

THE SUM OF PARTS: COLLABORATIVE PERFORMANCE AND SOCIAL COGNITION  
ON THE EARLY MODERN STAGE

by

ALLISON KELLAR LENHARDT

(Under the Direction of Sujata Iyengar)

ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores the connections between early modern rehearsal and performance practices and cognitive science. Examining early modern performance as a technology consisting of individually memorized parts, minimal rehearsal, and improvised interaction, I analyze early modern actors' roles for speech and cue structures and character relationship patterns, arguing that Shakespeare, as well as other playwrights, wrote specific emotional and physical prompts into actors' parts so that their performance on stage relied on collaboration and partnership in performance just as much as individual preparation. Through their actions and speech, actors affectively prime one another to react to different conceptual frameworks as the play's plot progresses. Since Shakespeare and his fellow playwrights created units of plays, distributed social cognition also aided early modern actors' performances: a particular unit would function as a network of memories for the actors, a shorthand code that allowed them to reconstruct traces of their previous partnerships, emotional and physical characteristics, and speeches into new plays that possessed similar structures.

INDEX WORDS: Shakespeare, Actors, Performance, Actors' Parts, Ben Jonson, Cognitive Science, Affective Priming, Conceptual Blending, Social Cognition, Facial Expressions, Distributed Cognition, Situated Cognition, Playwrights, Early Modern Drama

THE SUM OF PARTS: COLLABORATIVE PERFORMANCE AND SOCIAL COGNITION  
ON THE EARLY MODERN STAGE

by

ALLISON KELLAR LENHARDT

BA, The University of Georgia, 2001

MA, Clemson University, 2006

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2011

© 2011

Allison Kellar Lenhardt

All Rights Reserved

THE SUM OF PARTS: COLLABORATIVE PERFORMANCE AND SOCIAL COGNITION  
ON THE EARLY MODERN STAGE

by

ALLISON KELLAR LENHARDT

Major Professor: Sujata Iyengar

Committee: Christy Desmet  
David Saltz  
John Vance

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
August 2011

## DEDICATION

To Matt, for his unconditional love, strength, and support . . . and for always pulling me out of the “pit of despair” by making me laugh. To my parents, Ralph and Sara Kellar for their support and encouragement. Dad, thanks for all the trips to the bookstore and to plays, and Mom, thanks for letting me be your drama queen. For my sister, whose faith and love inspire me. And for my Grannie, for letting me read all night.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank my committee members, Christy Desmet, John Vance, and David Saltz, for their support and feedback in my years at UGA. In particular, I thank my major advisor, Sujata Iyengar, for her extensive, insightful comments, her encouragement, and her faith in my work. Her enthusiasm for my initial ideas about actors' parts and cognition was inspiring, and her suggestions for how to frame and connect my research within this dissertation have been invaluable. I also would like to thank Simon Palfrey for working with me on Chapter Five while I was at Oxford; our conversations and his comments on my work helped shape this chapter and the dissertation in new directions. Tiffany Stern was also helpful in suggesting possibilities for expanding this project: Chapter Six was inspired by her suggestions.

The Folger Shakespeare Library staff was immensely helpful when I studied their archived eighteenth- and nineteenth-century actors' parts. The American Shakespeare Center's staff and actors also aided my research of early modern performance and original practices. I thank UGA's English Department, the UGA at Oxford program, and the Graduate School for helping fund my research. I also would like to thank the seminar leaders, respondents, and participants in the Shakespeare and Social Neuroscience session at the 2010 Shakespeare Association of America (SAA) conference and the Shakespeare and Science session at the 2011 SAA conference for their helpful comments and encouraging feedback. Last but not least, I would like to thank my friends, Sonya Loftis, Lisa Bolding, Emily Kane, Vicki Worsham, and Jennifer Whatley for keeping me sane, amused, grounded, and inspired throughout this process.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	viii
CHAPTER	
1 Introduction.....	1
“Mistress Page, remember you your cue” .....	3
“My proud heart sues and prompts my tongue to speake” .....	20
Summary of Body Chapters.....	30
2 Cues and Clues in Extant Actors’ Parts: Fragments of the Whole in the Archives.....	35
3 Conceptual Blending and Affective Priming: Prompting and Performing Emotion in <i>Othello</i> .....	64
Prompts in the First Quarto of <i>Othello</i> .....	69
Priming Emotion and Expression in the Cognitive Blend .....	70
Priming Emotion and Action through Sensory Language .....	87
Texts, Speech, and <i>Othello</i> ’s Identity.....	90
4 “A brittle glory shineth in this face”: Embodying Expressions on the Early Modern Stage.....	97
A face “bankrupt of his majesty”: Performing Facial Expression in <i>Richard II</i> ..	108
Performing Facial Expressions and Textual Variations.....	117
5 Shakespeare’s Parts and Relationship Structures: Creating Networks of Memory ...	128

Character and Relationship Codes for Performance.....	136
Structuring Memory Scaffolding through Triangulation and Surrogation .....	146
Female Parts and the Absent Body .....	155
6 The “Poets’ War” and Actor Collaboration in the Chamberlain Men’s Company: Part Patterns and Spatial Cognition.....	162
Critical Overview of the So-Called Poets’ War.....	164
Mimetic Contexts and Relationship Codes.....	172
Entrance and Cue Signals and Spatial Cognition .....	183
Performing Desire and Repulsion through Verse or Prose? .....	190
The Switch from Repulsion to Desire: Sense Imagery and Spatial Concepts .....	199
Scene Endings.....	206
7 Conclusion: Social Cognition and the Future of Early Modern Performance and Scholarship.....	210
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	220

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1.1: Parts for Richard and Anne.....	22
Table 3.1: Iago and Othello parts for 3.3 (Q1) .....	74
Table 3.2: Iago and Othello parts for 3.3 (Q1) continued.....	77
Table 4.1: Shakespeare Searched Results for Word Usage .....	108
Table 4.2: Shakespeare Search Results for Expressive and Affective Prompts .....	111
Table 4.3: Folio Parts for Richard and Bullingbrooke.....	119
Table 5.1: Lady Macbeth and Macbeth Parts for 1.5.....	138
Table 6.1: Female Parts for Scenes of Mimetic Desire .....	179
Table 6.2: Parts for Fallace and Deliro .....	195

## CHAPTER ONE

### Introduction

Before I entered the University of Georgia's English Department PhD program, I used to act. I have no Actor's Equity card and make no claims to have ever been a "working" actor, but I trained as an actor, and at one time, considered it my future profession. My theatrical experience inspired my fascination with the process of acting in the early modern period. Like early modern actors, I performed plays with a close troupe of actors, using original stage practices like minimal costumes and props and running the play within a two-hour period. My fondest acting memories are of performing in the Upstate Shakespeare Festival in Greenville, SC. Our summer troupe, the twenty or so actors crazy enough to brave the summer heat performed on an outdoor stage in the park for audience members who picnicked and sipped wine while they watched our show. The stage was no more than a scaffold, flanked by painted plywood to hide offstage actors, who fanned futilely at the ninety-seven degree air. On stage, we attempted unsuccessfully to avoid sweating on each other during our characters' loving embraces and stage fights, yelled to compete with passing motorcyclists and ambulance sirens, and rushed to complete the run in two hours in order to avoid acting in the dark. Audiences flocked by the hundreds to see us each night, which is no small feat for a twenty-first-century community theater festival. Recently, USF has received funds for lighting and a permanent stage, but the core objective of the festival remains the same: a close band of players perform Shakespeare's works in an outdoor setting for people who "pay what they will" to see the show.

When I learned a role for USF, I could memorize my part within a few days, less time if it was a smaller role. And in rehearsing intensively for two to three weeks and performing the run for three to four weeks, I usually began to recall my acting partners' cue lines for scenes that I acted in before they said them. I could recall up to three of their lines before my cue to speak, depending on the lines' context, prosody, and affective impact. But memorizing their lines was something I tried not to do or think about because I was afraid that it would make my reaction predictable. All my acting instructors had always said, "hear the line as if it is new," so thinking about a line before it was said was something I tried desperately not to do. Yet I usually ended up doing it anyway—it's the proverbial "don't think of an elephant." One thing that always fascinated me that I could never do was memorize other actors' entire parts, but some of my fellow actors could. Toward the end of the rehearsal process, if we were working out a new gag, inevitably, one of my acting partners would say something like, "Yeah, you know when you say that speech, [which he or she would then spout from memory] then we should look out to the audience together for a beat at that line." Despite the different degrees of aural memorization skills, we all memorized each other's blocking and read over the scenes again and again to discover more about our characters' motivations and objectives, their reactions to other characters, and their emotional "arc" throughout the play. As you can see, my acting experience, particularly with Shakespeare, has been influenced by methods like Stanislavski, Uta Hagen, Meisner, and Kristin Linklater, although I have also taken workshops that focus more on physical acting. In thinking back over the parts that I have played, my well-rehearsed lines are not what I remember; I see my fellow actors' faces, see their physical enactment of their parts, and hear their voices as we perform scenes together. This is not to say that the lines are not important or that they would not come back to me if I rehearsed them, but the actor and character

relationships are what I remember when I think back over a scene – visual and aural fragments of the productions.

Scholars' knowledge of early modern parts is also fused together from fragments, but these fragments are texts: audience anecdotes, philosophical treatises, a theater company's records, several plots, a few actors' parts, and a multitude of play-texts. The plays, in quartos and folios, have fared better than early modern actors' parts and other production documents. In this dissertation, I piece together the process of early modern acting from the fragments of actors' parts and play-texts that remain in order to recreate the actors' sensorial, affective, physical, and cognitive moments on stage. As I started researching early modern rehearsal and performance practices, I realized that early modern actors' systems of learning and performing their parts were quite different from what actors consider to be traditional methods today. While a twenty-first-century actor might take for granted that he or she has detailed foreknowledge about the role and the play's characters, early modern actors could not rely on what we consider today standard techniques of dramatic preparation: individual hours of study poured over the play-text in solitude, table work with other actors and the director, and frequent rehearsals of climactic scenes and stage combat. Instead, actors in companies like the Chamberlain's Men rehearsed their roles individually and had little time, if any, for extensive group rehearsal.

**“Mistress Page, remember you your cue”**

An early modern actor's part, which he committed to memory, did not contain the entire play's text: the part consisted of the actor's lines, one- to three-word cues, and the occasional stage direction. The part did not inform the actor about who was going to cue him for each line, how many lines he had to wait before speaking again, or how long he would have to wait for his next scene entrance. Early modern performance was therefore a hybrid technology, consisting of

individually memorized parts and cues, minimal rehearsal, and improvised interaction. Recent criticism has explored the technology (parts, cues, plots) that Shakespeare and his contemporaries used to accommodate actors who worked in a repertory company that had brief rehearsals and did not guarantee more than one performance of a play. Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern, for example, have admirably set about revealing the rehearsal of parts and its implications for the early modern stage; Henry Turner discusses the possible mechanics of a production, arguing that a play is a form of code; Paul Menzer recovers the importance of cue analysis in examining the texts of *Hamlet*; and Scott McMillin and Evelyn Tribble have explored how parts are structured to help novice actors rehearse and perform. Through these studies' findings, we have revised our understanding of the rehearsal and performance system for early modern actors.

While twenty-first century actors can usually rely on many group rehearsals and performance runs to solidify their characters' parts, in the early modern period, "there was no guarantee that a play would ever receive a second performance" (Palfrey and Stern 76). Even though companies kept popular plays in their repertory, players "were expected to have upwards of forty roles in their heads or to hand, and might regularly be asked to learn new plays while performing an endless series of old ones" (76). An actor speaking his role might remember scenes from a brief rehearsal or a reading of the play, but he would not have time to grow familiar with the other actors' lines, as he would be more concerned with remembering and performing the lines he quickly memorized to play his character. In addition, if a play was performed beyond the opening day, the actor would not have long rehearsals or performance runs to refresh his memory of that particular play's scenes. As Stern notes, "A reasonably popular play could expect up to twelve performances in all spread over two years; an extremely

popular play might become ‘stock’ and be performed on a regular basis for a number of years” (*Making Shakespeare* 62). The actor’s part, his cues, and the clues that other actors provided with their parts in performance would therefore guide his interaction with his fellow players in new and revived plays.

To accommodate performing five to six plays a week and incorporate new plays in the company’s repertoire, the rehearsal process for early modern actors also contrasted dramatically with present-day actors’ independent study, scene rehearsal, and ensemble practices. Instead of reading the entire play from start to finish and memorizing a character’s lines by rereading and practicing the scenes in which the character appears, the early modern actor memorized his part and cues without having read all of the play’s scenes (Palfrey and Stern 71). When learning his part, the early modern actor might not know the name of the character who would speak the cue on stage because the part does not label the speaker of the cues.<sup>1</sup> Parts sometimes provide in-text clues as to who is speaking the cue, but an actor could not always rely on the part’s information, and the part would not give a clear indication as to how many actors were on stage. At most, an early modern ensemble would rehearse three times, but more often, a play had one full rehearsal, if that (71). In the early modern period, listening to the performance dialogue therefore became all the more crucial to performing one’s part. Instead of having to concentrate on making the performance “new,” early modern actors had to concentrate on keeping up with their cues to speak, as the success of an early modern actor’s performance depended upon the communication of lines that he either barely knew, vaguely recalled, or heard for the first time.

Although scholars such as Palfrey and Stern have admirably analyzed Shakespeare’s parts and the impact part composition had on the player’s individual rehearsal, the actual

---

<sup>1</sup> Palfrey and Stern also discuss the part’s mechanics and its implications in *Shakespeare in Parts*.

performance of the actors' parts remains a fascinating enigma that scholars have touched upon but have not explored extensively with regard to how all these parts come together to form a whole. Criticism focusing on the playwright's affective language and its impact on the individual actor or audience has overshadowed the vital connection between the playwright's language and the actors' collaboration in performance. This project analyzes the performance of action, emotion, and expression, described through Shakespeare's language, in order to examine the relationships among the actor and his play-text part, the actors who create a performance out of those parts, and the visual and aural performance that unites actors, language, and audience.

Researching individual parts and cues and how this document system would affect rehearsal and performance is still a relatively new specialization in early modern studies. While Tiffany Stern points out that the rehearsal process for an early modern actor was much more independent than contemporary actors' reliance on ensemble acting, the performance, I argue, would have been collaborative, even if the actors did not rehearse together more than a time or two before the performance. In fact, the performance might have even relied more on collaboration than today's Shakespearean productions because the actors, especially for the initial performance, had only a faint idea of what the other actor was going to say.

The early modern acting companies consisted of actors who were contracted to a company and its shareholders, but companies, as Knutson argues, were not as competitive as previous scholars, such as Andrew Gurr and Richard Dutton, have surmised (8). Knutson contends that the companies' shareholders structured a guild system to help the theater thrive:

Operating within the limits defined by various governmental pressures, the companies developed protocols and marketing strategies by which their industry might expand and prosper. Players learned strategies of cooperation from the networks of patronage in which they had grown up. They learned strategies of growth and productivity from the guild structures where newly authorized members were absorbed into the commercial life of the profession. They shared

the need to market their skills against competing recreations such as bearbaiting and games of hazard. They shared the need to minimize the effect of common enemies such as the plague, civic authorities, and anti-theatrical clergymen. (20)<sup>2</sup>

In a similar vein, I argue that if the theater companies were structured like a guild, then playwrights, scribes, and actors collaborated with one another to create and shape coded play parts and perform them successfully. The argument that actors rehearsed parts individually and were therefore less concerned with ensemble performance is too narrow for a part system that so clearly hinged upon collaboration in performance as well as in the theater's operational structure. Even if actors rehearsed individually, the performance was collaborative because it was a social, situated cognitive event in which the production's parts could not be pieced together by one individual's scroll.

My project explores how early modern actors created a collaborative performance of parts by investigating the process of cognition in early modern performance. Theories of social, situated, and distributed cognition, expressive response, affective priming, conceptual blending, and spatial metaphors all help to reveal how early modern playwrights and actors developed a shorthand code for performances so that new plays could be incorporated into the company's repertoire and actors could rely on previous partnerships to perform new scenes. Repetitions of entrances and exits, similar partnerships between plays, rhetorical patterns, affective response, and prosody all work to aid the actors' response to and memory of each part and play in the repertory system. Juxtaposing what scholars know about the actor's rehearsal process and performance with cognitive science and textual analysis, this dissertation reconstructs one

---

<sup>2</sup> Other scholars similarly have answered the call to study the acting companies' practices instead of just the individual playwrights. See, for example, editors Ostovich, Syme, and Griffin's *Locating the Queen's Men, 1583-1603: Material Practices and Conditions of Playing*, as well as as Scott McMillin and Sally-Beth MacLean's *The Queen's Men and Their Plays*.

possible imagined past for the early modern stage, a past that speaks through the parts and the play-texts.

In exploring early modern rehearsal and performance practices through cognitive science, I follow close behind other humanities scholars, who in the past decade, increasingly have incorporated and applied cognitive science theories when analyzing literature and performance. Critics have explored early modern drama in connection with conceptual blending theory, cognitive linguistics, mirror neurons, and distributed cognition, among other concepts. Amy Cook has used conceptual blending to describe audience members' understanding of and reaction to Shakespeare's language, and Rhonda Blair has used conceptual blending as a method for contemporary actors to rely more on images to create character. Linking Aristotle's theories about the senses to contemporary findings about cognition and memory, Arthur Kinney has investigated how early modern audiences understood and imagined unseen stage properties. Mary Thomas Crane and Phillip Davis have applied cognitive linguistics to Shakespeare's composition process. And Bruce McConachie and F. Elizabeth Hart have used research in mirror neurons and empathy to make claims about how audience members respond to emotionally charged scenes. Most recently, Evelyn Tribble has applied distributed cognition, situated cognition, and social cognition to explain early modern actors' memory and attention processes. While all these theories have been explored individually, few literary scholars have applied more than one or two of these concepts to their work, and none have focused intensively on actors' parts.

"The Sum of Parts: Collaborative Performance and Social Cognition on the Early Modern Stage" seeks to incorporate all these concepts and a few more, exploring combinations of different concepts in each chapter and demonstrating how these theories come together to form a

whole in collaborative performance. In explaining cognitive science terms and providing examples, my method in the introduction is to start with the largest concepts (social, situated, and distributed cognition) and works towards the smaller ones (conceptual blending, affective priming, social cues, and spatial language) so that the introduction demonstrates how the concepts can fit into one another's frameworks. In order to apply these concepts to early modern dramatic parts, I then analyze a scene from *Richard III*. The chapters after the introduction move from the smaller, more focused aspects of cognitive artifacts, affective priming, blending, and expressive prompts to the larger framework of social, distributed, and situated cognition; the chapters also evolve from analyzing extant parts (fragments of performance-texts), to discussing two actors in one play, to examining groups of actors in a single play, to discussing actor relationships in three plays, to analyzing two different playwrights' parts to demonstrate how the conceptual networks of the project unfold to create a theory larger than just one play, one actor, or one playwright.

My work is closest in scope to Evelyn Tribble's *Cognition in the Globe*. Tribble's analysis of early modern performance companies through situated, distributed, and social cognition explores how actors "off-load" "the attentional and mnemonic demands of the enterprise onto technological and social structures" (8). I agree with Tribble that acting in an early modern company relied on a "dynamic system" of distributed cognition,<sup>3</sup> a system developed by "the material conditions of playing, including play-space; artifacts such as parts, plots, and playbooks; the social structure of the companies, including methods of training and coordination; internal cognitive mechanisms such as attention, perception, and memory; and actor-audience dynamics" (2). I would argue, however, that although "no one element can be

---

<sup>3</sup> Tribble's work is informed by *Cognition in the Wild*, Edwin Hutchins's seminal study and definition of socially distributed cognition in his observations of navigational problem solving on U.S. Navy ships.

identified as *the* unit of analysis” (2), in order to understand fully how specific artifacts and relationships operate within this cognitive network, early modern performance scholars need to analyze actors’ parts, among other individual elements, more closely. Extending but also modifying Tribble’s work by focusing on specific pieces within this dynamic system of social, situated, and distributed cognition, my project analyzes actors’ parts and relationship patterns to argue that the way in which the texts were constructed helped actors collaborate in performance for the first performance as well as in subsequent revivals months or years later. As we reconstruct our ideas about early modern performance practices, it is paramount that we understand that actors relied on a system of parts and relationships not just during specific scenes and plays, but also among scenes in different plays and by different playwrights.

My study is informed by different, but closely related, theories of cognition: social cognition, situated cognition, and distributed cognition. In defining social cognition, Ralph Adolphs explains that this concept of cognition “concerns perception of, attention to, memory for, and thinking about other people, and in a way that involves emotional and or motivational processing. Examples include processing other people’s faces and voices, judging their personality, predicting their likely behavior, and planning our own interactions with them” (271). Adolphs’ definition of social cognition, when applied to early modern acting, provides some insight into how early modern players developed relationships on stage without extensive rehearsals or runs. The company’s actors, with their memorized parts, were constantly assessing the other players’ actions and speech. Granted, acting parts is not exactly what Adolphs has in mind, since the actors are performing roles in which they know the beginning, middle, and end of their characters’ speeches and actions, unlike people who use social cognition in everyday life to “predict” other people’s reactions. But when early modern actors performed new parts, they

did not know the entire play and were not familiar with each other's parts and lines in detail. So actors did have to rely on "processing" their fellow actors' language, expressions, speech tones, and physical movement in order to anticipate their "own interactions with them."

Situated cognition is concerned with how a person's body and environment inform and influence their cognitive processing (Robbins and Aydede 3). While all elements in a situated context are important, they are not necessarily equally significant (Smith and Conrey 459).

Theories about social and situated cognition support the argument that people and language in the theatrical environment influence performance and cognition more than the place or setting.

As psychologists Eliot Smith and Frederica Conrey explain:

social psychology, by definition, is concerned with the influence of the situation on cognition. However, a view of cognition as infinitely flexible and responsive to the situation lacks predictive power, unless we can identify those features of the environment that are most important in determining the course of cognition. Social psychology's perspective suggests that many of the most important features of the cognitive context are not physical but social. The immediate, interactive conversational context, our relationships with other individuals, and our broader memberships in social groups represent three levels of interpersonal context in which cognition and action are situated. (459)

Early modern players in the Chamberlain and King's Men's company more than likely played similar parts and interacted with the same actors who played similar characters throughout the years,<sup>4</sup> an argument which I discuss more in chapters five and six. While they would not know the characters' lines and the exact moment that a character would begin to alter his passions, they would know the types of characters that they would interact with during the play. Early modern actors relied on their past interactions with fellow actors to construct new character relationships.

---

<sup>4</sup> Although new players would be acquired by the company, and actors might leave for another company, other actors remained with the company for years, as shareholders such as Richard Burbage and William Shakespeare for the Chamberlain and King's Men exemplify. For extensive studies on specific actors and acting companies, see Andrew Gurr's *Shakespeare Company, 1594-1642, The Shakespearian Playing Companies*, and E.K. Chambers' *The Elizabethan Stage*, vol. 2.

Distributed cognition, which falls under situated cognition, is the theory that humans rely on tools and relationships in the environment to help them process their surroundings, to remember important theories as well as basic skills, and to interact in their environment (Smith and Conrey 461-62; Sutton 35). John Sutton's research on distributed cognition has been tremendously influential to the application of these theories to early modern performance. Sutton argues, "The human mind is 'leaky' both because it thus extends beyond the skin to co-opt external devices, technologies, and other people, and because our plastic brains naturally soak up labels, inner objects, and representational schemes, internalizing and incorporating such resources, and often redeploying them in novel ways" ("Exograms and Interdisciplinarity" 35). But social psychologists are keen to point out that "while cognition can certainly be distributed across objects and the physical environment, much of our distributed cognition is actually distributed across other people. Such a distribution occurs whenever people establish and maintain a socially shared system of meaning" (Smith and Conrey 461). For example, early modern players distributed their memories across the similar parts they played in various productions as well as the character relationships that they formed with other actors on stage.

But how do we define the relationship between character and actor in performance? Are they separate or always fused together when a player acts his part? Conceptual blending theory can help us answer these questions. In describing conceptual integration, or conceptual blending, Fauconnier and Turner note that "blending is an invisible, unconscious activity involved in every aspect of human life" (18). Conceptual blending is connected to but also goes beyond metaphor theory (29). As Fauconnier and Turner explain, "Identity and analogy theory typically focus on compatibilities between mental spaces simultaneously connected, but blending is equally driven by incompatibilities. Often the point of the blend is not to obscure incompatibilities but, in a

fashion, to have at once something and its opposite” (29). Conceptual blending is of tremendous importance for actors and audience members in performance, as Fauconnier and Turner observe:

Dramatic performances are deliberate blends of a living person with an identity. They give us a living person in one input and a different living person, an actor, in another. The person on stage is a blend of these two. The character portrayed may of course be entirely fictional, but there is still a space, a fictional one, in which that person is alive. In the blend, the person sounds and moves like the actor and is where the actor is, but the actor in her performance tries to accept projections from the character portrayed, and so modifies her language, appearance, dress, attitudes, and gestures. (266)

An audience member must blend the reality of sitting in the theater watching actors perform with the story of the characters in order to accept the actors as the characters (266-67). And as theatre practitioner and scholar Rhonda Blair observes, with regard to contemporary performance, an actor “must pull apart the blends in a play in order to be able to mine the potentials in their constitutive parts, live in the blend, and make new blends to serve imagination for the purpose of embodiment and action” (97). Early modern plays and performance also depended on the successful integration of conceptual blending in performance in a system in which actors’ blends were even more complex because although actors knew their lines and their characters’ actions, they did not always know how the other actors, who were also “living” in the blended space, would respond in character. Early modern drama scholars, like actors, need to “pull apart” the blend of actor and character in order to conceptualize how early modern actors performed in this complex repertory system. In addition, dissecting the blends of mental spaces that Shakespeare’s language prompts actors and audience members to experience helps us comprehend how actors work together to frame the emotional and physical concepts within a scene, as we shall see when we look at Anne and Richard’s parts in the *Richard III* scene.

Recently, critics have used conceptual blending and cognitive linguistics to analyze early modern drama from different perspectives. Amy Cook looks at Shakespeare’s language as well

as modern-day performance and casting in order to describe the audience's process of conceptual blending. Cook's work is fascinating from a contemporary perspective when she describes how casting, such as playwright Sam Shepard playing Hamlet's ghost in Almereyda's *Hamlet*, can create a complex blend for audience members, especially if spectators are familiar with the performance history of *Hamlet*: "because Shakespeare was thought to have played the ghost onstage originally, in Almereyda's film Sam Shepard becomes the modern actor/creator hybrid. With these mental spaces evoked, Almereyda's King Hamlet is the spectre of greatness temporarily walking in the shoes of a bit player" (*Shakespearean Neuroplay* 111). Yet her discussion focuses mainly on the cognition of modern-day audiences and cognitive linguistics and does not include theories about how seventeenth-century actors would negotiate blends within different conceptual frameworks as they perform.

Applying conceptual blending, cognitive linguistics, and cognitive ecology to Shakespeare's plays, Mary Thomas Crane's *Shakespeare's Brain* provides a model for the marriage between early modern humoral medicine and present-day cognitive science and linguistics. For example, she argues that *Hamlet* "uses language to conjure up multiple versions of what is within and multiple versions of the effects that language can have. The polysemic web of 'acts' is not hollow but resembles Hamlet's imagined pliable matter reflecting the form and pressure of culture, as well as the cognitive systems within Shakespeare's brain" (154). Crane, however, focuses less on the actual performance and more on the cultural and contextual implications of Shakespeare's language. My dissertation builds on Cook's and Crane's studies, as well as the work of Bruce McConachie and F. Elizabeth Hart, to come to a closer understanding of how cognitive processes and speech patterns can be applied not only to

Shakespeare, his characters, and the audience as these scholars have proved, but also to early modern actors performing Shakespeare as well as other early modern playwrights' parts.

In connection with conceptual blending, recent humanities research has paid special attention to empathy and audience members' neurological reactions to events: according to Vittorio Gallese's research, when we see someone else act, our brain's mirror neurons simulate this movement (37). This simulation is "a basic organizational feature of the brain" (46). This brain function allows a spectator to neurologically respond to what she or he sees and hears. As McConachie and Hart explain, an audience member's observation of an actor "is not the same as reading the body as a sign. Rather, it is a mode of cognitive engagement, involving mirror neurons in the mind/brain that allow spectators to replicate the emotions of a performer's physical state without experiencing that physical state directly" (5). But actors watching and listening to each other would also take part in this simulation. Their mirror neurons also "replicate" the other actor's emotional expressions, allowing them to empathize with or react against their fellow actor's emotional performance.<sup>5</sup>

While we might think that theories of social cognition and mirror neuron empathy are a far cry from what early modern spectators thought was occurring when they saw a play, early modern theories of passions and infection carry traces of similar kinds of thought about empathy and audience response. Tribble rightly observes, "For a player in this period, to play the choleric man is not simply to assume the outstretched and 'fiery' stance of such a character, but to generate and then regulate the passions that would result from reading such lines—that is, the

---

<sup>5</sup> Cognitive scientists, such as Vittorio Gallese and Shaun Gallagher, currently are debating how simulation and perception work, and if they are separate processes. When two or three actors are in rapid conversation with one another, I am inclined to agree with Shaun Gallagher that their reactions would be based more in perception than simulation. I discuss Gallagher's theory of perception in Chapter Three, when analyzing *Othello*. As new research about mirror neurons and simulation becomes available, I might be persuaded to agree with Gallese that the process is one of simulation. I discuss Gallese's theories in Chapter Six.

passion would seize his heart and move his body in the fiery way that cholera does, which would in turn infect the air itself and the spectators” (91). What this observation leaves out, however, is that the other actors would also be infected by the passions that their fellow players enacted.

Affective priming and associate priming work to prompt change in performers’ emotions and actions when actors are in character and speaking their lines. Affective priming occurs when an actor speaks an emotional or sensorial line that prompts another actor to react in character. By using affective language, an actor primes the other actor to respond in accordance with or against the affective prompt.<sup>6</sup> Scientists who study affective priming and evaluation in language observe that we speak about our emotions because “it appears that emotions are represented and expressed by use of emotion words and language, not only in order to communicate that a particular state is being experienced, but also as a way to (re)create a context in which the state can be regulated” (Niedenthal, et. al. 309). Of course, not all emotional language in all situations will have the same effect on different people. As Niedenthal, Rohmann, and Dalle caution, “Tasks that require extensive simulation of emotion concepts, due to protracted exposure, heightened motivation to imagine the concept, or the complexity of conceptual processing necessary for their performance may even result in the reexperience of an emotional state. More superficial treatment may not” (328). I would argue that actors, seeking to perform their characters’ emotions, are especially attuned to emotional and sensorial language and possess “heightened motivation” to respond to affective priming.

An actor’s part did not contain all the affective and expressive prompts he needed to perform; he also received prompts from other actors. Because of the minimal number of group rehearsals, it appears unlikely that actors could hear each other's lines enough times to memorize

---

<sup>6</sup> For more on affective priming, see Houwer. I will discuss this concept further in my treatment of 1.2 in *Richard III* at the end of this chapter and when analyzing Othello and Iago’s relationship in Chapter Three.

them, or even become familiar with them, before performance. Palfrey and Stern point out that the actors with the more substantial parts would probably hear the playwright(s) read a newly composed play, and some scholars argue that this reading would also serve as instruction for the actors in how to perform their parts (58-59). Yet one has to wonder how much “instruction” a two to three-hour read-through could provide. The play was not rehearsed until after the performance-text parts had been distributed and memorized individually, and even then, a rehearsal might cover only the more complicated scenes involving stage combat or large groups of actors.

In order to perform their parts passionately, as actors studied their parts, they would memorize their verbal cues and look for affective and gestural prompts and prosodic variation. But they would also have to react in performance to the prompts that other actors gave them. Within Shakespeare’s parts, words that describe a character’s passions and expressions help to establish a character’s emotional state, physical appearance, cultural status, and character alliances. These phrases, which are often found in a different actor’s part, function as affective, gestural, and expressive prompts in performance and are just as important as the one- to three-word verbal cues actors use to prompt each other to speak. Transitioning from prose to verse, of course, also could signal a change in the character’s emotion, thought, or action pattern. In performing different roles and plays, actors must equally have relied on spatial and temporal concepts to aid their blocking, movement, and sensitivity to time constraints within each scene. The actors use verbal cues and affective prompts to trigger each other to respond physically and vocally to the text parts each actor performs, creating a collaborative performance of parts. Without having the opportunity to rehearse numerous times, actors would rely on each other’s lines in performance to gauge the climaxes and changes in emotional intensity within scenes.

Integrating what we know about rehearsal and performance practices with early modern beliefs about passions and expressions and today's research in cognitive science, we can envision how actors cognitively prompt change in emotion through spoken parts and use each other's words to embody expressions and actions that will speak to and influence other actors. As Gail Kern Paster observes, "For the early moderns, emotions flood the body not metaphorically but literally, as the humours course through the bloodstream carrying cholera, melancholy, blood, and phlegm to the parts and as the animal spirits move like lightning from brain to muscle, from muscle to brain" (14). Early modern moral philosophers "believed that the magical force of the spirits, conducted to the appropriate muscles and organs, could effect spectacular physical transformations" (Roach 43). Early moderns were likewise concerned with how passions could infect other people. Carla Mazzio points out that antitheatricalists disapproved of the theater because they believed that the audience's bodies would be influenced by the speeches: "Words touch skin, blood and bone, and enter the bodily interiors as a kind of liquid physiology, altering the substance of heart and mind" (178-79).<sup>7</sup> But if the spoken words are to truly "touch" the audience, the actor himself must first be moved to express physically the anguish his character feels. In *Passions of the Minde* (1604), Thomas Wright explains:

the affection poureth forth itself . . . to discover unto the present beholders and auditors how the actor is affected and what affection such a case and cause requireth in them. By mouth [the actor] telleth his mind, in countenance he speaketh with a silent voice to the eyes; with all the universal life and body he seemeth to say 'Thus we move because by the passion we are moved, and as it hath wrought in us so it ought to work in you. (176)<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Mazzio rightly asserts that scholars should examine how antitheatricalists write about touching just as much as seeing and hearing in our understanding of what it was like to be playgoers in a Renaissance performance. As she notes, Andrew Gurr places emphasis on both "audience" and "spectator," as Renaissance playgoers went to "hear" a play instead of "see" one. Mazzio suggests that we can also understand the playgoers as an "assembly," which aligns the experience to one of touch (178).

<sup>8</sup> These early modern beliefs, which some critics would argue differs considerably from our understanding of emotions, feelings, and expressions today, nonetheless share similarities to the discoveries made in recent years regarding how our brains respond to language, action, and facial expressions.

As Wright suggests, for an early modern actor, performing a character's expressions and gestures imparts the character's passions, but the player must first feel the emotion before expressing it. Speech and outer characteristics were important to the actors playing the parts and the audience observing the scenes: each actor's actions and speech inform both the other actors and the audience members about the characters' internal and social conflicts as they change and develop throughout the play.

Gestures and body posture, for the Renaissance player, are not artificial or in opposition to a sincere display of passion but are a part of how he expresses his character's humour, emotions, and thoughts. John Bulwer's *Chirologia: or the Natural Language of the Hand* (1644) further describes the connection between the mind, emotion, speech, and expression:

For, the lineaments of the Body, doe disclose the disposition and inclination of the minde in generall; but the motions doe not only so, but do further disclose the present humor and state of the minde and will; for as the Tongue speaketh to the Eare, so gesture speaketh to the Eye, and therefore a number of such persons whose Eyes do dwell upon the Faces and fashions of men, do well know the advantage of this observation, as being most part of their ability; neither can it be denied that it is a great discoverer of dissimulation, and great direction in businesse. (9-10)

Like today, people of the early modern period used expressions and gestures to try to interpret what a person was thinking or feeling. Andrew Gurr and Mariko Ichikawa note in *Staging Shakespeare's Theatres* that in addition to observing movement to perceive emotions, an early modern would also assess gestures and posture to appraise a person's class: "Clothing signified social rank, and the body language that went with each rank was second nature to anyone living in Tudor society. Many of these decorums were exercised routinely in the body signals the players used" (35). Yet even if early modern body language was "second nature," Shakespeare's texts still provide expressive, emotional, and gestural clues for his actors because the words

prompt them to pay attention to gestures and expressions, show their characters' emotions through body language, and react to other players' words and actions.

**“My proud heart sues and prompts my tongue to speake”**

To illustrate examples of conceptual blending, priming (affective and associate), language prompts (sensorial and expressive), and social, distributed, and situated cognition, I will provide a brief analysis and visual treatment of 1.2 from *Richard III*, when Richard of Gloucester, murderer and Machiavel, woos the recently widowed Lady Anne over King Henry's corpse. When reading this scene or viewing it, audience members and readers often are perplexed by Anne's choice to trust Richard, the man who killed her husband and father-in-law, by the scene's conclusion. In composing this bold wooing scene, Shakespeare compressed complex references to the Henry VI plays' battles and alliances that helped trigger the actors' memories of past parts' emotions, actions, and character relationships. These primed concepts, in turn, helped the actors create a scene in which Anne and Richard's words and actions served as a surrogate for the violent acts that occurred in the previous plays.

But in order to make this scene work in performance, the actors had to rely on one another's parts for affective and expressive prompts. The Anne-actor, unfamiliar with Richard's lines, listened for prompts within Richard's language, as well as consulting his own part for clues, to physically manifest Anne's transition from a grieving, angry widow to a woman considering marrying a man whom she hated only minutes before. The two parts' language blends concepts of Anne as a grieving widow with her insecure, precarious position to create a “suitable” match for Richard. But the boy actor could not realize this blend without being primed affectively and associatively by Richard's lines. Affective, expressive, sensorial, and spatial language helped the boy actor effectively perform his part's passions in this scene. The Richard-

actor, likewise, was presented with a framework in which he had to alter the other characters' perception of his character. Anne's insults and depth of hatred are not always clear from the Richard-part's cues and lines, so the Richard-actor would have had some surprising moments to react to as well.

This scene is familiar to scholars because of its contrast of emotions, Richard's timing for courtship, and the two characters' witty verbal sparring. I therefore examine the Richard and Lady Anne-parts in the scene to understand, given the minimal rehearsal time and the gaps between performances, what the actors knew from studying their parts and what kind of prompts they gave each other on stage through the lines that they spoke. I lay out the parts in Table 1.1 as they would have been written out for the actors so that my readers can compare the parts side by side. The first two words of each cue are in brackets because we do not know for sure how many words each cue contained, as I discuss further in Chapter Two. The cue tails " \_\_\_\_\_ " visually aided early modern actors in discerning between their lines and their partners' cue words. For my readers, I have lined up the entrance for Richard (called Gloucester in Q1) with Lady Anne's cue so that the parts' intersections are easier to follow.

To illustrate and situate the concepts of affective and associative priming and physical and sensorial prompting, I have **bolded expressive prompts** (language about facial expressions) and **affective language** (words that describe emotion) that the actors exchange to prompt one another's reactions. **Spatial and physical prompts** (language that references space, distance, proximity, and body parts) that would help the actors map their emotions and bodies into the scene space are **bolded and underlined**. *Sensory language* (words that prompt strong sensory reactions and emotions) are ***bolded and italicized***. Since I intend for this visual treatment to provide an introduction for how I explore these concepts in the chapters that follow, I do not

examine in-depth all these prompts for this scene in this one section (as that would be a chapter in itself), but I mark the parts up to show how these affective, expressive, sensorial, spatial, and physical prompts intersected in the performance of the parts.

### Table 1.1 Parts for Richard and Anne for Q1 1.2

*Enter Lady Anne with the hearse of Harry the 6.*

**Set downe set downe** your honourable lo  
 If honor may be shrouded in a hearse,  
 Whilst I awhile obsequiously lament  
 The **untimely fall** of vertuous Lancaster:  
 Poore *key-cold* figure of a holy King,  
*Pale ashes* of the house of Lancaster,  
 Thou *bloudlesse remnant* of that royall bloud,  
 Be it lawfull that I **invoke thy ghost**,  
 To *heare* the lamentations of poore Anne,  
 Wife to thy Edward, to thy *slaughtered* sonne,  
*Stabd by the selfsame hands that made these holes*,  
 Lo in those *windowes that let forth thy life*,  
**I powre the helplesse balme of my poore eies**,  
**Curst be the hand that made these fatall holes**,  
**Curst be the heart that had the heart to doe it**.  
 More direfull hap betide that hated wretch,  
 That makes us wretched by the death of thee:  
 Than I can wish to adders, spiders, toades,  
 Or any *creeping venomde thing* that lives.  
 If ever he have child abortive be it,  
 Prodigious and untimely brought to light:  
 Whose *ugly and unnaturall aspect*,  
*May fright the hopefull mother at the view*.  
 If ever he have wife, let her be made  
 As miserable by the death of him,  
 As I am made by my poore Lord and thee.  
 Come now towards Chertsey with your holy loade,  
 Taken from Paules to be interred there:  
 And still as you are weary of the waight,  
 Rest you whiles **I lament King Henries corse**.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ **[set it] downe**.  
 What *blacke magitian coniures up this fiend*,  
 To **stop devoted charitable deedes**.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [for thy] **boldnes**.  
**What doe you tremble, are you all afraid?**  
 Alas, I blame you not, for you are mortall,  
 And *mortall eyes cannot endure the divell*.  
**Avaunt thou dreadfull minister of hell**,  
**Thou hadst but power over his mortall body**,  
**His soule thou canst not have, therefore be gone**.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [not so] **curst**.  
**Foule Divell**, for Gods sake **hence & trouble us not**,  
 For thou hast **made the happy earth thy hell**:  
*Fild it with cursing cries and deepe exclames*.  
 If thou delight *to view thy heinous deedes*,

*Enter Gloucester [Richard].*

\_\_\_\_\_ [King Henries] corse  
**Stay you** that beare the corse and **set it downe**.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [devoted charitable] deedes,  
**Villaine set downe the corse**, or by S. Paule,  
**Ile make a corse of him** that disobeies.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [coffin] passe.  
**Vnmanerd dog, stand thou when I command**,  
**Aduance thy halbert higher than my brest**,  
**Or by Saint Paul Ile strike thee to my foote**,  
 And spurne vpon thee begger for thy boldnes.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [therefore be] gone.  
**Sweete Saint**, for Charity be not so curst.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [arme hath] butchered.  
 Lady you know no rules of charity,  
 Which renders good for bad, blessings for curses.

*Behold this patterne of thy butcheries.*  
*Oh gentlemen see, see dead Henries woundes,*  
*Open their congeald mouthes and bleede a fresh.*  
**Blush blush thou lumpe of foule deformity,**  
**For tis thy presence that exhales this bloud,**  
*From cold and empty veines where no bloud dwells.*  
 Thy deed inhumane and unnaturall,  
 Provokes this deluge most unnaturall.  
**Oh God** which this bloud madest, **revenge his death,**  
**Oh earth** which this *bloud drinkst*, **revenge his death:**  
**Either heaven with lightning strike the murtherer dead,**  
**Or earth gape open wide and eat him quicke,**  
*As thou doest swallow up this good Kings bloud,*  
**Which his hell-governd arme hath butchered.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [blessings for] curses.  
**Villaine** thou knowest no law of God nor man:  
**No beast so fierce but knows some touch of pitty.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [am no] beast.  
 Oh wonderfull when **Divels** tell the troth.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [acquite my] selfe.  
 Vouchsafe *defused infection of a man,*  
 For these knowne evils but to give me leave,  
 By circumstance **to curse thy cursed selfe.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [excuse my] selfe.  
**Fouler then heart can thinke thee thou canst make**  
**No excuse currant but to hang thy selfe.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [accuse my] selfe.  
 And by **despairing shouldst thou stand excused,**  
 For doing worthy vengeance on thy selfe,  
 Which didst unworthy *slaughter* upon others.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [slew them] not.  
 Why then they are not dead,  
**But dead they are,** and divelish slave by thee.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [kill your] husband.  
 Why then he is alive.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [by Edwards] hand.  
 In thy *foule throat thou liest*, Queene Margaret saw  
 Thy *bloudy faulchion smoking in his bloud*,  
 The **which thou once didst bend against her brest**,  
 But that thy brothers beat aside the point.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [**guiltless**] shoulders.  
 Thou wast provoked by thy *bloudy minde*,  
*Which never dreamt on ought but butcheries*,  
 Didst thou not kill this King.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [I grant] yea.  
 Doest grant me **hedghogge** then **god grant me** too  
 Thou **maiest be damnd** for that wicked deede,  
 Oh he was **gentle, milde, and vertuous.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [that hath] him.  
 He is in **heaven** where **thou shalt never come.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [place then] earth,  
 And thou **unfit for any place but hell.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [me name] it.  
 Some **dungeon.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [Your] bedchamber.  
**Ill rest betide the chamber where thou liest.**

\_\_\_\_\_ [**touch of**] pitty.  
**But I know none**, and therefore am no beast.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [tell the] troth.  
 More wonderfull when **Angels are so angry**  
 Vouchsafe devine perfection of a woman,  
 Of these supposed evils to give me leave,  
 By circumstance but to acquite my selfe.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [thy cursed] selfe.  
***Fairer then tongue can name thee***, let me have  
 Some **patient** leisure **to excuse my selfe.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [hang thy] selfe.  
 By such **despaire** I should accuse my selfe.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [slaughter upon] others.  
 Say that I slew them not.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [slave by] thee.  
 I did not kill your husband.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [he is] alive.  
 Nay, he is dead, and slaine by Edwards hand.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [aside the] point.  
 I was *provoked by her slaundersous tongue*,  
 Which laid **their guilt upon my guiltlesse shoulders.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [kill this] King.  
 I grant yea.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [milde, and] vertuous.  
 The fitter for the **King of Heaven** that hath him.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [shalt never] come.  
**Let him thanke me that holpe to send him thither,**  
**For he was fitter for that place then earth,**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [place but] hell.  
 Yes **one place els** if you will heare me name it.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [Some] dungeon.  
**Your bedchamber.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [where thou] liest.  
 So will it Madame till **I lie with you.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [I hope] so.  
 I know so, but **gentle** Lady Anne,  
 To leave this keen incounter of our wits,  
 And **fall somewhat into a slower methode:**  
 Is not the causer of the timeles deaths,  
 Of these Plantagenets Henry and Edward,  
 As blamefull as the executioner.

\_\_\_\_\_ [lie with] you.  
**I hope so.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [as the] executioner.  
 Thou art the cause and most accurst effect.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [your sweete] bosome.  
 If I thought that I tell thee homicide,  
**These nailes should rend that beauty from my cheekes.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [day, my] life.  
**Blacke night overshadow thy day, and death thy life.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [thou art] both.  
 I would I were to be revenged on thee.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [that loveth] you.  
 It is a quarrel just and reasonable,  
 To be revengd on him that *slew my husband.*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [a better] husband.  
 His better *doth not breath upon the earth.*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [then he] could.  
 Name him.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Plantagenet.  
 Why that was hee.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [of better] nature.  
 Where is he. *Shee spitteth at him.*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [spitte at] me.  
 Would it were *mortall poison for thy sake.*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [sweete a] place.  
*Never hung poison on a fouler toade,*  
*Out of my sight thou doest infect my eyes.*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [have infected] mine.  
 Would they were **basilisks to strike thee dead.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [take up] me.  
**Arise dissembler, though I wish thy death,**  
**I will not be the executioner.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [will doe] it.  
 I have already.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [thou be] accessory.  
**I would I knew thy heart.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [in my] tongue.  
**I feare me both are false.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [was man] true.  
**Well, well, put up your sword.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [peace is] made.  
 That shall you know hereafter.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [live in] hope.  
 All men I **hope** live so.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [weare this] ring.  
**To take is not to giue.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [happiness for] ever.  
 What is it?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [me this] boone.  
**With all my heart, and much it joys me too,**  
**To see you are become so penitent:**  
 Tressill and Barkley go along with me.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ **[Bid me] farewell.**  
 Tis more then you deserve:  
 But since **you teach me how to flatter you,**  
**Imagine I have said farewell already.** *Exit.* (TLN 175-419)

\_\_\_\_\_ [most accurst] effect.  
**Your beauty was the cause of that effect,**  
 Your beauty which did *haunt me in my sleepe:*  
**To undertake the death of all the world**  
**So I might rest one houre in your sweete bosome.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [from my] cheekes.  
*These eies could never indure sweet beauties wrack,*  
*You should not blemish them if I stood by:*  
**As all the world is cheered by the sonne,**  
**So I by that, it is my day, my life.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [death thy] life.  
**Curse not thy selfe faire creature, thou art both.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [revenged on] thee.  
 It is a quarrell most unnaturall,  
**To be revengd on him that loveth you.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [slew my] husband.  
**He that bereft thee Lady of thy husband,**  
**Did it to helpe thee to a better husband.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [upon the] earth.  
 Go to, he lives that loves you better then he could.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [Name] him.  
 Plantagenet.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [that was] hee.  
 The selfesame name but one of better nature.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [Where is] he.  
 Heere. *Why doest thou spitte at me.*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [for thy] sake.  
*Never came poison from so sweete a place.*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [infect my] eyes.  
*Thine eies sweete Lady have infected mine.*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [strike thee] dead.  
 I would they were **that I might die at once,**  
**For now they kill me with a living death:**  
*Those eies of thine from mine have drawen salt teares,*  
*Shamd their aspect with store of childish drops:*  
 I never sued to friend nor enemy,  
*My tongue could never learne sweete soothing words:*  
*But now thy beauty is proposde my fee:*  
*My proud heart sues and prompts my tongue to speake,*  
*Teach not thy lips such scorne, for they were made*  
*For kissing Lady not for such contempt.*  
**If thy revengefull heart cannot forgive,**  
**Lo here I lend thee this sharpe pointed sword:**  
**Which if thou please to hide in this true bosome,**  
**And let the soule forth that adareth thee:**  
**I laie it naked to the deadly stroke,**  
**And humbly beg the death upon my knee.**  
**Nay, doe not pawse, twas I that kild your husband,**  
*But twas thy beauty that provoked me:*  
**Nay now dispatch twas I that kild King Henry:**  
*But twas thy heavenly face that set me on:*  
*Here she lets fall the sword.*  
**Take up the sword againe or take up me.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [be the] executioner.  
**Then bid me kill my selfe, and I will doe it.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [I have] already.

