shakespearean scholar is aware, Renaissance drama often echoes sixteenth-century conduct books and marriage manuals that praise the silent, chaste woman and warn those with loose tongues. However, Botelho argues in this chapter that Shakespeare complicates these popular stereotypes by offering the ear as a site of female transgression, power, and resistance—that is, women become earwitnesses by refusing to listen to men and by creating alternative aural spaces. This defiance becomes a weapon against dominant male power.

The final chapter explores what Botelho sees as an “emerging fixation” on listening as indicative of a larger concern with masculinity and the authorization of information in the plays of Ben Jonson. For Jonson, London had become a city of aural and visual excess. Growing displeased with the stage and other ephemeral networks of communication, Jonson wished to create authoritative auditors out of the untrained spectators who patronized London's theaters, a fantasy that he would eventually realize was perhaps only possible through the authority of the printed word. Botelho notes that Jonson's “comedy of rumors” plays—*Epicoene*, *Bartholomew Fair*, *The Staple of News*, *The New Inn*, and *The Magnetic Lady*—not only expose the dangers of failed earwitnessing but also make reference to and satirize information spaces (often gendered locations themselves). Botelho begins by comparing the broadside

ballad “Tittle Tattle,” which warns of female “tongue discourse” (98), and John Earle’s 1628 *Micro-cosmographie*, which argues against male chatter. Ben Jonson’s plays, he argues, attempt to reconcile these two texts by revealing that both men and women were capable of loose tongues and noisy talk in Renaissance London. Botelho positions Jonson as a poet and playwright unhappy with both the visual and aural excesses of his time. Amid the buzz of noise in early modern London, Jonson attempts to heighten the senses of seventeenth-century playgoers by exposing the failure of listening in distinct locations—inn, marketplace, fair—and by revealing the kinds of characters that occupy these noisy spaces. Yet the representations of these unauthorized locales occur in another space of ephemeral information exchange—that is, the theater. For Jonson, staging issues of rumor, gender, and authority went beyond entertainment to project his printed works, a more stable medium than the fair, marketplace, or even theater, as the authority of truth.

Botelho concludes his study by examining the fate of “failed earwitnesses” in the 1613 Elizabeth Cary play *The Tragedy of Mariam*. The work centers on how both male and female characters fail to discern truth from rumor. Botelho draws parallels between a statement made by the Chorus at the end of the second act, words spoken by Rumor in *2 Henry IV*, and Adam Overdo’s speech in *Bartholomew Fair*. The Chorus announces that “tales heard with ‘ear prejudicate’ spoil judgment and corrupt the sense.” Ears must be on guard against false rumors. Botelho finally comes full circle by noting that Cary completed a dramatic work depicting the same failed earwitness that Christopher Marlowe brought to the stage thirty-five years earlier—Edward II. When a monarch is a poor earwitness, both playwrights warn, the danger exists for the royal ear to be led astray, and thus rumor can subvert the law of the realm.

Botelho’s study is a fruitful and well-researched extension of the scholarship on acoustic environments and ephemera that has begun to grow in popularity in Shakespeare and early modern cultural studies. Clearly written with methodologies and cultural contexts accessible to scholars of various disciplines in the humanities, this study, and future work in its vein, could be enriched by consulting additional cross-disciplinary scholarship, both primary and secondary, on noise, audition, and even music—for instance, Bacon’s *Sylva Sylvarum*, Linda Austern’s prolific work on gender and the voice, as well as Laura Feitzinger Brown’s work on noise. As it stands, however, this book takes its place alongside important Shakespearean scholarship by elucidating how listeners, and discerners, were represented on the early modern English stage.



Gina Bloom, *Voice in Motion: Staging Gender, Shaping Sound in Early Modern England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007. Pp. 277.

Reviewed by Katherine R. Larson, *University of Toronto*.