Tush that was in **thy rage**:  
**Speake it againe, and even with the word,**  
**That hand which for thy love did kill thy love,**  
**Shall for thy love, kill a farre truer love:**  
 To both their deaths shalt thou be accessary.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [knew thy] heart.  
**Tis figured in my tongue.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [both are] false.  
 Then never was man true.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [up your] sword.  
 Say then my peace is made.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [know] hereafter.  
**But shall I live in hope.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [hope live] so.  
**Vouchsafe to weare this ring.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [not to] give.  
**Looke how this ring incompasseth thy finger,**  
**Even so thy breast incloseth my poore heart.**  
**Weare both of them for both of them are thine,**  
 And if thy **poore devoted suppliant** may  
**But beg one favour** at thy **gratious hand,**  
 Thou doest **confirme his happines for ever.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [What is] it?  
 That it would please thee **leave these sad designes,**  
 To him that hath more cause to be a mourner,  
**And presently repaire to Crosbie place,**  
**Where after I have solemnly interred**  
**At Chertsie monastery this noble King,**  
**And wet his grave with my repentant teares,**  
**I will with all expedient dutie see you:**  
 For divers unknowne reasons, I beseech you  
 Grant me this boone.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [along with] me.  
 Bid me farewell.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [said farewell] already.  
**Sirs take up the corse.**  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [Chertsie noble] Lord.  
**No, to white Friers there attend my comming.**  
**Was ever woman in this humor woed,**  
*Exeunt. manet Gl.*  
**Was euer woman in this humor wonne:**  
**Ile have her, but I will not keepe her long.** [ . . . ]  
 (TLN 206-426)<sup>9</sup>

I also chose to mark up this scene's parts because in two of my first three body chapters, I examine scenes from texts that have contested textual histories (*Othello* and *Richard II*) in order to argue that textual differences, whether attributed to memorial reconstruction, a particular

<sup>9</sup> References to TLN Lines are from Internet Shakespeare Editions, a website for Folio and Quarto editions of Shakespeare's texts, supported by The University of Victoria and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

performance, or revisions, could change actors' cognitive processing and performance of the parts. Peter Davison, among other scholars, argues that the Q1 version of *Richard III* is based on actors' memorial reconstruction of the text (Davison 5), but Laurie Maguire negates this claim (299-300). The Q1 (1597) version of this scene differs from the Folio (1623) in some word choices and has about fifteen lines fewer (Anne's part is two and a half lines short and one of Richard's speeches is missing twelve lines). The play was most likely performed in the early 1590s but was not printed until 1597 when, as Roslyn Knutson believes, the play most likely was revived (60). *Richard III* was printed in several quarto versions from the time it was acquired by the Chamberlain's men to the time it was printed in the Folio (80, 125, and 141). Knutson argues persuasively that these quarto printings, especially when affixed with a new title page that advertised new material about the Chamberlain or King's Men, could have been printed because the printers were capitalizing on the play's revival (125, 141). In looking back at the parts in Q1 and F, we can recreate two different performances of the parts: collaborative performances that involve affective and associate priming, affective and expressive prompting, and reliance on situated, distributed social cognition to create networks of emotions and memories.

This scene's language, in both Q1 and F, builds on opposites and blending to create a unification of two enemies, Anne and Richard. This scene and the lines within it function as a compression of the entire war of the roses. One party, Richard, wins over the other through rhetoric, or power, while the other party, Anne, yields because she both wants to believe in the rhetoric and also has no other option but to succumb to the dominant power. But this scene also tells a different story when we look at the Folio text – one of unification through family ties – a story that also compresses the war into a single scene and a single relationship.

When we read the scene or watch it as spectators, we are equally delighted by the rhetorical exchanges and repulsed by Richard's timing for courtship. Jonas Barish accurately observes that as a Machiavel, "Richard's trump card, in his own view, is his flair for dissimulation, a control over his face and voice as total as that of a professional actor, which permits him to feign emotions he does not feel and dissemble the emotions he does feel" (99). Reading the scene in parts, however, reveals how different the rhetorical and affective experience was for the actors speaking the lines on stage for the first time.

In describing affective priming, scientist Jan de Houwer explains, "affective priming effects have been found under a wide range of conditions, including when participants are asked to ignore the prime stimuli, when there is little time to process the prime stimuli, when valence is not task relevant, when participants are engaged in an effortful secondary task, and when participants are unaware of the presence of the prime stimuli" (315).<sup>10</sup> The actors, unfamiliar with one another's lines, would react affectively to one another's "prime stimuli," even with "little time to process" the other actor's language as they rapidly exchanged words. For instance, word play in the scene between "Sweet saint" and "Foul devil" and "Lady" and "Villain" would not have been in the actors' parts or cues; the antithetic rhetoric, instead, helped prompt the actors' memory of their lines on stage as well as incited their passions when they responded to the other characters' compliment or insult.

In both Q1 and F, body fluids seep through the scene's language and action, evoking images of war-torn flesh and love enraptured bodies: the Lady Anne-part is filled with references to blood and bloodless bodies, tears, and venom, while Richard's rhetoric centers on repentant weeping and tearless faces, moist eyes and sweet mouths. These images are opposites in

---

<sup>10</sup> Chapter Three applies these observations about affective priming to actors who perform *Othello*.

association and affect, creating discord between Richard and Anne which would have been easy for the actors to express as they heard one another's contrasting language. But the Anne-actor also transitioned from spewing hate to acquiescing to Richard's ministrations. The scene begins and ends with a funeral procession, but within the scene, the two characters arise from the depths of pain to the promise of a new beginning. As the scene progressed in performance, the two actors' lines worked to create a blend between the mental spaces of hatred and mourning to shape a space of hope.

What the actors did not say to one another was just as important in prompting emotion and expression as the words they did speak. Richard and Anne's language focuses on the body for the majority of the scene. Images of gaping wounds and bloated, bleeding corpses torture Anne. But for the end of the scene, each part contains language about eyes and mouths being infected by hate and love, indicating that the characters are shifting from hatred and physical distance to forming a more intimate relationship of shared pain and apparent admiration. In looking only at Anne's part, the actor would have been confused by the ending. Within thirty-two lines (including cues and stage directions) in the part script, Anne switches from spitting on Richard and hoping that her spit "was mortal poison for thy sake" (TLN 336) to trusting her unlikely suitor's intentions, as she believes that the new "penitent" Richard will take Henry's coffin to its proper burial ground. Yet the reason for Anne's transformation became apparent in the performance, when the Richard-actor delivered an impassioned speech that incited the boy actor to show Anne's passion and mercy. Richard confesses and asks, "My proud heart sues and prompts my tongue to speake, / Teach not thy lips such scorne, for they were made / For kissing" (361-63). Yet even more convincing than this rhetoric of courtship, he begs Anne to kill him if

she so desires to do so. The Richard-actor would close the physical space between them by offering the Anne-actor his sword and body.

This portion of the scene in the Folio text becomes all the more affectively persuasive. While Anne and Richard's lines occasionally substitute a synonym of equal syllables or exchange a word with another term that does not significantly alter the context, one of Richard's speeches has an addition in the Folio text that could prompt different reactions in Anne and Richard. After voicing the Petrarchan cliché that Lady Anne's eyes have infected his eyes with love, Richard confesses in the Folio version:

These eyes, which never shed remorseful tear—  
 No, when my father York and Edward wept  
 To hear the piteous moan that Rutland made  
 When black-faced Clifford shook his sword at him;  
 Nor when thy warlike father, like a child,  
 Told the sad story of my father's death  
 And twenty times made pause to sob and weep,  
 That all standers-by had wet their cheeks  
 Like trees bedashed with rain—in that sad time  
 My manly eyes did scorn an humble tear;  
 And what these sorrows could not thence exhale,  
 Thy beauty hath, and made them blind with weeping. (Folio TLN 346-57)

This passage, omitted from or added after the printing of the quarto text, prompted a wealth of memories for audience members who saw the *Henry VI* trilogy as well as the actors who performed the parts. With these additional lines, the Richard-actor reminded the Anne-actor as well as the audience that while the characters are not currently allies, their families were at one time. Richard's lines compress the trilogy's traumatic events into twelve lines to prompt a sympathetic response from Anne as well as to remind the audience of the tragic losses that he has endured. Associatively priming Anne with these images and overwhelming her with his words, Richard uses *sinathirismus*<sup>11</sup> to figuratively heap the bodies of the fallen onto the stage, setting

---

<sup>11</sup> Puttenham defines "sinathirismus" as the "heaping figure" in his *The Arte of English Poesy* (Book 3, Chapter 19).

before her the ways in which their losses are similar. Although he did not weep, he remembers the savageness enough to retell it vividly. His employment of pathos goes so far as to persuade her of his depth of feeling for her and for his past losses by linking their two fathers: “thy warlike father, like a child, / Told the sad story of my father’s death / And twenty times made pause to sob and weep.” Here, he simulataneously diminishes the loss of Anne’s father-in-law and king and reverses the impact of his own loss by focusing on Anne’s father’s reaction and narration rather than his father’s death. These lines, absent from Q1, created a cognitive link of affective response across the plays for the characters, actors, and audience members that prompted more emotionally complex memories than the Q1 text’s speech.

### **Summary of Body Chapters**

To explore early modern actor parts’ affective, expressive, and physical prompts further, each body chapter of my dissertation focuses on a different aspect of cognitive science in order to investigate how actors learn and perform plays in a collaborative repertory system in which each player could be responsible for as many as fifty roles at any given time. The first three chapters examine patterns and codes in individual parts and plays, while the last two body chapters map out connections in parts across units of plays. To unite the body chapters’ ideas with past and present, Chapter Two analyzes seventeenth- and eighteenth-century actors’ parts, while Chapter Seven’s conclusion connects the dissertation to contemporary productions from the American Shakespeare Center’s Blackfriars Playhouse, a twenty-first century repertory that incorporates early modern original stage practices.

I investigate extant parts to study the surviving “cognitive artifacts” of part-based composition and performance. The Folger Shakespeare Library and the Harvard Theatre Collections, among other libraries, have preserved actors’ parts from the seventeenth to the

nineteenth century, providing fascinating archives to mine for answers to performance and cognitive questions. Previous scholars, however, have felt that the documents lacked any coded system of cue structure and entrance and exit signals that went beyond giving the actors contextual details and mnemonic prompts. Based on my observations, I argue that a closer examination of extant parts reveals coded systems for performance that help actors cognitively map their written parts onto the physical stage. Andy Clark famously has explained tools, such as notebooks, calculators, iPads, etc, can function as extensions of our brains, or tools that our brains can access (Chalmers ix-x). While Tribble and Sutton have applied extended mind theory and distributed cognition to actor's parts, seeing them as a type of cognitive artifact or tool, extant parts' *parts* have not been thoroughly analyzed for cognitive clues of distributed knowledge. An early modern actor's part functioned as a technological tool because of the visual and verbal codes that the lines and the cues contained. In order to understand the early modern part and cue system, we need to look for patterns in the cue lengths, stage directions, and entrance and exit signals in the actors' parts that would enable actors to deduce shifts in cue partners and actions that they would then memorize and perform on stage. These patterns would then function as a coded language that the company and its actors could access for performance.

The third chapter on *Othello* demonstrates how the Iago-actor and the Othello-actor use their parts to negotiate the performance's emotional pace and embody the cognitive blends within the scenes' frameworks. Since they did not have open access to the play's text, the Iago and Othello-actors would have relied on each other's words to gauge how and when they should affectively respond to one another to shape the emotional tempo within the scene. In *Shakespeare the Director* Anne Pasternak Slater notes, "Much of Iago's power depends on his Shakespearean observation of gesture and expression, out of which he creates his impromptu

dramas” (29-30). But by examining the actors’ parts for affective prompts, one can see that while the Iago-character is the director of the plot, the Iago-actor and Othello-actor’s words work to create a collaborative performance between the actors, as the Othello-actor’s part lines also prompt changes within the scenes. In addition, when examining the texts of *Othello*, we will see that these affective prompts change depending on which text, Quarto or Folio, the actors perform.

Chapter Four on *Richard II* argues that the actors' facial expressions and language alter to symbolize the transformation of the body politic. Cognitive scientists who have studied emotional concepts and language in different cultures argue that affective language “is also about social coordination, and the creation of a temporary and a permanent social structure designed to meet one’s present goals” (Niedenthal, et. al. 309). The language in *Richard II*, more than other plays, shows substantial concern about character’s facial expressions, particularly the king’s and Bullingbrooke’s faces. Characters who read facial expressions and actors who prompt change in other actors’ expressions prompt the transformation of the characters’ allegiance from Richard to Bullingbrooke. Interpreting and controlling facial expressions aids both characters and actors in “surviving”<sup>12</sup> within their social environment.

Seeking to map out a middle ground between critics who believe that actors played the same type and those who argue that the actors could play many types, my last two chapters explore how distributed social cognition aided early modern actors’ performances by arguing that Shakespeare created units of plays: a particular unit would function as a network of memories for the actors, a shorthand code that allowed them to reconstruct traces of their

---

<sup>12</sup> In *Spark*, a study that argues for the importance of physical activity for regulating the brain’s chemicals, John Ratey, a popular writer and neuroscientist, and Eric Hagerman note that facial expressions function as survival cues (3:22:04). If one does not pick up on or read facial expressions correctly or control their facial expressions appropriately, they have less of a chance of functioning successfully in the social environment.

previous partnerships, emotional and physical characteristics, and speeches into new plays that possessed similar structures. Chapter Five explores how character groupings, affective prompts, the structure of entrances and exits, and speech patterns built into specific parts in *Macbeth*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, and *Coriolanus* serve as mnemonic devices for the actors to rely on when learning and performing new plays.

Widening the project's focus, the final body chapter discusses correlations between Jonson's parts in *Every Man Out of His Humour* and parts in *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night*, suggesting that the two playwrights fashioned similar character and relationship patterns for the company of actors; similarities in entrances, cue partners, prosody, and imagery aid the actors' choices in movement and expression on stage. Critics may ask how my argument explains all of the differences and variables between the texts. I fully acknowledge that it doesn't, nor does it try to do so through analyzing these plays' parts alone. Jonson's *Every Man Out* clearly states in the quarto publication that the play contains more than was spoken and performed on stage. Regardless of what was spoken, however, the old patterns of characters and relationships help actors focus on the new material. Yet we will not find all of the patterns or characters matching up in *As You Like It*, *Every Man Out*, and *Twelfth Night*. Some of the material is fresh. Other scene structures and character relationships might be from plays that are no longer extant. As Henry Turner suggests,

What we call 'character' was for early modern writers, actors, and audience members alike a bundle or assemblage of significant units at different scales, a code distributed across a series of registers that included words, gestures, objects and all embedded within—responding to and actively helping to shape—a 'context' that was itself saturated with significant units of various types. (210)

What my argument seeks to point out is that we should not make excuses, such as missing documents that would clue us into casting, for not identifying and analyzing the functions of the

language patterns and codes within similar parts that date closely in composition and performance. We should not hide behind what we do not know, but piece together what we can about the collaborations of “parts” and “parcels” that we see in these dramatists’ plays, which they wrote for the same company, or family, of players.

Some scholars might argue that I could explore the affective, rhetorical, and technical patterns within early modern dramatic parts without applying the theoretical framework of cognitive science. But in thinking about the parts in connection with social cognition, cognitive artifacts, affective priming, conceptual blending, and spatial metaphors, I have asked different questions than I would have without applying cognitive science, and in considering those questions, I have discovered different answers. Some of these answers have been shaped by analyzing early modern texts and reshaping them as parts of a whole, but others have been discovered through examining extant seventeenth- and eighteenth-century parts, which the next chapter will discuss.

## CHAPTER TWO

### Cues and Clues in Extant Actors' Parts: Fragments of the Whole in the Archives

*“From sounds in the air to inscriptions on the printed page, the material structures of language both reflect, and then systematically transform, our thinking and reasoning about the world”—Andy Clark*

Before we can put forth an argument that early modern actors' parts functioned as cognitive artifacts, or tools, in the early modern acting companies' social and situated cognitive system, we must first make sure that we closely analyze extant actors' parts for clues about this social system.<sup>13</sup> Although the introduction provided a brief overview of what early modern actors' parts probably looked like when the Chamberlain's Men rehearsed and performed Shakespeare's plays, this chapter analyzes extant parts to further reveal how the parts' layouts encouraged actors to collaborate in performance and rely on verbal and visual cues when learning and performing their roles. In independently studying his part, an actor not only memorized his lines, but also applied the part's spatial design, or visual arrangement, to his performance: the physical scroll or book, the markings, the layout of the part and cues, the stage directions, and other notes helped the actor to map his affective reactions, character interactions, and spatial orientation within the fictive performance space. Previous scholars have not paid enough attention to the patterns in these parts' cues and visual design; this lack of in-depth analysis has led critics to assert, for example, that the cues are a certain length based on context instead of looking for connections between cue-length variation and a shift in cue partners or

---

<sup>13</sup> While I am indebted to the work of John Sutton and Evelyn Tribble for pointing me to cognitive scientists' theories regarding cognitive artifacts and situated, social, and distributed cognition, neither Sutton nor Tribble study extant actors' parts in-depth to make their arguments about how these cognitive artifacts, or tools, function in the early modern theater.

stage action. This chapter examines how seventeenth- and eighteenth-century parts vary in the placement of cues, the number of words in a cue, and the amount of stage directions written on the page. Certain extant parts provide more clues than others, and the parts' rules for cue lengths, textual alterations, and stage direction notes seem somewhat to depend on the actor, scribe, or company. Cue lengths and other clues, however, can provide more information than we realize because actors, when rehearsing independently, can use cue-length variances as well as a cue's contextual clues to spatially map their parts onto the stage.

In order to make an argument about how early modern dramatic parts contain affective, expressive, and physical prompts to encourage actors to collaborate on stage, it is important to examine extant actors' parts to determine what information the parts provided, how actors studied their parts, if their parts were consistently designed, and if they marked their parts up when they studied them. No sixteenth- or seventeenth-century Shakespearean parts survive in manuscript, but we do have Shakespearean parts from the eighteenth century. If we widen our scope to include non-Shakespearean parts as well as amateur and professional parts, more roles exist in manuscript form. For example, there are four seventeenth-century Oxford university play parts (two in Latin and two in English), located in the Harvard Theatre Collection; one professional Renaissance actor part (from *Orlando Furioso*), preserved at Dulwich Library in London; one Restoration part, also at Harvard; and over forty British professional parts from the eighteenth century housed in the archives at Harvard and the Folger Shakespeare Library.<sup>14</sup>

While we do have main parts, like Charles Macklin's *Touchstone*, David Garrick's *King John*, and John Philip Kemble's *Macbeth* from the eighteenth century, according to the library

---

<sup>14</sup> The parts' archive increases if we examine European parts or include parts from the nineteenth century. For a more extensive examination of early British and European parts, see Palfrey and Stern's chapter on "The Actor's Part" (15-39), in which they discuss the Ashmole fragment, which is a fifteenth-century English part, and the surviving early sixteenth-century French and Swiss parts (16). Their chapter discusses parts from the medieval period to the twentieth century.

archives, we do not have any surviving female parts until the mid-nineteenth century,<sup>15</sup> even though women had been performing on public stages in England since the Restoration and in private performances, such as masques, since the sixteenth century.<sup>16</sup>

When we have so few early modern actors' parts, and only one extant sixteenth-century *professional* part, one wonders what the actors and companies did with all of their part scrolls and books. And as Paul Menzer asks, "Who made these parts, and how?" (*The Hamlets* 35). As Menzer as well as other critics acknowledge, scribes, actors, playwrights, or prompters could have written out the parts; we do not know for sure that there was a consistent system for part production (34). The early modern actors' system for preserving parts also puzzles contemporary scholars. Did actors pitch parts if they were memorized, especially if the play was considered a failure? Or were parts simply deemed unimportant if the play was printed? In *Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan*, Tiffany Stern notes that a retiring actor would hand his part or parts down to another actor (72), but if so, why don't more parts survive?

Conducting archival research for actors' parts requires imagination as well as analysis. Besides only having a few parts to piece together the whole of part-based rehearsal and performance in the early modern period, the parts that we do have are sometimes incomplete and cannot always be compared systematically to play texts. Studying the manuscripts that we do have is critical, however, for discovering further clues as to how the physical documents helped the actors memorize their roles and collaborate on stage. Even though part design remained

---

<sup>15</sup> This point is based not only on my own research on extant parts, but the fact that none of the extant parts that Palfrey and Stern examine are female parts. The earliest female parts that I have found so far have been for an 1860 performance of *The Comedy of Errors*. The play's female parts have been altered and other parts have been added, apparently to showcase the actresses' talents in singing or provide a part for another actress. The Folger has preserved, in the same file, a total of fifteen parts from this production, which is a rarity since parts are usually found in an actor's collection of papers. For example, the Folger boasts a large collection of John Phillip Kemble's parts: thirty-four part-books in all from different plays.

<sup>16</sup> See Eds. Pamela Allen Brown and Peter Parolin's *Women Players in England, 1500-1600* for extensive research on female performers (and the modification of the terms "performer" and "player" as they applied to early modern women) in the sixteenth century.

relatively stable from the seventeenth to eighteenth century, surviving parts do have variances in layout, stage direction notes, textual emendations, cue codes, and prosodic clues. Examining the parts that we do have reveals that actors did not excessively mark up their texts—there are no words circled for emphasis or notes written out beside difficult lines or stage directions. As Edward Langhans observes in his study of Restoration promptbooks and the part of Trico, “we may be wrong in supposing that the actors took notes. Under the twentieth-century influence of the Stanislavski system perhaps we assume incorrectly that players three hundred years ago went to great pains to develop a character and that precise blocking of stage movement was worked out for all the characters in a series of rehearsals lasting over a period of weeks” (xxiii-iv). While scholars are correct that we often place too much emphasis on our own contemporary ideas of rehearsal and performance, close analysis of the parts that survive could reveal that the actors’ parts were coded with information that encouraged the actor to rely on collaborating with cue partners to successfully perform parts. The lack of scribbling about gestures, emotions, and detailed blocking suggests that the actors depended on mnemonic devices, cue lengths, part types, and partnerships more than studying their own handwritten notes because there were few rehearsals to encourage marking up a text. Thinking about these extant parts and looking at what the actors did and did not “mark” helps us make the transition from seeing the early modern play as a whole text to understanding the play as a collaboration of parts.

Extant professional parts, at first glance, suggest that actors did not know from their parts which characters would be cuing them because cue characters are not named; that observation, however, does not mean that they would not be able to infer from their lines, the cue, or the cue length which actor was going to cue them.<sup>17</sup> In addition to Palfrey and Stern, several other

---

<sup>17</sup> Yet professional actors could also have thought that knowing one’s lines and one’s cue was enough, regardless of who was doing the cuing. We simply do not know for sure.

scholars have recently set about analyzing cues in early modern plays. Menzer's *The Hamlets: Cues, Qs, and Remembered Text* ingeniously identifies the similarities and variances in cues between the three *Hamlet* texts, but his argument does not analyze extant parts' cue lengths, focusing instead on the discrepancy in cues in the Q1 text and the Q2 and F texts. Based on his analysis of each text's cues, Menzer argues that "Q2 was set from an early authorial draft and that F represents a related but modified later version," but Menzer further contends that F's revisions, and cue stability when comparing F with Q2, demonstrate an accumulation of revisions from the play's performances over the years, not Shakespeare's sole authorial hand (20). For Menzer, Q1 is a "separate *Hamlet* project—an independent act of creation by a person or persons unknown . . . solely intended for publication" (20-21). Menzer's comparison of cues between the three texts reveals new ways of looking at Shakespeare's texts as performance and literary endeavors, but his project is based on cue analysis of the three texts and does not rely on archival research to discover what extant parts can tell us about cue variances in different versions of a play's text. In addition to Menzer's work, Evelyn Tribble rightly argues that the "cue space," which Palfrey and Stern often describe as an "individualistic model," according to Tribble, is in fact "a group enterprise" (65). Tribble's speculations, however, are less accurate when describing the early modern part's cognitive structure because her study does not closely explore extant parts.<sup>18</sup> She explains, "Our cognitive needs involve managing and filtering rather than committing to memory. In contrast, the early modern player needed to practice cognitive thrift: to learn exactly what was needed, and no more" (61). Scholars' assumptions about the part's so-called "cognitive thrift" need to be interrogated and modified in order to truly understand what, beyond his lines and cues, the early modern actor learned when studying his

---

<sup>18</sup> Her study briefly examines the parts of Orlando and Poore but does not look at Restoration or eighteenth-century parts for clues for cue systems.

part. In analyzing extant parts, I contend that early modern actors did “manage” and “filter” information within their parts based on the cue codes and stage directions that the parts provided.

The four early seventeenth-century university parts, two of which are written in the same hand (Thomas Goffe) and all four of which are bound together, provide the actor with his cue partner and indicate when a line is a shared line, suggesting that amateur or college parts give the player more information than the professional actor would need, as shown by the lack of shared line clues and character names in extant professional parts (Palfrey and Stern 24-25, 28).<sup>19</sup> David Carnegie notes, “All four university parts consistently make life easier for the amateur actor in two significant respects: first, they identify the character delivering the cue line, and second, they almost invariably give a longer cue than the two words usual in the Orlando part. In most cases, the cue consists of at least four words, often more (occasionally more than one line)” (12). The naming of the cue partners in the university parts correlates with the information provided in parts from miracle plays from the medieval period, which were also performed by amateurs, who were members of various guild groups (Palfrey and Stern 19). While two of the university parts were written out by Goffe and the other two by someone who has yet to be identified, all four parts were mostly likely written between 1615 and 1619 (Carnegie 6-7).

The problem with making assumptions based on these four parts is that they were all written for students who performed at the same college. The specific notes involving cue character names and shared lines might have been the students’ preferences and not the standard procedure for writing cues. In fact, there might not have been a standard procedure for university versus professional parts or for professional parts for that matter. Cue systems could have

---

<sup>19</sup> For an extended analysis of these parts’ shared line clues, see Rokison’s *Shakespearean Verse Speaking*. For more information on the parts’ handwriting, see David Carnegie’s “The Identification of the Hand of Thomas Goffe, Academic Dramatis and Actor” (1971). Palfrey and Stern describe the parts’ similarities (24-29), and Rokison’s reproduction of the part of Amurath is forthcoming from the Malone Society. The part of Poore, edited by N.W. Bawcutt, is available in the Malone Society Collections.

differed by company and by actor. Carnegie summarizes the missing “Play of Poore,” as he calls the play, by analyzing the part of Poore’s lines, cues, and stage directions. But when commenting on the part of Poore’s different cue lengths, Carnegie does not make any speculation about a pattern that would explain why some cues were longer. Longer cues could have not only supplied contextual information, but could also have indicated a transition in stage action or provided an actor who had a long time to wait for his next cue with a longer prompt to ensure that he follows along with the plot and also listens for this cue. This last reason is particularly compelling because the actor’s part did not provide the number of lines that the actor had until his next cue to speak. Tribble asserts, “For an amateur, the issue of orientation and situation awareness is crucial; knowing the addressee minimizes the need to draw inferences and greatly reduces working memory load. Similarly, longer cues provide a crucial breathing space that facilitates timely recognition and response” (60). But this explanation is not based on an extensive analysis of this university part or later actors’ parts. It is difficult to determine since the text for *The Play of Poore* has not survived, but based on other extant parts’ cues, the number of cue words written for the part of Poore was not a random decision, especially since Goffe was so specific about all of the other part’s conditions, such as stage directions and shared lines.<sup>20</sup>

Although scholars have acknowledged that parts were vital documents in the professional players’ performance process, critics have yet to analyze or put forth theories regarding the codes within extant parts, preferring instead to comment on the parts’ minimal markings as proof that actors memorized the lines and cues without as much concern for who their cue partners on stage were. I contend, however, that actors’ parts were concerned with collaboration and that the parts’ “minimal” text served as a cognitive mapping of cue codes for performance. When examining

---

<sup>20</sup> Moreover, the inclusion of more information in the university part could not only indicate less time for rehearsal, but also the playwright’s concern for preserving his parts for future university actors

the professional parts of Orlando and Trico, I use some of the same passages and excerpts that previous critics have used in order to discuss and sometimes disagree with their speculations. Using the same examples when discussing these two parts, creates a common ground for analyzing these parts' features so that we can continue to modify our understanding of these parts' codes for study and performance.

The Orlando-part (1591/92) from Robert Greene's *Orlando Furioso*, while archived at Dulwich Library, was transcribed and printed by W.W. Greg, and the part recently has been digitized by Grace Ioppolo in the Henslowe-Alleyn Digitisation Project.<sup>21</sup> Previous scholars have made inferences about the part's lines and cues by comparing the part to the extant 1594 quarto of *Orlando Furioso*.<sup>22</sup> In Greene's "heroic romance" (Foakes), Orlando, a French nobleman, woos Angelica, daughter to the emperor of Africa, winning her hand in marriage and defeating four other suitors, who are kings from various countries. Angelica and Orlando's romance is threatened, however, by County Sacripant, a conniving nobleman who is in love with Angelica and starts a war against the emperor. Sacripant dupes Orlando into believing that Angelica loves Medor, and Orlando becomes mad with grief. Before Angelica is killed for her supposed betrayal, Sacripant's lies are revealed to Orlando, and the play ends with the lovers' reunion.

Some of the 1594 quarto's text differs from the actor's part,<sup>23</sup> indicating that the quarto text, which was printed a couple of years after the part, is a revised copy of the play (Palfrey and

---

<sup>21</sup> The digital version, while valuable for cursory research, cannot match seeing the document in person. I plan on studying the physical manuscript in the near future. As Greg's transcription explains, the strips of the manuscript are destroyed by worms in some areas, so some of the text is impossible to recover.

<sup>22</sup> The play's full title in the 1594 quarto is *The historie of Orlando Furioso, one of the twelue pieres of France As it was plaid before the Queenes Maiestie* (Greene).

<sup>23</sup> Foakes notes the following differences between the part and the quarto text: "In the action represented by the part, it seems that Orlando in his madness imagines that he sees Angelica, or takes some mannequin brought on by his page Argalio to be her, until the thought of Medor, believed by him to be her lover, makes him turn against her. In the Quarto, Argalio brings on a 'Clowne drest lyke Angelica', according to the stage direction, and there follows some rather feeble comic dialogue in prose." Other clown scenes are also added to the quarto, as Foakes acknowledges.

Stern 20-21).<sup>24</sup> The part, more than likely written out by a scribe, has corrections that scholars believe are Edward Alleyn’s emendations because Alleyn played Orlando and gave this part, with a collection of other documents, to Dulwich Library (20).<sup>25</sup> The part possesses cue tails (lines drawn underneath a line of speech) to designate when the actor’s speech ends and the cue begins, and the cue tails run across the length of the part, with the one to three-word cues lining up with the right hand side of the actor’s lines (21). As Carnegie observes, “Apart from the name ‘Orlando’ at the top of the once independent strips from which the roll was made, there are no speech prefixes at all for Orlando or any other speakers” (11). Tribble contends, “For the experienced actor, the intimate knowledge of company practices would reduce the uncertainty about the identity of interlocutors—indeed, in the case of Orlando’s part, these are mostly made obvious through embedded dialogue.” But if cue partners are “made obvious through embedded dialogue” in the Orlando-part, then Greene possibly composed the part’s lines to complement the actor’s cue system.

The Orlando-part’s cue length, Palfrey and Stern assert, depends on the cue’s context: “If the addition of a word helps to give the cue a tangible presence or memorability, then a word will often be added; conversely, if one or two words give a sufficiently pithy picture, then a third word will often be deemed redundant” (21). They give the following excerpt of “consecutive cues” as an example:

_____	the world
_____	no answeerr
_____	doth lye
_____	pennylesse

<sup>24</sup> Even if Michael Warren’s depressing suggestion that the Orlando-part, which possesses numerous corrections, is an unfinished or discarded part (67-91; qtd in Palfrey and Stern 20), I prefer, like Palfrey and Stern, to think of the part’s revision status as less important to our understanding of parts since the document still demonstrates a part’s layout, cue system, and stage directions.

<sup>25</sup> According to Palfrey and Stern’s archival research, “The remaining strips of ‘Orlando’, now separate, were clearly originally stuck together in a roll of about 18 feet in length, as worm-hole evidence shows” (20). For a discussion about the advantages of writing parts on scrolls instead of in books, see *Shakespeare in Parts* (20).

_____	by force
_____	I give
_____	souldiours

When one could argue that two-word cues such as “by force” and “the world” would be just as “tangible” as one word, one has to wonder if there is a different explanation for the length of the cues. Why is “souldiours” enough when “world” is not? Yes, one word possesses two syllables while the other has only one, but is there another explanation beyond audible syllables? When are the cues three words and why? Unfortunately, as W.W. Gregg’s side-by-side comparison reveals, the Orlando part’s lines and cues are often different or altogether missing from the 1594 quarto, so it is difficult to determine whether the cue length has any set patterns for revealing new cue partners; therefore, previous scholars’ conclusions about the cue’s context and the lines’ clues about to whom Orlando is speaking with are the only cue codes that we can ascertain for certain from this early part. Yet looking at parts from the late seventeenth century and eighteenth century, such as the part of Trico (1662) and the part of Touchstone (1731), reveals how various cue systems could have been used by different actors and companies to provide actors with information that goes beyond using cues for contextual clues or mnemonic prompts for speaking.

But before looking at these later parts, we should also briefly examine some of the Orlando-part’s stage directions in order to determine what kinds of instructions about stage movement and blocking an actor’s part provided. As David Bradley observes about early modern stage and playwriting practices, “It is not an exaggeration to say that the action of an Elizabethan play *consists* of entrances. They are the means by which the story is told; the controllers of the illusion of time and place; the sign-posts for the understanding of the plot” (23). Extant documents such as the Plots of *The Battle of Alcazar* and *The First Part of Tamar Cam* suggest that early modern actors would have had a Plot—a one-page scene outline written by a

professional Plotter—to consult backstage (Bradley 115), so that actors would know who entered the scene and when and who was on stage in which scene (Palfrey and Stern 72). As Bradley notes, however,

What the actors were to do when they got on stage and how they were to make their exits appear to be matters of less concern to the Plotter, at any rate as far as making a record went. These matters appear to have been governed largely by the spoken text. Some Plots do not mark exits at all, and, even in prompt-books, exits are frequently overlooked, just as they often are in printed texts. Stage action is almost never described, although in many cases it must have been elaborate: the Plotter merely records the entrances and the properties that are to be carried on. (23)<sup>26</sup>

Although the Plotter's Plot would tell actors who would be on stage with them in a specific scene, it would not reveal in-depth details about the scene's action, which actor cued whom, or the characters' feelings about one another. A Prompter would only be able to provide actors with a cue if someone forgot his lines or cue (Palfrey and Stern 73). Actors analyzed their parts and cues in solitary study for in-text prompts and stage directions and listened carefully in performance to other actors' lines to determine character information that went beyond surface-level details.

As Palfrey and Stern note, "Parts serve a different purpose from the full text. While they might verbally follow the complete play, they are likely to be more accurate locally, at least as far as stage-directions are concerned" (31). Along with providing cues, the Orlando-part also gives the Orlando-actor stage directions when the scene calls for physical contact with another actor or usual stage movements. For example, the Orlando-part provides useful notes to the left

---

<sup>26</sup> Edward Langhans makes a similar observation about Restoration prompters and promptbooks: "the prompter seems to have been concerned with getting actors onstage but not with getting them off. Nothing in the promptbooks suggests that actors were coached on their exits—when to exit, which side, which door, or between wings" (xxiv).

of his speeches that prompt Orlando to act out physically and also reveal his cue partner's reaction:<sup>27</sup>

<u>he beates. A.</u>	and canst thou not weepe
	_____ Lord
A. Begins to	why then begin, but first let me geve you
<u>weepe</u>	you <sup>r</sup> watchword Argalio, Ang <el
	stay < > begin to so <

Here, Orlando beats Argalio (Orgalio), his servant, because Orlando has gone mad and believes that Angelica is in love with Medor, as the part's lines above this excerpt reveal. Since actors were not always given stage directions, we do not know for certain why he is given the information about when Argalio "begins to weepe," but I think it could be a direction to stop beating Argalio when he speaks, "why then begin, but first let me geve you / your watchword Argalio, Ang <el." I point to why he was given this information because Orlando is only given specific stage directions for two main sections in the part: when Orlando initially goes mad ("he walketh up & down," "he whistles for him," and "beat A") and when he fights several other actors at once ("N. Victus" and "Oliver victus"). Other sections of his part do not provide stage directions beyond "exit." He does not receive stage directions to cross to the center of the stage or to look at a certain character (Palfrey and Stern 23). During the second fight scene, the stage directions only reveal who wins each fight "N. Victus" and "Oliver victus" (23). The stage directions he does receive, as Palfrey and Stern also note, give him general directions about the scene's physicality and emotional context, not specifications for whom will be where on stage or who will cue him at what moment.

But the stage directions that are provided in these two sections are critical because the part's lines do not reveal how Orlando acts when mad or against whom he will fight first. The

---

<sup>27</sup> Unfortunately, this excerpt from the part is damaged, as noted by the symbols < and >. I use the same excerpt as Palfrey and Stern in order to discuss their response to this section of the part as well as to discuss the stage directions' implications for the part.

part's directions, therefore, indicate that an early modern actor's part would provide instructions when the part's physical movements are complicated and not embedded in the part's lines. By extension, for this particular part, these physical characterizations are mapped temporarily onto the Orlando-character's body, as the only time the Orlando-actor receives complex stage directions is when Orlando has gone mad. The stage directions serve as a clue that the Orlando-character has changed emotionally and physically. These instructions would aid the actor in memorizing the physical movements required for the part for complex scenes.

In discussing cognitive scaffolding and "linguaform," Andy Clark explains, "Linguistic forms and structures are first encountered as simply objects (additional structure) in our world. But they then form a potent overlay that effectively, and iteratively, reconfigures the space for biological reason and self-control" (59). Within the cognitive artifact of the part, I argue that linguistic structures like stage directions and cue lengths help actors "reconfigure the space" of the stage and its bodies. What appears to be "cognitive thrift" (Tribble 61), only providing a few stage directions, is actually an information-compressed code for the actor, who will have to negotiate his physical interactions in this complex scene based on the information that the stage directions and cues provide.

The Harvard Theatre Collections house the Restoration professional part of Trico (1662), which comes from a translated and altered version of George Ruggle's play *Ignoramus*, originally produced in 1615 (Tucker 5, 8). In this "legal satire," Trico, "a wily servant," maneuvers and tricks other characters within the plot to help Antonius wed Rosabella (5-8). Ferdinando Parkhurst, who translated the play from Latin to English in 1662, wrote out the part of Trico (Langhans, "Trico's Part" 509, Tucker 9). Langhans argues that the actor, Matthew Medbourne, might not have used this part: "Parkhurst based the part on an early draft of the play

and not the one used for the 1662 production. The reason it survived, one supposes, is precisely because it was not used by Medbourne after all” (509). Although the part is not marked up by the actor (509), an actor does not necessarily mark up his or her part, as we can see from the eighteenth-century parts I have examined.

Langhans notes that the “role of Trico, the clever servant to Theodorus, runs to 499 lines out of an approximate total of 2900 in the whole play as found in MS C (“A Restoration” 182).<sup>28</sup> Like the Orlando-part, as Palfrey and Stern note, the Trico-part possesses, on average, one to three-word cue lengths (29). The part, however, also contains some one-syllable cues as well as four-word cues (29). In contrast with the Orlando-part, Trico’s stage directions are on the right-hand side of his speech, and he is given more information about when characters enter and exit (Palfrey and Stern 31). The Trico-part’s stage information about entrances and exits suggests that the information that is provided depends on the part’s company, scribe, actor, and time period. Since we do not have more Restoration and Renaissance parts for comparison, this point is based in conjecture. Yet eighteenth-century parts offer evidence for its plausibility.

Langhans provides a transcript of Trico’s part alongside his first scene (1.5) in order to compare the part to the scene’s action.<sup>29</sup> The part appears to be in prose, based on the transcript’s preference for not capitalizing Trico’s lines. In this scene, Trico’s cues are one to three words in length, or two to four syllables long. Ten cues are three words, six are two words, and five are one-word cues. But the majority of cues are three syllables long: each one-word cue is three syllables. There are no stage directions for this scene, so Trico’s cues and lines are all the more important for the actor to study. In the scene, Trico has three cue partners, but the majority of his

---

<sup>28</sup> The Harvard Library holds three manuscript versions of the play (Tucker 8).

<sup>29</sup> In 2012, I will travel to the Harvard Library to see the part firsthand, but until then, Langhans’ transcript of this scene is the only version that I have access to for research.

cues are given by Antonius and an elderly lady (Surda), who is watching after Rosabella. Trico distracts Surda by flirting with her so that Antonius can speak with Rosabella.

None of Trico's cues name the cue partner, but some of the cues appear to hint that his cue partner will change or his partner's lines will require some kind of action from him. Trico's first cue to speak is from Antonius, whom he enters with for his first scene. This first cue is three words ("life runs minutes"). Trico's next three cues, "appearance," "what of her?," and "thy councell," are all spoken by Antonius. After his first three cues, Trico's lines indicate that he will soon switch cue partners: "ile stroak her gently, & make much of her, while you discourse your mind to Rosabella" and "saue you good woman—hah; I think shee's deaf" (1.5.12-13, 18). Surda now begins to cue Trico with "your hands" and "folde his armes," both cues indicating that Trico will be interacting with Surda. She continues to cue Trico until Rosabella cues him with "private token" at line 99 in the scene. Rosabella's cue starts the most complicated part of the cuing system in this scene, since for the next twenty lines, Trico is cued by all three characters in the scene. The following excerpt lists the cues for this section, placing the cue partners' names and the length of the cue in brackets for clarification for my readers. The cue speaker of the cues which have asterisks beside them would not be difficult to infer from Trico's lines, but the other cues are less easy to discern from the part's dialogue. The Trico-actor would therefore have to rely on other clues for who speaks the cue:

_____	this love [two-word, two-syllable cue: Surda]
_____	private token [two-word, four-syllable cue: Rosabella]
_____	thee my joy [three-word, three-syllable cue: Surda]
_____	oh Trico [two-word, three-syllable cue: Antonius]*
_____	convulsion [one-word, three-syllable cue, Surda]
_____	ha, ha, ha [repeated three-word, three-syllable cue, Surda]*
_____	permanent [one-word, three-syllable cue, Antonius]
	<i>[Exit Antonius and Rosabella]</i>
_____	prosper it [two-word, three-syllable cue, Surda]*

Rosabella's cue "private token" is the only time that she cues Trico. Since this cue is four syllables and provides a definitive shift in conversation, the Trico-actor could infer when studying his part that he has switched cue partners. The next cue, though, changes the cue length to three words, indicating another shift back to receiving cues from Surda, while "oh Trico," another change in cue length, is clearly from Antonius, based on Trico's lines that this cue prompts. With the one-word cue of "convulsion," the Trico-actor could deduce that his cue partner has switched back to Surda, who earlier was concerned that he had fainted, while the repeated cue of "ha, ha, ha" is an easy cue from Surda who "neighs," according to Trico's next line. The final one-word cue from Antonius would again indicate a switch in partners, whereas the scene's final cues are easy to comprehend because Surda and Trico are the only ones left on stage. Based on this analysis of cue lengths in 1.5, it appears that actors could rely not only on the cue's context but also on variances in the cues' lengths to know if their cue partner was changing.

Previous critics, however, have not seen any pattern in the cuing system, assessing that the part's cues are based on context alone and do not help the actor in perceiving speech lengths. For example, Palfrey and Stern observe that the Trico-actor is not clued in when Antonius's third cue in this scene is a short phrase that will prompt a "rapid-fire cue" response (30). They provide the following example:

Approach not neer her Sir, take my advice,  
See you not that old woman?  
\_\_\_\_\_ what of her?

While the part does not draw a line at the end of "old woman" to indicate that the next cue represents the *entire* line, the previous line's context would hint at this short exchange. In examining Langhans' transcript, it appears that the part is written in prose, but the lines and the

layout of the excerpt above indicate that some of the part's dialogue with Antonius could be written in verse, or at least rely on verse form occasionally. If the part was in verse, it would be easier to ascertain that the line was shared because the actor would count the syllables of his line and his cue and infer from the cue length, and the context, that the line was shared. Of course, since the part appears to be written in prose, this point might be speculative, but the layout of the lines above visually appeal to verse form for this brief exchange.

Edward Langhans also cites this same cue, as a part of an example of the part's layout and lack of an entrance cue, in his analysis and asserts that "there appears to be no logic behind the selection of cue length" ("A Restoration Actor's Part" 183). Langhans provides the following excerpt:

Trico, his part	Mr. Medburne Actus primus, Scen: 5.
_____ life runs minutes	
feare nothing Sir, both time & tide's preseru'd. giue me leaue to cleere your eyes – behold yon starr –	
_____ appearance approach not neer her Sir, take my aduice see you not that old woman?	
_____ what of her?	

For this scene, which as Langhans notes is Trico's first scene, the Trico-actor gets a three-word cue before he speaks his first line; the cue could be longer because it is his first cue. The Trico-actor does not receive a cue for entering. As the play-text reveals, he enters with Antonius. Langhans surmises that based on "extant Restoration promptbooks that the prompter or his assistant normally warned and cued entrances, so that actors did not have to depend on their memories" (183). Since this part is the only Restoration part that we have, Langhans' speculation could be accurate. Eighteenth-century parts, however, do have entrance cue lines, so it is difficult

to assume from this one part alone that the Restoration standard layout left out entrance cues. While the Trico-actor receives a three-word cue for his first speech, he only receives the one-word cue of “appearance” for his next cue. Of course, “appearance” is a three-syllable word and the third cue, “what of her?,” is also three syllables, but I contend that the actor is provided with three words instead of one or two to indicate that this cue represents the entire line. This part’s cues, while seemingly random, show signs of a system if we look at the part closer; this particular system, however, might only apply to this one production or company. Eighteenth-century parts provide a more persuasive study for cue systems because unlike earlier parts, we can examine both the complete parts and the complete text to draw conclusions about the codes within the parts.

Based on the parts I studied at the Folger Shakespeare Library, eighteenth-century parts vary in cue placement, cue length, and the amount of changes written in the part. These differences could be explained by looking at who is doing the writing—some of the parts are written in the actor’s hand, while others are written by scribes. One thing that the parts, regardless of the penmanship, have in common is that they uniformly do not have the plethora of detailed stage markings or scribbling about character with which many actors mark up their scripts today. Like earlier parts, eighteenth-century parts, on the whole, are written without any line numbers to indicate how long an actor has to wait from his exit in Act Two to his entrance in Act Four. Instead, parts, depending on the actor or scribe, might have as few as two stage directions per scene (enter and exit) and no additions or crossed-out text in the part. In contrast, other parts, such as David Garrick’s *King John*, might display hatch marks across several lines, indicating that those lines have been omitted from the performance, and some parts, like John

Philip Kemble's part of Maskwell (1785) in William Congreve's *The Double Dealer*, show more interest in noting other characters' entrances and exits.

What follows is an introduction to what parts looked like on the page for eighteenth-century actors and the conclusions that we can come closer to making about early modern rehearsal and performance practices by studying these parts since the part and rehearsal system was not altogether different a century and a half later. Granted, some scholars might argue that an analysis of eighteenth-century Shakespearean parts presents its own set of problems since the plays and parts were freely adapted in this period.<sup>30</sup> Whether the parts were altered significantly, however, does not matter as much as the parts' coded properties because no performance text is ever stable. We are looking at the bones of the part—the cues, cue lengths, deleted lines, and stage directions—more than the flesh of the play. Another claim to contend with is that more importance was placed on rehearsals, particularly by Garrick, in the eighteenth century (240), so parts might have had different codes and notes depending on the amount of rehearsals the production had. As Stern notes, however, twenty-first-century critics' vision of rehearsal is quite different than what actually occurred pre-production: "Garrick did rehearse more carefully than his predecessors, but his care consisted in more 'study', known sometimes, confusingly, as 'individual rehearsal' (and 'rehearsal' for short), and in more 'partial' rehearsals, which, together, did not amount to more than a few hours of rehearsal in all" (*Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan* 246). Even if Garrick and Macklin practiced longer and more intensely than previous actors, the following two parts both date from early in their careers, so these extant

---

<sup>30</sup> Productions in this period also had consecutive performance runs. For example, Garrick's *King John* ran for about a week and a half at Drury Lane Theatre, competing against Colly Cibber's Covent Garden production of his version of Shakespeare's play: *Papal Tyranny in the Reign of King John* (Pedicord 443). Garrick's *King John*, however, was not performed again until 1754. While his adaptation was revived several times over the course of the eighteenth century, Garrick's role as King John (and then Falconbridge later in 1745 and in 1754) was not his most well-received performance (443-45).

parts arguably demonstrate less of Garrick and Macklin's influence on acting and rehearsal and reveal more about the part systems that were handed down to them from previous actors.<sup>31</sup>

The earliest eighteenth-century Shakespearean part archived at the Folger Shakespeare Library is the part of Touchstone in *As You Like It*. The part's dating and origin is curious: the Folger has catalogued it an "Autograph transcript in the hand of Charles Macklin of the part for the role of Touchstone in *As You Like It*" and dates it "ca. 1731," but Macklin does not have a recorded performance of the part until 1741.<sup>32</sup> Despite this oddity, the part possesses conventional characteristics for the period, such as noting the length of the part, putting "at" before the entrance cue for a scene, and providing stage directions. Underneath Charles Macklin's autograph, the scribe writes "7 & ½" to indicate that the part is seven-and-a-half lengths, or 7 pages front and back and one front page. The part's worn pages are about seven-and-a-half inches long and about six inches wide.

The Touchstone-part's variance in cue lengths (two to four words) in his scenes appears to help the Touchstone-actor know which actor will cue him when the part-text does not clearly indicate who is speaking to him. This part's cue system, however, when compared to Garrick's part of King John (1745), suggests that a certain amount of individual or company ownership of the part decided the length of the cues and how stage directions would be marked. Of course, these parts are handled by eighteenth-century actors, who might or might not have had the same practices as early modern actors, but analyzing these professional parts in-depth can help us trace the importance of cue lengths, entrance signals, and stage directions for early modern actors.

When illustrating portions of the Touchstone-part, I use a different font to help the reader get the

---

<sup>31</sup> For an in-depth discussion of Macklin and Garrick's acting instruction, see Stern's *Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan*, especially pgs 261-66.

<sup>32</sup> In Autumn of 1960, *Shakespeare Quarterly* reproduced two pages of the part. The caption reports that the part was "prepared for Charles Macklin, who played the part at Drury Lane from 1741 to 1748."

feeling of what a part's handwriting would look like. I attempt to create a diplomatic edition of this part because too often, when we "recreate" archival work for our readers, we divorce the visual aspect from the experience.

Touchstone's cues do not list the character who speaks the cue, but there appears to be a method in his scenes for the length of the cue. The actual cue tails are only about a fourth of the line long, which is half the length of some of the other parts' tails that we have examined thus far. This line length means that the cue words are centered with the actor's speech. Not counting the "at" for entrance cues, the cues range from two to four words, but the cue usually contains three to four words:

*Touchstone - As You Like It - Act 1.P.S*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ *at whetstone of the wits.*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ *whither wander you?*  
*Mistress you must come away to your Father*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ *made the Messenger.*  
*No by my Honour but I was bid to come*  
*For you.*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ *Wit and Fortune will*  
*Or as the Destinies Decree.*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ *with a Trowel*  
*Nay if I keep not my Rank.*  
*with weeping Alas*  
*But what is this sport Monsieur that the*  
*Ladies have lost?*  
 \_\_\_\_\_ *I speak of.*  
*Thus men grow wiser every Day. It is the*  
*First Time that ever I Heard Breaking*  
*of Ribs was sport for Ladies*  
*Exit with Duke uc.*<sup>33</sup>

P.S. refers to "prompt side," which would tell the actor to enter on the side that the prompter is located, while O.P. refers to "opposite prompt" so that the actor enters or exits on the opposite

---

<sup>33</sup> While I would like to add actual images of the parts to this project in the future, I also want to demonstrate the orthography of the part as a handwritten, rather than printed, document. I owe this idea to a conversation with Paul Menzer, who is working on a larger project on actors' parts and handwriting, at the 2011 Shakespeare Association of America conference.

side of the prompter.<sup>34</sup> Touchstone's entrance, cued by Rosalind, is a four-word cue, not including "at." But later in the play, his entrance cue from Orlando for the scene between Touchstone and Corin is a two-word cue. These variances in entrance cue lengths appear to indicate different cue partners.

Moreover, Touchstone's cues to speak also have a set pattern. As the first page written out above indicates, speech cues from Rosalind are three words throughout this first scene, but when Celia cues Touchstone, instead, with "Wit and Fortune will," the cue is four words long. This system varies twice in this scene. Once, Rosalind cues him with a one-word line ("Alas"), but in a different hand, someone, possibly Macklin, wrote in Le Beau's "with weeping" before "Alas," which again, suggests that three-word cues are given by Touchstone's primary cuer in this scene, Rosalind (since she speaks the last word in this three-word cue). The second time that the rules change is when Touchstone is cued by Le Beau's "I speak of." Based on the part text, it is clear that he has asked Le Beau a question and Le Beau responds; Touchstone's attention would therefore be toward Le Beau, so there would be no need for a different cue length to signal that a different player will cue him. The scene's cue lengths therefore appear to help the Touchstone-actor when the part-text does not clearly indicate who will cue him. Granted, it could also be that "Wit" was added to "and Fortune will" so that the actor noticed the continued play on "wit" in the scene, but it is plausible that the length of the cues also helped the actor know that he would be cued by more than one person.

---

<sup>34</sup> The Oxford English Dictionary dates this definition for P.S. as "1780?," but in this case, the OED is inaccurate. From his study of late seventeenth-century and early eighteenth-century promptbooks, Langhans defines the following abbreviation codes: "LDOP lower door, opposite prompt[;] MDOP middle door, opposite prompt[;] UDOP upper door, opposite prompt[;] LDPS lower door, prompt side[;] MDPS middle door, prompt side[; and] UDPS upper door, prompt side" (66). These codes can be found in John Banks's *The Albion Queens* quarto (1714), which provides "extensive traces of prompt copy probably related to the Rich Company production at Drury Lane Theatre on 6 March 1704" (66).

Touchstone's second scene with Rosalind, Celia, and Corin further indicates that different cue lengths signal a new cue partner, a stability in cued conversation between two partners, or an end to one partnership's exchange to begin a new one with a new cue partner:

*Your Betters, Sir. \_\_\_\_\_ Exit with Rosalind & c[ompany]*

*Return with Corin. Act 3d - PS*

\_\_\_\_\_ *at unexpressive She*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Mr. Touchstone.*

*Truly Shepherd in respect to itself, it is  
a Good Life; but in respect, that it is  
[next page]*

*A Shepherds Life it is Naught. In respect  
it is . . . .<sup>35</sup>*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Dull Kindred.*

*Such a one is a Natural Philosopher. Wast  
ever in Court Shepherd [significant cuts here about courtiers]*

\_\_\_\_\_ *my Lambs suck*

*That is another simple Sin in you, to bring  
the ewes and the rams together . . . .*

[next page]

\_\_\_\_\_ *the Fair of Rosaline*

*I'll rhyme you so eight years together;*

*... Rank to market.*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Out Fool.*

*For a Taste.*

*If a hart doth lack a Hind,*

*Let him seek out Rosalind.*

. . . .

\_\_\_\_\_ *on a Tree*

*Truly the Tree yields Bad Fruit.*

\_\_\_\_\_ *Go you with him Sirrah.*

*Come Shepherd, Let us make an honourable*

[next page]

*Retreat . . . scrippage \_\_\_ Exit P.S.*

The Touchstone-actor would know from his part that he enters with Corin "at unexpressive She," but again, he would not know how long that was or what scenes came before this scene from his

<sup>35</sup> Ellipses in this part indicate where I have omitted some of the text from Touchstone's speeches when it does not affect my argument. The part is in Lucida Calligraphy, and my notes are in Times New Roman.

part. His focus, then, would be on the cues. The cue length for this entrance is two words (sans the “at”), and in looking at the full text, we see that the cue is spoken by Orlando, not Rosalind.

It is interesting to note that when Corin and Touchstone are alone on stage, two to three cue words suffice. Corin’s first two speaking cues for Touchstone are only two words; his cue partner is clear since Touchstone is addressing Corin in his responses. Corin’s last cue is three words, so Corin is not specifically tagged as a two-word cue character. I put forth that the scribe wrote in a three-word cue, “my Lambs suck,” because the part cuts a significant portion of Corin and Touchstone’s debate about whether country laborers should act as courtiers and kiss one another’s hands. The Touchstone-actor does not need the word “my” to make out what the context of the cue is because he picks up the subject in his next line, “That is another simple sin in you, to bring the ewes and the rams together.” So the additional word appears to help the Touchstone-actor memorize the part without thinking about the other cut material, if he has performed it before.

The additional word could also indicate that this is the last time he will be cued by Corin, as his next cue, which is four words, is from Rosalind. Her reply cue to Touchstone’s teasing is only two words, “Out Fool” but that is the character’s only words of response before Touchstone begins to spout verses that mock Orlando’s poetry. Her third cue for Touchstone is three words “on a tree,” but the cue after that one is five words, indicating a new cue partner. Celia delivers this last cue, which confirms that the length of the cue is a visual code for a change in subject matter and more importantly, a new cue partner. Both Corin and Rosalind’s last cue is three words, and the new cue partner’s cue length is longer, but both characters also provide him with two-word cues within their exchange, which confirms that different cue lengths functioned as codes for switches, or stability, in subject matter and cue partners.

Similar to the abbreviated exchange with Corin, the part omits other lines in Touchstone's scenes. It erases nearly all of Touchstone's bawdy lines about sex and cynical remarks about marriage: Touchstone's part-book does not mark out the lines because they simply are omitted from his part-text. For example, the following excerpt shows significant cuts to the scene in which Touchstone first attempts to marry Audrey:

\_\_\_\_\_ *I am foul*  
*Well praised be the Heavens for thy foulness,*  
 . . . . *xc and \** [the symbol is actually a cross in a circle]  
 \_\_\_\_\_ *the Gods give us Joy*  
 . . . .

"The Gods give us Joy" is the last cue in the scene. Martext is absent from this production's text, and Jacques appears to be omitted from this scene because Touchstone is not cued by any actor after this cue for Touchstone to speak his last speech and exit offstage. The last five-word cue, Audrey's "the Gods give us Joy," functions as a mnemonic device for the Touchstone-actor so that he remembers that a significant amount of lines and two characters have been cut from this scene. Touchstone not having the omitted lines in his part is an advantage because he is not distracted by them when he is memorizing his lines. Actors' parts in this period never cross out lines to the point that the lines are undecipherable, perhaps for fear that the lines might be added back in, so it would seem a cognitive advantage for Macklin to be able to memorize his lines without seeing the omitted portions of the scene. And the longer cues also help him remember that the lines and cues have altered for this production.

The Touchstone-part itself has few markings or corrections made by the actor, except for when something has been added back into the text. A circled cross symbol also draws the eye's attention to the above lines. But if we looked for clues on this page alone to decipher the

symbol's meaning, we would be disappointed. The symbol's meaning only becomes clear on the part's final page. At the very end of the part, the following has been handwritten in:

---

*The under lines restor'd and mark'd in the eighth page of the part. Thus \**

---

\*

*He should Marry us than another; for He is not Like to Marry me well; and not being well Married, it will be a good excuse for me hereafter to Leave my wife.*

The sparse amount of revisions to this part – no cross-hatching for cuts – suggests that revisions to the play text, if added to or changed significantly, were perhaps executed in the promptbook<sup>36</sup> or performance text, and actors would have been given freshly written parts, but this procedure does not apply to all eighteenth-century parts. Other parts, like Garrick's *King John*, show more extensive revision by the actors.

Comparing selections from two eighteenth-century parts close in performance dates, David Garrick's part in *King John* (1745) and Macklin's *Touchstone*-part (1731), allows us to investigate variances in textual omissions as well as whether a part's cue lengths depended on the scribe or actor's opinions of how a cue functioned.<sup>37</sup> Garrick's *King John*-part is thirteen-and-a-half lengths long, or twenty-seven pages. The lines for the part are only written on the front of the pages; Garrick occasionally writes additions or changes on the back of a page. Like Macklin's *Touchstone*, Garrick is never given his cue partner's name (unless he receives clues in his lines) but is given who he enters with at the top of the scene. Unlike Macklin's part for

---

<sup>36</sup> As Langhans explains, "A complete promptbook from the late seventeenth century [1660-1700] normally included warnings and cues for entrances, sound, music, and special effects; notes on large and small properties; descriptions of stage setting; warnings and cues for scene shifts; and indications of lines to be omitted in performance" (xiv). As Langhans observes, however, the promptbooks that have been preserved are not always "complete" and indicate that there might have been more than one promptbook involved in a production (xiv).

<sup>37</sup> Charles Macklin played Cardinal Pandulph in Garrick's 1745 production of *King John* (Appleton 74).

Touchstone, Garrick's King John-part contains numerous markings, in brown and black ink, that indicate when lines have been cut or added. Occasionally, Garrick also adds a dash after a line, possibly to indicate a pause in speech. When the scribe wrote out the part, he only wrote two to three-word cues. But the emendations that Garrick writes in provide four to five-word cues.

Garrick adds words when he has a different or new cue in his part, and his side shows the cuts to the text, unlike Macklin's lines, which are pre-cut to omit Touchstone's deleted lines from the part. For example, the following cue emendation from Garrick's King John-part shows that he added words to a cue that changed due to deletions from the performance text: on page 3, "         I was begot" is crossed out by brown ink and replaced with "call me so." But then the cue apparently changes again because Garrick marks out "call me so" and writes in "Sir Robert was away" on the right-hand side of the page (with "away" above "was" because he ran out of room on the page). To clarify this cue change, he then also makes this correction on the left-hand page in same line area, providing a neater version of the cue that has been changed three times. This particular new cue and change in cue length proves to be interesting when we compare the cues against the Folio text:

*From henceforth beare his name  
Whose forme thou bearest:  
Kneele thou down Philip, but rise more great,  
Arise Sir Richard, and Plantagenet.  
\_\_\_\_\_ Sir Robert was away [Bastard]  
\_\_\_\_\_ call me so. [Eleanor]  
\_\_\_\_\_ I was begot. [Bastard]  
Goe, Faulconbridge, now has thou thy desire  
A landlesse Knight, makes thee a landed Squire  
. . . (TLN 168-86)*

The first cue, "I was begot," would have been spoken by Bastard, the second cue, "call me so," would have been from Eleanor, while the final cue "Sir Robert was away" is spoken by Bastard. The first two cues were eliminated to cut Eleanor from the text. As Garrick noted on the MS,

“(the following speeches are put into King John's part in order to leave the part of Queen Eleanor out of the play)” (f.2v). Yet the card catalog in the Folger archives contends, “Queen Eleanor was not omitted in the known performances in London in 1745, yet this was the only year in which Garrick appeared as King John.” Regardless of whether Eleanor was cut from this performance, the part shows how the lines were cut from the text for a performance at some point.<sup>38</sup> Other lines that mention Eleanor are also boxed and hatched, indicating cuts to the text. For this particular cue, “Sir Richard was away,” it appears that Garrick added the extra word and wrote the cue on the opposite page to make sure that he remembered the change in cue and cue partners. Both Garrick and Macklin therefore appear to add extra words to cues to help them remember when they have a new cue or different cue partner because of textual cuts.

Garrick's part also shows an increasing tendency to provide him with the entrances and exits of other characters as the play progresses. This increase in stage directions involving other actors might be due to the complexity of the scenes toward the end of the play: Garrick's number of cue partners increases and the action becomes more frenetic as the play reaches its conclusion. For instance, in Act Four, the part begins to give him more information than his entrance stage directions alone. The part reveals when Hubert enters and when the Lords and Hubert exit; when a messenger enters, when Bastard and Peter of Pomfret enter, and the messenger exits; and when Hubert reenters the scene as King John exclaims, “My Mother Dead!” Act Five also provides similar descriptions regarding entrances and exits, but I only found one entrance signal for other characters in Act One. It appears, based on this intensified interest in noting entrance and exit signals in the last two acts, that eighteenth-century actors could have been provided with more information when their scenes' cue partners and action sequences required complex

---

<sup>38</sup> For a more in-depth look at David Garrick's emendations to this part, his alterations to the play itself, and the possible performances in which Eleanor could have been cut from the play, see Harry William Pedicord's “Garrick Produces *King John*.”

coordination. This increase in stage partner details would enable actors to simulate their spatial placement and physical interaction in complex scenes when rehearsing individually.

Closely examining the codes within these seventeenth and eighteenth-century extant parts is helpful in analyzing Shakespeare and other early modern dramatists' plays' parts for structures and patterns in cues and character and actor partnerships. Yet while a part's cues and stage directions can provide the actor with clues about the scene, these codes are not meant to function as the only clues for performing a role. The actor also listened carefully to other actors' parts to respond to affective and expressive prompts because his part did not always provide him with all of the answers, as we shall see when looking at scenes between Othello and Iago. As the next four chapters will prove, the Chamberlain and King Men's systems for cues, affective and expressive prompts, rhetoric, and character relationships were carefully structured within and among each actor's part, playwright's play, and company's production to aid actors in performing their parts in collaboration.

## CHAPTER THREE

*“This honest creature doubtless  
Sees and knows more, much more, than he unfolds”*

Conceptual Blending and Affective Priming: Prompting and Performing Emotion in *Othello*

In *The Way We Think*, Giles Fauconnier and Mark Turner discuss the conceptual blending that occurs when an actor performs and a spectator watches: both actor and spectator blend two concepts to accept the fictional world of the play (266-67).<sup>39</sup> Fauconnier and Turner qualify that the “actor, meanwhile [as opposed to the spectator], is engaged in a different kind of blend, one in which his motor patterns and power of speech come directly into play, but not his free will or his foreknowledge of the outcome. In the blend, he says just what the character says and is surprised night after night by the same events” (267). Their conceptual blending theory not only applies to contemporary performance but also to early modern performance collaboration: as actors work together to create the characters’ fictional world out of their individually memorized parts and cues, they blend two relationships to create this social network: the exchange between actors and the dialogue between characters. Applying conceptual blending theory to Shakespearean texts, Amy Cook’s work in cognitive linguistics and performance explores how Shakespeare’s language encourages conceptual blending by spectators: “Shakespeare’s imagery lies on a succession of blends that facilitate a prompting of future blends; the language stands on associations that it builds along the way. Shakespeare’s language is cognitively generative: the blends he weaves through the play create concepts as they go.”

---

<sup>39</sup> See Bruce McConachie’s *Engaging Audiences* (40-47) and McConachie and F. E. Hart’s Introduction to *Performance and Cognition* (19-20) for connections between Fauconnier and Turner’s theory and the actor/spectator relationship. See Rhonda Blair’s *The Actor, Image, and Action: Acting and Cognitive Neuroscience* for applying conceptual blending theory to twenty-first century individual acting rehearsal and performance.

(“Interplay” 582). She is referring, however, to reading and hearing the language from a spectator’s point of view. Her work, while admirable in terms of the audience member’s cognitive processing, is less concerned with one of the most important blends of all in performance: the blend of the actors/characters to create the collaborative, fictional play-space.

In this blend, the actors must affectively respond to the play’s different frames to react to the changes as the characters would, blending concepts of how the characters respond to the first scene and what characters feel and speak as the scenes progress. Early modern performance is complicated a step further regarding cognitive blending because the actors would not have had open access to the play’s full text pre-performance, so they would have had to rely on each other’s words and actions to effectively perform the conceptual frameworks within each scene. The actors aid one another in transitioning from one framework to another by affectively priming each other through language and action. As they perform, the actors, therefore, would need to listen carefully to each other’s lines to create the appropriate emotional intensity between characters in each scene.

Actors’ facial expressions, postures, and gestures were *informed* by—in the term’s Renaissance sense, that is, formed or created by even as they were thought to contain the idealized forms of—the spoken language, as their emotions were affected by the characters’ speeches. The interaction through dialogue between the actors creates a cognitive, affective space that registers physically in the actors’ movement and expressions. By speaking emotionally charged words and exchanging sensory language, the actors affectively prime each other, creating the tempo for the scenes and the overall plot’s emotional climaxes for both audience and players as they connect their parts in performance.

All actors use their characters' words to affectively prime one another into action, but certain scenes and actors' parts encourage emotional receptivity and response more than other scenes and roles. In performing *Othello*, the actors playing Othello and Iago use expressive, emotional, and sensory language to impart what each character is feeling; these prompts aid the actors in expression of emotion through body language and action. At first, the actor playing Iago controls the performance's emotional pace by communicating expressive and affective prompts: through associative priming, his language manipulates the Othello-actor's thoughts, senses, and passions into action, directing the other actor in how to appraise the emotional content in order to react physically to the scene's demands.<sup>40</sup> As the play develops, Iago's words continue to prompt the actor playing Othello to perceive what his character thinks, knows, feels, and sees and exactly when and in what way he should respond to each character, but the Othello-actor's part also provides expressive and emotional instructions that aid him in performance. The sensory and emotional language for each actor's part heightens as the action draws closer to Desdemona's violent death. While scholars often have acknowledged Iago's skills as a director, analyzing the actors' language in relation to social cognition reveals how both the Iago-actor and the Othello-actor's parts help to create a collaborative performance in which early modern actors depended on each other's lines to create characters and prompt changes in emotion and expression. During the individual rehearsal period, an actor examines his part's prosody and content, simulating a story about his character's role in the play: each actor simulates how his character thinks and responds to others as well as how the other characters think about and respond to him based on the partial story that the part and his cues provide. The accuracy of this simulation, however, all depends on what information the part provides and what it lacks, testing

---

<sup>40</sup> K. R. Scherer, A. Schorr, & T. Johnstone, Eds., *Appraisal Processes in Emotion: Theory, Methods, Research*, (Oxford University Press, 2001).

the certainty the actor possesses about what to do with his body and speech once on stage.

Performing for the actors is not a process of simulation, but perception, a process that humans experience daily as we adapt to our surroundings. Explaining how perception, instead of simulation, underscores embodied social cognition, Shaun Gallagher states,

When I see the other's action or gesture, I see (*I immediately perceive*) the meaning in the action or gesture; and when I am in a process of interacting with the other, my own actions and reactions help to constitute that meaning. I not only see, but I resonate with (or against), and react to the joy or the anger, or the intention that is in the face or in the posture or in the gesture or action of the other. (449)

Early modern actors relied on their pre-scripted parts to inform them about the scene, but they must equally have relied on other actors' words and movement to perceive how they should react in order to respond to emotional prompts embedded in Shakespeare's language. They listened and observed the other actors' voices, gestures, movements, and expressions to react on cue and play their parts. The actors used their perceptions and simulated stories to respond to and embody the cognitive blends and conceptual frameworks that the plot generates.

As actors perform, they create a cognitive space where the social group's order and rules are negotiated as the play progresses. As sociologist Bruno La Tour's Actor-Network Theory suggests, "all [groups] need some people defining who they are, what they should be, what they have been. These [people] are constantly at work, justifying the group's existence, invoking rules and precedents . . . There is no group without some kind of recruiting officer" (31-32).<sup>41</sup> With his part and the cues he uses to prompt other players, the actor playing Iago sets the "rules and precedents" and performs the function of "recruiting officer" in *Othello*, but the Othello-actor also shapes the scenes' rules as the play progresses, so the players are continually restructuring the play's social framework. Beyond the Othello-character seeing what is not there, the actor

---

<sup>41</sup> John Sutton's presentation at the 2010 Shakespeare Association of America also framed early modern performance using La Tour's Actor Network Theory ("The Extended Mind").

playing Othello must perceive what he cannot know from the part he was given by paying attention to Iago's words and expressing his character's reactions to those lines.<sup>42</sup> The Iago-actor speaks the lines that hint at Desdemona's infidelity, and the actor playing Othello physically deteriorates as his character's mind is affected by the images Iago feeds him. Blending his foreknowledge about the plot and his part with what the Iago-player tells him, the Othello-actor embodies the cognitive blend of Othello as a confident leader and fearful husband, physically projecting the concept of the jealous Moor.

Critics often note that Iago functions as a director within the play. Explaining how Iago manipulates the plot, Ann Pasternak Slater accurately suggests that Shakespeare uses his characters to control scenes through "indirect direction": "Iago's real triumph comes, of course, in the great temptation scene of III.iii. Here he manoeuvres Othello into the requisite reactions by pretending, with anxious solicitude, to see them dawning in his victim's face well in advance of their actual appearance" (30-31). And Michael Neill views Iago as a master anatomist, who cuts open Othello and reveals his inner parts to both Othello and the audience: "The whole dynamic of the temptation scene [3.3] depends on this carefully engineered reversal, which turns back upon Othello the scopic longing aroused in him by Iago's self-presentation as a man with something to hide. The effect is to foster in the Moor the horrifying sense that it is his own secret self that is being opened to the scandal of public view" (142). While I agree with critical interpretations that suggest Iago is an "indirect" director, a physiognomer,<sup>43</sup> and an anatomist, I wish to analyze the process of Othello's transition in more detail to understand how this "effect" occurs as the actors exchange lines in performance. It is clear that the Iago-character's rhetoric

---

<sup>42</sup> See Fauconnier and Turner's assessment of the actor/character blend (especially pg 266), as mentioned in Chapter One.

<sup>43</sup> Sybille Baumbach sees Iago as a physiognomer, whose "face readings anticipate pathognomic reactions that are yet to take place and could serve as stage directions, which feeds into his role as intra-theatrical director" (147).

manipulates the Othello-character's transformation from a confident leader and loving husband to his identity as the jealous Moor. But the more interesting question is how did the early modern actors who played the parts of Othello and Iago negotiate this transformation?

### **Prompts in the First Quarto of *Othello***

For my analysis of *Othello*, I primarily use Q1 because I agree with Scott McMillin's theory that this text was cut for a performance, but I also discuss the discrepancies between Q1 and F, and to a lesser extent Q2, and how these textual differences would affect a performance.<sup>44</sup> In interrogating the bad quarto theory's "fictions of competence and incompetence in the transmission of text," McMillin states, "The plain and obvious explanation of the 160 F lines which are missing in Q1 is that Q1 proceeds from a theatre script which has been reduced for performance. We do not know when the cuts were made, or who made them" (13). He rightly observes that the cuts could have been for the first performance or for any performance between the composition and publication date (13). In examining Q1 as a performance text, McMillin writes, "The mistakes in punctuation and syntax, the mishearing, the actors' interpolations all could belong to the scribe's situation of taking dictation, and the substantive variations from F . . . are often, I think, substituted by the voices the scribe is listening to, the voices of the actors" (35). Because we cannot be certain that this script was the one spoken on stage, not all critics will agree with my choice to rely more on the Q1 *Othello* to analyze the actors' parts. As Tiffany Stern astutely points out in *Documents of Early Modern Performance in Early Modern England*, "the actors' texts learnt for performance may—but need not ever—have descended from the book held by the prompter. Which is to say that editorial 'recovery' of a theatrical text may still not recover the script(s) from which performance was made" (238). Some lines or words in the

---

<sup>44</sup> The first Quarto was printed in 1622 and the Folio followed the next year. The second Quarto was published in 1630. The discrepancies between Q1 and F are extensive; Q2 borrows from both Q1 and F.

Q1 *Othello* could therefore vary from the actual parts the actors learned for performance; Stern's research comparing extant parts and whole plays indicates, however, that while punctuation differed, synonyms might have been used for certain words by actors or the part-copier, and actors might have added words or lines to the part, the speech, overall, remains in-tact (244). My analysis attempts to bridge the gap between the language the playwright wrote and how that language, spoken, informs the facial and body gestures expressed on stage. In addition, examining the textual differences at the end of 3.3 reveals that certain passages omitted from Q1 but present in F and Q2 could have altered the actors' performance and the audience's perception of the scene.<sup>45</sup>

### **Priming Emotion and Expression in the Cognitive Blend**

Both the Iago and Othello parts were played by experienced actors,<sup>46</sup> but experience is not all that makes a scene compelling: the actors create and shape their complex partnership on stage by reacting to the sometimes surprising, sometimes perfunctory affective prompts within one another's lines. If we look at the players' parts, the Iago-actor has the most knowledge pre-performance about the play and each character: each one's class, posture, emotions, facial expressions, and gesture is set up by his soliloquies and parts in the dialogue. For example, Iago's dialogue with Roderigo in 1.1 provides the Iago-actor with descriptive details about Cassio, Desdemona, Othello, Brabantio, and Roderigo. With this information, the actor playing Iago helps each actor perform his part, especially in the first four acts of the play. In *Othello's* opening scene, Iago instructs Roderigo to "rouse" Brabantio to "poison" Othello's marital bliss,

---

<sup>45</sup> See Leah Marcus's "The Two Texts of '*Othello*' and Early Modern Constructions of Race" for a discussion of how F's additional lines heighten the play's racial conflict.

<sup>46</sup> Critics believe that Richard Burbage was the first Othello since he was the leading man of the company; furthermore, an anonymous elegy, dated 1618[9], mourns the loss of Burbage, who played the "young Hamlet, old Hieronimo. / King Lear, the griev'd Moor, and more beside, / That lived in him, have now forever died" ("A Funeral Elegy" 182). While we do not know for certain who played Iago, it stands to reason that one of the company's leading men, or "master actors" as McMillin argues, played this part ("The Sharer and His Boy" 237).

but Roderigo's lines and the cue words that he would memorize for this moment only indicate that he wakes Brabantio and talks with him. Roderigo is no nighttime troublemaker, but more of a cowardly follower; in performance, the actor playing Roderigo would react to Iago's lines that egg him on as well as his foreknowledge that his character is more reticent than Iago.

Iago's speech and his contrasting, contemplative language, affectively primes the actor playing Roderigo to respond like a foolish gallant. From his part in the opening scene, the actor playing Roderigo would know that his character takes people at face value. He accuses Iago of lying when he says, "Thou told'st me thou didst hold him in thy hate," and when Iago assures him that he does, Roderigo retorts, "I rather would have been his hangman" and "I would not follow him then." During the performance when Iago responds that "Many a duteous and knee-crooking knave / . . . / Wears out his time, much like his master's ass," the lines indirectly refer to and speak to Roderigo, who as much as he may want to be a witty manipulator, will always be a fool for men like Iago to use. Cognitively, when the actor playing Roderigo hears these lines, along with Iago's preference for those who, like himself, are "trimmed in forms and visages of duty, / Keep yet their hearts attending on themselves," his actions would agree with his character's lines as he knows that, unlike Iago, Roderigo says what he believes and expresses what he feels. As Iago confides, "It is as sure as you are Roderigo, / Were I the Moor, I would not be Iago": Roderigo cannot envision being anyone but himself.

When Iago professes, "I am not what I am," Roderigo responds with naive bluntness: "What a full fortune does the thick-lips owe / If he can carry't thus!" It is as if he has not even heard Iago's words; Roderigo continues to say what he is thinking, and thereby acts exactly how he is feeling. When Iago goads Roderigo to wake Brabantio, Roderigo says, "Here is her father's house. I'll call aloud" as if he did not hear Iago's previous lines to "rouse" Othello and "poison

his delight” by alerting her father of the elopement. Some editors may look at this line as a repetition to help actors know what the action is when they learn their parts separately and help the actors if one forgets his line on stage; however, the repetition also works to further develop Roderigo as a slow-witted, cowardly follower. Iago tells Roderigo to call Brabantio with “like timorous accent, and dire yell,” but while Roderigo may wake Brabantio, Iago is the one who plagues Brabantio with vivid images of his daughter’s betrayal. Iago’s words egg on Roderigo enough to yell for Brabantio, but once Brabantio answers, he retreats to a more subservient body posture and speaking tone, muttering apologies for the disturbance, much like the “duteous and knee-crooking knave” that Iago contrasts with himself when he states, “I am not what I am.”

When a character such as Iago states that his face and actions do not give away what he feels and thinks, the actor playing Iago must show that his character is better at lying with his expressions and posture than the other characters, but Iago’s lines and asides also challenge both audience members and other characters to prove that they can read his thoughts and discover his character’s true emotions. From the beginning of the play, the Iago-actor prompts his fellow actors in how to act, but this does not mean that they always listen to his advice. Sometimes they go directly against what he tells them to do, while other times they combine what he is saying and what they know about their characters to create the appropriate emotional reaction.

As a Machiavel, the Iago-character manipulates the other characters to his advantage; the Iago-actor can therefore prompt each player to emotionally and physically respond within scenes within the world of the play. While Iago persuades Othello to believe his lies, the actor playing Iago prompts the Othello-player on how, when, and to what degree to respond to his character’s plan. Analyzing 3.3., where Iago first plants doubt in Othello’s mind about Desdemona’s purity, reveals how the Iago and Othello-actors can use the performance text to create an emotional

space where they exchange both verbal and nonverbal communication. This so-called temptation scene has long been a forum in which scholars have debated the centrality of thinking in *Othello*.<sup>47</sup> While Paul Jorgensen has pointed to the repetition of the word “think” in constructing Othello’s downfall and William Toole argues that Iago’s rhetoric infests Othello’s mind, scholars have hitherto said little about the importance of the rhetorical device of repetition (conduplicatio, epanalepsis, anadiplosis, prosonamasia, and traductio)<sup>48</sup> in determining how early modern actors conforming to then-standard performance practices negotiate the emotional trajectory of this scene.

Although the Othello-actor would know the overall plot and his part, the Iago-player controls the pace of the performance at the beginning of 3.3: the Iago-actor tells the Othello-actor how to appraise each of the other actors’ parts and exactly when to react in what way to each character. At Othello’s entrance in the so-called temptation scene, Iago observes Cassio departing from Desdemona and, for Othello’s benefit, says, “Ha, I like not that” (3.3.37). Responding to Othello, who questions whether it was Cassio who left, Iago replies, “no, sure, I cannot think it / That he would sneak away so guilty-like / Seeing you coming” (41-43). By commenting that he “likes not” what he sees and then pretending to negate what he knows and thinks, Iago sets up Othello to start questioning what he sees, knows, and thinks, which, in turn, also primes the actor’s affective and physical responses. The following table visually demonstrates what each actor would “know” from his part and marks the various rhetorical and affective words that each actor would speak, which would prime the other actor’s conceptualization and reaction in performance.

---

<sup>47</sup> See Paul Jorgensen’s “‘Perplex’d in the Extreme:’ The Role of Thought in *Othello*” in *Shakespeare Quarterly* 15.2 (Spring, 1964): 265-75 and William B. Toole’s “Iagothello”: Psychological Action and the Theme of Transformation in “*Othello*” in *South Atlantic Bulletin* 41.2 (May, 1976), esp. 73-74.

<sup>48</sup> See Puttenham’s *The Art of English Poesy*, Book 3, Chapter 19 for more rhetorical devices of repetition.

**Table 3.1 Iago and Othello parts for 3.3 (Q1)**

“Thought” and “knowledge” associated words are **bolded**. Negative words, such as “not,” are *italicized*. When there is a blend, or cross-over, in words associated with both “knowledge” and negation, such as “know,” the word is bolded and italicized. In Iago’s actual part, there would be no space to indicate when Desdemona and Othello are speaking. I have created this space so that the Iago and Othello-parts’ dialogue match up for the reader.

**The part of Iago**

\_\_\_\_\_ [thy cause] away.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [do your] discretion.  
 Ha, I like *not* that.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [dost thou] say?  
*Nothing*, my lord, or if – **know** *not* what.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [from my] wife?  
 Cassio, my lord? – *no*, sure, I **cannot think** it,  
 That he would sneak away so guilty-like,  
 Seeing you coming.  
 (TLN 1620-34)

**The part of Othello**

\_\_\_\_\_ [thy cause] away.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [like *not*] that.  
 What dost thou say?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [**know not**] what.  
 Was *not* that Cassio parted from my wife?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [Seeing you] coming.  
 I do **believe** ‘twas he.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [in your] displeasure.  
 Who is’t you mean?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [call him] back.  
 Went he hence now?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [call him’ back].  
*Not now*, sweet Desdemona, some other time.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [shall’t be] shortly?  
 The sooner, sweet, for you.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [tonight at] supper?  
*No, not tonight*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [Tomorrow dinner] then?  
 I shall *not* dine at home,  
 I meet the captains, at the citadel.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [could do] much.  
 Prithee *no* more, let him come when he will,  
 I will deny thee *nothing*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [to be] granted.  
 I will deny thee *nothing*,  
 Whereon I do beseech thee grant me this,  
 To leave me but a little to myself.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [farewell, my] lord.  
 Farewell, my Desdemona, I’ll come to thee straight.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [I am] obedient. (TLN 1620-90)

While the Othello-player knows the play’s conclusion, he can use other characters’ words to measure the distrust he should portray in a particular moment. At his entrance in 3.3, the

player would know beforehand, given his part with the cues, that his character suspects that Cassio just left the stage and that Iago says that he “likes not that.” But he would not know for sure what “that” meant. Iago’s words signal to the Othello-actor that his character should start to reappraise Cassio’s emotional reactions: the lines “steal[ing] away guilty-like, / Seeing you coming” hint how to react to Desdemona’s plea to forgive Cassio. These are the first lines that suggest that Othello should distrust Cassio’s friendship with Desdemona, instead of solely being disappointed by Cassio’s drunken brawl. Therefore, the Othello-actor could process this line acutely during performance, linking Cassio and Desdemona together, to a small degree, at that moment and responding accordingly with a small amount of doubt in his face, body language, and voice, which also complements Iago’s negations about what he “thinks” and the questions that Othello speaks at his entrance.

The Desdemona-actor, however, is responsible for affectively priming the Othello-actor to react not in favor of but against the Iago-actor’s initial words. To contrast Iago’s description of Cassio’s guilty posture, Desdemona pleads for Othello to call the “suitor,” Cassio, back by stating, “if he be not one that truly loves you, / That errs in ignorance and not in cunning, / I have no judgment in an honest face” (3.3.52-54). She persists, characterizing Cassio’s guilty-like expression as humble and “penitent” and indicating that his suit has moved her to “suffer with him” (59). While Othello is stalling his decision, her words, which negate Iago’s provoking remark, affectively prime the Othello-actor to slow down his process of appraising and reacting to the situation.

It would be impossible to prove that this is how the Othello-actor would have performed this part of the scene, but in focusing on how humans respond to words that hold a particular valence, we can seek to understand one way in which early modern actors could have relied on

the words which others spoke to emotionally prompt their reactions. Scientific studies show that when people are given a prime and target word or non-word that are opposite in nature, their emotional processing is slowed by the contrast (de Houwer 315). Desdemona's string of descriptive words affectively primes the Othello-actor to react in opposition toward, or at least question, Iago's statement. Her choice words, "honest" instead of "guilty," "ignorance" instead of "cunning," "humble" instead of "stealing away," contrast with how Iago prompts Othello to appraise Cassio's reactions, which would also affect how the Othello-actor could respond to her pleas. Would he respond with confusion, slight distrust, or bemusement? All of these are possible given her argument, but the way that Shakespeare sets Iago and Desdemona's parts against each other make the words much more effective in creating the confusion that the Othello-actor could be expressing.

With her next line, Desdemona accuses Othello of "stand[ing] so muttering on" instead of meeting her request (78). Othello's stalling shows the internal struggle that is occurring in his brain at this moment: he puts off her request four times before giving into her suit. After her statement, Othello quickly surrenders to her pleas, with no more "muttering." Desdemona astutely reads Cassio's expressions in this scene, as Sybille Baumbach has noted (154), but Desdemona does not emotionally prompt Cassio, commenting on his appearance only after he leaves. Yet having Desdemona describe Cassio's expressions in contrast with Iago's insinuations causes the Othello-player to blend two concepts as he physically responds to Desdemona's plea: Cassio is both penitent and untrustworthy. These contrasting words affectively prime the Othello-actor's emotional response in this moment to be slower and less certain of his character's affective response regarding Cassio. Iago's lines, however, prove to be much more persuasive once Desdemona departs.

Persisting with his plan, Iago again hints at the displeasure that the Othello-player should express when seeing Cassio and Desdemona together, seeking to create an opposite thought pattern. Othello, consumed with love for Desdemona, remarks, “But I do love thee, and when I love thee not, / Chaos is come again” (3.3.101-2). In order to create a pattern of chaos, Iago reconstructs Othello’s knowledge, filling him with doubt. Twisting words associated with “know” and “think,” Iago slowly whittles away Othello’s confident, loving nature, and in turn, the actor playing Iago affectively prompts the Othello-player to alter his passions so that Othello enters into Iago’s fictional chaos. Iago begins by questioning what Cassio knew of Othello’s feelings for Desdemona: “Did Michael Cassio, when you wooed my lady, / Know of your love?” (105-6). He then claims that his question merely functions as “a satisfaction of my thoughts” (108), a *paralepsis* that makes “light of the matter” when Iago actually wants Othello to think more about his question (Puttenham 3:19). In pretending to suspect Cassio’s knowledge and feigning to know more than Othello does, Iago piques Othello’s curiosity. Table 3.2 shows the parts’ progression when Iago and Othello are alone on stage. As the scene moves forward, the two actors repeat “think” and “know” back and forth, as Iago seeks to undermine Othello’s feelings for Desdemona.

**Table 3.2 Iago and Othello parts for 3.3 (Q1) continued**

“Thought” and “knowledge” associated words are **bolded**. Negative words, such as “not,” are *italicized*. When there is a blend, or cross-over, in words associated with both “knowledge” and negation, such as “know,” the word is bolded and italicized.

**The part of Iago**

\_\_\_\_\_ [is come] again.

My noble lord.

\_\_\_\_\_ [thou say,] Iago?

Did Michael Cassio, when you wooed my lady,

**Know** of your love?

**The part of Othello**

\_\_\_\_\_ [I am] obedient.

Excellent wretch, perdition catch my soul,

But I do love thee, and when I love thee *not*,

Chaos is come again.

\_\_\_\_\_ [My noble] lord.

What dost thou say, Iago?

\_\_\_\_\_ [of your] love?

He did from first to last: — Why dost thou ask?

\_\_\_\_\_ [dost thou] ask?  
 But for a satisfaction of my **thoughts**:  
*No* further harm.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [thy **thought**,] Iago?  
 I did *not* **think** he had been acquainted with her.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [us very] often.  
 Indeed?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [he not] honest?  
 Honest, my lord?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [Honest? Aye,] honest.  
 My lord, for aught I **know**.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [dost thou] **think**?  
**Think**, my lord?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [me thy] **thought**.  
 My lord, you **know** I love you.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [passion cannot] rule.  
 For Michael Cassio,  
 I dare **presume**, I **think** that he is honest.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [**think** so] too.  
 Men should be that they **seem**,  
 Or those that be *not*, would they might **seem** *none*.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [what they] **seem**.  
 Why then I **think** Cassio's an honest man.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [worst of] word.  
 Good my lord, pardon me;  
 Though I am bound to every act of duty,  
 I am *not* bound to that all slaves are free to.  
 Utter my **thoughts**? Why, say they are vile and false:  
 As where's that palace whereinto foul things  
 Sometimes intrude *not*? Who has a breast so pure,  
 But some *uncleanly* **apprehensions**,  
 Keep leets and law-days, and in session sit  
 With **meditations** lawful?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [to thy] **thoughts**.  
 I do beseech you,  
 Though I perchance am vicious in my **guess**,  
 As I confess it is my nature's plague  
 To spy into abuses, and oft my jealousy  
**Shapes** faults that are *not*, I entreat you then,  
 From one that so imperfectly **conjects**,  
 You'd take *no* notice, *nor* build yourself a trouble,

\_\_\_\_\_ [No further] harm.  
 Why of thy **thought**, Iago?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [acquainted with] her.  
 O yes, and went between us very often.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Indeed?  
 Indeed? Indeed, discern'st thou aught in that?  
 In he *not* honest?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [Honest, my] lord?  
 Honest? Aye, honest.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [aught I] know.  
 What dost thou **think**?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [Think, my] lord?  
**Think**, my lord? By heaven, he echoes me.  
 As if there were some monster in his **thought**  
 Too hideous to be shown: thou didst mean something;  
 I heard thee say but now, thou lik'st *not* that,  
 When Cassio left my wife: what didst *not* like?  
 And when I told thee he was of my counsel,  
 In my whole course of wooing, thou criedst 'indeed?'  
 And didst contract and purse thy brow together,  
 As if thou then hadst shut up in thy brain  
 Some horrible **counsel**: if thou dost love me,  
 Show me thy **thought**.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [I love] you.  
 I **think** thou dost,  
 And for I **know**, thou art full of love and honesty,  
 And weighest thy words, before thou give'em breath,  
 Therefore these stops of thine affright me the more:  
 For such things in a false disloyal knave,  
 Are tricks of custom; but in a man that's just,  
 They are close denotements, working from the heart,  
 That passion *cannot* rule.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [he is] honest.  
 I **think** so too.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [might seem] *none*.  
 Certain, men should be what they **seem**.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [an honest] man.  
*Nay, yet* there's more in this,  
 I prithee speak to me to thy **thinkings**:  
 As thou dost **ruminat**e, and give the worst of **thought**  
 The worst of word.

Out of my scattering and *unsure* observance;  
 It were *not* for your quiet, *nor* your good,  
*Nor* for my manhood, honesty, or wisdom,  
 To let you *know* my **thoughts**.

\_\_\_\_\_ Zounds!

Good name in man and woman's dear my lord;  
 Is the immediate jewel of our souls:  
 Who steals my purse steals trash; 'tis something,  
*nothing*,  
 'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands:  
 But he that filches from me my good name  
 Robs me of that which *not* enriches him,  
 And makes me poor indeed.

\_\_\_\_\_ [*know* thy] **thought**.

You *cannot*, if my heart were in your hand,  
*Nor* shall *not*, whilst 'tis in my custody:  
 O beware jealousy.  
 It is the green-ey'd monster, which doth mock  
 That meat it feeds on. That cuckold lives in bliss,  
 Who, **certain** of his fate, loves *not* his wronger:  
 But O, what damned minutes tells he o'er  
 Who dotes, *yet doubts*, *suspects*, *yet* strongly loves.

\_\_\_\_\_ [O] misery.

Poor and content is rich, and rich enough,  
 But riches, fineless, is as poor as winter,  
 To him that ever fears he shall be poor:  
 Good God, the souls of all my tribe defend  
 From jealousy.

\_\_\_\_\_ [love or] jealousy.

I am glad of it, for now I shall have reason  
 To show the love and duty that I bear you  
 With franker spirit: therefore, as I am bound  
 Receive it from me: I speak *not* yet of proof,  
 Look to your wife, observe her well with Cassio;  
 Wear your eye thus, *not* jealous, *nor* secure;  
 I would *not* have your free and noble nature  
 Out of self-bounty be abus'd, look to't:  
 I **know** our country disposition well.

In Venice they do let God see the pranks  
 They dare *not* show their husbands: their best  
**conscience**  
 Is *not* to leave *undone*, but keep *unknown*. . . .  
 (TLN 1693-1820)

\_\_\_\_\_ [With **meditations**] lawful?