Feminist explorations of speech and silence in early modern English literature and culture have tended to assume that the sound of the voice signals a speaker's authority, agency, and control. To speak is to possess a voice, to become, in Catherine Belsey's seminal formulation, a subject capable of sociopolitical intervention and disruption. Gina Bloom's *Voice in Motion* brilliantly interrogates and destabilizes this easy conflation of sound and subjectivity. Probing the voice's material attributes as it travels across time and space, Bloom's innovative and compelling study locates vocal agency in the distinctly unstable processes of vocal production, transmission, and reception.

Bloom's exploration of the material voice provides an especially valuable framework for examining the sounds produced by speakers usually perceived as silenced or vocally marginalized in the early modern context. Focusing on the gendered repercussions of the voice's volatile trajectory, she probes the rhetorical significance of often "eerily disembodied" (16) whispers, sighs, squeaks, and echoes. Such sounds, which underscore the voice's capacity to assume a life of its own, prompted considerable anxiety for men, whose identity was contingent on vocal mastery. For women, however, already characterized in the early modern cultural imagination in terms of uncontrollable vocal production, the decision to embrace the unpredictable materiality of the speaking voice could generate alternative and surprisingly potent forms of vocal agency.

Bloom theorizes the relationship between voice and agency by attending to "the material practice of vocal performance" (14). In so doing, she makes a notable contribution to recent critical discussions—exemplified by the work of Lynn Entelme, Elizabeth Harvey, and Carla Mazzió—that have traced the gendered implications of the voice's dislocation from the speaking body. Bloom's methodology, which elegantly combines theories of linguistic performativity with close readings of the communicative processes documented in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century medical, religious, pedagogical, and scientific writings, enriches her detailed consideration of the voices that animate early modern play-texts and performance spaces. The acoustic conditions of live performance—in the playhouse, in the church, or at court—provide particularly vivid insight into the voice's dynamism and instability.

The structure of *Voice in Motion* follows the movement of the voice within these spaces: as it is produced within the speaking body, as it journeys through the air as breath, and as it penetrates the ear of the listener. Chapter 1 considers how figurations of "the unstable voice as a function of an unmanageable body" inform "the dramatization of male masculinity" (22). Reading Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* and John Marston's *Antonio and Mellida* alongside pedagogical exercises designed to train and discipline the voice, Bloom considers moments when the male voice fails. Whether manifested in the squeaks of the boy actor's changing voice, in puns on waggish "cracks," or in a male character's scripted inability to control his voice,

such instances of vocal collapse draw attention to “the precarious, shifting nature of male identity” (39) and, more broadly, to the anxiety surrounding the fluidity of gendered boundaries in early modern England.

The material dimensions of spoken words further undermine any claim to vocal control. When words leave a speaker’s body, they do so as “ephemeral, mobile, unpredictable, . . . invisible” (109) breath. Even if a speaker articulates his words with confidence and authority, there is no guarantee that this carefully “crafted air” (2) will successfully negotiate spatial and temporal obstacles to reach its intended audience. In chapter 2, Bloom draws on early modern acoustic theories, notably those developed by Helkiah Crooke, Francis Bacon, and Walter Charleton, to consider how the ambiguous and volatile breath becomes an authorizing form of self-expression for Shakespeare’s female protagonists. Bloom’s work here builds in important ways on Christina Luckyj’s recent explorations of silence in the period. Eleanor’s powerful whispers, Constance’s “soft petitions” (87), and even Desdemona’s wordless “balmy breath” (101) constitute transgressive rhetorical interventions whose impact derives precisely from the breath’s “ungovernable” (89) nature. In such moments, seemingly silenced female characters capitalize on the voice’s instability and detachment from the body to establish their vocal agency.

As the voiced breath reaches the ear in chapter 3, a very different model of acoustic agency emerges: that of the active listener. Bloom considers the gendered body of the listener as a barrier that holds the power either to facilitate or impede the successful transmission of sound. She juxtaposes analysis of Protestant sermons, whose hearers were required to listen well to ensure salvation, with an exploration of the “transformative power of hearing” (122) central to Shakespeare’s late plays. The notion of “auditory agency” (117) developed in this chapter once again holds tremendous implications for Shakespeare’s female protagonists. Complicating the chaste “aural closure” demanded of women in the period, Bloom highlights the authorizing potential of “disruptive deafness” (116) that emerges in the late plays: “daughters trained not to hear have the propensity to become subjects who refuse to listen” (148). While the acoustic resistance modeled by characters like Innogen and Miranda could certainly wield profound social and political consequences, it also evokes the active and discerning reception expected of audience members in the playhouse or the church. If successful communication requires the active collaboration of both speaker and listener, Bloom creates a space for early modern women to exercise such acoustic agency.