Thou dost conspire against thy friend, Iago,  
 If thou but **thinkest** him wrong'd, and makest his ear  
 A stranger to thy **thoughts**.

\_\_\_\_\_ [*know* my] **thoughts**.

Zounds!

\_\_\_\_\_ [me poor] indeed.

By heaven, I'll *know* thy **thought**.

\_\_\_\_\_ [*yet* strongly] loves.

O misery.

\_\_\_\_\_ [defend From] jealousy.

Why, why is this?

**Think'st** thou I'd make a life of jealousy?

To follow still the changes of the moon  
 With fresh **suspitions**? No, to be once in **doubt**  
 Is once to be resolv'd: exchange me for a goat  
 When I shall turn the business of my soul  
 To such exsufflicate and blown **surmises**,  
 Matching thy **inference**: 'tis *not* to make me jealous  
 To say my wife is fair, feeds well, loves company,  
 Is free of speech, sings, plays, and dances well;  
 Where virtue is, these are more virtuous:  
*Nor* from mine own weak merits will I draw  
 The smallest fear, or **doubt** of her revolt,  
 For she had eyes, and chose me: *no*, Iago,  
 I'll see before I **doubt**, when I **doubt**, prove,  
 And on the proof, there is *no* more but this:  
 Away at once with love or jealousy.

. . . . (TLN 1690-1808)

After Iago offhandedly remarks that his question served as a “satisfaction of his thoughts,” Othello picks up on Iago’s phrase, iterating, “Why of thy thought, Iago?” (110). When Iago replies, “I did not think he had been acquainted with her” (111), the words “think” and “acquainted” are an attempt to plant the seed that Cassio knew more of Desdemona than Othello realizes. The rhetoric serves to incite Othello to question his perception of his relationship by blending two associations: knowledge and doubt. If Iago “thinks” rather than “knows” Cassio is “honest,” the knowledge of Cassio’s trustworthiness is in doubt. Even if Cassio knew of Othello’s “love,” this knowledge is also thrown in doubt by Iago questioning it because in hearing “know,” one cannot ignore the association of “know” with “no,” homophones<sup>49</sup> which blend the clashing concepts of knowledge and doubt to project uncertain thoughts instead of confirmed truth. This uncertainty, in turn, would be mirrored by the Iago and Othello-actors’ faces as the scene progresses.

Negating and withholding knowledge are central aspects for both actors in controlling this scene’s emotional tempo, and both characters’ lines rely on affective language to prime the other character’s response. The Iago-actor ultimately dominates but not without some complications. At first, the Othello-player expresses a stoic nature, as Othello tries to remain emotionally unaffected by Iago’s “thought” and use reason to persuade Iago to speak; the Othello-actor also manages the beginning of the conversation’s emotional intensity with his observations about Iago’s face and voice. For example, as Iago uses “think” and “know” to provoke Othello into rethinking his emotions towards Desdemona and Cassio, Othello observes that Iago “didst contract and purse thy brow together, / As if thou then hadst shut up in thy brain / Some horrible counsel” (3.3.128-30). While the words actually refer to Iago’s previous lines

---

<sup>49</sup> Diverse scientific studies have investigated how, when, and to what degree homophones prime meaning. For example, see Jonathan Grainger, et al. “Cross-modal Repetition Priming Heterographic Homophones.”

and expressions, the comment could encourage the Iago-actor to purse his brows as he continues and physically manifest Othello's accusations in a more pronounced manner for the audience to see.

All audience members might not have been able to see Iago's face, but they would know from Othello's speech why he believes he can read Iago's thoughts in his expressions. In *The Contemplation of Mankinde* (1571), a handbook on physiognomy, Thomas Hill writes, "The ouerbroowes haue a hidde vertue, to expresse the affections of the minde" (46).<sup>50</sup> Therefore, when Othello demands, "if thou dost love me, / Show me thy thought" (3.3.130-31), he believes that Iago's emotion can be seen by looking at his brow, but he wants him to pronounce his thought more explicitly. Early modern philosophers believed that a person could interpret another's thoughts through observing the body language that they "show." In *The Passions of the Minde in Generall*, Thomas Wright observes:

Superiors may learn to conjecture the affections of their subjects minds, by a silent speech pronounced in their very countenances . . . by this we may know the cause, why children, and especially women, cannot abide to looke in their fathers, masters, or betters faces, because, even nature it self seemeth to teach them, that thorow their eyes they see their hearts; neither doe we hold it for good manners that the inferiour should fixe his eyes upon his superiours countenance, and the reason is, because it were presumption for him to attempt the entrance or priue passage into his superiors minde, as contrawise it is lawfull for the superior to attempt to knowledge of his inferior. (29)<sup>51</sup>

As Iago's superior, Othello has the right to "conjecture" his ensign's emotions and thoughts, but Shakespeare's scene complicates this matter. Othello cannot read Iago's thoughts correctly, and Iago does not view the Moor as his superior. Iago willfully withholds the "thought" that Othello wishes him to "show." Instead, he shows his superior the thought he has fabricated. The

---

<sup>50</sup> As Sybille Baumbach notes, practicing physiognomy seems prevalent in the early modern period, if we take for evidence the resurgence of printed texts on the subject during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (7).

<sup>51</sup> Katherine Rowe helpfully adduces this quotation in the context of the exchange between Lady Macduff and Rosse in *Macbeth* and the political body of James's court.

audience, however, can read Iago's thoughts because he directly addresses the audience in his soliloquies leading up to this scene. Shakespeare here yields the power of authority to the audience to read the player's thoughts but denies the master player/character the privilege of interpretation, destabilizing Othello's superior position.

Interpreters can only read faces successfully if they know which signs they are looking for when observing someone's features. Othello misreads Iago's face, but not without cause: brows furrowed together could indicate more than one emotion. Even within Hill's physiognomy handbook, the author seems to admit that one could misread a person's facial characteristics if one were not careful.<sup>52</sup> Hill's description of the overbrowes in "Of the Forme, Nature, and Judgement of the Forheade," the first section on the forehead, advises that furrowing the overbrowes to the point where there are wrinkles in the forehead could indicate that the person is not to be trusted: "The person that *draweth* or *knitteth* together the skinne, in the myddle of the forehead, with the ouerbroowes: is not onely noted to be wayward, and irefull, but gréedilie bent and fixed, to the horrible excesse, and gréedy coueting of money, much to be detested . . ." (34 *ital. my emphasis*). In the section on eyebrows, however, Hill remarks that if the brows are joined or knitted together, it could mean that the person is either intelligent and observant, or miserable, and slow: "Some wryte, that if the ouerbrowes bended, are *ioyned* together at the cone of the nose, doe argue a subtill, and a studious person. If these there *knit* (by the agrément of all wryters) doe wytnesse a sadde person, yet not the wysest, as the Phisiogomer noted the same" (54 *italics my emphasis*). Here, the eyebrows "knit" indicate a dull person instead of a greedy one, but "joyned" brows are a sign that the person is wise; arguably brows knitted or joined

---

<sup>52</sup> As Baumbach remarks, regarding Hill's treatment of the art of physiognomy, "From the outset of the treatise it is emphasised that man's disposition cannot be deduced from a single though seemingly very telling feature. He is a compound of many individual observations which can be combined into a character portrait and pieced together like a jigsaw" (33).

could look similar, as both terms indicate that the eyebrows are drawing closer, if not touching. Regardless of the eyebrow's proximity in joining or knitting, Hill still gives two different readings for "knit" eyebrows, as one cannot wrinkle his forehead without also moving his eyebrows.

Othello's observations reveal his dominant position as Iago's general because he feels at ease in commenting on Iago's expressions, but it is clear that he thinks that Iago is "studious" and "honest" rather than "greedy." He has misread Iago's "purse[d]" brows (3.3.128). At this point in the scene, then, the Othello-player would react to his counterpart's expressions with thoughtful concern instead of suspicion. With his next observation, Othello continues to exude confidence in his interpretation of his lieutenant's expressions and behaviors:

Therefore these stops of thine fright me the more:  
For such things in a false disloyal knave  
Are tricks of custom, but in a man that's just  
They are close denotements, working from the heart,  
That passion cannot rule. (136-40)

As Iago persistently pretends to have Othello's best interests at heart, he feebly attempts to retract his thoughts, but he relies on these "stops" too long, a move which begins to align him with the lowly servant who has "scattering and unsure observance[s]" (3.3.171) that should not be trusted. When Othello starts to become exasperated, stating "By heaven, I'll know thy thought" (183), Iago warns,

O beware jealousy.  
It is the green-ey'd monster, which doth mock  
That meat it feeds on. That cuckold lives in bliss,  
Who, certain of his fate, loves not his wronger:  
But O, what damned minutes tells he o'er  
Who dotes, yet doubts, suspects, yet strongly loves. (169, 173-74)

At this moment in the scene, Othello believes he can interpret and alter Iago's expressions and emotions because he does not surrender yet to Iago's insinuations. The Othello-actor, therefore, equally participates in the emotional prompting during this portion of the exchange.

Yet as the scene progresses, Iago begins to dominate his superior by commenting on his facial expressions and emotions, and the actors exchange power through the expressive prompts Iago's words provide. The Iago-actor takes the lead once Othello makes it known that he needs proof to be moved by vowing a command over his body's passions:

No, Iago;  
I'll see before I doubt, when I doubt, prove,  
And on the proof, there no more but this:  
Away at once with love or jealousy. (211-14)

Sensing his chance, Iago confides, "I shall have reason / To show the love and duty that I bear you / With franker spirit" (215-17). "Show[ing]" this "franker spirit," in turn, gives the Iago-actor the reins to prompt the Othello-player's expressions and emotions. Iago's next lines instruct Othello on how to act:

Look to your wife, observe her well with Cassio;  
Wear your eye thus, not jealous nor secure;  
I would not have your free and noble nature,  
. . . be abused, look to't. (219-22)

Iago continues, "when she seem'd to shake and fear your looks, / She loved them most" (229-30), indicating that Othello's "looks" no longer have the same emotional power to incite Desdemona's fear and love. The opposition of jealous and secure, free and abused, and fear and love prime affectively contrasting emotions, again causing slower processing and confusion, indicating that the Othello-actor should still be emotionally controlled as Othello attempts to sort through his feelings.

Attempting to change Othello's passion from love to jealousy, Iago moves from speaking words that will manipulate Othello's thoughts to commenting on his expressions directly. Once Othello confides "I am bound to thee forever" (238), Iago feels confident enough to comment bluntly on Othello's physicality, stating "I see this hath a little dash'd your spirits" (239). Now the European lieutenant is observing and commenting on his general's expressions, at once questioning and challenging Othello's social and ethnic authority, a clear sign of power reversal for both the characters (and the actors) in the fictive space, which an early modern audience would sense and understand as a shift in social control. Regarding class body language, Gurr and Ichikawa note, "Without recognizing these stock actions, we miss features that would have clarified many aspects of the play. . . . Not to obey the standard patterns of familiar social behavior was a deliberate act, an active breach of decorum that spoke eloquently about a character's attitude, especially his opinion of those he was speaking to" (35). When Iago seeks to control his superior's feelings and expressions in a more overt manner, the actor playing Iago acts as if he is Othello's equal or even above him, possibly through an upright posture and knowing looks to the audience, even though his facial expression when looking at the Othello-actor might indicate false concern and subservience.

The Iago-actor prompts his fellow player cognitively to blend Othello's marital bliss with suspicious thoughts to create a character whose spirits are "dash'd." Not once, but twice, Iago's words prompt the actor playing Othello to appear "mov'd" (243, 251). While the Othello-actor might have had the cue "[dash'd your] spirits" and the second "[see you're] mov'd," he would know from his memorized lines that his character denies being moved by Iago's words. Yet upon hearing the Iago-actor speak his part, the build between "not a jot" (240) and "not much mov'd" (252) would actually be more intense because his fellow actor would state that he "sees" that his

spirits are affected. Even though Othello at first denies it, Iago's words press the actor to demonstrate physically that he is more than a little "mov'd" beyond suspicion to fear. By the conversation's end, the Iago-player has convinced the Othello-player to show visually that Iago's words have "dash'd his spirits," which is exactly what he set out to accomplish when the actors began the dialogue: he prompts the Othello-player to exchange his expression of cool reason for one of fear and jealousy, showing a progression from stoicism to passion.

If there is any doubt as to what emotion the Othello-actor should now physically express, Iago's final words strengthen the emotional concept. After asking himself why he married, Othello states that Iago "sees and knows more, much more, than he unfolds" (272). Othello's words indicate exasperation and suspicion, but perhaps not fear; however, Iago reenters, imploring Othello to "scan this thing no further" and "Let me be thought too busy in my *fears* -- / As worthy cause I have to *fear* I am--" (274, 282-83 italics mine). To which, Othello replies, "*Fear* not my government" (285), realizing, in performance, that the line refers to his military command as well as his control over his passions. Despite Othello's words of assurance, Iago's twice-voiced "fear" immediately infects the general: during his soliloquy Othello cries, "She's gone. I am abused; and my relief / Must be to loathe her" (296-97). As Katherine Rowe has argued, fear, anger, and other dangerous states of mind in Shakespeare are often contagious (171).

Iago, however, is not truly fearful: rather, the actor cues Othello to express his fear based on Iago's repetition of the word fear in connection with his suspicions regarding Desdemona and Cassio. So while the fear is contagious, Iago is simulating a fear that he does not feel. Iago thus infects Othello with fear rhetorically without himself cognitively experiencing the emotion. The stoic soldier has officially become the fearful, cuckolded husband, suffering from a "forkd

plague” (305) that infects him with a “pain upon [his] forehead” (314), which Desdemona cannot relieve with her handkerchief. Iago’s voiced thought has infected Othello’s brain, and the Othello-actor performs this transition through his speech, expression, and physicality.

### **Priming Emotion and Action through Sensory Language**

The Iago-player's influence over the other actor's emotions and expressions continues in 3.3 after Iago and Emilia's exchange about the handkerchief; at this moment, however, the Othello-player also starts to take part in verbally expressing Othello's emotional changes, providing the actor memorizing the lines with some physicality instructions pre-performance. Yet the words that indicate Othello's emotional and physical transformation are still stimulated by Iago's initial soliloquy, his feigned sympathetic questions throughout the scene, and his suggestive responses. During one of Iago's most famous speeches, the Othello-actor enters before Iago's finishes his soliloquy:

Iago: But with a little art, upon the blood,

*Ent* Othello.

Burn like the mindes of sulphur: I did say so:  
 Look where he comes, not poppy, nor mandragora,  
 Nor all the drowsy syrups of the world,  
 Shall ever medicine thee to that sweet sleep,  
 Which thou owedst yesterday.

Oth: Ha, ha, false to me, to me? (3.3.360-66)

Obviously, the Othello-character does not hear Iago's words, but the actor playing Othello would hear these words as he comes on stage after his cue. This passage presents a textual crux and a problem in staging. The stage directions for the Folio have Othello entering after Iago's line, “Burn like the *mines* of sulphur” (my emphasis), but Q1 states that Othello comes in before this line, so that his cue-word is “blood” instead of “sulphur,” and the actor hears the line about the

mines/mindes on stage. McMillin asserts that Q1's "mindes" is likely the scribe's "mishearing for 'mines'" (3.3.361n). While this may be the case, and "mines" makes more sense than "mindes," the pun on mines/mindes provides the beginning of a new scene of wordplay and priming between the two actors, as Othello's mind, senses, and body are transformed by what he now "know[s] a little" (370). "Blood," "mindes/mines," and "burn" serve as affective priming words for the Othello-actor's expressions and physicality as he enters. Shakespeare prompts the Othello-actor's emotional transformation from the previous scene to the present one by giving Iago these descriptive words to speak at the first of this scene.

Shakespeare's language deliberately mentions all five senses to prime the Othello-actor emotionally and physically in this scene. After Iago's soliloquy, the Iago-actor exchanges roles with the Othello-actor in the social network while the character Iago's role as the plotter stays intact: the Othello-actor has cues built into his lines that he would memorize that express how he is feeling and the change that has come over his passions and body. As Carla Mazzio astutely argues, "In much Renaissance drama, touch is integral not only to 'audience response' but to the trajectories of dramatic plots, metaphors, and actions. . . . [R]evenge dramas often shift from an exploration of the symbolism of touch as affect or cognition to a restriction of tactile economies in the body subject to harm" (178). It is no surprise that a thought which Iago planted now affects Othello's whole being as he lets the thought consume his mind and afflict his body.

While Mazzio calls for more emphasis in research on touch in the Renaissance theater, I would argue that in *Othello* attention to all of the senses is vital. Of course, critics often have commented on Iago's reliance on certain senses in manipulating Othello,<sup>53</sup> but scholars have yet

---

<sup>53</sup> See, for example, Patricia Parker's discussion of how hearing narrative is substituted for seeing "proof" in *Othello* in "Shakespeare and Rhetoric: 'Dilation' and 'Delation' in Othello" (1985). See also Karen Newman's "'And wash the Ethiop white': Femininity and the Monstrous in *Othello*" on sight and hearing, LaRue Love Sloan's "Trumpeting and 'seeded' Eyes: A Semiotics of Eyeconography of *Othello*" (2002), Wes Folkerth's section "The greedy ear in

to examine in detail how the early modern actor's performance is informed by the sensory words that Iago and Othello exchange when they learn and rehearse their parts separately but speak their parts together on stage. After hearing Iago's warning, he is now visibly changed because he imagines seeing Desdemona's adultery and feeling her betrayal as he speaks about it to Iago. As the player communicates this emotional change, his senses are aroused and his face and body express the character's anguish: Othello despairs, "What *sense* had I of her stol'n hours of lust? / I *saw't* not, *thought* it not, it *harm'd* not me / . . . I was *free* and *merry*" (372-74 *italics mine*). The word "sense" functions as a synonym for knowledge, a reminder of his new reliance on his senses instead of his reason, and a pun on scents. He has changed from a man who *was* "free and merry" to one who is tormented by his thoughts, shown in the actor's face and body language. Othello cries, "I found not Cassio's kisses on her lips" as he imagines another man touching Desdemona: the language of taste, smell, touch, and sight are all intertwined, piled on one another in succession, a concoction of *sinarthirismus* and *synaesthesia*,<sup>54</sup> as he visualizes Desdemona's indiscretions. While he was infected by hearing Iago's words, the imagery encourages the actor to rely on all of his senses to demonstrate the pain of her betrayal.

In response, the Iago-actor's words offer less explicit prompting of the Othello-actor's expressions than his previous lines and more subtle encouragement. The Othello-actor's physicality of his character's pain obviously creates the emotional impact of this portion of the scene for the audience, but Iago's feigned concern such as "How now, my lord?" and false apologies like "I am sorry to hear this" (378) enable Othello's downward spiral. Responding to Iago's simulated distress, Othello replies, "I had been happy if the general camp, / Pioneers, and

---

*Othello*" in his *The Sound of Shakespeare* (2002), and Ben Saunders' "Iago's Clyster: Purgation, Anality, and the Civilizing Process" (2004) on the permeation of smell in *Othello*.

<sup>54</sup> Puttenham refers to this figure as "sinathirismus" or the "heaping figure" (Book 3, Chapter 19).

all, had *tasted* her sweet body” (379-80).<sup>55</sup> Within the scene’s framework, the Othello-actor, while at first responding to Iago’s affective priming, now expresses how Iago’s words have infiltrated his senses and altered his perception of the situation.

The Othello-actor’s next lines transition from despair to sorrowful rage with the Iago-player observing his expression of anguish and commenting on his passions. Othello despairs, “Farewell the tranquil mind, farewell content / . . . / Farewell, Othello’s occupation’s gone” (3.3.382, 391). Unlike the persuasive figures of anthypophora or erotema, forms of questions that would function as arguments against Othello’s doubts,<sup>56</sup> Iago’s leading questions, “Is’t possible, my lord?” (398) and “Is’t come to this?” (392) convey Iago’s sympathetic concern. His expressions of surprise, however, fall on deaf ears as Othello turns on him, “Villain, be sure thou prove my love a whore” (393). Othello wants to “see’t” or at least for Iago to “prove it” (399). To which, after pretending to regret confiding in Othello, Iago responds, “I *see* sir, you are *eaten* up with passion / I do repent me that I put it to you, / You would be satisfied” (381 italics mine). Othello agrees that his rage and doubt must be satisfied. But Iago’s first suggestion that Othello “grossly gape on, / Behold her topp’d” is too vulgar and visceral for Othello to support. As Othello imagines her adultery, and the Othello-actor physically expresses his character’s misery, Othello and Iago’s sensory words prime the Othello-actor to appear “eaten up with passion.”

### **Texts, Speech, and Othello’s Identity**

As Leah Marcus points out, “Most of the key passages critics have repeatedly cited to define the play’s attitude towards blackness, miscegenation, and sexual pollution derive from the

---

<sup>55</sup> See Louise Noble’s “The *Fille Vierge* as Pharmakon: The Therapeutic Value of Desdemona’s Corpse” for an insightful description of how Desdemona’s chaste body serves as a restorative for the play’s patriarchal values.

<sup>56</sup> Puttenham defines two different types of questions used in persuasion. “Anthypophora” refers to asking difficult questions in order to counter the opponent’s arguments by answering these questions before they have a chance to do so (Book 3, Chapter 19). “Erotema” refers to when a speaker asks a succession of questions that end up supporting his or her perspective (Book 3, Chapter 19).

Folio version of the play, and do not exist in the quarto [Q1]” (22). Due to these textual differences, Othello’s image of himself changes more slowly in Q1 than in F or Q2. When discussing F and Q2 texts, scholars and performance critics alike acknowledge that the Othello-actor’s portrayal of the Moor’s changing passions and altering conception of his identity dramatically shift to a focus on race. As Michael Neill observes,

The audience, too, [as well as Othello] must be tempted into identifying it [Othello’s race] as the sign of Othello’s inherent corruption, the secret viciousness beneath his noble Venetian persona—so that the path from the oxymoronic ‘noble Moor’ and ‘Moor of Venice’ to the vicious tautology of ‘blacker devil’ and ‘dull Moor’ seems natural and inevitable. The long and unpleasant history of interpretations which see *Othello* as the study of a man reverting to innate barbarity is a proof of how well Iago succeeds. (148)

In F and Q2 this change begins to occur around one hundred lines before the close of 3.3. But the Q1 text omits several of Othello’s speeches, which critics often quote when discussing Othello’s transformation, at the end of 3.3, and Othello’s concept of his identity, therefore, shifts later in this scene in Q1. Of particular importance with regards to Othello’s conception of his race, at the moment in 3.3 where Othello demands proof, Q1 does not include a speech that both Q2 and F have that reveals Othello’s felt change in his physiognomic features before Iago asks him to “grossly gape on”:

By the world,  
I think my wife be honest, and think she is not,  
I think that thou art just, and think thou art not.  
I’ll have some proof. My name,<sup>57</sup> that was as fresh  
As Dian’s visage, is now begrimed and black  
As mine own face. If there be cords or knives,  
Poison, or fire, or suffocating streams,  
I’ll not endure it. Would I were satisfied. (3.3.386-93)

In F and Q2 at this moment, Othello first describes his face as “begrimed,” conveying his supposed racial inequity and the shame that he now feels because of Desdemona’s apparent

---

<sup>57</sup> Q2 has “Her name” instead of “My name,” and editors usually choose Q2’s phrasing, even when relying on F’s text. For a discussion of the editorial choice, see Marcus, esp. pg. 30.

betrayal. In Q1, however, Othello does not yet express that his face and reputation are “begrimed and black” because the actor lacks this speech.

Unlike F and Q2, in Q1 the Othello-actor’s expression of rage and self-hatred follows later in the scene after the Iago-player reveals Cassio’s dream to Othello. Instead, Iago is the first to associate Othello and Desdemona with dark, primal images, and Othello does not do so until later in the scene, following Iago’s lead. Iago inquires, “Are you a man, have you soul or sense?” (3.3.409). Iago then asks him if he will “grossly gape on, / Behold her topp’d?” (424-25), but Othello rejects this brutish manner of proving Desdemona’s guilt, despairing over “Death and damnation – oh” (426). Iago then tries to imply that Desdemona possesses an animalistic, oversexed appetite as well: “It is impossible you should see this, / Were they as prime as goats, as hot as monkeys” (432-33). Othello responds with “Give me a living reason that she’s disloyal” (439) because he does not see Desdemona or himself as “black and begrimed” beasts yet, even though Iago tries to make him out to be one who is “eaten up” with rage over his wife’s shameful transgressions.<sup>58</sup>

As cognitive linguist Scott Lidell explains, all narrative and performed dialogue project an image in the listener’s mind, but if “visible gestures” accompany the narration and dialogue, these gestures help the listener visualize the scene, grounding the narration of the dream in “Real Space” (310). For example, Lidell illustrates his terms, “grounded blended mental space,” “conceptual integration,” and “Real Space” by explaining how a person describes a cartoon by telling the story and using his or her hands to demonstrate the character’s action. These terms

---

<sup>58</sup> Iago refers to Othello and Desdemona’s sexual desires and even infers that their sexual acts are bestial throughout *Othello*. For example, in 1.1 Iago taunts Brabantio by describing how “Even now, very now, an old black ram / Is tupping your white ewe” (97-98), “you’ll have your daughter covered with a Barbary horse; you’ll have your nephews neigh to you” (123-34), and “your daughter, and the Moor, are now making the beasts with two backs” (127-28). See Karen Newman’s “‘And wash the Ethiop white’: Femininity and the Monstrous in *Othello*” for her treatment of how Othello’s “otherness” is linked with “femininity” (85).

also can demonstrate how “visible gestures” help Iago convince Othello to believe in his fabricated story. In *Othello*, the sensory language, descriptions of action and expression, and physical contact between the Othello and Iago-actors increase as the scene intensifies. Providing Othello with a “reason” to suspect Desdemona, Iago confides that Cassio “gripp[ed] and wring[ed] my hand” while dreaming of Desdemona, touching Iago as if he were Desdemona. While Iago’s lines prey on Othello’s imagination, the Iago-actor’s delivery of his speech and his actions would help solidify Othello’s physical and verbal response. The Iago-actor *could* “wring and grip” Othello’s hand as he tells him that Cassio “kiss[ed] me hard” and “laid his leg / Over my thigh, and sigh’d, and kissed, and then / Cried: cursed fate, that gave thee to the Moor” (451, 453-55). In touching Othello or even gesturing to how Cassio “laid his leg,” the Iago-actor is creating a “grounded blended mental space” (Lidell 310) for the Othello-actor. For Othello, Cassio’s dream and the affair it represents, though not physically seen, become real because Iago’s narration and gestures create a visual proof that he can imagine through the “conceptual integration” of this “grounded blended mental space.” The Othello-actor, in turn, would visually and vocally portray how Othello believes this conceptual blend is more of a reality than his own observations.

Even if the Iago-actor did not physically touch the Othello-actor, the sensory imagery is enough for the Othello-actor to feel the grip of the hand and the depth of the kiss as he hears the Iago-actor speak the lines. Sighing “cursed fate, that gave thee to the Moor” into the Othello-actor’s ear as he grips his hand and presses into his body would move the Othello-player to cry “O monstrous, monstrous” (456) and to vow “I’ll tear her all to pieces” despite Iago’s negations and remonstrations that increase with Othello’s anger.

In the early modern period, philosophers would say that the Iago-actor's words alone are enough to infiltrate the other player's senses, as Othello's next lines confirm. Othello vows,

Now do I see 'tis time; look here, Iago,  
All my fond love, thus do I blow to heaven, —'tis gone.  
Arise *black* vengeance, from thy hollow cell,  
Yield up, O love, thy crown and hearted throne,  
To tyrannous hate; swell, bosom, with thy fraught,  
For 'tis of aspics' tongues. (476-81 *ital. my emphasis*)

Unlike the F and Q2 text, this speech, which occurs about thirty lines from the scene's closing, is the first time that Othello refers to the color "black." As he gestures that he sends his pure "love" to heaven, he embraces his "black vengeance," contrasting his "fond love" with his blackness and his past feelings with his future actions.

As Iago falsely and apathetically pleads, "Pray be content," Othello kneels, uttering "O blood, Iago, blood" (483). To which Iago responds, "Patience, I say, your mind perhaps may change" (484). After advising Othello to quiet his mind and have "patience," Iago quickly exchanges these cautions for vows of service: Iago kneels and promises to carry out Othello's "bloody work," capitalizing on Othello's call for action instead of thoughts by creating a physical pact with Othello as the two actors kneel together on stage. Othello's transformation from a loving, confident man to a jealous, enraged husband is now complete, but the Othello-player continues to show Othello's emotional struggle in accepting this new role as the play propels towards its conclusion.

The emotional and sensory language that Iago and Othello exchange functions to move each scene forward to its emotional height. While Iago the character manipulates the other characters, the player performing as Iago stimulates changes in his fellow actor's expressions, gestures, and posture through his words. His affective and sensory language continues to prime the Othello-player's expressions and actions so that, later in the play, when Lodovico cries, "Is

this the noble Moor . . . / Whom passion could not shake? . . . Are his wits safe? Is he not light of brain?" (4.1.261, 263, 267), his questions are answered by the Othello-actor's transformation in previous scenes. The Moor, once "noble" and confident has been altered by his fear, a "passion" which Iago's rhetoric primed him to project. Suspicious of his wife's speech and actions, he no longer possesses all of his "wits" or senses.<sup>59</sup> While "wits" here refers to Othello's reasoning abilities, it also refers to his senses, which are a part of his reasoning faculty. Both his wits and his senses have betrayed him. He is "light of brain, or "delirious" (OED), because his senses have been overpowered by Iago's insinuating rhetoric and suggestive narratives. His mind simulates the possibilities, the various distortions of reality, which Iago's language has created. Othello, who at the beginning of the so-called temptation scene boasts, "Think'st thou I'd make a life of jealousy?" and "exchange me for a goat / When I shall turn the business of my soul / To such exsufflicate and blown surmises" now believes in Iago's "thought," which has transformed him into a vengeful lover. The Othello-actor, in turn, must respond to this new framework, acting as the jealous Moor, whom "thoughts" and "passion" can stir into committing an irreversible, tragic act of violence.

In *Othello*, affective priming and conceptual blending in Iago and Othello's parts helped the actors embrace performance as both embodied and extended within a collaborative system of interaction. The language while affecting and infecting audience members, also influenced and prompted change within the actors. As we will see in the next chapter, language about facial expressions in *Richard II* not only functions as helpful description for audience members, but also as important social cues for the group of actors, who appraise one another's facial

---

<sup>59</sup> The OED cites Dekker and Middleton's line "How fell he from his wits?" from *The Honest Whore* (1604) and Grafton's "Such a one as lacketh his right wittes" in *A chronicle at large and meere history of the affayres of Englande and kinges of the same* (1569) and cross-references Grafton's use of "senses" and "wits."

expressions and descriptions of physical features in order to perceive how their characters' relationships and emotions are changing as the scenes develop.

## CHAPTER FOUR

“A brittle glory shineth in this face”: Embodying Expressions on the Early Modern Stage

This chapter will analyze the collective performance of Shakespearean actors' parts in relation to early modern theater practices, early modern physiology and physiognomy, and cognitive science theory to examine how early modern actors performed and responded to facial descriptions such as Richard II's confession that a “brittle glory shineth in this face” (TLN 2210). Shakespeare's descriptive language often imparts the emotion that a character's face should be expressing, but why? Audiences might not have always been able to see the actors' faces, so scholars may have been right to assume that the descriptions help the audience identify the characters and understand what is taking place. But language that describes a character's expressions and emotions has an equal, if not a greater, effect on actors who are hearing lines that they barely know or have never heard before. Shakespeare's descriptive language often focuses on facial expressions to reveal a character's social stature and affiliations as well as his or her emotions and physical features. These descriptive phrases serve as expressive prompts in performance, which are different from the actor's one to three-word cues because expressive prompts occur not only in the short verbal cues but also within characters' speeches. Facial expression phrases in Shakespeare's *Richard II* suggest that playwrights wrote expressive prompts into plays to help actors perform various emotions, understand the emotional connections in the scenes, and shift character allegiances as the plot progressed, thereby creating a network of expressive and affective references for the actors so that they would successfully connect with the other actors whose lines and parts they did not know. In *Richard II*, as the

characters' allegiances transfer from one king to the next, their language prompts for facial expressions also alter, symbolizing the transformation of the body politic.

Certain Shakespearean plays (or early modern playwrights generally for that matter) rely on facial expression prompts more than others. Shakespeare particularly uses expressive cues and prompts to describe facial expressions and personality traits for a character's entrance, such as when Celia describes Duke Frederick entering "With his eyes full of anger" (*As You Like It* TLN 497); to form and strengthen relationships between characters, as when Mrs. Page tells Mrs. Ford she "look[s] very ill" (*Merry Wives of Windsor* TLN 581-2); to provide exposition about an absent character, as York tells the Duchess about Richard's "face still combating with tears and smiles" as the crowd threw debris upon his head (*Richard II* TLN 2399); and to reveal characters breaking down or evolving in emotionally heightened scenes, such as when Lady Macbeth asks, "Why do you make such faces?" when Macbeth sees Banquo's ghost (TLN 1336). Listening, on stage and off stage, was vital for an early modern actor to pick up on his expressive prompts as well as understand what the other characters knew and thought about his character.

Shakespeare's actors often instruct each other in how to act and respond when on stage together through the playwright's lines, but scholars usually interpret these expressive prompts as serving audience members who could not see the action. Yet while audience members would not have the opportunity to study an actor's face through a close-up cinematic shot, the face was just as important then as it is now in conveying emotion. In 1610, after seeing a performance of *Othello* at Oxford, Henry Jackson wrote (originally in Latin), "that famous Desdemona killed before us by her husband, although she always acted her whole part supremely well, yet when she was killed she was even more moving, for when she fell back upon the bed she implored the

pity of the spectators by her very face” (qtd in Salgado 30).<sup>60</sup> While that performance was in a more intimate space, evidence suggests that even in a large amphitheatre audience members were able to see actors’ faces: as traveler Thomas Platter wrote, “The playhouses are so constructed that they play on a raised platform, so that everyone has a good view” (26). The plays, of course, were performed in the afternoon, so the audience would be able to see the action. And as Tiffany Stern remarks, “The fact of the audience itself, its very presence, was also, selectively, part of the play. In the indoor and outdoor theaters of the time, spectators and actors clearly saw each other and borrowed reactions from one another” (26). Actors’ faces therefore serve as a central part of the performance.

While critics have set forth theories on how important the passions are in performance and how the actor expresses the passions through his body, few scholars have acknowledged the importance of the face and language about the face for actor collaboration because they often focus solely on the connection between the actor and the audience. For instance, scholars often point to facial descriptions that summon a character to speak after entering as benefiting the audience. In David Bevington’s view, Shakespeare’s visual language “functions deictically or demonstratively to inform viewers about identity, character, intention, or mood” when characters first meet, for example (*Action is Eloquence* 20-22). As Sibylle Baumbach in *Shakespeare and the Art of Physiognomy* also argues, words that characterize the eyes, for instance, point out to audience members, who may or may not be able to see the actor’s face, “the expressiveness of the human face and urge them to sharpen their view for other physiognomic features” (74). Indeed, the description provides a cue for the audience to observe the faces closely if possible, and comments about facial features and expressions often help the audience to remember a

---

<sup>60</sup> Andrew Gurr also uses this excerpt to argue that “audiences were highly responsive in sentiment” (279).

character for that specific trait or action so that the next time they see him they will be able to distinguish him from the other characters. But this argument lumps all the audience members into one group, not distinguishing between those close to the stage from those far away; privileges facial expression as being solely important to the audience's experience and not to the actors' performance of their parts; and further suggests that actors would have used their faces to express emotions less because audience members in the balcony or stalls would not be able to see their faces. All of these points, when considered from the actors' perspective are unsubstantial claims.

Because of Renaissance actors' brief and often independent rehearsal period, I argue that the visual description within a line has another function before and as the words register with the audience: the visual prompt determines how the actor hearing the lines will act and how the actor speaking them will react to his addressee or antagonist in the scene. As Paula Niedenthal, a leading scientist in the study of cognition and emotion, points out, "experiencing an emotion, perceiving an emotional stimulus, and retrieving an emotional memory all involve highly overlapping mental processes" (1003). The actors, then, depend upon expressive prompts to discover, embody, and express their characters' status and action. In addition, as another scientific study posits, "A given facial expression is both the manifestation of an internal state and a social tool, as it influences others' actions" (Ferri, et al. 1). The face therefore serves as a vital contribution to performance and is one of the player's primary physical tools for collaboration.

Cognitive scientists are not the only ones who have pointed to the value of the body in expressing emotions. In his introduction to *Chirologia* (1644), a treatise on the art and rhetoric of gesture, John Bulwer explains,

Two Amphitheatres there are in the Body, whereon most of these patheticall subtilties are exhibited by Nature, in way of *discovery* or *impression*, proceeding either from the effect of sufferance, or the voluntary motions of the Minde, which effect those impressions on the parts which wee call the Speaking Motions, or Discoursing Gestures, and naturall Language of the Body, to wit, the *Hand* and the *Head*. (A7r-v)

Both hand and face were important in performing the passions or “motions of the Minde,” but scholars tend either to focus on the face or gestures’ importance to the single actor or the connection between audience and actor, instead of examining the impact of expressive language and action on the other actors on stage. Comparing Bulwer’s theories to cognitive science studies, Evelyn Tribble observes, “Gesture has become an increasingly important area of research in cognitive linguistics, neuroscience, and embodied cognition. Long ignored as random hand waving, gesture is now widely seen to play an active causal role in thought and in language production” (93). While Tribble perceptively examines the significance of gesture and action for actors’ memory, attention, and performance, she circumvents discussing the importance of actors’ reliance on facial expressions, the other amphitheatre, to feel and communicate emotion.

When we examine recent findings in cognitive science, we see that scientific results often agree with and add to Bulwer, Wright, and other early modern philosopher’s theories. I admire and seek to match Tribble’s complex study of socially distributed cognition in my own work, but I wish to modify some of her arguments to reframe the performers’ experience of social cognition, language, and expression. For example, in discussing and applying Susan Golden-Meadow’s contemporary findings in *Hearing Gesture: How Our Hands Help Us Think* (2003), Tribble notes, “Difficulties in producing or remembering speech tend to increase gesture, and more complex cognitive tasks—such as describing a picture from memory rather than while viewing it—result in more gesture production (2003: 48)” (95). But how much does gesture increase and what kinds of gesture would increase in a performance? Would it not also depend

on the kinds of speech memorized and delivered? In addition to these questions, a difficulty exists for an actor who has memorized lines—often without a large amount of practice time—his limbs can be frozen as he seeks to remember the words, not wanting to let gestures which inhibit the expression of the line interfere or distract from his performance. Tribble concedes, “We have all perhaps seen novice speakers or actors painfully map an action onto a word, often a beat or two behind the proper moment. But this is precisely what we would expect of novices, because one of the major challenges in learning any skill is to get to a level at which performance becomes fluid and formerly disparate skills become integrated” (97).<sup>61</sup> Yet this explanation does not take into account how a character’s language about gestures and facial expressions influence him and the other actors on and off stage. I therefore apply early modern and contemporary cognitive theory to explore how actors respond to the speeches of other players in order to create facial expressions that visually demonstrate the descriptive lines that they are hearing in performance, perhaps for the first time.

Tribble is not alone in diminishing the significance of facial expressions for early modern acting. Bevington asserts, “one finds everywhere in [Shakespeare’s] writings a sense of his fascination with wordless actions that can speak through their own language of gesture” (*Action* 17). The gesture that Bevington believes to be the most moving in the entire Shakespeare canon is when Shakespeare’s stage directions call for Coriolanus to silently take Volumnia’s hand. Granted, gestures are vital for performing in a larger space to convey the character’s passions to all of the audience members, but facial expressions, like movement, cannot be divorced from the physical and emotional performance of a part and can furthermore aid actors in extending the emotion beyond their faces to their bodies. In the 1970s, when psychologist Paul Ekman was

---

<sup>61</sup> I also argue that an actor gains confidence by interacting with familiar partners and playing similar roles to become more comfortable with that type of characters’ gestures, expressions, and movement, as I discuss in chapter five.

creating his “Facial Action Coding System,” a method for measuring facial expressions, Ekman noted the following discovery:

I found that when I made certain expressions, I was flooded with strong emotional sensations. It wasn't just any expression, only the ones I had already identified as universal [expressions of enjoyment, sadness, anger, and disgust] to all human beings. When I asked Friesen if this was happening to him also, he reported that he, too, was feeling emotions when he made some of the expressions, and they often felt very unpleasant. (36)

As this narrative explains, expressions inform and *form* our emotions just as much as emotions trigger our expressions. Language that imparts descriptions about facial expressions and emotion would therefore influence actors' faces as they respond to the words in performance.

Early moderns were just as invested in understanding the expressions of the face as we are today. As Bulwer's *Pathomyotamia* (1649) explains:

Man with his very Countenance alone, should expresse all his Will, Mind, and Desire, when at any time it happened to be inconvenient or unlawfull to open in words at length. The reason why the Face doth so naturally follow the motions of the Mind, and is an Index of the Affections, is, as *Baldus* thinks, That Affections being Passions in matter, and in the Body, they are the forms of a certaine Body, to wit, of the Mass of Bloud; and insooth, a certaine passion requireth a certaine matter, as Anger Choller, Joy pure Bloud, Sadnesse Melancholly, Astonishment Phlegme; which humors conteyned in their Naturall Vessels and mixt together, furnish the Affections with matter; which while it remaineth about the Heart and the first sensory, from the image perceived and adjudged to have the cause or matter of molestation or placencie, excited by Heat and Spirits, it is drawn into Act, and is made such in act; from thence the altered Spirits, or vapours with the Spirits are elevated, which by the Arteries coming to the Braine, the Principle of the Nerves, which bring the Commands for motion to the Muscles into which they are inserted, so making them the Instruments of Voluntary motion, pluck and pull it after divers manners, according to their quality Affecting, Contracting, Dilating, Heating, Refrigerating, more or lesse drying or moystening: And any the least mutation made in a Principle, there followes a change in those things that depend upon that Principle; (101-3)

According to Bulwer, passions are made of affections, which consist of “mixt” humors. The “affections,” while stemming from the heart, move through the arteries and nerves to the brain,

which, in turn, prompt the “face to expresse the affections of the mind.” Continuing his explanation Bulwer notes:

Wherefore the *Arteries* and *Nerves* that follow the Heart and Braine are changed, and because the Face is nigher the Braine, the chiefe organ of the Sense, made remarkable by the Cognizanze of the greatest Arteries, and endued with Nerves, & such varietie of proper and common Muscles which entertaine them: Hence it comes to passe that all changes and passions in or with matter, or not existing without it, which happen to be done about the Heart, are participated to the Braine, so that the Soule may take notice of them and judge them. All these working upon the Muscles of the Face, after some manner more or lesse, alter and vary the Face, and move it from its former state, introducing some of their signs therein. Yet we allow not the Heart to be the chiefe originall and seat of the Affections, which are (indeed) originally from the Head; for although in asmuch as they concerne the Body, their chiefe seat is in the Heart, because that is chiefly alterd by them, yet forasmuch as they affect the mind also, it is onely in the Braine, because the mind can immediatly suffer from this onely. And hence it followes that the Head and Face doe so manifestly by signes (exhibited by the operation of certaine Muscles) expresse the affections of the mind. (103-4)

Bulwer’s observation that the face “naturally follow[s] the motions of the mind,” further supports the argument that an early modern actor could not perform without expressing various passions through changes in his countenance, regardless of whether the audience members could see each muscle fiber twitch as the actor cried or each eyelid crinkle when he laughed. As the “Index of the Affections,” the face was an important means of communicating the heart’s affections. Over three hundred and fifty years later, scientists, in some ways, agree with Bulwer’s description of the face. As Ekman explains, “Indeed, we have much better control over our bodily muscles and our words than we have for our facial muscles or the settings in our vocal apparatus” (63). The body’s physical manifestation of affections cannot be separated from the face, as the face connects to and reveals the language of the body.

In turn, an actor’s expression and language cannot be separated from his fellow actors’ response. A popular passage from Thomas Wright’s *Passions of the Minde in Generall* speculates, “the passion in the persuader seemeth to me to resemble the wind a trumpeter

bloweth in at one end of the trumpet, and in what matter it proceedeth from him, so it issueth forth at the other end, and cometh to our ears, even so the passion proceedeth from the heart, and is blown about the body, face, eyes, voice, and so by gestures passeth into our eyes, and by sounds into our ears” (174).<sup>62</sup> Gestures, here, include facial expressions, as Thomas Wilson’s *The Art of Rhetorique* (1553) reveals, “Gesture is a certaine comely moderacion of the countenance and all other partes of mans body, aptely agreeyng to those thynges whiche are spoken” (OED 3b). In his groundbreaking book *The Player’s Passion*, Joseph Roach explains how a player’s passion could infect audience members: “It was widely believed that the spirits, agitated by the passions of the imaginer, generate a wave of physical force, rolling through the aether, powerful enough to influence the spirits of others at a distance” (45). While scholars have been right to incorporate Wright’s quote when trying to explain the connection between the early modern actor and the early modern audience, it is just as important to examine this passage and how it relates to the actors performing their parts on stage. If the actor’s “passion proceedeth from the heart and is blown about the body, face, eyes, voice, and so by gestures passeth into” the spectator, or audience member, then the passion’s expression through gesture and voice also “passeth into” the actors on stage. Their reaction to the actor’s passions, however, would be more physically pronounced than the audience member’s empathy because the actors are closer in distance to the actor, and they also are invested in reacting to the passions that their fellow actors express.

In the past, scholars have also explored Shakespeare’s use of language to communicate expressions that they feel cannot be acted literally on stage. Bevington analyzes Shakespeare’s imaginatively stimulating metaphors about characters’ expressions, such as Coriolanus’s “face

---

<sup>62</sup> Quoted in Tribble’s *Cognition in the Globe* when she discusses Bertram Joseph’s application of Bulwer’s *Chirolgia* and *Chironomia*. Joseph also quotes this passage from Wright (90).

sours ripe grapes” and his eye can “pierce a corslet,” in order to argue that Shakespeare uses language to convey emotions that actors cannot represent literally (*Action* 90-91). Yet I believe that characters’ metaphorical language can prompt expressions and allow actors to react to a character’s emotional state. While Bevington posits that the above figurative language, spoken by Menenius while Coriolanus is off stage, allows audience members to *imagine* Coriolanus as a terrifying god of war, this language can also instruct the actors on stage in how to act when coming in contact with this intimidating figure and could cue Coriolanus, who might be listening off stage, to furrow his brows, squint his eyes, shoot condemning looks, and scowl with all his might when coming on stage for his next scene. To bring in a contemporary example, when someone today says, “if looks could kill, he’d be dead,” we know that someone is “shooting daggers” toward the person who would be dead if looks were lethal. How different is this idiom from his eye could “pierce a corslet”? Could not both of these expressions indicate that the angered person is glaring, squinting his eyes as he stares down his enemy or anyone else who crosses his path?

With regard to characterization, Bruce R. Smith has challenged critics’ attempts to compartmentalize early modern acting as formal. Smith believes that the voice serves as the core of character development, even surpassing what the audience sees:

When it comes to human voices within the aura of the wooden O, auditors likewise hear an amalgam of physical phenomena (volume and pitch), perceptual phenomena (qualities Quintilian describes as ‘clear or husky, full or thin, smooth or harsh, narrow or diffuse, rigid or flexible, sharp or blunt’), and imaginative phenomena (the voice of a king, the voice of a maiden disguised as a page, the voice of an air spirit, the voice of an earth spirit). The object the audience hears in a human voice is character. (245)

Yet Smith’s research fails to analyze how an actor would respond to verbal communication in order to embody expression and how he might concurrently use his expressions to cue another

actor's subsequent lines. A line such as “what haste looks through his eyes” (*Macbeth* 1.2.46), which Baumbach uses as her example of a Shakespearean description of the eyes that an audience member might not be able to literally see (74), can cue the actor whose character embodies this description to react physically to the line, internalizing the words and embracing the energy behind them as part of his character. The actor’s prompt to express an impatient gaze would radiate through his body and the way he physically and vocally delivers the message. Hearing these words, he would spring forward at the command to speak, his body upright with an air of importance; his impatient eyes would be wide and unblinking to suggest the severity of his message, while his words would spew forth from his mouth at a fast tempo to complement the look of haste residing in his eyes. As this description demonstrates, the actor voices lines that communicate to another actor how to act physically, not just with his eyes. Likewise, York’s complimentary remarks regarding Richard II, “Yet looks he like a king. Behold, his eye, / As bright as is the eagle’s, lightens forth / Controlling majesty,” would also provide the actor playing Richard II as well as the other actors with instructions of how to act during this scene (*Richard II* 3.3.68-70). While I agree that vocal intonations are important to a character’s development, it is the combination of both the sound and the visual image that solidify the affect.

Paul Menzer also points to past critics’ errors in assuming that late sixteenth-century acting progressed from “artifice” to “naturalism” (29): “not only must these binaries be false--more trope than truth--but also they tell us nothing, in fact, about the way early modern actors shaped and presented the human body on stage” (32).<sup>63</sup> While early modern actors did not use Stanislavskian techniques, their facial expressions were informed by the spoken text. Using cognitive science research, we can speculate on whether their expressions could be cognitively

---

<sup>63</sup> Tribble also points to and agrees with Menzer’s argument (*Cognition in the Globe* 89).

affected by the other characters' speeches. A character's lines often reveal the facial expressions and gestures that he is performing or that a fellow character should be enacting; therefore, the actor speaking the descriptive lines would cognitively react to the lines and the physical changes taking place in the other actor. Concurrently, another actor's reactions might rely on listening to the words being spoken and physically responding to the unfamiliar description communicated. The interaction through dialogue between the actors creates a cognitive, empathetic space that registers physically in the actors' gestures and expressions.

### **A face “bankrupt of his majesty”: performing facial expressions in *Richard II***

In describing a character's emotional appearance, early modern actors spoke lines that comment on the quality or change within a character's face, visage, or countenance. I believe that these terms do not define hermetic categories, as each word's function does not adhere to a fixed meaning within Shakespeare's plays. In contrast, Baumbach makes this distinction between when characters use the term “face” and when they use “countenance” or “visage”: “Insofar as the countenance derives from the verb *velle*, it suggests the possibility of performance, of staging and imitating certain expressions in order to fashion facial features even though the passions of the mind are thought typically to emerge involuntarily” (69). Yet by using Shakespeare Searched, an internet search engine for Shakespeare's plays, we can see that Shakespeare uses the word “face” far more than he uses “countenance” or “visage” in his plays:

#### **Table 4.1 Shakespeare Searched Results for Word Usage**

Admittedly, this table only gives us an idea of the number of times each word was used in each text because the website does not break down the plays by quartos and folios, relying instead on collated modern versions.

	<b>Face</b>	<b>Visage</b>	<b>Countenance</b>
<i>Love's Labor's Lost</i>	29	1	4
<i>Romeo and Juliet</i>	22	1	0
<i>Henry IV.1</i>	18	0	5
<i>King Richard II</i>	17	1	0

<i>Macbeth</i>	15	0	1
<i>Antony and Cleopatra</i>	14	1	2
<i>VI Henry 2</i>	14	1	3
<i>Julius Caesar</i>	14	1	2
<i>King John</i>	14	0	0
<i>Comedy of Errors</i>	13	0	0
<i>Hamlet</i>	13	5	5
<i>Henry IV.2</i>	13	1	4
<i>VI Henry 3</i>	13	0	0
<i>Much Ado About Nothing</i>	13	0	1
<i>Coriolanus</i>	12	1	3
<i>Henry V</i>	12	2	1
<i>King Lear</i>	12	2	4
<i>Cymbeline</i>	11	0	1
<i>Taming of the Shrew</i>	11	0	8
<i>Twelfth Night</i>	11	1	0
<i>Measure for Measure</i>	10	3	1
<i>Pericles</i>	10	0	0
<i>Richard III</i>	10	0	0
<i>Titus Andronicus</i>	10	0	1
<i>Henry VIII</i>	9	1	2
<i>Midsummer Night's</i>	9	2	0
<i>Winter's Tale</i>	9	2	4
<i>VI Henry 1</i>	8	0	1
<i>Two Gents</i>	8	0	0
<i>All's Well</i>	7	1	0
<i>Merchant of Venice</i>	7	2	0
<i>Othello</i>	7	3	0
<i>Troilus and Cressida</i>	6	1	2
<i>Timon of Athens</i>	5	1	0
<i>As You Like It</i>	4	0	4
<i>Merry Wives of Windsor</i>	4	0	1
<i>The Tempest</i>	4	0	0

Baumbach also asserts that “the term *face* can, however, [unlike *countenance*] open up a much broader range of possible meanings” (70). While an interesting contextual difference to unravel, I would argue that many of Shakespeare’s lines show a preference for “visage,” “countenance,” or “face” depending upon the syllables needed to make the line iambic pentameter: Shakespeare used “face” when he needed a monosyllabic word, “visage” when he need two syllables, and

“countenance” to fill up more aural space. It also appears likely that he would choose the term according to the sound that he was looking for: as an example, Baumbach refers to Lear calling General’s face a “wolvish visage” as proof that the “visage” is “coupled to” “bestial features,” but “wolvish visage” aurally enraptures a listener, whether a fellow actor or audience member, much more than wolvish *face* or wolvish *countenance* because of the repetition of consonants and rhythm of the two-syllable words. Likewise, Hamlet’s line “the dejected havior of the visage” also seems to rely on alliteration and rhythm to create a powerful sound for the listener as well as a nice mnemonic device for the player learning the lines. While the difference between the words seems important, the word selected appears to be chosen for its sound, which complements the image and effect Shakespeare is trying to create, and he also shows a preference for face over countenance or visage.

Baumbach analyzes the use of the word “countenance” to describe the broken body politic in *King Lear*: “it is significant that Kent . . . does not [sic] locate signs of ‘authority’ (1.4.27) and kingship not in Lear’s *face* but in his ‘countenance’ (1.4.24). The lack of royal character in Lear’s face points to the loss of the *body politic* that Lear has jeopardized by giving away his power and his land to his greedy and invidious daughters Goneril and Regan” (69). Her claim about the body politic, while persuasive, does not incorporate an analysis of how an actor would react to Kent’s words, adhering, instead, to a character analysis in her attempt to distinguish between “countenance,” “face,” and “visage.” I would like to take Baumbach’s physiognomic analysis a step further and in a different direction to examine how the actors’ use of expressive words combine the words’ performance function with the playwright’s composition process, the actor’s character analysis, and the audience’s response.

As cognitive neuroscientist Vittorio Gallese notes, scientific study “shows a tight relationship between the activation of the motor system and processing of the emotional content of language. Understanding happy sentences activates muscles associated with smiling, while understanding sad and angry sentences activates muscles associated with frowning” (532). These findings suggest that when an actor hears another actor’s expressive prompts, his face and body would respond to the line’s emotional content. Using Shakespeare Searched, we can cull a cursory study of how many times *Richard II*, *Othello*, and *Hamlet*, for comparison, incorporate specific words that prompt facial expressions of emotions. This list is by no means exhaustive, as other words in each text also allude to or comment on facial expressions and passions, but it does give us an idea of the kinds of words that are used in each play and the frequency of usage:

**Table 4.2 Shakespeare Search Results for Expressive and Affective Prompts**

	Eye	Cheek	Smile	Brow	Tear	Weep	Sorrow	Grief	Pale
<i>Richard II</i>	28	4	4	3	19	7	21	26	10
<i>Hamlet</i>	32	2	4	5	9	5	7	12	9
<i>Othello</i>	21	1	5	1	7	12	5	8	3

Possessing abundant references to the face and its expressions, *The Tragedy of King Richard II* provides early modern actors and audiences alike with descriptions about characters that reveal the characters’ status and personality before or as they enter, show characters whose relationships are changed by the spoken words and facial expressions of others, give exposition about a face in the character’s absence, and reinforce emotionally charged scenes where facial expressions demonstrate altered roles in power. In fact, Shakespeare’s dramatic account of Richard II’s demise appears to be structured around physiognomic observations about Richard and his noblemen at key moments within the play. King Richard and Bullingbrooke exchange visages: as Bullingbrooke assumes monarchial power, Richard’s face loses its austere, kingly power. The king’s face functions as a metonymy for the body politic. The language used reveals

how early modern actors embodied expressions to demonstrate changes within a character's social power as well as emotional state.

Narrative detail about a character's facial expression frequently appears in entrances as well as monumental scenes. Often, a play's characters will speak about each other when the character in question is absent from the stage, either to provide the audience with further clues about the character and his relationship to the ones on stage or to cue a character's entrance. The first scene in *Richard II* provides an excellent example of how facial descriptions are used to characterize and embody passions as well as social status in Shakespeare's plays. While Bullingbrooke's face transforms into the proper kingly face by the end of the play, at the beginning of the tragedy, Richard comments on how Bullingbrooke's lack of temperance surfaces in his facial expressions. When King Richard calls for Bullingbrooke and Mowbray in Act One of *Richard II*, the king states before (or as) the two enter:

Face to face,  
And frowning brow to brow, ourselves will hear  
The accuser and the accused freely speak.  
High-stomached are they both, and full of ire;  
In rage, deaf as the sea, hasty as fire. (1.1.15-19)

The actor playing Bullingbrooke would have had the cue "fire" or better yet "hasty as fire" to study when learning the lines his character speaks to his majesty after entering. Although Mowbray speaks after Bullingbrooke, both actors would more than likely have the same cue words in their parts because they enter together, and they would certainly hear the lines spoken about their characters as they wait to enter.

Before ever speaking, the actors therefore know and demonstrate that their characters are "full of ire" and prepared to do battle in words with each other; "frowning brow to brow," the actors are prompted to enter with brows furrowed and jaws set in frowns with a high-stomached

or haughty countenance and posture. Moreover, Richard believes that their emotional states are unequal to his kingly, balanced humors, and his lines encourage each to “freely speak” in front of the king and to let their characters’ rage and haste show through their lines, expressions, and actions from the beginning of the scene. While Richard’s lines therefore provide the audience with information about the characters entering the scene, his lines also direct the actors playing Bullingbrooke and Mowbray how to act and communicate what the king thinks of their characters so that they, in turn, reinforce his characterization of the haughty noblemen. By listening to this expressive prompt in a performance, the two actors playing Bullingbrooke and Mowbray would understand that the actor playing the king will most likely try to remain a calm patriarchal figure to demonstrate his superiority while they will need to act rashly to portray their inferior status as his subjects or children of the realm.

Of course, actors could also challenge each other’s directions and character descriptions, creating emotional tension between speech and action, especially toward the end of a scene. Regarding this opening scene, Bruce Smith asserts, “With its confrontation, rhetorical and physical, of Bullingbrooke and Mowbray, Act One, scene one of *Richard II* plays out an aural competition in which Richard is the loser. His failure to establish verbal authority in this opening scene—in rhetorical effectiveness, Bullingbrooke clearly carries the day—predicts the silencing of Richard’s own voice in the end” (277). Indeed, Bullingbrooke is vocally the victor with his passionate speeches, and as the scene’s dominant figure, his words also direct others to respond accordingly: his final speech at the end of the scene provides excellent expressive cues for the actors playing Gaunt and Mowbray as well as Bullingbrooke himself and challenges Richard to respond to his rage. When King Richard demands that Bullingbrooke surrender his gage, Bullingbrooke protests:

Shall I seem crestfallen in my father's sight?  
 Or with pale beggar-fear impeach my height  
 Before this out-dared dastard? Ere my tongue  
 Shall wound my honor with such feeble wrong,  
 Or sound so base a parole, my teeth shall tear  
 The slavish motive of recanting fear  
 And spit it bleeding in his high disgrace,  
 Where shame doth harbor, even in Mowbray's face. (1.1.188-95)

The actor playing Bullingbrooke would know from studying these lines that his character will not yield his gage to appear “crestfallen” or “pale” with fear, which actually points to Bullingbrooke rejecting the role of the passive, fearful subject in favor of the rebellious, raging individual who will spew forth his tongue into the shame-filled face of his opponent. As Bulwer observes, “*Anger, Swelling indignation, Pride, Disdain, Arrogancy, and Ambitious love of praise, puff up the Cheekes of self-conceited men . . . But if the puffs of Anger swell this Orbicular Muscle, he that puffs and chafes after this manner, seemes to be his own Trumpeter, and to sound defiance to those against whom he presents himselfe with Cheekes so inflat*” (206-9). Contemporary scientific findings concur with Bulwer: “embodiment of anger might involve tension in muscles used to strike, the enervation of certain facial muscles to form a scowl, and even the rise in diastolic blood pressure and in peripheral resistance, for example” (Niedenthal 1003). The player, then, would be prompted to spit forth his speech viciously, gnashing his teeth, puffing his cheeks, and frowning his brows, demonstrating an exterior sign of courage rather than fear as Bullingbrooke disobeys the king and insults his opponent.

When hearing a speech performed to its full effect for the first time, or even after the first time, the actor would react physically to the lines depending on what he knows about his character. The question, then, is how the actor playing Mowbray would react to this visceral language. The actor would know that Mowbray in fact feels responsible for the king's brother's death, but he would also know that the king sanctioned the act because the king is very keen on

reconciling the two men, and Mowbray is only banished from court instead of being killed. If the actor is playing the part with this knowledge in mind, he may express, if only briefly, shame. A shamed facial expression would provide the audience with the necessary clue needed to decide whom they side with in the argument and would also lead the audience to believe that more is going on in this scene than Richard or Mowbray will admit; however, the actor could choose to try and hide his character's shame by expressing both shame and anger. Likewise, Gaunt may also act shamefaced and angry, hanging his head down as he exits, but his expression would be initiated by his son Bullingbrooke's violent speech, not because of a guilty conscience. All of these reactions would occur because of Bullingbrooke's lines and how he delivers them: the other actors would respond, whether in shame, anger, or shock, to the visceral image he creates in this speech.

Critics must look closer at the link between physiognomy and character allegiances to analyze the power structures that change when characters' emotions and faces transform and how an actor would perform these expressions as he embodies these changes in emotion and status: the dialogue between John of Gaunt and Richard in 2.1 demonstrates the technique of using language about facial expressions to communicate the deterioration of character relationships. As the dying John of Gaunt, who says that he sees Richard "ill" and "reputation sick," attempts to shame the king into acting as a benevolent monarch instead of a greedy landlord, Richard roars, "Darest with thy frozen admonition / Make pale our cheek, chasing the royal blood / With fury from his native residence" (2.1.117-19). Through these lines, Richard indicates that he is pale with fury instead of fear, indicating that as the king, his face never expresses fear or weakness. In learning these lines, the actor playing Richard more than likely would not have had access to John of Gaunt's speech about Richard being "Landlord of

England,” but he would know that whatever Gaunt said would upset his character enough to go pale with fury, so in listening to Gaunt’s lines, the actor could have prepared a look of pale fury through internalizing Gaunt’s verbal attack. Yet instead of being cowed into submission, Gaunt’s next lines show him standing up to the king, his brother’s wayward son, disregarding his royal title and predicting his shameful downfall; therefore, Richard’s lines could also be an indicator that Gaunt’s face, perhaps pale from illness, would also drain paler as rage invades his face due to Richard’s disrespectful, insulting retort.

Shortly after Gaunt’s tongue becomes a “stringless instrument” at his death, his brother York states that he has remained patient no matter what ill-advised act Richard has committed, saying no deed has “sour[ed] my patient cheek / Or ben[t] one wrinkle on my sovereign’s face” (2.1.169-70), but now, he pleads with Richard to yield Gaunt’s inheritance to Bullingbrooke. Hence, the actor performing York’s role would know from memorizing his lines that his face changes from patient facial expressions to a look of frustration. York then compares Richard’s face to his father’s: “His face thou hast . . . / But when he frowned, it was against the French / And not against his friends” (2.1.176-77). Richard, of course, does not succumb to York’s pleading request, continuing to “frown” on his followers by ordering Bullingbrooke’s land to be seized for the crown. This is not the face of a king, as York describes Richard’s father’s face, and after the king exits, Northumberland vows to “redeem from broking pawn the blemished crown, / Wipe off the dust that hides our scepter’s gilt, / And make high majesty look like itself” (2.1.293-95). Gaunt, York, and Northumberland’s language about the king’s “blemished” countenance symbolizes his ill-governed country, and his face must be cleared or removed from the throne to save England from his evil countenance and actions. By commenting on their sovereign’s face and its inappropriate expressions, the two uncles are foreshadowing his demise; he is no longer a

majestic king, but a posing “pawn.” Richard, in turn, also foreshadows his downfall when he speaks of his own face growing pale with fury, which likens him to his followers, whose faces in the play’s opening scene revealed all too much passion to be composed of perfect harmony as a king’s face would be. The actor playing Richard would therefore know from the lines he speaks as well as the ones he hears that his character is starting to lose his composure, indicating that the actor’s face should reveal cracks in the king’s countenance to portray his unsettled emotional state.

### **Performing Facial Expressions and Textual Variations**

As Roach observes, “within a given role an actor could be expected to effect sudden, highly visible transitions between passions in the length of a speech or even a single line” (42). Closely examining the actors’ cue and prompt-triggered collaborative performance shows how actors reacted quickly to each other’s lines to make these “sudden” changes in expression and how actors on and off stage listened to cues to know how they would act and respond to each other in future scenes. The actors’ performance of expression and empathy, however, is also informed by textual variations, as we shall see in examining 4.1 in *Richard II*.

Instances of how characters speak of other characters’ faces to communicate their social status and emotions abound in this play, but the pivotal moment for how metaphors of the face symbolize the transformation of the body politic occurs when Richard looks to his own reflection in search of his waning power in the deposition scene of 4.1. Bevington accurately observes, “Again and again, the ritual effects of staging and style draw our attention to the balanced conflicts between the two men and within Richard. . . . In particular, the deposition scene, with its spectacle of a coronation in reverse, brings the sacramental and human sides of the central figure into poignant dramatic relationship” (Introduction 744). Richard’s entrance and speech in

this scene, however, are not in Q1 (1597), leading us to question when the additional 155 lines, which include “a brittle glory shineth in this face,” were performed.

Despite five quarto versions being printed before the first Folio, the *Richard II* texts are fairly stable, compared to some of Shakespeare’s other play’s textual histories (Gurr 61). The initial three quartos have minor discrepancies, but a major change occurs after Q3: the section where Richard gives the crown to Bullingbrooke, the “deposition scene,” first appears in the fourth quarto (61). As Gurr notes, “The Folio text (F) by contrast was independently collated with a copy profoundly influenced by playhouse use. It is basically a copy of the third quarto (Q3), corrected in most of its stage directions, its metre and in occasional words or lines, and with some passages cut. It has a better version of the deposition scene than Q4” (61). Gurr, like other modern editors, uses Q1 as the control text and adds F’s deposition scene to the New Cambridge text. While this choice is acceptable for today’s readers, it obscures the fact that for the first ten years of the play’s performance the deposition scene, perhaps, was not performed.

Bevington argues that 4.1 “was considered so provocative that it was censored in the printed quartos of Shakespeare’s play during the Queen’s lifetime” (Introduction 740). Yet if this is the case, it stands to reason that the scene was also too controversial for the stage and could possibly even have been written later, which would also explain the scene’s publication delay. Gurr argues that the omission of Richard’s appearance in Q1 was “cobbled” from a censored play-text (185), but this claim cannot be proven, nor can it be proven whether the lines were performed in 1597 when the play first was performed, as Gurr acknowledges. When examining the Q1 text, no awkward “cobbled” lines discredit the page: in fact, Carlisle’s treasonous remarks against Bullingbrooke and his subsequent arrest transition effectively to Henry’s announcement about his coronation. Richard’s abdication of the crown, however, with the additional dialogue’s

attention to facial expressions and emotions, visually solidifies the social factions that surround Henry and Richard with a more intense dramatic effect than Carlisle's speech can deliver alone.

Even within the additions to the scene, the texts of Q4, Q5, and F differ slightly:

Richard's lines in Q4 and Q5 are missing several halves of lines, or phrases, in his mirror speech; are lineated differently because of these omissions in the Q texts (or additions to the F text); have several discrepancies in word choice between Q4, Q5, and F; and have additions of one-word exclamations in the Q texts. Scholars, depending on their proclivity for textual authority, explain these differences in various ways. The abdication lines, Gurr argues, are greatly improved in the Folio because, he argues, that the compositor was using Q3 and some other version to repair the text's inaccuracies (186). He also asserts that the Q4 deposition addition "has instances of mislineation and mishearing which suggest it is a hasty transcript probably made from dictation" (186). Gurr's remarks, while understandable perhaps from an editor's perspective, sensationalize the differences between the three texts in performance. The missing or added phrases are not essential to the text's meaning and do not change the Richard-actor's emotional expressions or the other actors' reactions and cues; moreover, the lineation, while different because of the omissions, is not a disaster. Instead of a "hasty transcript," the discrepancies appear to indicate phrases that were cut and words that were substituted in performance.

### Table 4.3 Folio Parts for Richard and Bullingbrooke

#### Excerpt of Part of Richard in F's 4.1

Phrases not in Q4 or Q5 are underlined.

*Substituted words (mostly synonyms) are italicized.*

Lineation differences are not noted.

With mine owne Teares I wash away my Balme,  
 With mine owne Hands I giue away my Crowne,  
 With mine owne Tongue denie my Sacred State,  
 With mine owne Breath release all *dutious Oathes*;  
 [. . .]  
 Nay, all of you, that stand and looke vpon me,  
 Whil'st that my wretchednesse doth bait my selfe,  
 Though some of you, with Pilate, wash your hands,

#### Part of Bullingbrooke when Richard enters in F's 4.1

. . .  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [up on high.  
 I thought you had been willing to resigne.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [King of those.  
 Part of your Cares you giue me with your Crowne.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [me they stay:  
 Are you contented to resigne the Crowne?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [of his Maiestie.  
 Goe some of you, and fetch a Looking-Glasse.

Shewing an outward pittie: yet you Pilates  
 Hauē here deliuer'd me to my sowre Crosse,  
 And Water cannot wash away your sinne.

\_\_\_\_\_ [o're these] Articles.

Mine Eyes are full of Teares, I cannot see:  
 And yet salt-Water blinds them not so much,  
 But they can see a sort of Traytors here.  
 Nay, if I turne mine Eyes vpon my selfe,  
 I finde my selfe a Traytor with the rest:  
 For I haue giuen here my Soules consent,  
 T'vndeck the pompous Body of a King;  
 Made Glory base; a Soueraigntie, a Slaue;  
 Prowd Maiestie, a Subiect; State, a Pesant.

\_\_\_\_\_ [My] Lord.

...

Oh, that I were a Mockerie, King of Snow,  
 Standing before the Sunne of Bullingbrooke,  
 To melt my selfe away in Water-drops.  
 Good King, great King, and yet not greatly good,  
 And if my word be *Sterling* yet in England,  
 Let it command a Mirror hither straight,  
 That it may shew me what a Face I haue,  
 Since it is Bankrupt of his Maiestie.

\_\_\_\_\_ [Glasse] doth come.

Fiend, thou torments me, ere I come to Hell.

\_\_\_\_\_ [then] be satisfy'd.

They shall be satisfy'd: Ile reade enough,  
 When I doe see the very Booke indeede,  
 Where all my sinnes are writ, and that's my selfe.

[Enter one with a Glasse.]

Giue me that Glasse, and therein will I reade.  
 No deeper wrinckles yet? hath Sorrow strucke  
 So many Blowes vpon this Face of mine,  
 And made no deeper Wounds? Oh flatt'ring Glasse,  
 Like to my followers in prosperitie,  
Thou do'st beguile me. Was this Face, the Face  
 That euery day, vnder his House-hold Roofe,  
 Did keepe ten thousand men? Was this the Face,  
That like the Sunne, did make beholders winke?  
 Is this the Face, which fac'd so many follyes,  
 That was at last out-fac'd by Bullingbrooke?  
 A brittle Glory shineth in this Face,  
 As brittle as the Glory, is the Face,  
 For there it is, crackt in an hundred shiuers.  
 Marke silent King, the Morall of this *sport*,  
 How soone my Sorrow hath destroy'd my Face.

\_\_\_\_\_ [of your] Face.

Say that againe.

The shadow of my Sorrow: ha, let's see,  
 'Tis very true, my Griefe lyes all within,  
 And these externall manner of Laments,  
 Are meerely shadowes, to the vnseene Griefe,  
 That swells with silence in the tortur'd Soule.  
There lyes the substance: and I thanke thee King  
 For thy great bountie, that not onely giu'st

\_\_\_\_\_ [come to Hell.

Vrge it no more, my Lord Northumberland.

\_\_\_\_\_ [destroy'd my Face.

The shadow of your Sorrow hath destroy'd

The shadow of your Face.

\_\_\_\_\_ [I obtaine it?

Name it, faire Cousin.

\_\_\_\_\_ [neede to begge.

Yet aske.

\_\_\_\_\_ [shall I haue?

You shall.

\_\_\_\_\_ [leauē to goe.

Whither?

\_\_\_\_\_ [from your sights.

Goe some of you, convey him to the Tower.

\_\_\_\_\_ [true Kings fall.

On Wednesday next, we solemnly set downe

Our Coronation: Lords, prepare your selves.

**Exeunt.**

(Folio TLN 2110-2245)

Me cause to wayle, but teachest me the way  
 How to lament the cause. Ile begge one Boone,  
 And then be gone, and trouble you no more.  
Shall I obtaine it?

\_\_\_\_\_ [ it, faire] Cousin.

Faire Cousin? I am greater then a King:

For when I was a King, my flatterers

Were then but subiects; being now a subiect,

I haue a King here to my flatterer:

Being so great, I haue no neede to begge.

\_\_\_\_\_ [Yet] aske.

And shall I haue?

\_\_\_\_\_ [You] shall.

Then giue me leaue to goe.

\_\_\_\_\_ Whither?

Whither you will, so I were from your sights.

\_\_\_\_\_ [to the] Tower.

Oh good: conuey: Conueyers are you all,

That rise thus nimble by a true Kings fall.

\_\_\_\_\_ [prepare] your selues.

**Exeunt.**

(Folio TLN 2128-2245)

As Laurie Maguire’s textual study argues, the deposition lines are not a memorial reconstruction (298) because she contends that the “bad quartos” or “suspect” texts’ “features are symptoms of some malfunction in textual transmission which may include, but is not limited to, memorial reconstruction” (155). She further explains that “the textual disturbance caused by faulty memory is very difficult to identify because it is identical to the textual disturbance caused by scribes, compositors, forgetful authors, revising authors, adapters, or other playhouse personnel adding to a MS” (155). In agreement with Maguire, I believe that Q4, Q5, and F could therefore have been amended or revised based on authorial additions or actors’ parts and performances.<sup>64</sup>

The title page of Q4 announces that the newest quarto includes “new additions of the Parliament scene, and the deposing of King Richard. As it hath been lately acted by the Kinges

<sup>64</sup> James Marino makes a similar argument about the quarto and folio versions of *Hamlet*: “Scholars may wish to reconstruct Shakespeare’s final draft of *Hamlet*, but it is not clear that Shakespeare ever finished *Hamlet*, or that *Hamlet* is finished” (79).

Majesties Servantes, at the Globe” (*Richard II* 1608).<sup>65</sup> This addition suggests, but does not prove, that the scenes are in fact new, and not previously censored from the earlier quarto texts. In the new section of the scene, Richard has four times as many lines as Bullingbrooke, suggesting that the lines were written as a way for the Richard-actor to sway the other characters as well as the audience with his verbal and visual rhetoric of passionate expressions.

After yielding his crown to Henry Bullingbrooke, Richard II sorrowfully asks for a mirror to read his face with since it is “bankrupt of his majesty” (4.1.268). Thomas Hill observes in his *The Contemplation of Mankinde*, “all the workings and passions of the spirite, appeare to be matched and ioyned with the bodie: which especially appeareth in the passions of the concupiscible or desirefull spirite: as are yre, méekenesse, feare, pittifulnesse, mercie, and such lyke” (4a). In asking for the mirror, Richard therefore expects to see his interior physiological “sorrow” mirrored on his face. Looking in the glass, the dejected king is surprised to see that “no deeper wrinkles” reveal the emotional trauma that his defeat has caused, but in the Folio text, he also wonders that his face could have, at one time, had the power to “like the sun . . . make beholders wink” but now has no rhetorical force over his previous followers (285). In Q4, Q5, and F, Richard implies that his face is still that of a king’s, even though he no longer wears his crown, but Bullingbrooke and his followers are unconvinced by Richard’s “staged” physiognomic self-examination. As Richard smashes the mirror, Bullingbrooke responds, “The shadow of your Sorrow hath destroy’d / The shadow of your Face” (TLN 2215-16), judging Richard’s expressions and actions as artificial and overly dramatic representations of what he can no longer be, the king likened with the “sun.” Richard turns Henry’s insult on its head by replying that his face cannot possibly show the depths of his sorrow:

---

<sup>65</sup> As Gurr notes, another title page was attached to Q4 copies that simply repeated the advertisement of Q3 (1598) and does not announce the new material. According to Gurr, “this [old] title page was cancelled, and replaced by the version advertising the deposition, in the course of printing” (185-6).

my Grief lyes all within  
 And these externall manner of Laments  
 Are meere shadows, to the unseene Griefe  
 That swells with silence in the tortur'd Soule.  
There lyes the substance . . . (Folio TLN 2219-23)

But if he cannot accurately display his grief, then his powers are diminished as a king and as an actor. At this point, the actor playing Bullingbrooke, or King Henry, surpasses the actor playing King Richard in kingly facial expressions, as the glory and calm composure now shines in Henry's face as he dismisses from his sight the overly expressive Richard, who can no longer compose a kingly face.

Although Bullingbrooke and his loyal followers remain immune to Richard's display of emotions, not showing any empathy for his performance, the Abbot, Carlisle, and Aumerle's final discussion at the end of the scene show that they were persuaded by Richard's passionate performance to empathize with him as the true king:

**Abbot.** A wofull Pageant haue we here beheld.  
**Carl.** The Woes to come, the Children yet vnborne,  
 Shall feele this day as sharpe to them as Thorne.  
**Aum.** You holy Clergie-men, is there no Plot  
 To rid the Realme of this pernicious Blot.  
**Abbot.** Before I freely speake my minde herein,  
 You shall not onely take the Sacrament,  
 To bury mine intents, but also to effect  
 What euer I shall happen to deuise.  
 I see your Browes are full of Discontent,  
 Your Heart of Sorrow, and your Eyes of Teares.  
 Come home with me to Supper, Ile lay a Plot  
 Shall shew vs all a merry day. (Folio TLN 2246-58)

Granted, their loyalties are already with Richard from the beginning of this scene, but Richard's display of emotion gives them more reason to side with him and show their own sorrow and pity for the late realm's state and the future of England. Richard's lines before the mirror speech prompt the three actors who play these characters to feel and express their sorrow:

Though some of you, with Pilate, wash your hands,  
 Shewing an outward pittie: yet you Pilates  
 Haue here deliuer'd me to my sowre Crosse. (TLN 2161-3)

Here, Richard's words prompt his followers to express sorrow and shame, while also condemning Henry's followers, who would not show remorse for their part in his abdication.

Without Richard's lines, the 4.1 scene in Q1 is but a "shadow" of 1.1, with Aumerle, Bagot, and Fitzwater echoing the earlier argument between Bullingbrooke and Mowbray. In the absence of Richard's performance in this scene, his supporters (Abbot, Aumerle, and Carlisle) cannot directly mirror his sorrow, but must instead rely on Carlisle's lines in Q1 as a surrogate for Richard's grief:

**Bull.** In Gods name Ile ascend the regall throne.  
**Car.** Mary God forbid.  
 Worst in this royall presence may I speake.  
 Yet best beseeming me to speake the truth,  
 Would God that any in this noble presence,  
 Were enough noble to be vpright iudge  
 Of noble Richard. Then true noblesse would  
 Learne him forbearance from so foule a wrong,  
 What subiect can giue sentence on his King:  
 And who sits here that is not Richards subiect?  
 Theeves are not iudgd but they are by to heare,  
 Although apparant guilt be seene in them,  
 And shall the figure of Gods Maiesty,  
 His Captaine, steward, deputy, elect,  
 Anointed, crowned, planted, many yeares  
 Be iudgd by subiect and inferiour breath,  
 And he himselfe not present? Oh forfend it God,  
 That in a Christian climate soules refinde,  
 Should shew so heinous blacke obsceene a deed  
 I speake to subiects and a subiect speakes,  
 Stird vp by God thus boldly for his King,  
 My Lord of Hereford here whom you call King,  
 Is a foule traitour to proud Herefords King,  
 And if you crowne him let me prophesie,  
 The blood of English shall manure the ground,  
 And future ages groane for this foule act,  
 Peace shall go sleepe with turkes and infidels,  
 And in this seate of peace, tumultuous warres,

Shall kin with kin, and kinde with kind confound:  
 Disorder, horror, feare, and mutiny,  
 Shall heere inhabit, and this land be cald,  
 The field of Golgotha and dead mens sculs.  
 Oh if yon raise this house against this house,  
 It will the wofullest diuision proue,  
 That euer fell vpon this cursed earth:  
 Preuent it, resist it, let it not be so,  
 Lest child, childs children, crie against you woe.  
**North.** Well haue you argued sir, and for your paines,  
 Of Capitall treason, we arrest you heere:  
 My Lord of Westminster, be it your charge,  
 To keepe him safely till his day of triall.  
**Bull.** Let it be so, and loe on wednesday next,  
 We solemnly proclaime our Coronation,  
 Lords be ready all. (Q1 TLN 2033-2245)

Carlisle's speech, while built on persuasive rhetorical devices like antithesis ("My Lord of Hereford here whom you call King, / Is a foule traitour to proud Herefords King") and chiasmus ("What subiect can giue sentence on his King: / And who sits here that is not Richards subiect?"), does not possess the expressive beauty, or "brittle glory," of Richard's lines and is therefore less effective in garnering empathy for Richard's state.

Throughout the play the actors express the transition of power from Richard to Henry through their facial expressions and the language that reveals what each man is feeling. When Henry discovers that Richard has been murdered, the actor playing Henry directs his fellow actors in how to respond and exit the stage: "Lords, I protest my soul is full of woe./ . . . March sadly after. Grace my mournings here / In weeping after this untimely bier" (5.6.45, 51-52). With this final rhyming couplet, the newly crowned king player puts on a mournful face for the old king and instructs his fellow players to do the same, at once acting as king and director on stage. The other actors, in turn, would cognitively recognize and respond to the new king's empowered facial expressions. In discussing the impact of social cognition on embodied emotion, Niedenthal explains, "The imitation of other individuals' emotional expressions is part of the bodily

reenactment of the experience of the other's state" (1004). As the Henry-actor walks "sadly after," his fellow actors would demonstrate their characters' dependence on the social construction of the new king's court by also donning faces of mourning.

Throughout *Richard II* allusions to facial expressions impart characters' changing feelings, social status, and allegiances, aiding the actors on stage in performing their parts and connecting with one another in each scene. The affective and expressive language allows them to prompt one another to express physically the transformation of the body politic through their faces, voices, and bodies. This attention to and reliance on facial expressions, when connected to the rehearsal and performance process of parts, suggest that description within characters' lines is not just for the actor or audience, but for the *actors* on stage.

Language about facial expressions is therefore paramount in creating and shaping actor's parts and performance. Because of the lack of specific casting charts for each play, scholars debate whether actors play the same types of characters or if they play a wide-ranging degree of parts. Whether they played a character type or various roles, early moderns believed that actors took great risks in performing passions and expressing their characters' emotions through their countenances. As Edmund Gayton, a son of Ben, remarked in *Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixot* (1654),

Strong passions left too long unsuppress'd, may overthrow the temper of the braine, and totally subvert the rationall parts, and some passions counterfeited long, whether of grieffe or joy, have so alter'd the personaters, that players themselves (who are most usually in such employments,) have been forc'd to fly to Physick, for cure of the disaffection, which such high penn'd humours, and too passionately and sensibly represented have occasion'd. I have knowne my selfe, a Tyrant comming from the Scene, not able to reduce himselfe, into the knowledge of himselfe, till Sack made him (which was his present Physick) forget he was an Emperour, and renew'd all his old acquaintance to him; and it is not out of most mens observation, that one most admirable Mimicke in our late Stage, so lively and corporally personated a Changeling, that he could never compose his Face to the figure it had, before he undertook that part. (Book III, 144)

Roach, among other critics, has used Gayton's remarks to point out the concern that antitheatricalists as well as physicians had about an actor's profession (48-9). But the wording of this passage is particularly enlightening if we think about an actor playing the same type of character over a period of plays: observations about "passions counterfeited long" needing a remedy and the player who "could never compose his Face to the figure it had, before he undertook that part" indicate that the fear not only could be about the actor playing different characters but also the anxiety that he would be "stuck" with the face and humour of the character that he enacted. Gayton's remarks suggest that the man played the "part" so often and with such conviction, no matter the play, that he had trouble discerning between reality and the stage, and particular parts, like the tyrant or changeling, were especially dangerous. These observations about "counterfeiting" facial expressions and passions do not end with *Richard II*, as many parts, relationships, and scenes in Shakespeare revolve around language about facial expressions, as a section of the next chapter on *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Macbeth*, and *Coriolanus* will demonstrate. In Chapter Five, I will explore the patterns of speeches, cues, personalities, and relationships in plays composed and performed close in time that demonstrate that the plays were written so that actors could play the same part or type and rely on similar character bonds to aid the actors' memorization and performance of new plays.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Shakespeare's Parts and Relationship Structures:

#### Creating Networks of Memory

Because our brains create and recognize networks of associative memories, what we learn about specific relationships, types of people, and even speech structure we carry over into our future experiences.<sup>66</sup> While some critics would argue that real-life experience and acting on stage do not possess the same values and that the rules of social cognition are therefore different for players who are performing characters in a fictional space, these frames have more similarities than differences, especially for actors in the early modern period who possessed pre-scripted parts but not reliable access to the entire play-text.<sup>67</sup> By performing in plays with few, if any, rehearsals and no performance runs, actors relied on relationships and types of characters that they played in the past in order to construct new performances on stage. This kind of reliance is not unlike that of a professor using previously successful methods of instructing in the classroom when responding to certain types of students, a doctor interacting with a patient based on the symptoms the patient reports, or a lawyer responding to a client's questions based on her experience in that particular kind of case. We all play roles and have certain pre-scripted parts

---

<sup>66</sup> See John Sutton's *Philosophy and Memory Traces: Descartes to Connectionism* (1997) and Anthony J. Greene's "The Sparks of Memory: How Brain-Cell Links Create Our Past—and Future" in *Scientific American Mind* (July/August 2010).

<sup>67</sup> Scripts, or texts, are not entirely representative of the characters actors play in performance. Worthen cogently explains in "Drama, Performativity, and Performance" that a performance is not an interpretation of the text, but a "surrogation," as Roach coins it, of the text (1101). By studying part scripts, I am not arguing for one particular interpretation of the text in performance or for the domination of text in performance. My analysis seeks to understand how the actors' parts came together to form a whole in the early modern period, while fully acknowledging that we can never recover a performance through text alone.

that we rely on for different contexts.<sup>68</sup> Early modern actors, working in a repertory system, would rely on their fellow actors, previous parts, and play genres to perform a “new” part in a play. Distributed cognition attests to the fact that we rely on tools and relationships to operate in our social environment. While Edwin Hutchins has focused on how tools, artifacts, and group problem solving help us operate in our work environments,<sup>69</sup> and Evelyn Tribble has shown how early modern actors could rely on a system of distributed cognition to help them perform, I argue that language scaffolding and social distributed cognition also aid early modern actors in performing parts *across* plays so that they can introduce new plays into their repertoire.

This chapter further explores how distributed social cognition aided early modern actors’ performances by arguing that Shakespeare created units of plays: a particular unit would function as a network of memories for the actors, a shorthand code that allowed them to reconstruct traces of their previous partnerships, emotional and physical characteristics, and speeches into new plays that possessed similar structures. Analyzing the technology built into specific parts in *Macbeth* (1605-06), *Antony and Cleopatra* (1606-07), and *Coriolanus* (1607-08)<sup>70</sup> for character groupings, affective prompts, the structure of entrances and exits, and speech patterns reveals how actors could incorporate previous part and relationship dynamics when performing new plays. My intent in this analysis is not to pin down the plays to more specific dates of performance or composition, but to show how Shakespeare’s part structures could have helped integrate new plays into the King’s Men’s repertory. While structuring a unit of plays would help

---

<sup>68</sup> As August Boal acknowledges in *Theatre of the Oppressed*, “Each one of us, in real life, exhibits a type of pre-established, mechanized behavior. We create habits of thought, of language, of profession. All our relations in daily life are patterned. These patterns are our ‘masks,’ as are also the ‘masks’ of the characters” (168).

<sup>69</sup> See Edwin Hutchins’s *Cognition in the Wild* in which Hutchins first discovered and defined “socially distributed cognition” through naval expert group studies (xii). Before this study, he was calling his study of nautical work spaces as investigating “naturally situated cognition” (xii).

<sup>70</sup> Roslyn Knutson’s *The Repertory of Shakespeare’s Company* dates *Macbeth* for the 1605-06 playing season, *Antony and Cleopatra* for 1606-07, and *Coriolanus* for 1607-08 (107); whereas Andrew Gurr lumps the three plays together as acquired in 1606-09 (284).

each actor learn and remember his parts, this method could be invaluable to a player with larger parts, especially if the actor had intermediate instead of advanced skills: if one actor, presumably a younger male, played Lady Macbeth, Cleopatra, and Volumnia, he could rely on patterns within the parts to memorize and perform these roles.

Although critics have argued about the likelihood (or unlikelihood) that Shakespeare and other dramatists wrote parts with particular actors in mind (beyond the main role), not many have closely explored patterns between the parts and relationships to argue for or against actor and relationship-based composition.<sup>71</sup> Nor have scholars spent as much time as warranted on how Shakespeare and other dramatists might have written new plays with mnemonic devices that helped actors memorize their parts and character interactions for a performance that might never be repeated if the play was not well-received. Contesting Tiffany Stern's comment in *Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan* that Shakespeare's actors played "roughly the same part,"<sup>72</sup> Evelyn Tribble argues that "while some specialization seems to have occurred, especially in the case of the leading man and the clown, the implication that players had 'a formula that covered every performance' confuses the framework—the types of part played—with the individual performance—the unique demands made by any one part written and performed within it" ("Distributing Cognition" 137). She further asserts that "if the parts were *too* similar to one another, the actor risked confusing his roles" (137) and cites memory "interference as a factor in forgetting" (n8, 137).

---

<sup>71</sup> Speculations about early modern performance casting dates back at least to T.W. Baldwin's *The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company* (1929), in which Baldwin painstakingly attempts to trace specific roles to the actual players in the company. For recent speculations, see David Grote's *The Best Actors in the World* (2001).

<sup>72</sup> Palfrey and Stern further describe how "typecasting" would have worked in *Shakespeare in Parts*, explaining that "though there was not one-character typecasting, there were particular characters written for certain body and humour types. For a more thorough explanation, see especially pgs 40-45.

As humanities scholars work to incorporate cognitive science studies into our interpretations, however, we have to be careful how we use scientists' findings. Some of the interference and memory distortion studies that Tribble notes to support this point actually only address lab experiments that individuals participated in at random. Memory interference and memory distortion studies from the 1950s demonstrate, for example, that if a person is given a list of words and then asked if another associated word, which was not on the list, was a part of the grouping of words that the respondents would often report that the word was on the list (Roediger and McDermott 152). While this study does connect to how actors would memorize, and *might* confuse, parts that possessed similar language, the study did not examine individuals' expert knowledge, so the study does not quite match up with professional actors memorizing parts. Another study by Loftus and Palmer (1974) reports that when people are primed with verbs that describe two cars colliding as "smashing" together instead of "hitting" one another that the respondents, who watched a video of the car crash, more often would report that the video showed shattered glass when it did not (Roediger and McDermott 154). This report, however, only shows an 18% increase in those responding inaccurately, and the individuals chosen for the experiment were not chosen for their expertise in car crashes. The stakes for remembering the exact details were therefore not elevated to a point of importance in connection with the respondents' careers. What would happen, then, if we looked at a company of actors who were quite familiar with one another's work and whose success depended upon remembering the parts for each play? In examining the parts of Lady Macbeth, Cleopatra, and Volumnia, I seek to map out a middle ground between Stern and Tribble's arguments, suggesting that the parts' conceptual and rhetorical structures would aid an actor's memory and performance.

Critics have analyzed astutely younger boy actors' roles and how playwrights used verbal cues and in-text prompts to help introduce novice actors into the repertory system.<sup>73</sup> Scholars, however, have focused less on how actors would take on and handle more difficult parts as well as keeping a handle on various parts for performance. I wish to address what I see as parts that are written for intermediate actors—female-parts, like Lady Macbeth, Cleopatra, and Volumnia, which require a range of emotions and actions, demanding more from an actor than a novice boy or ingénue female part. Evidence suggests that Burbage, or an equally talented actor, played Macbeth, Antony, and Coriolanus,<sup>74</sup> whereas scholars debate whether a talented boy actor or an adult male played the parts of Lady Macbeth, Volumnia, and Cleopatra.<sup>75</sup> Regardless of the actor's age, I believe that the female parts were written for the same actor to perform, or at the very least, written with the same actor in mind because the character dynamics, language, and the actors' cues possess noticeable connections.

In order to understand the cue and prompt system for these intermediate parts, however, it is important to review what scholars have discovered about novice parts. In discussing early modern dramatic structure and boy actors' roles, Evelyn Tribble notes, "In the larger sense, of course, all theatrical action is scaffolded in that it takes place within a highly structured social and physical environment that supports and prompts the complex cognitive work of performing a play" (7-8). As Tribble points out, when discussing the structure of boy actors' parts,

---

<sup>73</sup> For a study of historical records involving the boys in the company and speculations, based on the records, about how novice roles would help prepare boy actors to play larger roles, see Catherine Belsey's "Shakespeare's Little Boys: Theatrical Apprenticeship and the Construction of Childhood."

<sup>74</sup> As Andrew Gurr states in *The Shakespeare Company, 1594-1642* (2004) Burbage was "the most celebrated actor of his time, [and] he very likely played all of Shakespeare's leading parts, including almost certainly Richard III, Hamlet, Othello, and Lear . . ." (222). See also my note on the Burbage elegy in Chapter Three on pg 70. As A.R. Braumuller observes, "Modern accounts of acting styles and production practices are largely guesswork" (280). But scholars believe that Burbage played Macbeth, Antony, and Coriolanus because he was the company's lead actor and is said to have played so many other protagonists.

<sup>75</sup> No extant cast lists exist for these three plays, and no one is certain who played the title roles, but the structure of the parts suggests that the female part was intended to be played by the same actor.

scaffolding<sup>76</sup> could mean restricting the actor's cue partners or specific cue words, prompting the boy with direction in his lines, or having a master actor lead him on or off the stage. The examples Tribble finds in Marlowe reveal that "a form of social scaffolding underpins the dramatic event; that is, the social hierarchy in the extra-dramatic world—that of the master and the boy—mirrors the hierarchy within the play" (8). Although I agree with Tribble's assessment regarding Marlowe, I would like to develop her argument about scaffolding and her previous work in distributed cognition to think about how Shakespeare's later plays demonstrate a different approach to writing female parts.

Shakespeare's larger, more emotionally complex female parts, unlike Marlowe's novice actor parts, are cued by more than one or two actors, have noticeably larger speeches, have more cues to learn, often cue other actors to enter and speak, and lead other actors offstage. Scott McMillin, who also has analyzed the importance of cues and scene composition for early modern boy actors' parts, rightly observes, "It is impossible to think of Cleopatra as a 'restricted' role," defining a part as "restricted" if one or two master actors cue the boy actor's lines (237). Instead, he refers to the part as a "wide-ranging" role because Cleopatra "has 200 speeches, which are cued by eighteen characters" and "begins new scenes eight times—that is, she speaks the opening lines without a cue when she enters after the stage has been cleared of its previous grouping" (237). McMillin uses textual facts to argue that Cleopatra is played by a more experienced boy, while Desdemona could be played by a more novice boy-actor who rehearsed with his sharer. I am more concerned, however, with what Cleopatra's part-knowledge reveals and how this evidence can be used to speculate about the actor's performance, regardless of whether he rehearsed with or without a scene partner.

---

<sup>76</sup> As Tribble notes, the term originates with Lev Vygotsky's work in children's psychological development; scaffolding can refer to any method in which children receive aid from adults that helps them reach a higher level of learning, thus allowing them to develop as they use what they have learned to solve problems (7).