In the final section of the book, Bloom deepens her exploration of the unstable processes of vocal transmission and reception and of the potential agency of the alienated female voice through an analysis of the uncanny echo. Chapter 4 probes the tension between the eerie potency of Echo’s voice in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* and the “moral corrective” (181) imposed on the poem by George Sandys. Sandys’ insistence on Echo’s body in his translation situates her within the “conduct-book trope of the loquacious and lascivious woman” (184), while his commentary anxiously contains the power that her voice represents. Bloom rightly underscores the extent to which echoic sound disrupts “the unity of voice, body, and subjectivity” (163) even as it eludes male attempts to control vocal production. However, she is

too quick, I think, to dismiss the subversive potential of Echo's body, which plays a prominent vocal role in other versions of Echo's story. In Longus' account, to which Bloom briefly alludes, Echo is a chaste singer whose scattered body parts continue to produce ravishing music after her Orphic demise. The sound that so frustrates Pan emanates from those buried limbs, which Longus describes as breathing out a voice. This characterization complicates Bloom's insistence on Echo's disembodied agency, even as it underscores the difficulty of locating and confining echoic sound.

While Sandys' commentary exemplifies the "efforts by men on and off the stage to stabilize volatile voices" (187), the capricious acoustic realities of live performance reinforce the impossibility of fully containing the voice. Bloom concludes her study by examining the dramatization of Echo in George Gascoigne's transcription of the 1575 entertainments at Kenilworth Castle, as well as *Laneham's Letter*, a supposed eyewitness account of the festivities. Like Sandys, Gascoigne downplays Echo's agency, depicting her as a "sounding board for knowledge the Savage man already has" (189). This "carefully scripted" Echo, whom Bloom reads as a "fantasy" (191) version of Elizabeth, contrasts sharply with the spontaneity of live performance preserved in *Laneham's Letter*, which features a decidedly off-script interjection by the Queen in response to a performance mishap. *Laneham's Letter* exemplifies the extent to which live performance exceeds the control of actor and script and, as a result, holds the potential to communicate in unanticipated and potentially subversive ways. This physical and acoustic volatility is, of course, as the author's delighted reaction to Elizabeth's unexpected intervention suggests, integral to the pleasure and the politics of theatre. It also accentuates, however, the voice's resistance to categorization and control, particularly when that voice is "understood as produced by an unstable humoral body, as composed of ephemeral breath, and as received by unpredictable listeners" (194-95).

The whispers and sighs, squeaks and echoes that animate Bloom's work convincingly elucidate the rich soundscapes integral to the performance of gender in early modern England. By interrogating the impact that the voice's materiality has on its rhetorical and acoustic potency, Bloom illuminates the often overlooked and sometimes barely audible sounds that could authorize individuals whose voices and ears were closely monitored in the period. In so doing, she persuasively reshapes the parameters of feminist debates surrounding the gendering of voice and sound. *Voice in Motion* broadens and—like the dynamic communicative processes it charts so beautifully—fruitfully disrupts our understanding of vocal and auditory subjectivity in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century context.



Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper (eds.), *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Pp. xxii + 268.

Reviewed by Zoltán Márkus, *Vassar College*.