McMillin defines “restricted” roles as those in which one or two master actors would cue the boy actor’s lines, but I would argue that easier roles do not have to be cued by the same actors as long as they provide pre-performance information, a type of scaffolding, as Evelyn Tribble notes. I agree with McMillin that Shakespeare may have written “restricted” roles for more novice boy-actors, but I do not think that novice or intermediate actors could always rely on rehearsing with a master regardless of the play’s structure. Having the emotion prompts and plot information within their lines as well as familiar character relationships and similar cues would be what they followed, watched, and listened for in performance. Whereas McMillin impressively analyzes the percentages of lines and who cued whom, it is just as important to also look at what knowledge the actors’ parts contained versus what information lay outside of the part, indicating what expression and emotion prompts they memorized and which ones they had to act upon in performance with little or no rehearsal time to prepare for their interactions. For example, much of Cleopatra’s role is scaffolded so that the actor would not have to rehearse with anyone because he knows from her lines what the character is about to hear, but the actor only has partial control over the scene’s pace. His dilemma then, would be acting as if he did not know what was about to happen before the other actors spoke their lines. The Cleopatra-part, like the Lady Macbeth and Volumnia-parts, contains emotion prompts, plot information, familiar character relationships, and similar cue patterns that help the intermediate-skilled actor play his part even if the role is not “restricted.”

Commenting on the boy actor’s lines in the final scene of Marlowe’s *Edward II*, Tribble asserts, “for the first time he commands rather than is commanded, taking charge both within the fiction of the play and on the stage itself. Marlowe thus layers the character’s trajectory during the play over the young actor’s move from scaffolded and restricted scenes to independent

command of the stage” (14). While Marlowe uses this technique in *Edward II* for his boy actor, Shakespeare uses a very different way of prompting the young actor who plays Lady Macbeth, Cleopatra, and Volumnia. Actor and character relationships do not always complement each other in Shakespeare’s plays. In the case of Lady Macbeth, Cleopatra, and Volumnia, the supposedly less experienced actor at times controls the Macbeth, Antony, and Coriolanus-actor; in other moments, the actors are equal in knowledge and affective prompts; and in still other instances the Lady Macbeth, Volumnia, and Cleopatra-actor relies on the master player for affective cues.

Obviously, the Lady Macbeth, Cleopatra, and Volumnia parts, which are larger and more complex, are meant to be played by a talented actor, but that does not mean that the same actor who played a part like Cordelia or Regan could not also be equipped and trained to play a larger role like Cleopatra based on Shakespeare’s employment of scaffolding within and *across* plays. Dialogue from the three plays reveals how each play’s part builds on and speaks back to one another, making lines, perhaps, easier to memorize and relationships easier for actors to fashion while they still improvise new speeches and moments on stage. In analyzing these parts, I am not arguing for what Sutton describes as the “temptation, common in cognitive-scientific investigation of complex collective action in specific cultural contexts, to think that some single or determinate component of the overall system (such as the cue-scripts, the plots, or the individual actors) must have fully encoded ‘the play’ in order for a successful performance to emerge in practice” (311). But I do believe patterns in specific parts, partnerships, and groupings need further attention. Granted, the actors’ world is constantly shifting, malleable to the characters’ personalities, social status, and emotional revelations, and the parts are not the only “artifacts” which would aid the players’ performance, but the underlying structure for the parts

establishes a pattern for the actors, a network of memories that they reference in creating and building upon each part and relationship.

### **Character and Relationship Codes for Performance**

Within each of these three plays, characters of both genders comment on how the female character is stronger, or more powerful, than her male counterpart. Most notably, Antony's masculinity is called into question by his followers at the start of the play, yet like Coriolanus and Macbeth, he is a renowned warrior. Both the Lady Macbeth and Cleopatra parts emotionally control their respective partners in the plays' opening scenes, while losing this power at various points as the plays develop. Coriolanus and Volumnia's relationship does not come into focus until the second act, but their dynamic, though son and mother, is quite similar to the two previous partnerships. Beginning by analyzing the structure of *Macbeth*, the earliest play, and continuing to see how structural patterns resurface in *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus* reveals a framework of character and relationship codes that the actors could reference as they perform the new plays.

Given the fame of Antony and Cleopatra, the actors most likely already knew that Cleopatra would control Antony within the play,<sup>77</sup> but they could not fully know from each part and its respective cue lines how this character dynamic would play out as they performed the roles on stage, and a brief rehearsal period would not give them time to choreograph their movements and become overly familiar with each other's speeches. Looking back to Lady

---

<sup>77</sup> By the time Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* was written (ca. 1606), several plays about the two lovers had already been published in the late sixteenth century. The Countess of Pembroke's *Antonie* was printed in 1592, and Samuel Daniel's *Cleopatra*, originally published in 1594, went through three subsequent publications by 1607 (Bevington 1). Among other scholars, David Bevington observes that Daniel's fourth edition, when compared to Shakespeare's play, demonstrates that Daniel might have revised his play after seeing or reading Shakespeare's play, but other scholars, like Ernest Schanzer, have argued that these revisions could also have been based on Pembroke's *Antonie* and Plutarch's writings (1). The couple's lives were also described in Plutarch's "The Life of Marcus Antonius" as well as numerous medieval and Renaissance writers' works. For a detailed account of Shakespeare's possible sources, see David Bevington's introduction to the New Cambridge edition of *Antony and Cleopatra* (1-13).

Macbeth and Macbeth's first scene, we can draw some comparisons between the two couples that the actors could rely upon for the opening scene of *Antony and Cleopatra* if they had little time to rehearse. In *Macbeth*, entrances and exits visually demonstrate Lady Macbeth and Macbeth's power struggles and emotional vulnerability. Moreover, the Lady Macbeth-actor's part provides him with a great amount of knowledge about each scene, but in later scenes, the Lady Macbeth-character, like Cleopatra, is not always in control emotionally.

In his first scene, the Lady Macbeth-player controls the emotional tempo and intensity with his lines, functioning as the dominant player as he commands the other players' entrances and exits and cues their first speeches. In contrast with other female and boy parts, the Lady Macbeth-actor enters and delivers an evocative, lengthy soliloquy on stage. This actor would then also be responsible for cuing the attendant for his entrance with "[thee crowned] withal," cuing him to speak with "[is your] tidings?," and getting him off the stage with orders to take care of the messenger. But this exchange serves as more of an interruption of Lady Macbeth's soliloquy than a powerful message or cue for the actor since Lady Macbeth's next lines reveal that the actor would know prior to the performance the attendant's message.

Unlike the Cleopatra-part, Lady Macbeth's character reveals much more about the kind of woman she is within her first lines, probably to provide more instruction for the actor as well as more description for the audience to follow the plot points since they would have been more familiar with Cleopatra's fame. In the letter the Lady Macbeth-actor enters reading, Macbeth calls his wife "my dearest partner of greatness," and in the soliloquy Lady Macbeth reveals her concern that Macbeth is "too full o'th'milk of human kindness" (1.5.9-10, 15). Instructions such as these placed in the female part inform the actor learning the part that Lady Macbeth carries herself boldly and thinks of herself as more cunning than her husband.

While Macbeth's entrance should serve as a moment in which ordinarily the wife would yield control to the husband and the younger actor would defer to the master, Macbeth's presence and lines function much like the attendant's words in that they do not change the Lady Macbeth-actor's understanding or control in the scene; therefore, Shakespeare reverses the audience's expectations as well as the Macbeth-actor's simulated understanding of his part. From his part, the Macbeth-player would know that Macbeth tells his wife about Duncan's visit, when he will leave, and that they will talk more about it later. His cues, "[in the] instant," "[when goes] hence?," and "[sway and] masterdom," for his brief half-lines, which are shared lines, provide him with no scaffolding for what his character will experience. Yet as the more experienced actor, he would not need to be provided with emotional prompts prior to the performance; he would react to the female part's prompting instead, showing his skill as an actor and cognitive control by the way he constructs his emotions and his relationship with the other actor through the lines he hears and the physical prompts he receives on stage.

### Table 5.1 Lady Macbeth and Macbeth Parts for 1.5

In this table, I have **bolded** lines that the actors would probably assume were **shared lines**. In-text prompts that direct the Lady Macbeth-actor in how to instruct and react to the Macbeth-actor's expressions are *italicized*, as is Macbeth's first line that sets the tone for the couple's relationship. The final shared line, which seems to encourage stichomythia as well as physical interaction and instruction, is **bolded and italicized**.

Lady Macbeth-part Excerpt for 1.5

...

Nor Heaven peepe through the Blanket of the darke,

To cry, hold, hold. [Enter Macbeth]

Great Glamys, worthy Cawdor,

Greater then both, by the all-haile hereafter,

Thy Letters have transported me beyond

This ignorant present, and I feele now

**The future in the instant.**

\_\_\_\_\_ [here to] Night.

**And when goes hence?**

\_\_\_\_\_ [as he] purposes.

O never,

Shall Sunne that Morrow see.

*Your Face, my Thane, is as a Booke,* where men

May reade strange matters, to beguile the time.

Macbeth-part for 1.5

\_\_\_\_\_ [cry, hold,] hold.

*Enter Macbeth.*

\_\_\_\_\_ [in the] instant.

***My dearest Loue,***

**Duncan comes here to Night.**

\_\_\_\_\_ [when goes] hence?

**Tomorrow, as he purposes.**

\_\_\_\_\_ [sway, and] Masterdome.

***We will speake further,***

(TLN 404-26)

*Looke like the time, beare welcome in your Eye,  
Your Hand, your Tongue: looke like th' innocent flower,  
But be the Serpent under't. He that's comming,  
Must be provided for: and you shall put  
This Nights great Businesse into my dispatch,  
Which shall to all our Nights, and Dayes to come,  
Give solely soveraigne sway, and Masterdome.*

\_\_\_\_\_ [will speake] further,

***Onely looke up cleare:***

To alter favor, ever is to feare:

*Leave all the rest to me. Exit*

(Folio TLN 404-29)

Shakespeare scripts the Lady Macbeth-actor to try to dominate the Macbeth-player physically, aurally, and emotionally. The Macbeth-actor could react in opposition to the other actor's lines and instructions, but the Lady-Macbeth actor ultimately wields the dominant aural power of the scene because of the female parts' passionate lines. The younger actor cues Macbeth's entrance with the repeated cue "'Hold, hold.'" A repeated cue can give the actor speaking it power because he can decide when to deliver the repetition and make the other actors wait (Palfrey and Stern 238).<sup>78</sup> As the preceding lines for the part increase in a chant-like tempo, if the Lady Macbeth-actor were to deliver the entrance cue word directly to the Macbeth-actor, acknowledging his presence and making him wait for him to continue speaking, the master actor could respond as if the younger actor controls him with his words and body language, mirroring Lady Macbeth's power over her husband. This response would create a dynamic visual effect since the Macbeth-actor, perhaps unbeknownst to him based on his part and cue, must wait four more lines before he is allowed to speak; what is more, while his character has four shared lines in this exchange, the Lady Macbeth-player delivers fourteen full-lines, finishes three of his four shared lines by prompting him with a question for one of them and contradicting him when completing the other two, and uses two half-lines to physically direct the scene.

<sup>78</sup> As Palfrey and Stern note, "Repeated cues [can also] direct actors toward real ensemble playing, and to dialogues that are interpretive, staccato, polyphonic, chorused, or harmonically scored" (240).

The Lady Macbeth-actor calls Macbeth “Great Glamis” and “worthy Cawdor,” so that the Macbeth-actor would swell with pride as he completes her line with “My dearest love” (55). But when the Lady Macbeth-player vows, “O never / Shall sun that morrow see” (58-59), he pauses, indicating a shift in passion. As Palfrey and Stern point out, “short speech units [in verse] are always prompts for action” (346). Taking advantage of the pause, the Macbeth actor can physically express Macbeth’s shock while the Lady Macbeth-actor, after her first half-line, prompts the audience members to pay attention to his face as they hear the lines: “Your face, my thane, is as a book where men / May read strange matters to beguile the time” (60-61). Meanwhile, the Lady Macbeth-actor can further the two actors’ physical connection and continue to influence the Macbeth-actor’s facial expressions and body language by imploring: “Look like the time, bear welcome in your eye, / Your hand, your tongue” (62-63). The Lady Macbeth-player’s instructions to “look like the innocent flower / But be the serpent under’t” (63) would prompt the Macbeth-actor to express Macbeth’s initial fears as Lady Macbeth instructs her husband in how to prepare for Duncan. Macbeth attempts to prevent or delay her plot with “We will speak further—” but the Lady Macbeth-actor interrupts the master actor, stating “Only look up clear; / To alter favour ever is to fear. / Leave all the rest to me,” leading his master off the stage with the rhymed couplet that provides an expressive cue and the ending half-line that gives him a final assurance.

With these words Shakespeare’s actors set up the dynamics of the Macbeths’ relationship in a way that the actors could use when they play Antony and Cleopatra, the next couple whose master and young actor “roles” are reversed. In this context, Antony and Cleopatra’s relationship in the beginning becomes a parody of the Macbeths’ relationship, where the two fight over Fulvia instead of Duncan. In the opening scene of *Antony and Cleopatra*, the Philo-actor

instructs the actor playing Demetrius to look in disgust at Antony's behavior toward Cleopatra: Antony's "goodly eye" and "captain's heart" has been "transformed" by his lasciviousness for Cleopatra. In studying his cue the Cleopatra-actor would know that he enters on "[gypsy's] lust" and speaks after "[behold and] see" (1.1.13) but in performance the actor would more than likely hear at least Philo's last two lines as he enters with the Antony-actor: "The triple pillar of the world transform'd / Into a strumpet's fool: Behold and see" (1.1.12-13). Therefore, the Cleopatra-actor would know that Antony's followers are to act from the play's inception as if Cleopatra has too much power over Antony; this information, in turn, would affect how the player responds to the actors who are already on stage as well as to Antony after their entrance. The rest of the emotion cues that the Cleopatra-actor must express in this scene Shakespeare either provides for him in Cleopatra's lines or has Antony provide. For example, from his lines, the Cleopatra-actor would know that a messenger arrives with news for Antony, and Cleopatra fears the news will demand his appearance in Rome; yet she feigns that she wants him to hear the message while delivering deprecating descriptions of Caesar and Fulvia. As she plagues Antony with guilt, she simultaneously taunts his followers with the lack of regard she carries for the "scarce-bearded" Caesar and "shrill-tongued" Fulvia; knowing this information prior to the performance, the Cleopatra-actor could improvise how he would physically express Cleopatra's rudeness to Antony's followers while alternating between sexually tempting Antony and upbraiding him for his shortcomings.

The Cleopatra-actor has a few less lines in the scene, but for the most part, he overpowers the Antony-actor through the female part's emotional speeches and strong cues, while the Antony-actor must react to the rules of the game that the female part sets in place. From his lines and cues, the Antony-actor would know that Cleopatra plays the "wrangling queen" in this

scene: this line reveals that whether the queen “chide,” “laugh,” or “weep,” Antony thinks her perfect. The Antony-actor would not know from his part, however, the insults that Cleopatra heaps upon his estranged wife and Caesar. In addition, the Cleopatra-actor cues him at the beginning of the scene, indicating the power Cleopatra has over Antony and the power that the actor playing the female’s part has over the male-part.

Shakespeare provides Antony with twenty full-lines and five shared lines in this first scene and Cleopatra with fifteen full-lines, four shared lines, and two half-lines. Analyzing the function of the Antony actor’s five shared lines, we see that he finishes Cleopatra’s line three times, starts a line that Cleopatra finishes once, and cuts off the messenger’s line, wanting him to be quick. All five of these shared lines are either perfunctory, such as the one with the messenger, or designed to please and bow to Cleopatra. In contrast, Cleopatra’s four shared lines and two half-lines are much stronger in prompting him to action while shocking the listeners with her brazen attitude. The Cleopatra-actor negates Antony’s command for brevity with a half-line of his own that begins Cleopatra’s first speech about Caesar and Fulvia, which ends with “Perform’t, or else we damn thee” (1.1.25). The Antony-actor finishes this passionate line with his dull question: “How, my love?” (1.1.25). Her second half-line begins her second tirade about the message after this question while the next shared line contradicts Antony’s vow of love. Her lines then end in another shared line that accuses Antony of loving Fulvia, which he denies. With her final shared line in this scene, she stubbornly commands Antony to “Hear the ambassadors” (49). This last command Antony answers with “Fie, wrangling queen” and after delivering a speech about her beauty and the power it has over him, conducts her off stage without hearing Caesar’s message.

The Cleopatra-actor's lines in the first scene seek to control the Antony-actor's emotional responses until the end of the scene when the Antony-actor leads her off stage after refusing to hear the message. Cleopatra berates Antony,

Call in the messengers! As I am Egypt's Queen,  
Thou blushest, Antony, and that blood of thine  
Is Caesar's homage; else so thy cheek pays shame  
When shrill-tongued Fulvia scolds. The messengers!" (1.1.30-33)

The Cleopatra-actor part, then, not only forces the Antony-actor to follow his lead in movement and speech, but the female part also instructs the Antony-actor in his passions and expressions, here stating that the Antony-actor shows guilt for his estrangement from his wife; in his answering speech, Antony negates the emotion she accuses him of, but not the expressive direction, when he proclaims his love with both passion for Cleopatra and anger at Caesar's summoning him. Yet, like the Macbeth and Lady Macbeth roles, nowhere in this scene does the Antony-part verbally instruct Cleopatra in emotions, and the Cleopatra-actor knows from his cues and speech how Antony reacts to Cleopatra's words, except for the final speech in which the Antony-actor conducts him off stage.

Scholars often note Antony and Cleopatra's range of emotions and contend that they are two of Shakespeare's most emotionally volatile creations. Antony is unlike Macbeth in that "like Coriolanus, Shakespeare's other great Roman soldier, he never intellectualizes, has practically no soliloquies and acts always upon impulse" (Wilders 44). But both Antony and Macbeth are under their partner's commanding spell. While he finds his wife endearing, Coriolanus has an unusually strong connection with his politically shrewd mother, suggesting remnants of these two strong female lover parts in this fierce maternal role.

Scenes between Coriolanus and Volumnia, unlike the parts in *Macbeth* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, do not occur until Act Two, and their first scene together is short and full of other

characters; however, the scene has the same pattern as the Macbeths' first scene. Both the Volumnia-part and the Lady Macbeth-part are written so that the player enters and repeats what the audience already knows about the male protagonist's triumph, so in addition to providing the audience with the female's perspective and showing them the characters' strong bond, Shakespeare wrote this opening as a way for the player acting the female part to have pre-performance information about the present and the subsequent scenes. Entering with Virgilia and Valeria, Volumnia eagerly anticipates her son's arrival as Menenius and she discuss Coriolanus's victory: "the Senate has letters from the General, wherein he gives my son the whole name of the war. He hath in this action outdone his former deeds doubly" (2.1.133-35). These lines echo Macbeth's letter, which Lady Macbeth reads aloud in 1.5: "[The witches] met me in the day of success . . . . Whiles I stood rapt in wonder came missives from the King, who all-hailed me 'Thane of Cawdor' . . ." (1.5.1-2,5-7). Although Macbeth's letter also contains information about the witches' prophecy, the two female parts are equivalent in nature because they each repeat what the audience already knows in order to demonstrate the male protagonist's bond with his respective wife or mother.

After announcing the male protagonist's success, each female part shifts the focus to the male warrior's absent body. Volumnia rejoices that her son has more battle scars to prove his courage: "[he is wounded] I'th shoulder and i'th' left arm. There will be large cicatrices to show the people, when he shall stand for his place" (2.1.133-35, 146-49). Instead of Macbeth's physical wounds, Lady Macbeth discusses his flawed psychological traits that she wants to cure: his "nature" which is "too full o'th' milk of human kindness" and his "ambition" that lacks the "illness" that "impedes thee from the golden round" (1.5.14-17, 26). Each character fixates on the new place of honor she desires for her son or husband. But the Volumnia-part also carries



I have lived  
 To see inherited my very wishes  
 And the buildings of my fancy. Only  
 There's one thing wanting, which I doubt not but  
 Our Rome will cast upon thee. (197-201)

This speech bears resemblance to Lady Macbeth's lines from the earlier play: "Thy letters have transported me beyond / This ignorant present, and I feel now / The future in the instant" (56-58). Yet unlike Lady Macbeth's instructions to "look up clear," Volumnia must wait until Act Three to persuade Coriolanus to placate the citizens with counterfeit expressions. Coriolanus finishes Volumnia's last line, and Cominius is responsible for prompting the sound cue for everyone to leave the stage, while Lady Macbeth finishes Macbeth's "We will speak further" and leads him off stage.

### **Structuring Memory Scaffolding through Triangulation and Surrogation**

While the actors playing Macbeth and Lady Macbeth, Antony and Cleopatra, and Coriolanus and Volumnia have similar speech and cue patterns, the structure of the plays' scenes also often produce an image of the triangulation that exists between the three main characters (Macbeth, Lady Macbeth, and Macduff; Antony, Cleopatra, and Octavius; and Coriolanus, Volumnia, and Aufidius), while the three actors themselves are rarely, if ever, on stage together in the same scene. This triangulation symbolizes the couple's ultimate ambition, which often is reproduced by surrogates, as the two characters are usually plotting against someone who is offstage. For *Macbeth*, Lady Macbeth and Macbeth's scenes revolve around securing and keeping the throne, with the characters' dialogue focusing on eliminating their rivals: Duncan, then Banquo, and finally Macduff. In *Antony and Cleopatra*, the couple defies Rome at all costs: Fulvia, Octavia, and Octavius all serve as surrogates of Roman rule. Finally, in *Coriolanus* mother and son bond over their hatred of Rome's enemies: for Volumnia and Coriolanus, the

mob of citizens represent Rome's impurities or a weaker race of people, while Aufidius symbolizes the impending deterioration of Rome. These moments where the two main characters speak about a third absent body (or bodies of the mob) reinforce the oppositional substructure that breathes life into each play's narrative, encouraging the actors to perform particular routines to create and recreate moments within and across these three plays.

In order to explore this trajectory, I would like to first point out some consistencies and oppositions in the speech patterns in *Macbeth* and then continue to look at how these patterns resurface in *Antony and Cleopatra* and *Coriolanus*. In Act One, scene seven, the Lady Macbeth-actor has thirty-four full-lines, seven shared lines, and one broken line. Within these lines, Lady Macbeth poses eleven questions to her husband. The Macbeth-actor opens the scene with a twenty-eight line soliloquy, after which he cues the Lady-Macbeth actor's entrance. He also cues the Lady Macbeth-player's first line, but the Macbeth-part only has thirteen full-lines, one half-line, seven shared lines, and one broken line. Compared to the Lady-Macbeth actor's tirade of questions, he has only five. The Macbeth-actor does cue the couple's exit with the rhyming couplet "mock the time with fairest show, / False face must hide what the false heart doth know" (1.7.81-82), but these lines merely speak back to Lady Macbeth's rhyming couplet about disguising emotions with a pleasant face, "Only look up clear; / To alter favour ever is to fear" (1.5.69-70), which the Lady Macbeth-player spoke at the end of 1.5 as he led the Macbeth-actor off stage. Intriguingly, the second scene of Act Two inverts some of the patterns set up in 1.7.

The temporal scene structure between 2.1 and 2.2 reinforces the image of the Duncan, Macbeth, and Lady Macbeth triangulation, a vital unit of the first section of the play. The Macbeth-actor has a thirty-one and a half-line soliloquy in 2.1 that cues the Lady Macbeth actor's entrance for 2.2: reversing the speech structure by having the Lady Macbeth-actor speak

a soliloquy at the beginning of the scene provides Macbeth with a chance to murder Duncan off stage. The Duncan-actor is absent from the stage, but both Macbeth and Lady Macbeth's speeches reference him and the act of the murder, so his off-stage presence is created through the words that they speak. At the end of his 2.1 soliloquy, the Macbeth-actor has two rhyming couplets separated by a line that prompts his attention to the sound cue:

Which now suits it. Whiles I threat, he lives;  
 Words to the heat of deeds too cold breath gives.  
 I go, and it is done. The bell invites me.  
 Hear it not, Duncan, for it is a knell  
 That summons thee to heaven or to hell. (60-64)

In learning the part, the Macbeth-actor would see that the first couplet is his call to shift his character's musings to a more active resolve. While for Macbeth the bell functions as his wife's code that she has drugged the guards so that he can murder Duncan, for the Macbeth-player, the bell also functions as the sound cue for him to speak his last rhymed couplet in the scene and exit to "kill" Duncan. The Macbeth-actor's last two lines are ironic when thinking about them from the Duncan-actor's perspective: it does not matter whether he hears the sound cue or not because he no longer needs to be cued to be on stage to play Duncan. Therefore, the three actors do not experience this triangulation on stage, but Macbeth's words and exit along with Lady Macbeth's entrance allows the audience to associate the three characters as a unit. With Duncan's death, a new triangulation appears at the end of 2.2 with Macduff knocking at the gate.

This bell cue foreshadows the sound cues of 2.2, which drive the beginning and the end of the scene for the actors and contribute to the characters' paranoia that their deed has been discovered. While the bell cues the Macbeth-actor to exit, the owl shrieking reveals to the audience and Lady Macbeth that Macbeth has murdered Duncan. For the Lady Macbeth-actor, the owl shriek prompts him to shift from conveying his character's unfeminine boldness through

beautifully contrasted images spoken in iambic pentameter to waiting anxiously for the Macbeth-actor to enter. The actor would sense this change not only because of the sound cue, but also because he switches from speaking in two lines in perfect pentameter to speaking a nine-syllable line followed by an iambic line with a feminine ending:

That which hath made them drunk, hath made me bold;  
 What hath quench'd them, hath given me fire.  
 Hearke, peace: It was the Owle that shriek'd,  
 The fatal Bell-man, which gives the stern'st good-night. (TLN 648-51)

Again, while two of the three characters are absent from the stage, the sound cue becomes the surrogate for the triangulation, indicating the imagined action that takes place between the other two characters off stage.

During 2.2 the female part controls the action. The Lady Macbeth-actor's soliloquy is interrupted by the Macbeth actor's entrance; therefore, the Lady Macbeth-player cues the other actor's entrance and his first line as well as the action that indicates that they find each other on stage. The young male actor also cues his own exit during the scene and with this exit, he cues the first knock on the door. When he enters again, he breaks off the Macbeth-actor's brief soliloquy, and more knocks are interspersed in the Lady Macbeth-actor's speech. In comparison to their previous scene, the Lady Macbeth-actor cues their departure with his lines, but the Macbeth-actor has the final lines. The most intriguing similarity between 1.7 and 2.2 is the number of questions the two actors ask each other: the Macbeth-actor asks eleven questions, and the Lady Macbeth-player asks five. The likelihood of this numerical reversal being a coincidence is less warranted than the argument that Shakespeare structured the reversal to provide the actors with a way to create two scenes that are structurally opposite in speech and cue patterns to mirror the reversal in power that the characters are experiencing based on the imagined action that has occurred off stage.

Act One, scene three in *Antony and Cleopatra* has some interesting similarities and inversions of the cues in 1.7 of *Macbeth*: the actors' speeches again use rhetorical questions, commands, pathos, and hyperbole to communicate that Cleopatra is affectively controlling the scene and Antony must follow her lead. Unlike the *Macbeth* scene, 1.3 in *Antony and Cleopatra* opens with dialogue between Cleopatra and Charmian instead of a soliloquy, so the Cleopatra-actor first enters and cues the Charmian-actor to speak, demanding an answer to "Where is he?" (1.3.1). Although the scene opens with dialogue between the two women, Cleopatra's question mirrors Lady Macbeth's first line in 1.7, "Why have you left the chamber?" (29), when she enters after Macbeth's soliloquy. Each character's objective as she enters the scene is to find her weaker partner so that she can manipulate him. The Charmian-actor cues the Antony-actor's entrance with his couplet that provides Cleopatra about advice in how to keep Antony's love, which Cleopatra ignores. Instead of "cross[ing] him in nothing," the Cleopatra-actor pretends to be so full of emotion, "sick and sullen," that "the sides of nature / Will not sustain it" (1.3.14, 17-18). After Antony finishes this line with "Now my dearest queen—" and finishes Cleopatra's next command of "Pray you, stand farther from me!" with "What's the matter?" (18, 19), Cleopatra begins a tirade that reveals remnants of Lady Macbeth's fury with her husband when he wanted to back out of their murderous plans.

Like Lady Macbeth, Cleopatra comments on Antony's appearance within her first few lines of this first speech: "I know by that same eye there's some good news, / What says the married woman you may go?" (20, 21). The facetious remark that he has "good news" and the epilexis "you may go?" are meant to stir Antony's guilt and grief. Cleopatra continues to heap blame upon her lover with her defeated exclamation: "Would she had never given you leave to come! / Let her not say 'tis I that keep you here / I have no power upon you; hers you are" (22-

24). These lines weakly imitate Lady Macbeth's rhetorical questions and accusations when Macbeth changes his mind about killing Duncan:

Was the hope drunk  
Wherein you dressed yourself? Hath it slept since?  
And wakes it now to look so green and pale  
At what it did so freely? From this time,  
Such I account thy love. Art thou afeard  
To be the same in thine own act and valour,  
As thou art in desire? (TLN 512-18)

Both female parts call their male counterparts cowards for seeking to honour their stately duties instead of serving themselves. The Cleopatra-actor's tactics in this scene continue to emulate the Lady Macbeth-actor's rhetorical strategies: although this role has far fewer questions, four instead of eleven, like the Lady Macbeth-part, Cleopatra's speeches pile a string of lines filled with remorse onto Antony, pressuring him to show his allegiance to Cleopatra through words and action instead of speaking about his duty to Rome. The Cleopatra-actor's lines have traces of the Lady Macbeth-actor's words: Cleopatra's vow "Oh, never was there queen / So mightily betrayed!" is a lighter version of "What beast was't then / That made you break this enterprise to me?" (47-48). While possessing the same reproachful tone as Lady Macbeth's words, Shakespeare seems to have written Cleopatra's lines in this scene as statements instead of questions to convey the scene's context and the characters' less immediate time constraints and motivations. While the Macbeths' scene is intimate, two of Cleopatra's maidservants observe Cleopatra and Antony's scene. The exchange between Antony and Cleopatra is also thirty percent longer in line length than the Macbeths' altercation. The increased length of the scene demonstrates that their dispute has fewer temporal constraints than the Macbeths scene: Duncan can only be murdered that night, whereas Cleopatra is trying to persuade Antony not to make a long journey to Rome. The scene's stakes are therefore not as high as the scene between Lady



(59-61). Lady Macbeth's "We fail?" could indicate that she is mocking Macbeth, questioning the possibility along with him, or acknowledging the consequences.<sup>79</sup> But the use of *conduplicatio*, the repeating variations of "we fail," places emphasis on the couple's agreement in the enterprise while foreshadowing that they ultimately will fail to keep the throne.

Volumnia's first prolonged interaction with Coriolanus also serves as a scene of persuasion in which, like Lady Macbeth, she instructs the male warrior in how to act in order to gain more power. Similar to Antony and Cleopatra's discussion, Volumnia and Coriolanus's dialogue in 3.2 has observers. Volumnia's methods of persuasion, however, are more mature than Cleopatra's impatient display of emotions and softer than Lady Macbeth's rhetoric. Her speeches, like the previous two parts, often begin with half lines, completing Coriolanus, the senator, or Menenius's line, and end on half lines, as the senators are all too eager to agree with her while Coriolanus often defiantly interrupts her persuasions with bitter retorts. Even though the Volumnia-part contains a few rhetorical questions, they subtly persuade her son rather than overtly challenge his behaviour. But her commands and reasoning, while subtler, use rhetorical strategies that would be familiar to an actor who played Lady Macbeth and Cleopatra. When she first speaks, Volumnia appeals to Coriolanus's masculinity:

\_\_\_\_\_ [thus to] them.  
 Enter Volumnia  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [man I] am  
 O, sir, sir, sir  
 I would have had you put your power well on  
 Before you had worn it out  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Let go.  
 You might have been enough the man you are  
 With striving less to be so. Lesser had been  
 The checkings of your dispositions, if  
 You had not showed them how ye were disposed  
 Ere they lacked power to cross you. (17-24)

<sup>79</sup> As Bevington notes, "F's question mark (which stood for both modern '?' and '!') can represent either interrogation (sincere or scornful) or exclamation (surprised, scornful, or resigned)" (1.7.59 fn).

As Volumnia admonishes him for overreacting and mishandling his power, the Volumnia-actor physically touches or embraces the Coriolanus-actor, as is apparent by the Volumnia-part's cue "Let go." Her reply, "You might have been enough the man you are / With striving less to be so" speaks back to and alters Lady Macbeth's "When you durst do it, then you were a man: / And to be more than what you were, you would / Be so much more the man" (TLN 528-30). Here, Volumnia, unlike Lady Macbeth, wishes that Coriolanus had subdued his actions. But when Coriolanus replies, "Let them hang!," Volumnia vehemently chimes in, "Ay, and burn too," communicating the characters' agreement about what they would like to do with the offstage mob. While Volumnia openly wishes for the commoners deaths, she advises Coriolanus, "I have a heart as little apt as yours, / But yet a brain that leads my use of anger / To better vantage" (TLN 2120-22), echoing Lady Macbeth's instruction that Macbeth alter his face to hide his emotions.

Volumnia then switches to asking rhetorical questions that appeal to Coriolanus's logic in warfare:

. . . . I have heard you say  
 Honour and policy, like unsevered friends,  
 I'th'war do grow together. Grant that, and tell me  
 In peace what each of them by th'other lose  
 That they combine not there?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [A good] demand.  
 If it be honour in your wards to seem  
 The same you are not, which for your best ends  
 You adopt your policy, how is it less or worse  
 That it shall hold companionship in peace  
 With honour as in war, since that to both  
 It stands in like request?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [force you] this?  
 Because that now it lies you on to speak  
 To th' people, not by your own instruction,  
 Nor by th'matter which your heart prompts you,  
 But with such words that are but roted in  
 Your tongue, though bastards and syllables

Of no allowance to your bosom's truth.  
 Now, this no more dishonours you at all  
 Than to take in a town with gentle words,  
 Which else would put you to your fortune and  
 The hazard of much blood. (TLN 2136-58)

She attempts to reason with him through analogies of warfare and peace, asking him to “take in a town with gentle words” instead of wasting the “blood” of his soldiers, but Coriolanus obstinately refuses to be persuaded by the analogy. When her logical appeals do not persuade him to speak “roted” words instead of his “bosom’s truth” to the citizens, Volumnia switches to emotional appeals that evoke Lady Macbeth and Cleopatra’s manipulative rhetoric:

\_\_\_\_\_ [most inherent] baseness.  
 At thy choice, then.  
 To be of thee, it is my more dishonor  
 Than thou of them. Come all to ruin. Let  
 Thy mother rather feel thy pride than fear  
 Thy dangerous stoutness, for I mock at death  
 With as big a heart as thou. Do as thou list.  
 Thy valiantness was mine, thou suck'st it from me,  
 But owe thy pride thyself.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [of flattery] further.  
 Do your will. (TLN 2232-48)

Volumnia’s epitrope “Do as thou list” brings to mind Cleopatra’s “I have no power upon you; hers you are” (1.3.24). And her “Thy valiantness was mine, thou suck’st it from me / But owe thy pride thyself” stirs up memories of Lady Macbeth’s speech about nourishing her babe in which she challenges Macbeth’s indecisiveness, lines that also are evoked by one of Volumnia’s earlier speeches in her first scene.

### **Female Parts and the Absent Body**

The initial domestic scene in *Coriolanus*, which features Volumnia and leads up to her son’s triumphant arrival, speaks back to moments in *Macbeth* and *Antony and Cleopatra*, creating a web of memories for the actor memorizing the female parts. In this first scene in

*Coriolanus* between the three ladies (1.2), Volumnia's rhetoric is eerily similar to Lady Macbeth and Cleopatra's initial part structure. Affirming Volumnia's belief that her son should die for Rome, the actor states, "Hear me profess sincerely: had I a dozen sons, each in my love alike and none less dear than mine and my good Martius, I had rather had eleven die nobly for their country than one voluptuously surfeit out of action" (21-25). This speech's structure and content is another version, albeit in prose and less violently vivid, of Lady Macbeth's iambic verses:

I have given suck and know  
 How tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me  
 I would, while it was smiling in my face  
 Have plucked my nipple from its boneless gums  
 And dashed the brains out, had I so sworn  
 As you have done to this. (55-60)

The inverted syntax of "Had I so sworn" and "had I a dozen sons," the idioms "I had rather had" and "I would . . . Have plucked," and the vows of "how tender 'tis to love" and "each in my love alike" speak back to one another, creating a web of words and emotions for the actor to reference in performance. While Lady Macbeth would willingly murder her child, Volumnia would send hers off to war to be slaughtered for Rome. Both women vow that they would sacrifice their children for a higher cause, and both seek power through the men they have created.

Volumnia's first long speech also carries linguistic and contextual clues from Lady Macbeth's impassioned lines. Volumnia reminisces, "When yet he was but tender-bodied and the only son of my womb, when youth with comeliness plucked all gaze his way . . . . To a cruel war I sent him, from whence he returned, his brows bound with oak. I tell thee, daughter, I sprang not more in joy at first hearing he was a man-child than now in first seeing he had proved himself a man" (5-8, 13-17). The "tender" love that Lady Macbeth remembers giving a child now carries over to the "tender-bodied" babe of Volumnia's "womb;" Lady Macbeth's "pluck[ing]" the breast away from the infant shifts to the onlookers that admired Volumnia's son's beauty while

she “plucked” her own “gaze” away to send him to war; and Marcius returning from the war with “brows bound with oak” is Macbeth reincarnated, coming home from battle. Lady Macbeth who prods Macbeth with “When you durst do it, then you were a man; / And, to be more than what you were, you would / Be so much more the man” (1.7.50-52), reveals her ambitions again as Volumnia, who celebrates when her son “proved himself a man” (17). For the actor playing these two parts, these semantic and contextual similarities create an associative link to reference in performing the new part, making it easier to explore the emotional connections between the two roles to solidify his performance.

The Volumnia-part also has pieces of the Cleopatra-part’s structure as well. The first two scenes among just the women (and the eunuch in *Antony and Cleopatra*) are fairly equivalent in actor groupings and scene composition. The Cleopatra-player interacts with two actors, Charmian and Mardian, from the scene’s inception, but the Volumnia-player has two interruptions: the first, a Gentlewoman, announcing Valeria’s presence, also serves as second audience member to Volumnia’s speech about Coriolanus in battle, much like Cleopatra’s audience of three servants (only two of which speak in the scene).

Like Volumnia, who speaks first and cues the more novice actor (Virgilia), in *Antony and Cleopatra* in 1.5, Cleopatra cues Charmian to speak when she commands her to drug her with “mandragora” to pass the time in Antony’s absence; she then asks her eunuch to entertain her with song. Both commands seek to disguise her concerns for Antony with diversions, much like Volumnia wishes Virgilia to behave in a happier manner while her husband is at war so that Volumnia can envision her son’s triumphs without being infected by her daughter-in-law’s fears. The two women imagine what their respective loved ones are doing at that moment. Cleopatra asks Charmian,

Where think'st thou he is now? Stands he or sits he?  
 Or does he walk? Or is he on his horse?  
 Oh, happy horse, to bear the weight of Antony!  
 Do bravely, horse, for wot'st thou whom thou mov'st?  
 The demi-Atlas of this earth, the arm  
 And burgeonet of men. He's speaking now,  
 Or murmuring, "Where's my serpent of old Nile?" (20-26)

Charmian and Virgilia each try to avoid the dominant character's obsession with the absent figure. Whereas Charmian discourages her queen's musings, Virgilia tries to leave, but Volumnia refuses her request; instead, like Cleopatra, she tries to entice Virgilia into picturing Coriolanus as a god-like warrior:

Methinks I hear hither you husband's drum,  
 See him pluck Aufidius down by th' hair;  
 As children from a bear, the Volsces shunning him.  
 Methinks I see him stamp thus, and call thus,  
 "Come on, you cowards! You were got in fear,  
 Though you were born in Rome." (30-35)

While Cleopatra's speech is explicitly sexual, with the horse bearing the weight of Antony, the parts have strong syntactical and rhetorical links. Both female parts envision the males' strength in movement, but also picture the males' speeches as reflecting their influence. Opening with versions of thought, "think'st thou" and "methinks," both speeches vividly demonstrate the speaker's musings. Cleopatra imagines Antony longing for his Egyptian queen or "serpent" and wishing to be back in Egypt; Volumnia pictures Coriolanus insulting cowardly soldiers, as he implies that he was not "got in fear" but birthed by a fierce matriarch of Rome. In addition to the similarity in subject matter, the speeches are voiced at about the same time—a fourth of the way through the two short scenes of 80 to 100 lines.

While comparable in speech structure and emotional content, the scenes also both have a messenger interrupting the dialogue with news about the male protagonist. Both messengers, Alexas and Valeria, enter the scene at about the half-way mark and share the protagonist's feats.

In response to Alexas's first speech, the word "pluck" resurfaces in this play as Cleopatra wishes to "pluck" Antony's message from Alexas's "heart" with her "ear" (1.5.43-44); whereas Lady Macbeth's "pluck" invoked taste and Volumnia's sight, Cleopatra's "pluck" requests sound. Cleopatra asks, "What, was he sad, or merry?" (53). When Alexas replies that he was neither, Cleopatra is pleased:

Oh, well-divided disposition! Note him,  
 Note him, good Charmian, 'tis the man; but note him.  
 He was not sad, for he would shine on those  
 That make their looks by his; he was not merry,  
 Which seemed to tell them his remembrance lay  
 In Egypt with his joy; but between both.  
 Oh heavenly mingle! Be'st thou sad or merry,  
 The violence of either thee becomes,  
 So does it no man else. (56-64)

Her satisfaction with Antony's measured expression recalls Lady Macbeth's instructions for Macbeth in their initial scene together: "look like th' innocent flower, / But be the serpent under't. . . . Only look up clear / To alter favor ever is to fear" (1.5.63-64, 69-70). Although, based on Alexas's report, Antony effectively hides his emotions, Macbeth needs his wife to remind him to outwardly compose himself. Yet for the actor playing both parts, the two scenes have striking connections, as both Lady Macbeth and Cleopatra are interested in their lover's emotional state and best pleased when his emotions cannot be read on his face by others.

Coriolanus's facial expressions are also discussed briefly in the scene between the women when Valeria recounts seeing Coriolanus's son's "confirmed countenance" and his "enraged" expression as he killed a butterfly. To which, Volumnia replies, "One on's father's moods" (1.3.60-61, 64, 67). Here, Volumnia approves of her son's rage, but in later scenes, like Lady Macbeth and Cleopatra, she wishes he would disguise his emotions to gain the citizens' votes. To conclude these three initial domestic scenes, all three female parts command the exit of

the players as they respond to the male protagonist's news: Lady Macbeth focuses on Duncan's demise to promote her husband, Volumnia will witness a laboring woman's pains as she awaits her son's return, and Cleopatra will reply to Antony's letter with numerous messages. The attention to facial expressions in each scene points not only to the intimacy between the characters, who comment on their loved ones' physical manifestation of emotion, but also to the female-part actor's significant control over how the audience reads the actors' expressions.

These scenes, therefore, while having different contexts and outcomes, are structured as a network of images, relationships, emotional values, and rhetorical patterns for the actor to recall and perform anew. In *Shakespeare Thinking* Philip Davis remarks, "there are always in Shakespeare's mind millions of these verbal seeds, these nascent hints and thoughts of life—some of which go on to live and grow as people; some to become embodied in events and structures; others to find no niche and die away this time, yet perhaps to get their chance again in a different form in another play" (27-28). The parts' patterns of resemblance demonstrate that these "verbal seeds" are worked into plays again to provide Shakespeare's actors with a referential framework to shape into being on stage. Providing a comforting framework for the actors in the beginning scenes gives them confidence to exercise their passions in their final dramatic moments within each play.

Examining female character parts and relationships in *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Macbeth*, and *Coriolanus* reveals how distributed cognition and cognitive scaffolding can help us understand a playwright's part composition process as well as how actors memorized and performed so many roles in a repertory system that relied upon producing a variety of plays to bring in audiences each week. Finally, in looking at Jonson's and Shakespeare's plays from the

turn of the sixteenth century, I explore how part composition can affect an actor's spatial cognition and referential connection to parts between plays, regardless of the playwright.

## CHAPTER SIX

The “Poets’ War” and Actor Collaboration in the Chamberlain Men’s Company:

### Part Patterns and Spatial Cognition

Chapter Five examined three plays that Shakespeare composed within a two to three-year period in order to analyze the leading female parts for patterns in character relationships, affective prompts, and cue structures that would aid one actor in memorizing and performing each new role. This chapter takes social situated cognition in the playhouse a step further to investigate patterns not only across plays, but also patterns in female parts written for the Chamberlain’s Men by different playwrights. Critics often contend that Shakespeare and Jonson’s styles represent competing dramatic theories, but the playwrights’ similar technical approaches to writing parts, such as character relationships, cue partners, entrance signals, and spatial and sensorial language, suggest that actors playing parts in the two men’s plays could rely on associative links between the two men’s works to memorize their lines, perform their parts, and build upon previously established character and actor relationships in new plays. By comparing Jonson’s *Every Man Out of His Humour* to Shakespeare’s *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night*, we can come closer to determining what kinds of cognitive tools actors could rely on even when they were performing parts for different playwrights’ plays. Correlations between Jonson’s and Shakespeare’s parts suggest that the two men fashioned similar character and relationship patterns as a kind of shorthand code for the company’s actors. This system allowed the players to develop and recreate a familiar fictive performance space, or cognitive environment, where

previous movements and emotions could be mapped onto new plays' parts and scenes through the actors' reliance upon spatial cognition and language.<sup>80</sup>

In the past, scholars have viewed Shakespeare and Jonson as competitors, influenced by one another's works. Some critics argue that tension between Shakespeare, the more experienced playwright, and Jonson, the younger playwright, led to the development of their conflicting comedic styles.<sup>81</sup> At the end of the sixteenth century, Shakespeare preferred pastoral settings and romantic plots, while Jonson opted for city settings and satire. As Russ McDonald observes, "Jonson has usually been regarded as pedantic, classical, satiric, Shakespeare as natural, accessible, romantic" (103). While the two playwrights used a variety of prose and verse combinations in their plays throughout their careers, Jonson experimented more with prose in his earlier works, and Shakespeare's earliest plays relied solely on verse.<sup>82</sup> Their contrasting styles, among other anecdotal evidence, have inspired numerous studies revolving around the so-called war between the theatres, or the Poets' War between John Marston, Thomas Dekker, Jonson, and Shakespeare. Critics admirably approach the Poets' War as a battle between authors who had differing approaches to drama and to entertaining audiences, but this approach overlooks the early modern actors who performed the playwrights' parts.

---

<sup>80</sup> Evelyn Tribble also discusses fictive performance spaces, spatial cognition, and cognitive scaffolding in *Cognition in the Globe*. Tribble, however, is more concerned with entrance and exit doors and "play space" when discussing spatial cognition. While her work on cognitive scaffolding in novice boys' parts has inspired my analysis of the role of cognitive scaffolding in Shakespeare and Jonson's work, my analysis reframes and goes beyond her argument because I examine connections of scaffolding and spatial language in parts in different plays or playwrights' works composed within a specific timeframe. Tribble argues that we cannot base our entire understanding of social situated cognition in the early modern theater by examining the parts alone. But I contend that because parts would have been one of the dominant cognitive tools that the actors relied upon in performance, we should examine the part's spatial language, entrance signals, and cue patterns more closely across playwrights' works to further understand the role of scaffolding within the actors and playwrights' space.

<sup>81</sup> For a thorough study of the critical history of the Poets' War, see Bednarz's *Shakespeare and the Poets' War*.

<sup>82</sup> This brief comparison of the two men's approaches is not intended to be all-encompassing. The two men's choices for venues, subject matter, and prosodic form most likely were influenced by one another's plays, as well as other playwrights' works. Critics, however, often point to these differences to contrast the two playwrights' styles.

At first glance, the Poets' War is not obviously connected to cognitive science and acting, but by using cognitive theory to approach plays that critics believe were a part of this writers' war, we can rethink and reframe Jonson and Shakespeare's relationship as one of interdependence. An in-depth analysis of the two playwrights' composition approaches for plays that were written and performed by the same company within a year or two of each other allows us to determine how the playwrights' technical codes enabled the actors to perform their various parts. This approach demonstrates that plays were similarly structured as a kind of cognitive scaffolding for the actors, who could be expected to play at least six different parts each week. In this light, Shakespeare and Jonson composed similar plot, character, language, and spatial patterns for the company's actors, developing a practical performance system for the company, which had little to do with the playwrights' personal feelings about one another's writing. To examine the two playwrights' scaffolding techniques in-depth, I focus on the female parts of Phoebe, Falstaff, and Olivia, which probably would have been played by the same boy actor, because these parts clearly show patterns of cue and entrance signals, relationships, and language that would help the boy actor and his partners quickly learn and successfully perform their parts.