Let's begin at the end. In the very last paragraph of his "Afterword" to the volume, Gordon McMullan quotes and critiques a passage from Chapter 1 by Franklin J. Hildy in which Hildy quotes and critiques a passage from Howard Brenton's May 2007 article from *The Guardian*. Against Brenton's enthusiastic account of a visit to the Globe ("seeing the scenes flow one against the other in something like their natural habitat, I marvelled at Shakespeare's stagecraft . . ." [13]), Hildy cautions that "[i]t is certainly possible [. . .] that the flow of scenes Brenton observed has nothing to do with Shakespeare's actual stagecraft and everything to do with what we want that stagecraft to have been" (14). McMullan insists that the risk of which Hildy has warned is "worth taking": "More than that, it can be seen to be not a risk at all, but rather both an inevitability and a productivity of a kind [. . .]—not a recovery of things lost but a genuine, even an authentic, invention" (233).

One of the reasons I start my review with these quotes is that all three arguments are also reviews of sorts (Brenton's of a performance at the Globe, Hildy's of Brenton's thoughts, McMullan's of Hildy's). *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment* collects reflections on the new (or third) Globe Theatre's first decade of operation, and thus I am reviewing reviews. More important, these three arguments represent three different critical attitudes. They span from Brenton's enthusiasm about the new Globe's success in recuperating Shakespeare's stagecraft, to Hildy's caveat about this "naïve notion" (14), to McMullan's qualified enthusiasm—if not about the triumph of any kind of historical recovery (let alone revival), then about the Globe's compelling achievement in creating "something new" that "draws on both early modern and postmodern practice . . ." (233). These three attitudes epitomize both the current spectrum and the diachronic trajectory of the arguments (both in this book and beyond) regarding the conception and the first ten years of the new Globe Theatre.

Moreover, the quotes above create a strong cohesive link between the beginning and the end of this volume. These and several other connecting passages and methods within *Shakespeare's Globe* effectively serve the purpose of turning a group of individual papers into a coherent volume. Collections of essays are an increasingly endangered species of academic publishing, and I cannot say I am flummoxed by the decrease in their number. The old model of publishing volumes of under-conceptualized (and under-edited) conference proceedings led to an uneven quality of work and left questions, such as the following, unanswered: beyond thematic links, why else are the individual essays (and not others) included in a given volume? What's the rationale of the volume that points beyond reading the specific essays? Does the collection bring about revelations that amount to more than just the sum of the individual essays?

Shakespeare's Globe, or more precisely, the volume's editors, Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper, offer convincing answers to these questions. In their Introduction,

which follows Andrew Gurr's brief but inspiring "Foreword" and precedes Hildy's informative overview and criticism of the "essence of Globeness," they describe a typical scholar's progress from "early enthusiastic and romantic participation" to "the involvement of the scholar as chronicler" to an "'objective,' critical observer." The editors declare that the chief aim of their volume is "to re-establish a dialogue between the scholar and the practitioner, juxtaposing their observations and discoveries of the first ten years of the Globe's performance practice" (6). They do that (especially in the first half to two-thirds of the volume), but they also do more: they record and structure the dialogue in a clear and engaging fashion. They organize their volume into three parts and offer helpful introductions to each section: Part I, introduced by Carson, is dedicated to "The 'Original Practices' Project" (or OP); Part II, introduced by Karim-Cooper, to "Globe Education and Research"; and Part III, introduced by both editors, to "Research Practice: Practice in Research."

Part I fulfills the volume's declared mission of bringing scholars and practitioners into a dialogue: it offers four pairs of essays, each pair consisting of an essay by a theater practitioner and another by an academic. The first of these focuses on "Stage Action" with essays by director Tim Carroll and theater historian Alan C. Dessen. Carroll (whom later in the volume former artistic director Mark Rylance identifies as "the serious OP director" [110]) claims that the unique challenges of the Globe Theatre originate from its lack of a roof. Dessen urges "historically correct" ("HC," as opposed to PC—or OP) staging practices and warns against "theatrical essentialism" and transhistorical "if you have it, use it" approaches. The essays of the second pair on "Stage Appearance" complement each other nicely: Jenny Tiramany writes about the main principles of "Exploring Early Modern Stage and Costume Design," and Karim-Cooper focuses on "Cosmetics on the Globe Stage." The third couple of essays discusses "Music and Sound": Claire van Kampen writes about "Music and Aural Texture at Shakespeare's Globe," and David Lindley about "Music, Authenticity and Audience." The fourth pair, devoted to the subject of "Actor / Audience Interaction," presents a conversation between the volume's editors and Mark Rylance, as well as an essay by Carson called "Democratizing the Audience." In these paired essays, the reader can find a somewhat biased yet informative account of the Globe's theatrical practices by the practitioners (these reviewers are, after all, reviewing their own work), and a scholarly contextualization of these practices by the academics.

Perhaps Part I achieves the editors' stated goals most fully, but the work presented in Part II under the rubric of "Globe Education and Research" seems equally, if not more, significant to me. In the General Introduction, the editors note that "to date there has been virtually no critical engagement with the idea that Shakespeare's Globe acts as a combined centre for education, research and theatre" (2), and Part II makes a respectable effort to fill in this gap. We could perhaps grumble that the essays in this section are hardly "critical," since their authors report chiefly on their own activities, but the lack of an external critical perspective is soon forgiven (but not forgotten) as we take stock of all the wonderful achievements of the Globe Education programs. I think Globe Education Director Patrick Spottiswoode is correct when he states in the opening of his essay "Contextualizing Globe Education" that "The Globe is unique among theatres . . . in its commitment to

education” (134). Karim-Cooper’s pithy and useful introduction to this section is followed by Spottiswoode’s similarly concise and enlightening introduction to the history and current work of Globe Education. James Wallace’s report about “Staging Shakespeare’s Contemporaries” describes one of the most exciting aspects of Globe Education: the “Read Not Dead” series has presented staged readings of about 160 non-Shakespeare plays since 1995. Fiona Banks gives a similarly impressive account (“Learning with the Globe”) of Globe’s extraordinary work with local, national, and international schools. In the last essay in this section titled “Research and the Globe,” Martin White (who chaired the Globe’s Architectural Research Group until 2007) underlines two main research topics: “original practices” and research on the building itself. I, for one, share his excitement about the “most significant new development” (173) at the Globe: the construction of the indoor playhouse.

As I was reading Part II, it became clear to me how much Globe Education benefited from the work of Globe Theatre. At the same time, I was increasingly curious to know how, if at all, Globe Education has influenced the practice of the Theatre. I much hoped that Part III, “Research in Practice: Practice in Research,” would answer this question, and it does to some extent, but this section remains rather frustrating. The Introduction to Part III seems a new (but false) start in the volume, discussing issues that have already been, directly or indirectly, covered earlier. In the same way, the majority of the various (otherwise remarkably talented) artists’ personal accounts are rather repetitive and superfluous; indeed, the mini personal reports often repeat not only what has already been said before in the previous two sections of the volume but also what has already been said *within* Part III. Ralph Alan Cohen’s “Six Big Rules for Contemporary Directors” (211-25), on the other hand, is clear and thought-provoking: after contemplating the “‘pros and cons’ of a rulebook for directors” (212), Cohen offers the gems of his multi-decade experience as a director and scholar of early modern theater.

In Part III, the Globe’s musicians (Claire van Kampen, Keith McGowan, and William Lyons in Chapter 14) and actors / directors (Mark Rylance, Yolanda Vazquez, and Paul Chahidi in Chapter 15) share with us their personal views on their artistic development within the Globe, and thus grant us a unique insider’s perspective. In fact, this “insider’s scoop” quality permeates the entire volume, for almost all the authors of this book have been personally and intimately involved in the work of Shakespeare’s Globe. On the one hand, the personal involvement makes it difficult to stick consistently and rigorously to a critical approach, and the essays in the volume often turn into a kind of apologia or vindication of the Globe’s work. On the other, we receive a firsthand, thorough, and immensely useful account of the Globe’s first decade of operation. In my view, the benefits of the volume outstrip its disadvantages, and I heartily recommend this informed and informative book to anyone who would like to learn more about the complex cultural enterprise of Shakespeare’s Globe.