### **Critical Overview of the So-Called Poets' War**

Before analyzing these parts for spatial cognition and scaffolding, however, we must briefly look back at the critical history of the Poets' War to understand why previous scholars have developed a very different opinion of how and why these plays were composed. Critics contend that between 1599 and 1602, Marston, Shakespeare, and Dekker composed sarcastic characters that fired back on-stage retorts to Jonson's intellectual snobbery and caustic satire. But attempts to date the composition and performances of the plays and to determine the playwrights' motives have resulted in an academic "war" between scholars. According to some

early modern drama critics, such as James Bednarz, the war of words broke out between playwrights in 1599. Scholars point to “Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden” in which Jonson alleged that Marston wrote a pedantic, proud character (Chrisoganus) resembling Jonson in *Histriomastix*, which angered Jonson (Dusinberre 369-70).<sup>83</sup> In response to this personal affront, Bednarz argues that Jonson revised the recently performed *Every Man Out*, inserting a minor character who is an idiotic and inept social climber (Clove) to fire back at Marston’s caricature of him in *Histriomastix* (87). But the Poets’ War went beyond Marston and Jonson, according to Bednarz and other Poets’ War supporters, to recruit Dekker and Shakespeare into the battle of words.

Although scholars agree that Jonson and Shakespeare had different dramatic approaches, the playwrights’ reasons for composing the contrasting styles and the chronology of the plays are areas for debate. The composition and performance dates for *Every Man Out*, *As You Like It*, and *Twelfth Night* are based on sparse records, circumstantial evidence, and supposed references between the plays. Because of Jonson’s concern for publishing his plays and acknowledging their performances, we know that *Every Man Out* was performed for the first time in the fall of 1599 by the Lord Chamberlain’s Men at the Globe and again at court at the turn of the century, with Queen Elizabeth enacting the purging of Macilente in Act V at court (Ostovich 39). As a part of his theory, Bednarz asserts that Shakespeare’s *As You Like It* was written and produced after *Every Man Out* to respond to Jonson’s satirical approach: “During this first crucial year at the Globe, the Chamberlain’s Men appealed to their audience’s heterogeneous tastes by offering them Jonson’s comical satire, invented to abolish festive comedy, and Shakespeare’s festive

---

<sup>83</sup> Critical opinions have varied on whether Chrisoganus was meant to be a compliment toward Jonson or an insult; while Herford and Simpson, among other early scholars, thought that the war began with Jonson’s *Every Man Out*, twentieth-century critics point to Marston’s Chrisoganus-part, which clearly emulated Jonson’s personality, as a “mixture of admiration and derision” (Bednarz 83).

comedy, designed to deflate comical satire” (105). Bednarz, furthermore, argues that *Twelfth Night* responds to Jonson’s *Cynthia’s Revels* and that *Troilus and Cressida* was written after *Poetaster*. Like many critics, he frames Shakespeare as the “popular” playwright, who writes what the audiences want, and presents Jonson as the rogue newcomer, who writes a “provocative experiment” in satire (105). Yet while Bednarz argues that *As You Like It* was performed after *Every Man Out*, Juliet Dusinberre proposes an earlier date. Based on an epilogue poem attributed to Shakespeare, a payment to the Chamberlain’s Men for Shrove Tuesday, and an allusion to pancakes (the celebratory food for Shrovetide), Dusinberre suggests that *As You Like It* was performed on March 25, 1599 (377-79).<sup>84</sup> Michael Hattaway, however, has most recently argued that the performance venue, public or private, and date, anytime between 1599 and 1603, cannot be narrowed down by such circumstantial evidence (165-67).

Whether, however, Bednarz is correct in his suggestion that *As You Like It* was a reaction to *Every Man Out of His Humour*, or *Every Man Out* was written after *As You Like It* (or if the two were composed at the same time for that matter), Shakespeare and Jonson have more in common stylistically in these plays than earlier scholars have acknowledged. These similarities carried over into other plays that the company performed like *Twelfth Night*. While several dates have been suggested for the first production of *Twelfth Night*, the general academic consensus is that the play was written around the time of *Hamlet* in 1600 or 1601 and performed in 1601 or 1602, but the first *recorded* performance of *Twelfth Night* did not take place until February 2, 1602 (Elam 93-96). Regardless of the actual dates of composition and performance, Jonson and Shakespeare, during this brief period, were writing plays for the same company of actors. These

---

<sup>84</sup> Previous scholars believed that *As You Like It* was one of the first plays performed at the Globe, which opened in the fall of 1599, because of Jacques’ famous line “All the world’s a stage,” which scholars have suggested refers to the Globe’s motto “Totus mundus agit histrionem (All the world plays the actor)” (Norton Textual Note 1598). Tiffany Stern, however, has pointed out that the Globe might never have had such a motto (“Was *Totus Mundus*” 122).

playwrights' thoughts about dramatic scene structures were therefore informed not only by one another's work, but also by what the players were capable of remembering and performing in a short amount of time.

Some twentieth-century critics point out similarities between Jonson's and Shakespeare's plots and language, but they conclude that the two men use one another's plots to delight *elite* audiences who would pick up on scenarios that are turned upside down,<sup>85</sup> rather than wondering whether the playwrights might have had a systematic, commercially motivated reason for structuring plots and character types of the same variety. More recently, in the twenty-first century, critics have begun to contest the idea that a war of the theatres revolved around playwrights' egos. By questioning scholars' assumptions about the writers' competitive nature, Ian Donaldson seeks to reframe our understanding of Jonson and Shakespeare's interactions in his influential essay "Looking Sideways: Jonson, Shakespeare and the Myths of Envy" (2001):

Is there another way in which the relationship of Jonson and Shakespeare can be viewed; another way in which we can imagine Jonson and Shakespeare viewing each other? How does one begin to describe the creative relationship that subsisted between these two men, the greatest dramatists ever to have written for the English stage? What models of emulation or anxiety, of influence or independence, of dominance or subservience, of stimulus or inhibition, seem most appropriate to their case? (246)

Donaldson does not attempt to fill in all the lacunae of Jonson and Shakespeare's relationship, but his questions regarding the myth that surrounds their relationship, a myth which was created in the eighteenth century, open the two playwrights' association up for reexamination. For these two men at the turn of the century, I argue that their relationship was one of *interdependence*, rather than influence or independence, because they were writing for the same company of actors, creating roles and scenarios that the players could quickly memorize and aptly perform.

---

<sup>85</sup> See, for example, Brian F. Tyson's "Ben Jonson's Black Comedy: A Connection between *Othello* and *Volpone*" and Henk Gras's "*Twelfth Night*, *Every Man Out of His Humour*, and the Middle Temple Revels of 1597-98."

As Donaldson notes, “Competition and collaboration are the central and conflicting impulses in many of Jonson’s plays in which teams of collaborators—Volpone and Mosca, Tiberius and Sejanus, Dol and Face and Subtle—are torn asunder by the irresistible and at times inexplicable need to compete against one another, breaking loose from the pack and thus (as a rule) precipitating disaster” (246). While Donaldson is correct in his observations about Jonson’s characters, I would add that these characters, whether teaming up or competing against one another, are written this way because it helps the actors collaborate (when learning new plays and reviving old ones) when Jonson creates analogous relationships structures.

In discussing Jonson and Shakespeare’s influence on one another, Donaldson compares Thorello from *Every Man in his Humour* to Othello, demonstrating the similarities in structure and language between the two parts: “It is tempting to speculate whether Shakespeare may not have played the part of Thorello, rather than that of Lorenzo Senior in the original performance of *Every Man in his Humour*. Had he, as an actor, committed Thorello’s part to memory, it would not be surprising to find elements [of the part] . . . returning in his own work just a few years later” (252). I would like to modify this speculation to argue that whether Shakespeare played the part or not may not matter: if we look at the plays that are closer in composition and performance dates, like *Every Man Out*, *As You Like It*, and *Twelfth Night*, we will see patterns of plot, language, cues, and imagery that serve as a kind of scaffolding that would help the actors in learning and performing their parts, making the similarities have a much more practical function than the playwrights solely being influenced by one another’s work. Donaldson begins to acknowledge this possibility when he points out that “Burbage, who took so many major roles in Shakespeare’s plays – Malvolio, Richard III, Hamlet, Othello, Lear – was to become from 1598 a leading actor also for Jonson. In the 1616 folio he heads the list of actors for *Every Man*

*Out of his Humour, Sejanus, Volpone, The Alchemist and Catiline*” (247). But he stops short of making any more comparisons regarding the actors’ specific parts because he is focused more on reshaping the relationship, “myth of envy,” that scholars have fashioned between Jonson and Shakespeare.

While scholars have not been wrong to point out Jonson’s spats with other playwrights, more attention must be paid to the structure of the actors’ parts in these playwrights’ works. As Donaldson rightly observes, “With several of these collaborators—Dekker, Marston, Chapman, for example—Jonson is known to have quarreled seriously, yet the quarrels seem curiously not to have destroyed the possibility of further collaboration with them. The same can be said of Jonson’s most famous and enduring collaboration with Inigo Jones” (247). In *Playing Companies and Commerce in Shakespeare’s Time* (2001), Roslyn Knutson’s findings and arguments complement Donaldson’s call to reframe the poets’ war. Knutson points out, “The War of the Theatres [only] focuses on four dramatists: Jonson, Marston, Dekker, and Shakespeare. It does not include men in other categories [like actors] whose theatrical motives were less likely to be ideological and literary” (14). Knutson argues that individuals in the company would not allow disputes to damage the theater’s profit and suggests a more collaborative view of the theater industry:

The players, having worked with one another in various organizations and lived as neighbors, might have been friends or enemies, but their personal relations did not govern company commerce. Rather, the playing companies relied on a cooperative workforce of playwrights who could readily supply scripts on popular topics in fashionable genres that were marketable on stage and, when some advantage to the companies presented itself, at the bookshop. (49)

Knutson relies upon historical documents to make her case that the companies functioned as a guild, but analyzing the parts in the plays of the Chamberlain’s Men further proves her historical

claims.<sup>86</sup> Correlations in character scenarios, language, and cues between *As You Like It*, *Every Man Out*, and *Twelfth Night* suggest that the playwrights were writing not only for particular actors, but particular groups of actors who had similar character partnerships in each play, indicating that they could count on each other in performance and brief rehearsals to play the same part or bit as before, even if the speeches or circumstances were a little different from earlier versions. Interacting with the same players created a more secure environment in which the actors could not only fall back on old tricks but also improvise new ones.

These patterns in cues and stock jokes also suggest why it would not always be difficult to know who was going to cue whom: actors could rely on and collaborate with the same person or group, creating character relationships that otherwise would be difficult to improvise effectively on stage. Skeptics of this theory argue that playing the same character type and enacting similar partnerships might get old for the audience and confusing for the players, an argument I discussed in Chapter Five, but I argue that plays, like playwrights and actors, did not function merely as separate entities, even if there was no sequel or trilogy for the characters; instead, plays functioned as a series or unit where actors could delight audiences time and again with the popular humorous situations or tragic downfalls that the characters entered into when relationships and character types were sustained and further perfected. Much like the plethora of TV series today, which rely on the same popular actors playing similar types of characters in familiar relationships, early modern audiences might have wanted to see the same characters and character relationships in different circumstances and environments. They might have attended to see how the characters (and actors) who they liked, or hated, in last week's play would reappear

---

<sup>86</sup> Knutson alludes to playwrights possibly assembling their plays by following the present trends, suggesting, "Perhaps it is also plausible that playwrights who worked for a company regularly were familiar enough with the abilities of company personnel and the tastes of its usual audience to choose subjects and formulas that the company would want to buy" (54). However, she sidesteps the opportunity to compare particular "formulas" in favor of focusing more on the companies' transactions and correspondences.

in the new play of this week, regardless, or perhaps in spite of, the so-called “war of the theatres.” This system is similar to *commedia dell’arte* because of its reliance on character types and familiar circumstances, but it also differs from *commedia dell’arte* because the parts do not rely upon improvised speech.

Although Palfrey and Stern anticipate that Shakespeare could be toying with an actor whom he knows well, who is fully capable of performing during the cue space, or the temporal space between his line and his next cue, scholars additionally need to focus upon how actors might have relied on their fellow players and previous roles and partnerships. Palfrey and Stern imagine a gifted and experienced actor whom Shakespeare could “tease, and exploit, delight or terrify [with] . . . performative decisions” (135). Such *scripted* improvisation can only come into being, however, within a company of actors who work collectively to cue each other on the one hand and share a shorthand code of theatrical knowledge and works on the other.

In theorizing about parts and the mechanics of early modern theater, Turner uses Bottom’s play to suggest that “Shakespeare experiments with the coded and intermediated nature of theatrical performance at several levels simultaneously: the level of syntax and punctuation, the level of the prop and location, and the level of part and character” (211). Proposing that Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* can be viewed as a program that writes codes and functions for performance, Turner encourages scholars to see early modern theater as a technology, arguing that “in a culture without computers, indeed without any electrical mechanism or knowledge of electricity whatsoever . . . the theater provided a device with which to experiment with different forms of life according to a variety of codes and ‘scripts’: to examine its definitions, causes, variety, and significance, to model and experiment with, in a word, its ‘character’” (209). Turner cogently identifies early modern theatrical composition and

performance as a programmed system with various character codes and plot outcomes, which playwrights and actors could plug into the play's framework. Applying cognitive science to codes that exist across playwrights' works allows us to uncover a more in-depth understanding of how early modern theater's technical language—contexts, relationships, cues, entrances, prosody, sense imagery, and spatial metaphors—served as a scaffolding system where actors used the commonalities of the fictive performance spaces to perform successfully parts in different plays. The following sections analyze each code's functions across the three plays.

### **Mimetic Contexts and Relationship Codes**

The actors who play Phoebe, Silvius, and “Ganymede”; Fallace, Deliro, and Brisk; and Olivia, Orsino, and “Cesario” all perform desire when these characters are struck by Cupid's arrow. The purity of this love, versus its reliance on artificial or narcissistic mimesis, depends upon the characters' “*model*” and “*object*” of desire, as René Girard's theory of “*mimetic or mediated* desire” suggests (9). For example, “Cesario” woos Olivia for Orsino. In order to do so, “Cesario” must imitate Orsino (his model), who desires Olivia (the object). The problem, however is that when “Cesario” seeks to imitate Orsino, Olivia falls in love with “Cesario” (her object), and Orsino also begins to desire “Cesario.” Girard contends that Olivia is in love with herself until “Cesario” imitates her disdain, which causes Olivia to fall for “Cesario” (106-11). Orsino, in turn, functions as the object of Viola's desire.

Yet the characters' mimetic desire is complicated a step further when thinking about the actors who perform these parts in *Twelfth Night* and the parts that they performed in the two previous plays that have similar triangulations of mimetic desire. The actor who plays Olivia would recall being the object of desire (Fallace and Phoebe) in the two previous plays and also remember playing a character who was infected with desire for another character (Fastidius and

“Ganymede”) who could not or would not return her affection. Since the actor who imitates Olivia’s love for “Cesario” is also the actor who performed Fallace and Phoebe’s infatuations, the mimetic passion can be traced through the three parts and their patterns of relationships, cues, and rhetoric. The Olivia-actor could therefore use these previous experiences to shape his performance of this new part: he would simulate an understanding of the role based on his past interactions with the character types that Olivia interacts with in this “new” scene and react to the other actors’ prompts and cues as he perceives the similarities and contrasts between the three parts’ contexts.

Humanities scholars who are familiar with Girard’s work might view his theory of mimetic desire as a foreshadowing of cognitive science’s findings regarding simulation and emotional contagion. In fact, cognitive neuroscientist Vittorio Gallese incorporates Girard’s mimetic desire theory into his own work on mirror neurons and simulation. In explaining his theory of the human brain’s Mirror Neuron System, which is based upon the mirror neuron studies that scientists have conducted on monkeys, Gallese notes “every time we relate to other people, we automatically inhabit a we-centric space, within which we exploit a series of implicit certainties about the other. This implicit and pre-theoretical, but at the same time contentful state enables us to directly understand what the other person is doing, why he or she is doing it, and how he or she feels about a specific situation” (16). Gallese furthermore notes that our capacity for mimesis, for imitating others and their desires, helps us simulate an understanding of what another person feels and wants: “Every instantiation of mirroring or interpersonal resonance, in a word, embodied simulation, is always a process in which others’ behavior is metabolized by and filtered through the observer’s idiosyncratic past experiences, capacities, and mental attitudes” (17). Phoebe, Fallace, and Olivia all spurn the advances of men in their class, seek to control

their destinies by obstinately denying their lovers' suits, and chase after men who behave more like youthful boys. Not only do the characters have similar objectives and tastes, but an actor playing the parts would notice similarities in entrances and cue partners, patterns in the switches from verse to prose, and corresponding emotional and physical analogies. These traits would establish a relationship code for the actors to depend on, mirror, and alter within each play's performance.

Palfrey and Stern speculate that the actor who played Rosalind might have played Olivia, although they do agree that that actor could have also been assigned Viola's part. If we are to make a comparison that would be beneficial to actors who were used to playing "types," however, it makes more sense, looking at the actor relationships, scenes, and language, that the actor who played Phoebe played Falstaff and Olivia. At the very least, both suggestions are plausible. Building off of Palfrey and Stern's work on parts as well as Evelyn Tribble's theory of distributed cognition in the Globe, I contend that this casting arrangement would be most useful because it is easier for the company's actors to perform similar roles and relationships when they have little to no time for rehearsal, have to remember so many roles, and do not have the advantage of a performance run for a new play.

Examining these parts (and partnerships) in-depth allows us to see the patterns of relationships, cues, entrances, and physical space that the parts provide for the actors. Falstaff, Phoebe, and Olivia are by no means the parts that theater scholars discuss when making claims about the Poets' War: they are far more interested in the connections between Jacques, Malvolio, and Malvolio because they see these characters' melancholic, caustic personalities as commenting upon one another, and performance scholars propose that Burbage, as the Chamberlain's leading actor, played all three of these characters. But if we are to look for

cognitive scaffolding within the plays and examine the codes of affect, temporality, prosody, and space, it is more revealing to look at partnerships and triangulations that carry across the plays through female parts that more than likely would have had the most similar scaffolding methods for the boy actor playing those parts.

If *As You Like It* was composed and performed earlier than *Every Man Out*, as Dusiherre's date suggests, then Fallace and Deliro are a post-newlywed version of Phoebe and Silvius. Jonson, as he often does, creates names that suit the two characters' excessive humors. Deliro is completely infatuated with his wife, delirious with grief at her disdain for his loving gestures, and Fallace is consumed by adulterous thoughts for Fastidius Brisk, a would-be courtier whom her husband finances. Macilente's comments about Fallace clearly indicate that she is attractive but domineering, and her name foreshadows her deceit and perhaps alludes to her sexual appeal.<sup>87</sup> Her husband cannot quell her appetite with his romantic ministrations. Her name's symbolism, however, becomes more complicated when thinking about the boy actor who played this female part. The young male, dressed in women's clothing, becomes the Fallace/phallus of this subplot in the play; all action in this subplot revolves around Fallace's sexual appetite for Fastidius Brisk, which, in turn, implies that not only does Fallace desire Brisk, but the boy actor enacts a desire for an effeminate courtier. Fallace is attracted not to Brisk's masculinity, but to his delicate gentlemanly features, much like Phoebe and Olivia are attracted to "Ganymede" and "Cesario's" youthful, feminine features, respectively. Of course, Fastidius cannot be put in the exact same category as "Ganymede" and "Cesario" because he is a gull and courtier, not a woman dressed as a young man, but his desire for expensive suits to

---

<sup>87</sup> The Oxford English Dictionary first cites the term "phallus" in 1613; Early English Books Online, however, archives a translation of Plutarch's *The Philosophie, Commonlie Called, the Morals* in 1603, which includes a description of Phallus statues used in Greek and Egyptian ceremonies (214, 1294). It is likely that the term was used or at least understood as a pun by educated audience members in 1599.

disguise his penury and ineptitude at court makes him just as, if not more so, vulnerable to shameful exposure as “Ganymede” and “Cesario,” who dress up as males to hide their identities as two of the “weaker” sex. While “Cesario” and “Ganymede” lack male genitalia, Brisk lacks money and feeds off of Deliro’s wealth, emasculating him in the eyes of the men in the play.

The Olivia-part contains more lines than the other two parts, but the Olivia-part possesses many contextual connections to the Phoebe and Fallace-parts. When discussing *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night*’s similar plots in *Theatre of Envy*, Girard observes, “Even though less caricatural in some ways than the Phebe-Silvius episode of *As You Like It*, the pseudonarcissistic structure in *Twelfth Night* is a more radical, more undifferentiated version of the same pattern [used for Phoebe, Silvius, and Rosalind]” (110). Both Olivia and Phoebe prefer to love themselves instead of their admirers, Orsino and Silvius, and they both seek to dismiss their unwanted suitors. But *Every Man Out* also needs to be brought into the equation when analyzing the plays’ similarities since it was written closer to the composition date of *As You Like It*. Like Phoebe and Olivia, Fallace also has “pseudonarcissistic” tendencies and seeks to avoid her husband’s suffocating attention.

Plot points and contextual similarities between these three plays demonstrate that the so-called Poets’ War, if it occurred, did not adversely affect the composition and performance of these parts; moreover, the connections between the parts show how these two playwrights worked within the same framework of circumstances, creating networks of memories for their actors. Triangulations of mimetic desire abound within all three of these plays: Olivia does not love Orsino and falls in love, instead, with his page; Fallace falls for Fastidius Brisk, who depends on Deliro for money; and Phoebe is struck with love for “Ganymede,” who bought the pasture that Silvius could have bought with his own money, but “little care[d] for buying

anything,” presumably because of his lovesickness (2.4.88-9). Both Olivia and Fallace have male family members who live off of their fortunes in some manner, and both interact with men who envy other characters’ stations, Malvolio and Macilente, respectively. In addition, Phoebe sends Silvius as a messenger to woo Ganymede, Fallace sends her brother to warn Fastidius Brisk of her husband’s jealousy, and Olivia sends Malvolio to give “Cesario” her ring. While Shakespeare introduces Orsino’s love for Olivia in Act One instead of Act Two, the context remains unchanged: Olivia spurns Orsino’s advances. However, instead of appearing in person to woo, Orsino sends a messenger, so the disdain that Olivia feels for Orsino is directed at his proxy instead; therefore, “Cesario” has a double function, serving as Olivia’s thwarted admirer as well as the object of her desire.

When Rosalind’s “sight and shape be true” (5.4.118), Phoebe agrees to replace “Ganymede” with Silvius. Fallace, who deceives her husband, finds herself deceived by Brisk, who like Rosalind disguises his social identity through dress. Obviously, Fallace’s last scene differs since Brisk admits that he is in debt instead of revealing that he is a girl in men’s clothing, but Fallace abandons him in prison for her husband when Macilente shows Deliro the scene. Fallace runs after her husband, who is repulsed that he has caught his beloved wife with the penurious, imprisoned Fastidious Brisk, who was attempting to kiss her. When her husband no longer dotes on her, she wants him and seeks to substitute his wealth for the poor, but handsome, Brisk. Similarly, Olivia also does not discover “Cesario’s” deception until the last scene in the play. Not discovering what “Cesario” lacks in “sight and shape” until the play’s conclusion,<sup>88</sup> Olivia unwittingly substitutes Sebastian for “Cesario,” though one could argue that her

---

<sup>88</sup> Stephen Orgel, however, points out that Cesario never changes back to Viola’s costume: “Viola announces in the final moments of *Twelfth Night* that she cannot become a woman and the wife of Orsino until her woman’s clothes have been recovered . . . . For Viola to become a woman requires, in short, a whole new play with Malvolio at its center” (50).

substitution is a better match for her desire than the fate of the two characters in the previous plays, since Sebastian physically resembles his sister and shares her social station.

What do these similarities in character-motivations mean for the actors playing these parts? For the player performing as Fallace, Phoebe, and Olivia, whether he is playing a city wife, a shepherdess, or a lady of the court, he is acting the part of a sexually-driven, controlling female, and whether the same actor plays Silvius, Deliro, and Orsino (or Andrew Aguecheek), the female part's reaction to him would be the same: repulsion in varying degrees. But the plays' structures show more than just connections in characters' motivations and passions. The actor's part for each character (Phoebe, Fallace, and Olivia) exposes intriguing parallels in relationship patterns, cue structures, sense imagery, and spatial orientation that an actor could reference when performing the parts. Table 6.1 (below) shows the actor's parts side by side for comparison. The sections on entrance and cue signals, prosody, and sensorial and spatial language that follow incorporate in-text and block quotes into the analysis, but Table 6.1 provides a cohesive visual layout of each part to assist the reader in seeing the sum of these female parts.

### Table 6.1 Female Parts for Scenes of Mimetic Desire

The parts' punctuation and lineation are based on the Folio text for *As You Like It* and *Twelfth Night* and the quarto text for *Every Man Out*. As Abigail Rokison notes, with Shakespeare's Folio, unfortunately, decisions regarding punctuation were most likely to have been made by the scribes, and lineation errors, such as a pentameter line being split into two lines for the sake of space due to the Folio's double column layout as well as verse being confused for prose, are possibilities that prevent us from making too many assertions about how early modern actors would have studied and used their parts' punctuation and lineation since the Folio text does not contain the actual scroll parts.<sup>89</sup>

<p><b>Phoebe's part</b> [3.5]</p> <p>_____ [in their] play.</p> <p>[Enter Silvius and Phoebe]</p> <p>_____ by bloody drops?</p> <p>I would not be thy executioner, I fly thee, for I would not injure thee: Thou tell'st me there is murder in mine eye, 'Tis pretty sure, and very probable, That eyes that are the frail'st, and softest things, Who shut their coward gates on atomies, Should be called tyrants, butchers, murderers. Now I do frown on thee with all my heart, And if mine eyes can wound, now let them kill thee: Now counterfeit to swoon, why now fall down, Or if thou canst not, O for shame, for shame, Lie not, to say mine eyes are murderers: Now show the wound mine eye hath made in thee, Scratch thee but with a pin, and there remains Some scar of it: Lean upon a rush, The cicatrice and capable impressure Thy palm some moment keeps: but now mine eyes, Which I have darted at thee, hurt thee not, Nor I am sure there is no force in eyes That can do hurt.</p> <p>_____ [keen arrows] make.</p>	<p>Fallace's part [2.2]</p> <p>_____ [Behold she] comes.</p> <p>[Enter Fallace]</p> <p>Here's a sweet stink indeed: What, shall I ever be thus crossed and plagued? And sick of husband? O my head doth ache As it would cleave asunder with these savours, All my rooms altered, and but one poor walk That I delighted in, and that is made So fulsome with perfumes, that I am feared (My brain doth sweat so) I have caught the plague. _____ [not correct] it.</p> <p>Why, an I did find fault sir? _____ [No woman] better.</p> <p>Ay, long since perhaps, But now that sense is altered: you would have me (Like to a puddle or a standing pool) To have no motion, nor no spirit within me. No, I am like a pure and sprightly river, That moves forever, and yet is still the same; Or fire that burns much wood, yet still one flame. _____ [Is nothing] changed.</p> <p>Why those were growing flowers, And these within my walk are cut and strewed. _____ [have one] scent.</p>	<p>Olivia's part [1.5]</p> <p>...</p> <p>Give me my veil; come throw it o'er my face; We'll once more hear Orsino's embassy. _____ [which is] she?</p> <p>Speak to me, I shall answer for her: your will. _____ [least sinister] usage.</p> <p>Whence came you, sir? _____ [in my] speech.</p> <p>Are you a comedian? _____ [of the] house?</p> <p>If I do not usurp myself, I am. _____ [heart of my] message.</p> <p>Come to what is important in't: I forgive you the praise. _____ [and 'tis] poetical.</p> <p>It is the more like to be feigned, I pray you keep it in. I heard you were saucy at my gates, &amp; allowed your approach rather to wonder at you, than to hear you. If you be not mad, be gone: if you have reason, be brief: 'tis not that time of moon with me, to make one in so skipping a dialogue. _____ [am a] messenger.</p>
---	--	--

<sup>89</sup> For interesting commentary on this issue as well as how modern-day theater companies and actors often mistakenly think of the Folio and/or modern edition punctuation and lineation as Shakespeare's "code" for actors, see Rokison's *Shakespearean Verse Speaking*, especially 37-77.

<p>But till that time Come not thou near me: and when that time comes, Afflict me with thy mocks, pity me not, As till that time I shall not pity thee. _____ [Fare you] well.</p> <p>Sweet youth, I pray you chide a year together, I had rather hear you chide, than this man woo. _____ [so upon] me?</p> <p>For no ill will I bear you. _____ [to our] flock.</p> <p>Dead shepherd, now I find thy saw of might, Who ever loved that loved not a first sight? _____ [Sweet] Phoebe.</p> <p>Ha: what sayst thou, Silvius? _____ [Phoebe, pity] me.</p> <p>Why I am sorry for thee gentle Silvius. _____ [Were both] extermined.</p> <p>Thou hast my love, is not that neighbourly? _____ [would have] you.</p> <p>Why that were covetousness: Silvius; the time was, that I hated thee; And yet it is not, that I bear thee love, But since that thou canst talk of love so well, Thy company, which erst was irksome to me I will endure; and I'll employ thee, too: But do not look for further recompense Than thine own gladness, that thou art employed. _____ [I'll live] upon.</p> <p>Know'st thou the youth that spoke to me erewhile? _____ [was master] of</p> <p>Think not I love him, though I ask for him, 'Tis but a peevish boy, yet he talks well, But what care I for words? Yet words do well When he that speaks them pleases those that hear: It is a pretty youth, not very pretty, But sure he's proud, and yet his pride becomes him;</p>	<p>Ay, have they so? In your gross judgement: if you make no difference Betwixt the scent of growing flowers and cut ones, You have a sense to taste lamp-oil, i' faith. And with such judgement have you changed the chambers, Leaving no room that I can joy to be in In all your house: and now my walk and all You smoke me from, as if I were a fox, And long belike to drive me quite away: Well walk you there, and I'll walk where I list. _____ [Bear all] away!</p> <p>Ay do: for fear Aught that is there should like her. O this man How cunningly he can conceal himself, As though he loved? loved? nay, honoured and adored? _____ [Why, my] sweetheart!</p> <p>Sweetheart? O, better still: And asking, why? wherefore? and looking strangely, As if he were as white as innocence. Alas, you're simple, you: you cannot change, Look pale at pleasure, and then red with wonder: No, no, not you: I did but cast an amorous eye e'en now Upon a pair of gloves that somewhat liked me, And straight he noted it, and gave command All should be ta'en away. _____ [took from] hence.</p> <p>'Sbody sirrah, but do not: Bring in no gloves to spite me: if you do— _____ [did you] not?</p> <p>Why should I take you for him? _____ [to ride] in.</p> <p>O, now I see the cause of his idle demand was his new suit. _____ [you my] suit?</p> <p>O you are a gallant in print now brother. _____ [I assure] you.</p> <p>I cannot but like it to the desert. _____ [me an] angel.</p>	<p>Sure, you have some hideous matter to deliver, when the courtesy of it is so fearful. Speak your office. _____ [peace, as] matter.</p> <p>Yet you began rudely. What are you? What would you? _____ [any others,] profanation.</p> <p>Give us the place alone, We will hear this divinity. Now sir, what is your text? _____ [Most sweet] lady.</p> <p>A comfortable doctrine, and much may be said of it. Where lies your text? _____ [ In Orsino's] bosom.</p> <p>In his bosom? In what chapter of his bosom? _____ [first of his] heart.</p> <p>O, I have read it: it is heresy. Have you no more to say? _____ [see your] face.</p> <p>Have you any commission from your lord, to negotiate with my face: you are now out of your text: but we will draw the curtain, and show you the picture. Look you, sir, such a one I was this present: Is't not well done? _____ [God did] all.</p> <p>'Tis in grain sir, 'twill endure wind and weather. _____ [world no] copy.</p> <p>O sir, I will not be so hard-hearted: I will give out divers schedules of my beauty. It shall be inventoried and every particle and utensil labelled to my will: As, item two lips indifferent red, item two grey eyes, with lids to them: item, one neck, one chin, &amp; so forth. Were you sent hither to praise me? _____ [non-pareil of] beauty!</p> <p>How does he love me? _____ [sighs of] fire.</p> <p>Your lord does know my mind, I cannot love him Yet I suppose him virtuous, know him noble,</p>
---	--	--

<p>He'll make a proper man: The best thing in him Is his complexion: and faster than his tongue Did make offence, his eye did heal it up: He is not very tall, yet for his years he's tall: His leg is but so so, and yet 'tis well: There was a pretty redness in his lip, A little riper, and more lusty-red Than that mixed in his cheek: 'twas just the difference Betwixt the constant red, and mingled damask. There be some women Silvius, had they marked him In parcels as I did, would have gone near To fall in love with him: but for my part, I love him not, nor hate him not: and yet Have I more cause to hate him than to love him, For what had he to do to chide at me? He said mine eyes were black, and my hair black, And now I am remembered, scorned at me: I marvel why I answered not again, But that's all one: omittance is no quittance: I'll write to him a very taunting letter, And thou shalt bear it, wilt thou, Silvius? _____ [all my] heart.</p> <p>I'll write it straight: The matter's in my head, and in my heart, I will be bitter with him, and passing short; Go with me Silvius.</p> <p>[Exit]</p> <p>(Folio TLN 1768-1914)</p>	<p>Now beshrew my heart then. _____ [into the] fashion.</p> <p>I care not. _____ [here anon] sister.</p> <p>You jest? _____ [say, in] truth.</p> <p>When did you see him? _____ [things they] are!</p> <p>Come, when will you pay me again, now? _____ [you please,] sir.</p> <p>Why look you so pale brother? _____ [and ink] sister?</p> <p>What would you do withal? _____ [it's above] wonder.</p> <p>Indeed sir, 'tis a most excellent suit, and you do wear it as extraordinary. _____ [into their] circle.</p> <p>Ah, the sweet grace of a courtier! _____ [no fewer] bankrupts.</p> <p>Out, out, unworthy to speak where he breatheth. _____ [seam-rent] fellows.</p> <p>He says true. _____ ['tis for] thee.</p> <p>So sir. _____ [my sweet] wife!</p> <p>Good Lord! How you are perfumed in your terms and all: pray you, leave us. _____ [Adieu,] sweet lady.</p> <p>Ay, ay, let thy words ever sound in mine ears, and thy graces disperse contentment through all my senses: O, how happy is that lady above other ladies, that enjoys so absolute a gentleman to her servant! A countess give him</p>	<p>Of great estate, of fresh and stainless youth; In voices well divulged, free, learn'd, and valiant, And in dimension, and the shape of nature, A gracious person; but yet I cannot love him: He might have took his answer long ago. _____ [not understand] it.</p> <p>Why, what would you? _____ [should pity] me.</p> <p>You might do much: What is your parentage? _____ [am a] gentleman.</p> <p>Get you to your lord: I cannot love him: let him send no more, Unless (perchance) you come to me again, To tell me how he takes it: Fare you well: I thank you for your pains: spend this for me. _____ [Farewell fair] cruelty.</p> <p>What is your parentage? Above my fortunes, yet my state is well: I am a gentleman. I'll be sworn thou art, Thy tongue, thy face, thy limbs, actions, and spirit. Do give thee five-fold blazon: Not too fast: soft, soft, Unless the master were the man. How now? Even so quickly may one catch the plague? Methinks I feel this youth's perfections With an invisible, and subtle stealth To creep in at mine eyes. Well, let it be. What, ho, Malvolio. _____ [at your] service.</p> <p>Run after that same peevish messenger The county's man: he left this ring behind him Would I, or not: tell him, I'll none of it. Desire him not to flatter with his lord, Nor hold him up with hopes, I am not for him: If that the youth will come this way to morrow, I'll give him reasons for't: hie thee, Malvolio. _____ [Madam, I] will.</p> <p>I do I know not what, and fear to find Mine eye too great a flatterer for my mind:</p>
---	---	--

	<p>her hand to kiss! Ah, foolish countess; he's a man worthy (if a woman may speak of a man's worth) to kiss the lips of an Empress. _____ [Fastidius gone.] sister?</p> <p>Ay, brother: he has a face like a <i>cherubin</i>. _____ [Can you] tell?</p> <p>Not I, in good faith: and he has a body like an Angel. _____ [since he] went?</p> <p>Why but e'en now: did you not meet him? and a tongue able to ravish any woman i' the earth. _____ [yonder by] Paules.</p> <p>Well, I will not altogether despair: I have heard of a citizen's wife has been beloved of a courtier; and why not I? Heigh ho: well, I will into my private chamber, lock the door to me, and think over all his good parts one after another. [Exit] (2.2.96-357)</p>	<p>Fate, show thy force, ourselves we do not owe, What is decreed, must be: and be this so.</p> <p>[Exit]</p> <p>(Folio TLN 459-608)</p>
--	--	--

### Entrance and Cue Signals and Spatial Cognition

In comparing Jonson's Fallace-part to Shakespeare's Phoebe and Olivia-parts, we can see how the playwrights systematize these three female parts through entrance and cue patterns, maintaining the scene structure for the players involved while reshaping the context and language. When we whittle the play-text down to the cue structure of each character's first scene, we see that each female part-actor is first cued to speak by an adult male actor, picks up a new cue partner when a new person enters the scene, and is either left on stage by himself at the end of the scene or conducts the first person who cued him off stage. If the boy actor had an idea of who was going to cue him and when his cue partner would change, then he would feel more secure in the world of the fictive performance space.

Similar cue structures would allow the actor to rely on a set system of codes and develop a sense of spatial cognition. Cognitive scientist Andy Clark gives the following example when thinking in terms of how spatial relations inform our understanding of language and complex processes. Clark notes that when a seasoned bartender fulfills orders for drinks, he or she performs the job more efficiently if there are different glass types for each drink that he or she is making: "experts select and array *distinctively shaped glasses* at the time of ordering. They then use these persistent cues so as to help recall and sequence the specific orders. Expert performance thus plummets in tests involving uniform glassware, whereas novice performances are unaffected by any such manipulations" (9).<sup>90</sup> This example can be used to understand how the cue system worked in early modern performances, but I preface this analogy with some qualifications: one, I do not interpret the boy actor who played the roles of Phoebe, Fallace, and Olivia as a novice actor; while he might not have had as much experience as an adult actor, a

---

<sup>90</sup> Clark uses this example in this article as well as his book *Being There*, but as he acknowledges, the experiments were conducted by King Beach in 1988.



Phoebe and Silvius are therefore cued to go onstage by another boy actor, who, in character, seeks to disparage Phoebe's vanity. Although Silvius is not in control of their relationship, the Silvius-actor controls the start of the scene, because he speaks first, pleading with Phoebe to be more sensitive when denying his love, and cuing the shepherdess to speak after "[by bloody] drops" (3.5.7). The Phoebe-actor is cued to enter by Phoebe's future love obsession and cued to speak by the character she hates. Rosalind and Celia reenter as Silvius's first speech is coming to a close. After about thirty lines of dialogue, the majority of which are Phoebe's scornful remarks, Rosalind takes over cuing Phoebe until exiting, leaving Phoebe with Silvius again. Based on this part's structure, the boy actor might know that when someone entered, the new person would likely pick up cueing him until he leaves or someone else enters the scene. This system of cue codes is repeated and reconfigured in Fallace's and Olivia's parts.

In an amusing allusion to the first play's pastoral setting, Deliro brings the pastures of Arden to his city wife by strewing flowers over her walk at their house. The town and country couples are socially and economically each other's equals. Even if one believes that *Every Man Out* was written before *As You Like It*, the parts still closely parallel each other in tone, meter, and certain cue structures. Unlike Phoebe, Fallace does not enter at the beginning of the scene (2.2), but like the shepherd Silvius, Deliro confides his devotion to his wife to a knowledgeable advisor (Macilente), so the context for the actors who play Deliro and Fallace is quite similar to Shakespeare's Silvius and Phoebe: the key differences are that the two are now husband and wife, they live in London instead of the forest of Arden, and their parts have significantly more lines. Yet these lines would feel quite familiar because the cues they speak and passions they express are quite similar to the previous parts.

Fallace enters during Act Two, unlike Phoebe whose entry was merely anticipated in Act Two. By placing Fallace's entrance in the same scene in which Deliro complains to Macilente of the difficulty he has in pleasing his wife, Jonson speeds up the subplot for Fallace and Deliro and makes the characters more of a focus for the play since their story does not end with this scene. Despite this difference in timing in the overall plot, the part set-up remains the same: Fallace is talked about before the boy actor comes on stage, so the actor could very well have heard the description, yet even if he did not, Jonson provides enough description in the Fallace-part for the boy actor to know what is occurring on stage, to whom he will speak, and whom he will speak about once on stage. Deliro cues Fallace to enter after finishing his speech to Macilente about why he is ordering his servant to strew flowers on the walk:

**Deliro . . .**

Then here she hath a place, on my backside,  
Wherein she loves to walk, and that (she said)  
Had some ill smells about it. Now this walk  
Have I (before she knows it) thus perfumed  
With herbs and flowers, and laid in diverse places—  
As 'twere on altars consecrate to her—  
Perfumèd gloves and delicate chains of amber  
To keep the air in awe of her sweet nostrils.  
This have I done, and this I think will please her.  
Behold, she comes.

*Enter Fallace*

**Fallace**        Here's a sweet stink indeed:  
What, shall I ever be thus crossed and plagued?  
And sick of husband? O my head doth ache  
As it would cleave asunder with these savours,  
All my rooms altered, and but one poor walk  
That I delighted in, and that is made  
So fulsome with perfumes, that I am feared  
(My brain doth sweat so) I have caught the plague. (2.2.87-103)

Although the Fallace-actor is cued by an adult male character to enter the stage, the cue preface is of the same mold: the scene is set for Fallace's entrance, with Deliro acting as set designer, setting the stage for her arrival with the flowers on her walk. We will now see a play acted out

between Fallace and Deliro in which Macilente, over the course of *Every Man Out*, will take part, much like Rosalind/Ganymede observes and advises Silvius. Therefore, the setup for the Fallace and Deliro-actors can be traced to their scene in *As You Like It*, which also had an on-stage audience. In acting out the Fallace and Deliro-parts, however, the actors now have two meta-representational on-stage audiences: Macilente and Asper's friends, who watch Asper's play while seated on stage. These similarities recreate a familiar fictive space in which the parts are scaffolded for the actors to perform their new parts by mapping their past relationship and movements onto these new characters' interactions. The first Silvius/Phoebe scene is obviously shorter than the Fallace/Deliro scene, and Jonson's scene has more interruptions in the couple's discourse after their initial quibbling. The scene's opening structure, however, is similar to the scene in *As You Like It* because the actor playing Fallace is cued to speak by her partner, the Deliro-actor.

Yet the Fallace-actor does not depend on Deliro for all of the cues in this scene. Once an important new character enters and the subject matter changes, the new character picks up cuing the Fallace-player. This pattern carries over from Phoebe's cues in the scene with Silvius and "Ganymede," but the Fallace-part has more cue partners because the scene involves more players entering and exiting. The cues and cue partners continue to establish familiar cognitive scaffolding techniques that help the boy actor know when someone else will take over cuing him. For example, when Funguso, Fallace's brother enters, he cues almost all of Fallace's lines until he exits over seventy lines later. During this section, the Fallace-actor is cued once by Macilente and once by Deliro, but even then, the character's lines still revolve around her brother. Fallace only changes cue partners once Funguso exits. After his exit, Macilente cues Fallace once, but Fastidius Brisk, along with Deliro, picks up the primary responsibility of cuing the younger actor

until the male characters exit. While Brisk is in sight, Fallace's lines and emotions revolve around noticing and pleasing him during this section of the scene and shooing away her husband's generosity at the scene's conclusion. Therefore, while Fallace *could* be cued by anyone on stage, the young actor is primarily cued first by the husband character, then the brother, and finally, the love interest. In addition, when the Fallace-actor's cue partner shifts, the Fallace-part's lines often indicate a switch to a new partner. But one final change comes in this scene: Funguso reenters as Fallace thinks on Fastidius Brisk's "parts" and cues her until he exits, leaving the Fallace-actor on stage for a prose soliloquy about her desire for Brisk. The character's lines are similar to Phoebe's last lines but even more analogous structurally to Olivia's first scene ending because the Fallace-actor is left on stage alone instead of leading another actor off stage.

As far as entrances and cues are concerned, the Olivia-part in *Twelfth Night* is more complicated than the Phoebe or Fallace-parts because of the length of the character's scenes, the number of characters with whom Olivia interacts, and the number of scenes the actor performs in, especially compared to Phoebe's smaller part. Yet the Olivia-part's cue and entrance signals build off of these two previous roles' scaffolding system. Although Olivia speaks to different characters within her household before she speaks to "Cesario," the Olivia-part shares similarities in cues with the other two parts. Resembling the Phoebe-actor, the Olivia-actor is cued on stage for his first entrance by another boy actor, who plays Maria. Lady Olivia enters with Malvolio; although Malvolio is in love with Olivia, he is beneath her in class, so the characters do not pair up as well as Andrew Aguecheek does to Silvius. Of course, Malvolio's fantasy about wedding Olivia is quite reminiscent of Deliro's initial speech of devotion for his wife. Yet Malvolio has even more of a connection with Macilente and Jacques: Macilente also

wishes that he had more money so that he could have a wife like Fallace, while Jacques scorns Touchstone's supercilious nature, much like Malvolio loathes Sir Toby's drunken behavior. These comparisons aside, I note whom the Olivia-actor enters with because it in some ways mirrors how the Phoebe-part requires the younger actor to enter with another actor, who might have been more experienced.

Despite the character pairings not quite matching up because Olivia has more than one admirer, the part's cue patterns are relatively similar to that of the two previous plays. Maria cues Olivia and Malvolio's entrance, like Rosalind cued Phoebe and Silvius. The boy playing Olivia is cued to speak by an adult male actor who plays Feste, just as Phoebe and Fallace were cued to speak by one of the adult male actors on stage instead of beginning the scenes themselves. After Olivia enters, Feste and Olivia exchange wits until Olivia asks, Malvolio, "What think you of this fool, Malvolio, doth he not mend?" (1.5.69). At this point, the Olivia actor brings Malvolio into their conversation, but before that, Olivia has a one-on-one verbal interaction with Feste so that the boy actor could perhaps expect his cue to come from one person until his part indicates otherwise with a significant clue such as naming another character, like Malvolio, to speak. Once Malvolio speaks, he passes the conversation back into Feste's power, who then, again, cues Olivia's lines.

One would think that the pattern would continue with Feste cuing Olivia, but after Olivia cues Malvolio, it is again the boy actor's turn to speak; however, the boy actor would have known from his lines that he was speaking to Malvolio because the part provides a clue that Malvolio was the one cuing his next speech: "O, you are sick of self-love, Malvolio, and taste with a distempered appetite. . . ." (1.5.86-87). Feste closes the triangulation with his lines: "Now Mercury endue thee with leasing, for thou speak'st well of fools" (1.5.93-94). Maria enters on

these words, which cue her entrance and her speech. With Maria's entrance, Olivia is now cued by Maria. After Malvolio exits, Feste cues Olivia to speak and cues Sir Toby to enter. Once Sir Toby enters, Olivia is cued by him (except for one instance in which Feste says "Good Sir Toby," which is really more of a throwaway line than anything). When Toby exits, Feste cues Olivia's next line, and Olivia orders Feste to go after Sir Toby. As he departs, Feste cues Malvolio's entrance and speech. Malvolio then takes control of the cuing and orders Maria to enter as he exits.

After this seeming whirlwind of cuing activity, which in actuality is really controlled by one to two main cue partners and entrances and exits, Olivia is left on stage with just one partner, "Cesario," for awhile. But with "Cesario's" entrance, Olivia continues to be cued by the "male" figure, so the pattern is not broken. Olivia requests that Maria veil her and cues Viola's entrance and speech with "We'll once more hear Orsino's embassy" (1.5.162). Even though Viola is a girl, it appears that since she is dressed as a male, she speaks first upon entrance and cues Olivia to speak. "Cesario" continues to cue Olivia to speak, with no cue partner interruptions, until his exit. After her soliloquy, Olivia calls to Malvolio, who enters and again, speaks first, mirroring Silvius's role as cuer after Rosalind exits. Like the Fallace-part, the Olivia-part requires the player to conclude the scene on stage by himself, cuing Antonio and Sebastian's entrance. Although the three female parts differ in length, it would appear that the boy actor could rely on established patterns, based on entrances and exits, for who would cue him and look to his lines for variations in these patterns.