Heather Dubrow

HIPPOLYTA'S WEDDING ANNOUNCEMENT

They were introduced by mutual friends at a battle.
She walked away from a myth dark as dried blood
and co-signed the mortgage application with Theseus
for a penthouse condo with the insistent geometries
of the right neighborhood.

She has no name he can pronounce
(Shakespeare got that wrong too),
but an oncologist, highly respected by his colleagues,
will reattach her severed breast,
and her daughters will be satin.

The words that were spoken by her back there
have been planted too deep
for the most determined of journalists.

So her story and her face
will be made up
before the paper goes to bed,
and her heart unstrung by them
like her bow.

The years before he entered will be erased
so that Act I can be performed.

He is the son of Poseidon and Aethra;
before retiring, his father was a sea god.

She is the daughter of many mothers,
none of whom can make it to the wedding.



CALL FOR PAPERS

Shakespeare and Early Modern Studies *The Upstart Crow, Volume XXX (2011)*

We are currently inviting submissions for Volume XXX (2011). We seek outstanding scholarship on any topic in Shakespeare and early modern studies. Interdisciplinary and innovative approaches are welcome. Submissions will be reviewed as received.

Submission of Manuscripts

Please submit a hard copy of the manuscript or an electronic copy to Kristin Sindorf at ksindor@clermson.edu. The author's name should not appear on the title page or on other pages of the manuscript; name, address, phone numbers, and email address should appear on a separate sheet. *The Upstart Crow* uses modified Chicago Manual guidelines, with notes instead of Works Cited. Manuscripts should be typed, double-spaced (including inset quotations and endnotes), and must not exceed twenty-five pages (including notes). Photocopies of illustrations are acceptable at submission stage. For more details, go to <http://www.clemson.edu/cedp/cudp/crow>.

Send submissions in hard copy to:

The Editor, *The Upstart Crow*
Department of English
Strode Tower, Box 340523
Clemson University
Clemson, SC 29634-0523

“There is an upstart crow beautified with our feathers that, with his ‘tiger’s heart wrapped in a player’s hide,’ supposes he is as well able to bombast out a blank verse as the best of you; being an absolute Johannes Factotum, in his conceit the only shake-scene in a country.”

— Robert Greene, *Groatsworth of Wit* (1592)



For those persons who have become subscribers this year, I want to welcome you and extend my personal thanks to you, as well as to continuing subscribers, for your support. I know I speak for the journal’s editors, staff, and advisory board. Your help makes a great difference as the Center for Electronic and Digital Publishing (CEDP) endeavors to maintain high standards and strives to do new things with this publication for Clemson University Digital Press (CUDP). The two shoulders of our publishing house are *The South Carolina Review* and *The Upstart Crow*. The latter is one reason Clemson is associated with William Shakespeare’s good name (and Greene’s epithet). *The Upstart Crow* continues its transformation in the new millennium. Outwardly, the annual has generated a new appearance—starting with volume XXI (2001). Inwardly, its organization, policies, and operating procedures are also new. In memory of Jim Andreas, late editor and co-founder (in 1990) of the Clemson Shakespeare Festival, we decided to change the cover and include a special section each year to match the theme of the festival. Although the Clemson festival had its last season in spring 2008, we plan to stick to the format for the journal, with themes announced in advance.

Another change to acknowledge is that CEDP, given the opportunity of staff changes in the English Department, has a new Accounting Fiscal Analyst and the journals have a new Business Manager. Respectively, Beverly Pressley and Kristin Sindorf have made it possible for us to begin accepting credit card purchases, including subscriptions, to help shore up our fiscal infrastructure in these challenging times. The advent of e-commerce and direct online transactions from our website should be advantageous for all of us, particularly our audience, who will find it faster and easier to purchase copies and to subscribe to *The Upstart Crow*. We expect the new system to be operating by March 2011.

Subscriptions and sales are crucial to running a successful journal. That’s why your help is appreciated. Tell your friends about us, visit our website, and watch us grow at <http://www.clemson.edu/cedp/crow/>

Wayne K. Chapman
CEDP Director / CUDP Executive Editor