### **Performing Desire and Repulsion through Verse or Prose?**

Patterns in contexts and cues, however, are not the only codes that Shakespeare and Jonson write into the actors' parts: transitions in prosody also provide actors with clues about

how they will interact with their cue partners in the scene, and these transition codes speak back to one another when the actors are learning their parts for each new play. As George Wright observes in *Shakespeare's Metrical Art*, short or long lines “may seem, on the whole, to be merely attractive variants to a regular pattern, but they often also serve specific expressive functions, especially that of disturbing the metrical, moral, and psychological peace” (107). In *Performing Shakespeare's Verse*, Rokison contests some of the assumptions and speculations made by renowned theatre directors and practitioners about how actors can use shared and short lines as Shakespeare's directions for actors. Although she does not disagree with the method of picking up cues if they are shared lines or pausing if they are short lines, she argues that too often directors and scholars base assumptions off a modern editorial copy or use a couple of examples from Shakespeare's plays to make broad claims. She recommends, instead, that directors and scholars examine different versions of the text to analyze prosodic patterns throughout Shakespeare's career before postulating theories about how to deliver a short or shared line or what a shorter line indicates about the character's emotional or physical state (1-7). In analyzing parts from three plays that were composed by two different playwrights within a three-year period, however, we can learn more about how shared lines, verse, and prose functioned in setting the tone for specific early modern actors' character relationships. Transitions from verse to prose in each scene provide the early modern actors with information about how they affectively and physically connect with each cue partner.

For example, Phoebe and Silvius's prosody in their scene clashes in meter and rhythm, enabling the actors to establish their characters' conflicting desires through their discordant speeches and contradicting physical reactions. They structure and negotiate the physical space between them through their mismatched prosody. Phoebe and Silvius's dialogue in 3.5 is spoken

mainly in blank pentameter verse with occasional use of short and shared lines. In Silvius's first seven-line speech, the pentameter is forced in a couple of the lines (3,4), but Phoebe's retort, which is over twice as long, is in perfect pentameter for the entire speech until her cue for Silvius: "That can do hurt" (27). The Phoebe-actor can only assume that Silvius will pick up on Phoebe's half-line to finish the iambic pentameter at the end of the speech, but that does not occur. Phoebe's four-syllable line "That can do hurt" is answered by Silvius's four-syllable reply of "O dear Phoebe" (28). This gap implies either a short shared line with missing syllables or two short lines: modern practitioners would argue that the gap in meter would call for a pause and possibly movement on Silvius's part, especially if they are two short lines, but the early modern actors would not have had access to each other's parts unless they rehearsed separately together. So as Rokison points out, actors might not have known based on their cues, if they did not rehearse beforehand, that the line was short instead of shared; therefore, the actors would have had to instead rely on picking up the cues regardless of the short or shared lined conundrum (124-25). Silvius's plea of "O dear Phoebe," however, does seem like an opportune time to prostrate himself in front of his scornful lover, but some critics would say that this suggestion is conjecture at best. While Phoebe's first speech ends on a four-syllable line that is picked up by Silvius's lame four-syllable reply, she finishes his "That love's keen arrows make" with her "But till that time" (3.5.32), sharing a line of perfect iambic pentameter that demonstrates their conflicting thoughts and passions with her negative interjection.

Yet Silvius's desperation and his lovesick verse soon infect Phoebe when "Ganymede" speaks. Phoebe cues "Ganymede" to speak with "As till that time I shall not pity thee" (3.5.32). "Ganymede" criticizes Phoebe for nearly thirty lines of verse. At "Ganymede's" "Fair you well" (64), Phoebe attempts to make her new object of love stay with "Sweet youth, I pray you chide a

year together! / I had rather hear you chide than this man woo” (65-66). But “Ganymede” breaks into prose, responding to Phoebe’s flattery with disdain. While “Ganymede’s” prose in this scene is brief, compared to other scenes where this character speaks prose, it does indicate that he is breaking the pattern of iambic pentameter, which the lovers began, to comment more abstractly on the scene that he has observed. As Wright observes, “Shifts in style (from verse to prose, for example) are normally a signal of some shift in the stance or feeling of a character or in the pace or mood of a scene, and such signals can be sent subtly and surely through a patterned system that uses an extensive array of structured oppositions and graded variations” (255). “Ganymede” then returns to verse, but through delivering a short line. After stating that he will “sauce her with bitter words” (70), “Ganymede” asks Phoebe a seven-syllable question “Why look you so upon me?” (71). To which, Phoebe replies with a six-syllable line of her own, “For no ill will I bear you” (72), indicating that the two do not match up in meter or in minds. The short lines, again, could also indicate movement on the players’ part. In response to Phoebe’s infatuated remark, “Ganymede” asks her not to fall in love with him, and after giving the shepherd and shepherdess advice, he leaves Phoebe on a half-line, saying to Celia, “Come, to our flock” (81).

At this point, Phoebe could pick up on “Ganymede’s” line, but she does not. Instead, she recites a rhymed couplet reference to Marlowe. Again, the short lines that are either not finished by the next player or are inadequately answered are a kind of aural proof as to how they do not match. After Rosalind’s exit, Silvius begins to cue Phoebe again, and the two share a line, but then Silvius again ends this shared meter with a pathetic six-syllable line:

Silvius: Sweet Phoebe –

Phoebe: Ha? – What sayst thou, Silvius?

Silvius: Sweet Phoebe, pity me. (1.5.83-85)

But Phoebe's reply to his line is now sweeter, "Why, I am sorry for thee, gentle Silvius" (86). Yet a few lines later, it is clear that they are still not metrically in tune when Phoebe finishes Silvius's "I would have you" with "Why, that were covetousness!" (92), making the shared line a long twelve-syllable line, or creating two short lines. From this point on, the two do not share a line until the end of the scene when Silvius agrees to help Phoebe, indicating that they are finally on the same page in both meter and emotion:

Phoebe: I'll write to him a very taunting letter  
And thou shalt bear it. Wilt thou Silvius?

Silvius: Phoebe, with all my heart.

Phoebe: I'll write it straight.  
The matter's in my head and in my heart;  
I will be bitter with him and passing short.  
Go with me, Silvius. (135-41)

Phoebe's "The matter's in my head and in my heart" complements the meter and the two characters' synchronous lovesickness, while her next line, being eleven syllables long, possesses a joke about how "short" she will be with him, the imperfect verse indicating her inability to keep her message "short," even if it is "bitter." Phoebe leads Silvius off stage with a half-line, echoing "Ganymede" and *Aliena's* style of departure.

In comparison to Phoebe and Silvius's first exchange, Jonson's scene makes much more use of shared lines in his scene's opening to demonstrate the strife between the married couple. Wright notes that in Shakespeare's plays, the "proportion of short and shared lines to full blank-verse lines increases from about 2 percent in the earliest plays to more than 13.5 percent in every play from *Hamlet* on, and to more than 20 percent in *Macbeth*, *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Coriolanus*, *Timon of Athens*, and *The Tempest* (Appendix C)" (119). We can assume, therefore, that Shakespeare's more conservative use of shared and short lines in Phoebe and Silvius's first

scene fits in with his style at the time of composition, but the playwrights' reasons for using shared lines appear to be similar.

Deliro's speech before Fallace's entrance ends on a four syllable half-line: as the Fallace-player enters, he could pick up the line and finish it with his first short line, or he could pause to turn his nose up at the flowers before exploding with Fallace's pestilent humour. Fallace's first line indicates that the actor is supposed to feign smelling a disturbing scent, so it is plausible that as he enters, he would be ready to smell the air and react to the supposedly repugnant scent. Therefore, the line could be a shared line. But how would the actor know that it was supposed to be a shared line? Again, he might not. Would he be given the cue "Behold, she comes" (2.2.96), indicating that the line would be completed by the six syllables from his first line? It is possible, but we are not sure if the actor would have been given a one word or a three-word cue. In examining his other lines, however, the actor may glean whether it is a shared or short line by looking at the shape of his lines and cues.

To visually address this issue, the following excerpt demonstrates how the parts might have looked on the page (on separate scrolls and in a scribe or actor's handwriting, of course):

**Table 6.2 Parts for Fallace and Deliro**

**Fallace's part**

\_\_\_\_\_ [Behold she] comes.

Here's a sweet stink indeed!  
 What, shall I ever be thus crossed and plagued?  
 And sick of husband? O, my head doth ache  
 As it would cleave asunder with these savours!  
 All my rooms altered, and but one poor walk  
 That I delighted in, and that is made  
 So fulsome with perfumes that I am feared  
 (My brain doth sweat so) I have caught the  
 plague.

\_\_\_\_\_ [not correct] it.

**Part of Deliro**

{ . . . }  
 Behold, she comes.

\_\_\_\_\_ [caught the] plague.

Why, gentle wife, is now thy walk too sweet?  
 Thou said'st of late it had sour airs about it,  
 And found'st much fault that I did not correct  
 it.

\_\_\_\_\_ [find fault,] sir?

Nay, dear wife,  
 I know thou hast said thou hast loved

Why, an I did find fault, sir?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [No woman] better.

Ay, long since, perhaps,  
 But now that sense is altered. You would have  
 me,  
 Like to a puddle or a standing pool,  
 To have no motion nor no spirit within me.  
 No, I am like a pure and sprightly river  
 That moves forever, and yet is still the same;  
 Or fire that burns much wood, yet still one  
 flame.  
 . . . (2.2.96-115)

perfumes,  
 No woman better.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [still one] flame.

But yesterday I saw thee at our garden  
 Smelling on roses and on purple flowers,  
 And since, I hope, the humour of thy sense  
 Is nothing changed.  
 . . .  
 (2.2.96-119)

The vast majority of lines in these two parts for this scene section are in pentameter, but the couple shares nine lines, about twice the amount that Silvius and Phoebe share for their entire scene. This number of shared lines means that their speeches often end on half lines that are picked up and finished by their partner. Since Fallace and Deliro are arguing, the two players would pick up on each other's lines at a fast pace to not only keep the iambic pentameter but also indicate the wife's waspishness and the husband's desperation. The part would indicate this timing based on the dialogue's content as well as the shape of the speeches, which often begin and/or end on half lines; in addition, it is fairly clear from the dialogue that the two do not have any interruptions in their conversation, or at least not interruptions that switch up their cue partnering.

In addition to his use of shared lines, Jonson organizes his couple's speeches into verse when they are arguing with one another and changes their speech to prose when other characters enter the scene and the subject changes from love to material objects, such as clothes and money. Yet while Phoebe and Olivia speak in verse at the end of their scenes when talking of their newfound love interests, the Fallace-part remains in prose. The majority of Jonson's *Every Man Out* is in prose, so Fallace and Deliro's first scene together proves to be the only time the two

speak in verse. Jonson uses verse to show how ill-matched they are in love; the merchant and city-wife, far removed from idyllic pastoral or courtly lovers, use everyday speech in the rest of their scenes. While George Wright reminds us that prose and verse are not always used to indicate class or station, in this particular instance, Jonson uses verse, and the breaking down of the verse through shared lines, to contrast Deliro's fantasy world with the reality of the merchant couple's ill-fated marriage.

At odds with Fallace's long section of verse with her husband, in "Cesario" and Olivia's first meeting, the Olivia-part is half in prose and half in verse. The scene's section begins in verse, with Olivia ceremonially stating, "Give me my veil; come, throw it o'er my face; / We'll once more hear Orsino's embassy" (1.5.161-62); however, after these lines cue "Cesario's" entrance, the two actors swiftly switch to prose. The Olivia-part does not switch back into verse until halfway through the first scene with "Cesario," once Olivia begins to take an interest in the page. As Palfrey and Stern observe, "As Olivia falls in love with 'Cesario', her tenacious identification with prose is whittled down—although not without a struggle" (416). But this point does not explain why "Cesario" also speaks in prose until the halfway mark – "Cesario" is the one who actually starts the shift to prose as well as the one to verse. Palfrey and Stern note, "When first meeting 'Cesario', Olivia reverts to the clipped, impatient, and haughty prose that has typified her previous disquisitions" (416). Indeed, Olivia's first questions and commands are icily phrased. However, in addition to what the part tells the actor, her "Whence came you sir?" and "Are you a comedian?" also inform the two actors who are playing "Cesario" and Olivia that she wants someone to finish her half-lines with verse instead of prose. Later on in the scene, once the switch to verse has been made, Palfrey and Stern assert, "throughout, the fit of one line into another lacks real grace or ease, while Olivia's content continues to suggest discrete prose

statements rather than shared verse-lines. There is no comfortable prosodic folding of one person's speech into the other; correspondingly, the actor is told, there will be no harmonious merging of mind and emotion" (419). Yet I would argue that if the same actors played the parts of Rosalind and Phoebe, they would already know that their parts would not match up in shared iambic pentameter lines and that they would complete each other's phrases, instead, with another short line or by finishing the line over ten syllables.

Like "Ganymede's" prose in *As You Like It*, the prose here could indicate the characters' lack of connection, the distance between their worlds when the two begin their conversation. Yet the prose itself is no less rhythmical than the blank verse, and the characters' bantering is equally entertaining. As Wright observes, "Shakespeare's prose . . . typically serves as a worthy alternative mode to Shakespeare's verse, as another register to add to the iambic keyboard, a whole new set of stops, a para-metrical system that works with the metrical system to enable Shakespeare's choices of word, phrase, figure, and rhythm to be not merely various but infinitely graded and toned" (113). While the same could be said for Jonson's prose, the point is that we cannot pin down prose and verse as being for one type of character or situation, but the actors themselves would know that when there is a switch between verse to prose, or vice versa, that the change does matter and triggers a change in emotion or action. The switch from prose to verse indicates that "Cesario" and Olivia will both begin to speak of love; however, while their lines begin to mimic one another in meter, they do not share the same love interest. The actor playing Olivia, of course, while seeking to mirror Olivia's newfound desire for "Cesario" through verse, also would reference his Falstaff and Phoebe-scenes to understand how the prosody functions in this scene to communicate the characters' emotional and physical distance from one another.

### **The Switch from Repulsion to Desire: Sense Imagery and Spatial Concepts**

In *Metaphors We Live By*, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson explain that our “conceptual system” functions through “simple spatial concepts” like “UP-DOWN, FRONT-BACK, IN-OUT, NEAR-FAR etc. . . . In other words, the structure of our spatial concepts emerges from our constant spatial experience, that is, our interaction with the physical environment” (56-57). As Lakoff and Johnson explain, “what we call ‘direct physical experience’ is never merely a matter of having a body of a certain sort; rather, *every* experience takes place within a vast background of cultural presuppositions” (57). Within our culture, subcultures exist in which spatial concepts like up and down function as a short-hand for a certain movement. For example, in the theater, up and down function not only as getting up or sitting down but also as moving down stage or up stage. We also move near another actor or distance ourselves farther from him depending on the scene’s emotional and physical context and the characters’ relationship type. Furthermore, we experience spatial concepts through sensorial and spatial language. For early modern actors who had to perform up to six plays a week, the parts’ spatial concepts and sensory language not only helped them memorize their lines, but also, more importantly, prompted them to ground these spatial concepts and sense imagery in their movement and interaction with other actors within their shared fictive space.

It is likely that these scenes would have only been rehearsed once or twice, if at all, before the performance. Without having access to Silvius’s speech before the performance, the actor playing Phoebe would have had to rely on what he could determine from his scroll to understand the scene’s framework. In looking at Phoebe’s first speech, it is clear that she is rebuking Silvius for his overdramatic Petrarchan vows of love:

I would not be thy executioner,  
I fly thee, for I would not injure thee:

Thou tell'st me there is murder in mine eye,  
 'Tis pretty sure, and very probable,  
 That eyes that are the frail'st, and softest things,  
 Who shut their coward gates on atomies,  
 Should be called tyrants, butchers, murderers.  
 Now I do frown on thee with all my heart,  
 And if mine eyes can wound, now let them kill thee:  
 Now counterfeit to swoon, why now fall down,  
 Or if thou canst not, O for shame, for shame,  
 Lie not, to say mine eyes are murderers:  
 Now show the wound mine eye hath made in thee,  
 Scratch thee but with a pin, and there remains  
 Some scar of it: Lean upon a rush,  
 The cicatrice and capable impressure  
 Thy palm some moment keeps: but now mine eyes,  
 Which I have darted at thee, hurt thee not,  
 Nor I am sure there is no force in eyes  
 That can do hurt. (3.5.8-27)

In memorizing this speech, the Phoebe-actor could be drawn to the visual imagery that Shakespeare invokes, as he repeats “eye(s)” seven times within the first speech. The shepherdess spurns Silvius’s accusation that she is like an “executioner,” whose eyes have injured him to death. Phoebe mocks Silvius by willing her eyes to physically wound him: “And if mine eyes can wound, now let them kill thee” (16). When his death does not occur, she berates him to show physical evidence of the love wound that her eyes have made. The repetition of “eyes” works well here to ground the actor in focusing on his senses and reactions to how repulsed Phoebe is to look on Silvius as well as keeping the actor’s and audience’s focus on the physical space and connection, or lack thereof, between the two characters.

But the metaphors of space and relationship would also speak to the actor’s passions and movement. If we apply Lakoff and Johnson’s metaphor theory to Phoebe’s concept of space and Silvius’s love at the beginning of the scene, we will view Phoebe’s reaction as seeking more space for herself, which, in turn, affects the actor’s expression of emotion and movement. As Lakoff and Johnson observe,

We experience ourselves as entities, separate from the rest of the world—as containers with an inside and an outside. . . . We experience many things through sight and touch, as having distinct boundaries, and, when things have no distinct boundaries, we often project boundaries upon them—conceptualizing them as entities and often as containers (for example, forests, clearings, clouds, etc.). (58)

Phoebe’s “I fly thee, for I would not injure thee” clues the actor to put distance between himself and the Silvius-player. The pun on “I” and “eye” also alludes to the Phoebe-part’s desire for a separate space. Phoebe argues emphatically that her eyes are in no way connected to Silvius’s wounded heart, rationalizing that her eyes cannot be murderers because they cannot touch Silvius. This rationale, again, demonstrates the distance that the Phoebe-actor should put between the two, as the character seeks to sever any connection that Silvius tries to create between them.

Yet Silvius pushes against her concept of his love, seeking to draw her closer to his understanding of love as physically torturous. He piteously replies,

O dear Phoebe,  
 If ever – as that ever may be near –  
 You meet in some fresh cheek the power of fancy,  
 Then shall you know the wounds invisible  
 That love’s keen arrows make. (28-32)

His reference to time as “if ever,” hoping that “ever” be “near” equates love at first sight again as both spatially near and temporally close. “You meet in some fresh cheek the power of fancy” seeks to reframe her concept of the eyes as impenetrable and distant, equating sight with touching upon a “fresh cheek” which she will love. And most of all, his metaphor of love as a weapon that wounds equates his relationship to Phoebe as one that is spatially connected, physically painful, and temporally both immediate and infinite. His use of “near,” “ever,” and “meet” bring him closer to her, perhaps prompting the actor to move, but even if the actor does not take this prompt, his words seek to create a physical space for their love.

Yet Phoebe's second speech even more emphatically sets distance between the two:

But till that time  
Come not thou near me: and when that time comes,  
Afflict me with thy mocks, pity me not,  
As till that time I shall not pity thee. (32-35)

She finishes his six-syllable line with "But till that time" and finishes the enjambed phrase in the next line "Come not thou near me." Lakoff and Jonson remark, "the TIME IS A MOVING OBJECT metaphor is based on the correlation between an object moving toward us and the time it takes to get to us. . . . Events and actions are correlated with bounded time spans, and this makes them CONTAINER OBJECTS" (58-59). "Till" and "that" re-conceptualize time as distant, while "Come not" and "near me" seek to physically and spatially push Silvius out of her contained world. And "when that time comes" seeks to frame time as a fixed event that can spatially "come" closer, but is not "near" her now. She characterizes their future relationship as being close enough for Silvius to "afflict" her with his "mocks," but it does not show emotional closeness, as she states that neither will pity the other. So again, the actor could use this speech to create distance between the Silvius-actor and himself, as Phoebe seeks to sever their connection. Of course, when "Ganymede" interjects, Phoebe is immediately physically drawn to him, creating another emotional space for actors to negotiate physically onstage.

Fallace and Deliro's first scene together also contains references to the senses and spatial imagery. Like Shakespeare, Jonson provides the actor with sensory images to motivate the actor's movement, emotions, memory, and reactions; yet instead of sight, Jonson focuses on Fallace's sense of smell, playing on the puns of "sense," "since," and "scents" throughout her dialogue with her husband: "Ay, long *since* perhaps, / But now that *sense* is altered" (2.2.109-10) and "If you make no difference / Betwixt the *scent* of growing flowers and cut ones, / You have a *sense* to taste lamp-oil, i' faith" (122-24). In addition, death, illness, and wounding also recur in

Fallace's speech, but instead of being the "executioner," Fallace is the one who is "plagued," whose "head doth ache," and whose "brain doth sweat so" from her husband's acts of love that he has become *her* executioner. Although, historically, perfumes were used to ward off disease, Deliro's floral scents plague Fallace with loathing.

Fallace's frenetic energy pours off the page as she explains how she is anything but stagnant and cannot be contained by her husband:

But now that sense is altered. You would have me,  
Like to a puddle or a standing pool,  
To have no motion nor no spirit within me.  
No, I am like a pure and sprightly river  
That moves forever, and yet is still the same;  
Or fire that burns much wood, yet still one flame. (2.2.110-15)

Fallace describes herself as filled with "motion" and energy, as opposed to her husband, who seeks to confine her to one spot. She speaks of her need to develop her own space, attempting to physically distance herself from Deliro through her words and actions. Suffocating from her husband's attention, she feels restricted within the space he has created for her, trapped by the invasion of her senses and her physical walking space:

And with such judgement have you changed the chambers,  
Leaving no room that I can joy to be in  
In all your house: and now my walk and all  
You smoke me from, as if I were a fox,  
And long belike to drive me quite away:  
Well walk you there, and I'll walk where I list. (125-30)

As a creature "smoke[d]" from her favorite place, she attempts to draw a physical boundary between her husband and herself, ordering him to walk in the space he has infiltrated, while she will find her own space, presumably on a separate part of the stage.

The Olivia-part also possesses sense imagery, and Olivia, at least at first, seeks her own space on stage as well. While Jonson uses smell to awaken Fallace's ire, and Shakespeare evokes

anger from Phoebe through eye imagery, Olivia's part is influenced by several senses during the scene. Since she veils herself, her eyes are protected, at first, so the character-part instead relies on words and actions that revolve around speech and hearing: "Speak to me, I shall answer for her" (1.5.164) and "I pray you keep it in. I heard you were saucy at my gates, and allowed your approach rather to wonder at you, than to hear you" (191-94). The Olivia-part continues to mock Orsino's messenger, complaining, "Sure, you have some hideous matter to deliver, when the courtesy of it is so fearful. Speak your office" (201-2) and "Yet you began rudely" (206). Her critical references to speaking and hearing all indicate that she has distanced herself from "Cesario" both physically and emotionally. Her veil keeps her protected, providing her with a private, secure space, until "Cesario" requests to see her face.

Once Olivia lifts the veil, her eyes light on 'Cesario,' and she is attracted to him. Olivia runs through a litany of her facial features that men find impressive: "O sir, I will not be so hard-hearted: I will give out divers schedules of my beauty. It shall be inventoried and every particle and utensil labelled to my will: As, item two lips indifferent red, item two grey eyes, with lids to them: item, one neck, one chin, & so forth. Were you sent hither to praise me?" (TLN 535-40). This language is quite different than Phoebe and Fallace's speeches to Deliro and Silvius because Olivia's itemization seeks to draw "Cesario" closer to her face. In asking if "Cesario" was "sent hither to praise" her looks, Olivia is mocking Orsino's romantic ministrations, but also showing decided curiosity in the page's next move. Unlike Phoebe and Fallace, she does not seek to distance herself from "Cesario" because he now functions as her object of desire instead of the mediator for Orsino's love. Olivia wants to know more about Orsino's love, asking, "How does he love me?," not because she cares about Orsino, but because she wants to continue to be near "Cesario" and hear him speak.

Turning from prose, Olivia begins to mimic “Cesario’s” verse as she come closer to falling in love with him. After “Cesario” professes that Orsino loves her with “sighs of fire” (TLN 548), Olivia speaks in verse:

Your lord does know my mind, I cannot love him  
 Yet I suppose him virtuous, know him noble,  
 Of great estate, of fresh and stainless youth;  
 In voices well divulged, free, learn'd, and valiant,  
 And in dimension, and the shape of nature,  
 A gracious person; but yet I cannot love him:  
 He might have took his answer long ago. (TLN 549-55)

Palfrey and Stern argue that Olivia’s speech about Orsino reflects that the character is “uncomfortably at odds with the trite clichés and paratactic formulae he [the Olivia-actor] is here asked to express (which of course hail Orsino’s virtues rather than “Cesario’s”). So, Olivia’s list of worthy adjectives . . . suggests a wearily rehearsed catalogue” (418). But it is important to point out that this “catalogue” begins the switch in Olivia and “Cesario’s” relationship from one of distant acquaintances of different stations to two characters that come closer through verse as they influence each other’s realization of love. Although Olivia does not wish to apply these virtues to Orsino, she is more than willing to associate “Cesario” with these praises. Closing the scene, Olivia seeks to take control of her new emotional connection as well as the physical space between “Cesario” and herself:

Get you to your lord:  
 I cannot love him: let him send no more,  
 Unless (perchance) you come to me again,  
 To tell me how he takes it: Fare you well:  
 I thank you for your pains: spend this for me.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ [Farewell fair] cruelty  
 (TLN 574-83)

Olivia again seeks to separate herself physically and emotionally from Orsino and his page with “Get you to your lord / I cannot love him: let him send no more.” But she changes her mind,

realizing that she wants to see “Cesario” again and closes the physical distance between them with “Unless (perchance) you come to me again” and “spend this for me,” at once beckoning “Cesario” into her emotional and physical space as well as seeking to connect with him through monetary tokens of desire. In later switching Sebastian for “Cesario,” the Olivia-actor finally performs a scene in which the character, who is so contextually intertwined with Phoebe and Fallace, might finally possess a pleasing substitute for her desire.

### **Scene Endings**

Like Lady Macbeth, Cleopatra, and Volumnia’s lines, the Phoebe, Fallace, and Olivia-parts speak back to one another, prompting memory in movement, expression, and rhetoric. Olivia’s part in her first scene with “Cesario” ends on two rhyming couplets, but like Phoebe’s part these last lines do not reveal as much about Olivia’s thoughts as the speech she delivers before ordering Malvolio to go after “Cesario.” Olivia’s echoing of “Cesario’s” words, “Above my fortunes, yet my state is well: / I am a gentleman. I’ll be sworn thou art” (1.5.282-83) speaks back to Phoebe’s “He’ll make a proper man” (3.5.116) and Fallace’s “O, how happy is that lady above other ladies that enjoys so absolute a gentleman to her servant” (2.2.333-35). Olivia’s praises, “Thy tongue, thy face, thy limbs, actions, and spirit, / Do give thee five-fold blazon” (1.5.284-85), prove to be a more timid version of Fallace’s “he has a face like a cherubim,” “a body like an angel,” and “a tongue able to ravish any woman i’th earth” (2.2.340, 343-44, 347). However, Olivia’s verses do voice more confidence in her desire than Phoebe’s first description of “Ganymede”:

... The best thing in him  
Is his complexion: and faster than his tongue  
Did make offence, his eye did heal it up:  
He is not very tall, yet for his years he’s tall:  
His leg is but so so, and yet ‘tis well:  
There was a pretty redness in his lip,

A little riper, and more lusty-red  
 Than that mixed in his cheek: 'twas just the difference  
 Betwixt the constant red, and mingled damask.  
 There be some women Silvius, had they marked him  
 In parcels as I did, would have gone near  
 To fall in love with him: but for my part,  
 I love him not, nor hate him not: and yet (3.5.116-28)

The young shepherdess waffles between thinking her love interest's leg is only "so so" and "'tis well," that his height "not very tall" but "for his years he's tall," and faults him for his quick "tongue" but praises him for the red and white in his "complexion." Clearly, the city wife's ruminations are bawdier than the shepherdess's musings, but Olivia's desire seems to match Fallace's as Olivia attempts to slow down her thoughts on his parts with "Not too fast: soft, soft, / Unless the master were the man" (1.5.285-86). Unlike Fallace, the Olivia-part equates the "plague" with love instead of repulsion (287), but like Silvius, Olivia believes that her eyes are to blame for her falling in love: "I feel this youth's perfections / With an invisible, and subtle stealth / To creep in at mine eyes" (288-90).

Each female character ends with thinking on her love interest's parts. All three women suggest that their thoughts have been infected by love; therefore, each one begins to create a space for that thought and puts into motion the scheme of how she will next meet her respective love interest. Both Phoebe's "I'll write it straight: / The matter's in my head, and in my heart" (3.5.138-39) and Olivia's "I do I know not what, and fear to find / Mine eye too great a flatterer for my mind" (1.5.301-2) both reveal how love preoccupies their thoughts, making a space for change in the character's actions. But Fallace's prose suggests the clearest sense of how she wishes to contain and protect her fantasy: "I have heard of a citizen's wife has been beloved of a courtier; and why not I? Heigh ho: well, I will into my private chamber, lock the door to me, and

think over all his good parts one after another” (2.2.353-57). For her, this is one space that she does not want her husband to invade, on or off stage.

Connecting clues about the plays and their chronologies has led to a false sense of antagonism between the playwrights, when the allusions to the other plays could also indicate whom the actor interacted with or sparred against in the previous play, which would function as a memory device for the actors and an in-joke for audience members who had seen all of the plays. While these plays are not a series or trilogy as we imagine them to be, the plays’ connections did speak to early modern playwrights, actors, and audience members, creating a focus on playful collaboration rather than, or just as much as, caustic antagonism in the Chamberlain’s Men’s Globe. Audiences who had not seen each play would be motivated to see the one they missed should it be performed again or tempted to not miss the “next” play, which functions as another installment to the character relationships and plots. Parts and scenes in *As You Like It*, *Every Man Out*, and *Twelfth Night* prove to be intricately coded patterns for performing old material in a new way.

This chapter provides an introduction to how playwrights’ parts, which are written within the same timeframe and are scripted for the same actor, are systematically coded and cognitively scaffolded for performance. In order to expound upon this theory and further clarify how scaffolding works in the early modern theater for novice, intermediate, and advanced actors, we need to examine more parts by more playwrights that were written for the same company. For example, comparing male and female parts from *King Lear* and *Volpone* or *The Revenger’s Tragedy* and *Macbeth* also would reveal interdependent parts and relationship patterns. Scholars also could examine court performance documents to see which plays were paired together and how these plays’ parts cognitively relate to one another. In addition, looking at the boys’

companies' plays also would develop this theory beyond the Chamberlain's Men in exciting ways. Ultimately, while playwrights like Jonson and Shakespeare have different styles of writing, in order for early modern actors to perform these contrasting styles, playwrights' parts and scenes were recreated and reshaped to develop and ground actors' social and spatial cognition in performance.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

## Conclusion: Social Cognition and the Future of Early Modern Performance and Scholarship

This dissertation has used different concepts of cognitive science to investigate acts of collaboration in composing, structuring, rehearsing, and performing early modern actors' parts. For the actor studying his part, cue lengths, stage directions, and entrance and exit signals function as visual and verbal codes for shifts in action and cue partners. But an actor's individual part for a play was not the only device that the actor relied on in performance. He also depended on other actors' lines that would prompt him to change emotions, expressions, and actions. Responding to prompts within each other's parts, actors operated in a socially situated and distributed cognitive system to successfully embody, vocalize, and express their characters' emotions and actions.

More work remains to be done, however, in examining actors' parts, the process of composing parts, and the performance itself. More extant parts must be analyzed for rehearsal and performance codes. In particular, studying nineteenth-century Shakespearean parts would be useful, not only because studying these parts would add to our data as we continue to study parts as cognitive artifacts, but also because we can study extant female character parts from the nineteenth century.<sup>91</sup> We can also compare the same parts from different productions: for example, the Folger has preserved two eighteenth-century King John actors' parts, David Garrick's from 1745 and John Philip Kemble's from 1783. In addition, more attention needs to be paid to parts other than Shakespeare and early modern dramatic roles. John Philip Kemble's

---

<sup>91</sup> As noted in Chapter Two, no female early modern parts appear to be preserved until the mid-nineteenth century.

collection of thirty-four parts provides a wealth of information about other roles, such as Maskwell in Congreve's *The Double Dealer* and Alexander in Nathaniel Lee's *Alexander the Great*. Closely studying parts like these two would not only further our knowledge of how codes in Shakespeare's and other early modern playwrights' parts work, but also provide us with the opportunity to see if these codes can be traced to other periods' plays and playwrights.

Along with studying extant cognitive artifacts, scholars could also benefit from continuing to apply socially situated and distributed cognition to the study of early modern plays to resurrect knowledge about the early modern performance. Scientists R. Keith Sawyer (who has written on improvisation and cognition) and James Greeno explain that the "situative perspective conceptualizes knowledge as distributed across people and artifacts, and the focus [of scientists who study learning and situated cognition] is on understanding activity systems in which knowledge is contributed and used in joint actions by the people and other resources that participate collaboratively" (348). Reexamining early modern dramatic texts, or "artifacts," through the lens of social, situated, and distributed cognition can reveal how early modern actors collaborate within their "activity systems" to learn their parts and transmit affective and expressive prompts in performance. Although my analysis of *Othello* demonstrates how actors can prompt one another's emotions and expressions through language and my study of *Richard II* shows how actors use language about facial expressions as social cues for character alliances and empathy, both of these ideas could be expanded. For example, we could compare *Othello* to other plots that revolve around a Machiavellian character to look for similarities within the actors and characters' relationships. In order to implement this idea, we would not have to look too far: Shakespeare's *Measure for Measure* (perf. 1604-05) and *King Lear* (perf. 1605-06) and Jonson's

*Volpone* (perf. 1605-06), all performed within a year or two of *Othello* (perf. 1604-05)<sup>92</sup>, have plots structured around Machiavellian characters (Angelo, Edmund, and Volpone), who manipulate other characters' emotions and actions.<sup>93</sup> We might find similar modes of affective priming and conceptual blending in comparing these four plays' parts and relationships. *Richard II's* dependence on social cues for expression could be compared to affective and expressive prompts in other history plays or to prompts within comedic or tragic plays. In addition, Shakespeare's language about facial expressions needs to be evaluated in light of other playwrights' physiognomic descriptions to determine if expressive cues were as useful to actors in other playwrights' plays.

Likewise, in comparing *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Macbeth*, and *Coriolanus*, we have found patterns in parts and relationships across Shakespeare's plays, but comparing these texts to Middleton's *The Revenger's Tragedy*<sup>94</sup> could also yield intriguing discoveries about the King's Men's rehearsal and performance codes for parts. Gary Taylor rightly argues, "No modern audience can watch the first scene of *The Revenger's Tragedy* without thinking of *Hamlet*. The comparison would have been even more inescapable for the original audiences, because Middleton's play was performed at the Globe by the King's Men" ("A Mad World"). Although comparing these two scenes demonstrates contextual connections between Hamlet's and Vindice's grief, looking at the plays that are closer in composition and initial performance dates

---

<sup>92</sup> Roslyn Knutson's Appendix in *The Repertory of Shakespeare's Company, 1594-1613* provides the repertory years in which each play was most likely first performed and any documented seventeenth-century revivals of the plays.

<sup>93</sup> Jeremy Lopez makes a similar observation in "Imagining the Actor's Body on the Early Modern Stage": "As far as I know, no modern company has presented in the same season the three perverse and chaotic families that burst onto the Globe stage in the remarkable 1606-7 season: Lear, Cordelia, Goneril, and Regan; Vindice, Hippolito, Gratiana, Castiza; Volpone, Mosca, Dwarf, Eunuch, Fool" (189). But Lopez's article focuses on the spectators' viewing of the same actors playing these parts instead of looking for patterns within the parts that would aid the actors learning and performing them.

<sup>94</sup> Roslyn Knutson lists the *The Revenger's Tragedy* as being in the company's repertory in 1605-06 (200), but Lars Engle dates the performance between 1606-07 (1299). *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, edited by Gary Taylor, records the year of composition as 1606 (Jackson 543), but Knutson records 1607 as the publication date, as evidenced by the October entry in the Stationers' Register and the Quarto printed in 1607/08 (200).

reveals intriguing patterns in part and relationship structures that would benefit the actors. The final body chapter on Jonson and Shakespeare begins to reveal these connections in codes for the Chamberlain's Men, but assessing plays from different years would bolster these findings regarding part patterns and spatial cognition. We could also examine the court records for plays that were paired together to perform at court in order to further our understanding of part and relationship patterns and codes.

Moreover, in reaching beyond the Chamberlain's Men to examine other companies' actors' parts, we could determine if early modern playwrights composed parts differently for other companies. Thomas Middleton, for example, composed plays for the Paul's Boys and the King's Men as well as other companies (Taylor, *Thomas Middleton* 18). How would part-based composition influence other companies' reliance on collaboration and social and situated cognition? In looking for answers to this question, we also could look at plays that cross over to another company's repertoire, such as Marston's *The Malcontent*, which was produced first by the Children of the Queen's Revels at Blackfriars but was performed again by the King's Men (Rasmussen 545). For the King's Men's production, the company "commissioned an induction and additions to the text. The revisions must have been expensive . . . for between them, John Webster (induction) and John Marston (text) provided nearly six hundred new lines" (Knutson 108). Scholars could examine these two texts of *The Malcontent* to determine if the additions show any differentiations between the two companies' part and cue systems.

Yet one critic or even the early modern drama field itself will not be able to untangle the history of actors' parts without research from other scholars in different fields. We must enlist help from today's cognitive scientists and actors. More scientific studies should address actor collaboration instead of performances by individual actors or actor-audience empathy. A scientist

such as Edwin Hutchins, who pioneered studying socially distributed cognition in complex, “expert” groups, would benefit from studying Shakespearean repertory companies of the past and present, just as early modern scholars, such as Tribble and Sutton, have benefitted from applying his theory of socially distributed cognition to their studies. And repertory companies that perform early modern drama could help us piece together the fragments by performing from cue scripts and producing plays in the order that we think the companies produced them. While the former suggestion regarding scientific study is beyond my immediate control, the second suggestion already has been partially addressed by the American Shakespeare Center (ASC), whose actors use cue scripts in rehearsal. Tiffany Stern’s work, among other theater scholars, has inspired the company’s incorporation of cue-scripts and brief rehearsal periods (2011 Blackfriars Conference).

For the past six years, the ASC’s resident troupe has produced an Actors’ Renaissance Season in which the company’s resident actors incorporate even more original practices from the early modern period than usual. While the Blackfriars Playhouse troupe adheres to using early modern practices when designing costumes, lighting, music, and sets in its regular season’s productions, which are housed in a replica of the London Blackfriars Theatre, the Actors’ Renaissance season further experiments with original stage conventions, challenging the actors to stage the plays without the aid of a director, rehearse each play for a few days instead of a few weeks, and memorize their lines from cue scripts that provide their parts and one-to three-word cues. Most of the ASC actors have participated in at least two of the Actors’ Renaissance seasons, so the actors’ staging, ensemble work, and memorization techniques are informed by more than one year’s experience. By applying their previous acting training to the Renaissance season productions, the actors successfully modify original stage practices to fit their ensemble’s

productions, adapting early modern performance practices to meet their needs instead of strictly conforming to how scholars believe Renaissance players rehearsed and performed.

Scholars have become increasingly interested in how twenty-first century companies incorporate original stage practices into their productions and how these companies can help us discover more about early modern theatrical practices. In particular, since 2001, the American Shakespeare Center has held a biennial conference for scholars to present ten to thirteen minute papers about staging and other performance history issues, and in their presentations, scholars are encouraged to use the ASC actors to prove their points (Conference History). This cross-over has been beneficial for scholarship: as Peter Kanelos and Matt Kozusko note, when scholars incorporate actors into their presentations, they can discover whether their interpretations and theories “hold up—or if other, unforeseen possibilities emerge” (12). But few critics have examined the ASC’s productions and their textual fragments in-depth. Through studying the ASC’s productions and rehearsal process, scholars can analyze specifically how professional actors use and modify original practices and theatre practitioners can effectively incorporate these practices into their productions. In addition, observing ASC’s performance and rehearsal practices in the Actors’ Renaissance Season can reveal questions, and possibly answers, about the connections between early modern part-based composition and performance and cognitive science.

Several scholars have written about twentieth- and twenty-first-century companies that incorporate original practices. Don Weingust, for example, gives a “brief overview” of the kinds of early modern theater practices that specific companies such as the ASC’s Blackfriar Playhouse troupe, the New England Shakespeare Festival, and Patrick Tucker’s Original Shakespeare Company use in rehearsal and performance. Both the Original Shakespeare

Company, no longer in operation, and the New England Shakespeare Festival use parts, or cue scripts, for rehearsing and performing their productions and rely on Shakespeare's First Folio instead of modernized texts (252-53). As for the ASC troupe, as Weingust remarks, the "artistic management prepares the performance texts, but the actors have flexibility negotiating changes to them. Often a leading actor in a particular play will take on a modified actor-manager role, guiding the work of the company, which otherwise is accomplished through surprisingly efficient consensus efforts" (252).<sup>95</sup> But for Weingust's commissioned essay for the 2007 Blackfriars Conference essay collection, since it is intended to provide an "overview," does not go beyond giving scholars a glimpse at various companies' practices.

Tribble describes the Original Shakespeare Company, Globe, and ASC's systems of production in *Cognition in the Globe's* conclusion, which contends that modern-day companies that incorporate original practices can lead us to view theater as a "model of cognitive ecology" (158). Tribble's description of ASC's performance practices for their Ren Season is particularly interesting because her observations lead to more questions. From listening to some of the actors' discussions at ASC's scholar conferences, Tribble summarizes the troupe's incorporation and development of the part-based system:

In 2005, following the first winter season, some of the actors reported themselves bereft without the accustomed artifacts and props that normally supported their preparation for a play; one actor said that he highlighted his entire cue-script because he couldn't remember anything that was not yellow. Such a result might be predicted from a theory of cognitive ecology—simply changing the "objects" or cognitive artifacts does not immediately produce changes to cognitive mechanisms or social structures. At the 2007 conference, however, members of the company discussed the ways that the practice had evolved over time. One change simply evolved from the greater familiarity of the established members of the company with the processes of rehearsal. This facilitated an informal enskillment process, in which experienced members of the company were able to induct new players into the procedures and habits of the company. Such an *ad-hoc*

---

<sup>95</sup> For some ASC Ren Season productions, a particular actor will "cut" the text for the troupe. For example, Ben Curns, who played Richard of Gloucester, served as dramaturg for the ASC's 2011 production of *King Henry VI.3*.

arrangement is far removed from a formal apprentice system, yet shows the power of social structures in distributed cognition. (162)

Tribble's explanation provides an excellent starting point for investigating the socially distributed cognitive system that the actors have developed, but her speculations about the "enskillment" process would need some modifications if we look at the company's casting choices. For example, one of the newest company members, Gregory Jon Phelps, was cast as a lead character (Dromio of Syracuse) in the season's first play, *The Comedy of Errors*. The cast lists apparently are also made up in advance so actors would possibly have time to think about and read up on their roles and the other characters they interact with in the plot. For example, in ASC's podcast for *The Comedy of Errors*, Tyler Moss (Dromio of Ephesus) and Gregory Jon Phelps (Dromio of Syracuse) discuss how they worked together ahead of time to create the twin's physical characteristics and mannerisms (Blackfriars Backstage Pass). These kinds of details reveal how the actors incorporate original practices but also rely on collaboration and their previous acting training to shape their character choices. More importantly, without actually speaking with the actors in person and asking more detailed questions about their rehearsal process and specific productions, observations about the troupe's development are rather limited to another overview (albeit more detailed and thesis driven) instead of a more complex understanding of how the actors' rehearsal and performance practices are informed by cognition and collaboration.

Unfortunately for Tribble and the other scholars who attend the innovative ASC conferences, the Actors' Renaissance Season is not arranged in conjunction with the conference: the Ren Season runs from January to April, while the conference is in October. The actors' fall season productions have directors, *full* scripts, more rehearsals, and costume designers. If scholars want to see the Ren Season actors produce plays from cue scripts and brief rehearsals,

they have to “pay what they will” to venture to the Blackfriars Playhouse for the winter season.<sup>96</sup> In the 2011 Renaissance Season, the actors put up five plays: *The Comedy of Errors*, Marston’s *The Malcontent*, *Look About You* (anonymous), Shakespeare’s *Henry VI.3*, and Middleton’s *A Trick to Catch the Old One*. In seeing three out of the five of these plays, I was struck by how the casting replicated some of the same actor and character relationship patterns across plays and how some of the actors’ relied on specific stage spaces and blocking more than other stage locations when performing their parts, which seemed to function as a way of mapping the actor’s overlapping character parts into a secure space for each play. For example, the actor (Ben Curns) who played Walkadine Hoard (*A Trick*), Richard of Gloucester (*Henry VI.3*), and Duke Altfronto (*The Malcontent*) was paired<sup>97</sup> with the same actress (Miriam Donald)<sup>98</sup> for *A Trick* and *The Malcontent*. These two actors, then, acted out a similar romantic relationship for these two plays and relied on similar blocking and physical interactions. Other actors also were grouped together for the three plays, perhaps shaping the actors’ reliance on one another’s similar part types during performance. The actors also made use of the diagonals in the stage space, and particular actors, such as the male lead, frequently blocked their characters in the same space on stage.

While the American Shakespeare Center seeks to “delight” audiences, it also seeks to “instruct” theatergoers about early modern drama’s original stage practices. Other companies could use ASC’s Renaissance Season as a model for staging cue-script performances. Even more helpful, ASC or another drama troupe could stage plays by performance year and cast actors in similar parts to see how scaffolding these parts helped the early modern actors not only learn

---

<sup>96</sup> For scholars like Tribble (who lives in New Zealand), this scheduling is a disadvantage since they must learn secondhand about the actors’ rehearsal and performance practices.

<sup>97</sup> I use passive voice here because while the actors have more control over the Ren Season productions, the company’s artistic directors cast the plays.

<sup>98</sup> Miriam Donald played Jane (*A Trick*), Prince Edward (*Henry VI.3*), and Maria (*The Malcontent*).

their lines and cues, but also create and recreate relationships, emotions, and action on stage. Granted, contemporary actors might have more time to look at their parts and would still have the opportunity to access the play's full text with a few clicks on the computer keyboard. So as scholars might point out, we can never truly recreate or reconstruct the early modern theatre. But early modern actors also might have had ways of gathering more detailed information that their individual parts lacked. Perhaps they compared parts when they were handed out or backstage during a performance. Or perhaps like the American Shakespeare Center's troupe, they attached their parts or notes to the walls behind the stage. We do not know for sure, but experimenting with these texts in the archival library and on the stage can bring us closer to understanding early modern actors' parts and dramatists' plays not just as individual texts but also as fragments of collaborative performance. In formulating more questions about how early modern parts' function in the actors' socially situated and distributed cognitive system, we can discover new answers for extant as well as absent parts and texts from the early modern theatre.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “2011 Blackfriars Conference.” *American Shakespeare Center*. American Shakespeare Center. 2011. Web. 21 May 2011.
- Adolphs, Ralph. “What is Special about Social Cognition?” *Social Neuroscience: People Thinking about Thinking People*. Ed. John Cacioppo, Penny Visser, and Cynthia Pickett. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006. 269-86.
- Appleton, William. *Charles Macklin: An Actor’s Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960.
- Baldwin, T. W. *The Organization and the Personnel of the Shakespearean Company*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1927.
- Barish, Jonas. *The Antitheatrical Prejudice*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1981.
- Baumbach, Sibylle. *Shakespeare and the Art of Physiognomy*. Tirril, Penrith: Humanities-Ebooks, 2008.
- Bednarz, James P. *Shakespeare and the Poets’ War*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.
- Belsey, Catherine. “Shakespeare’s Little Boys: Theatrical Apprenticeship and the Construction of Childhood.” *Rematerializing Shakespeare: Authority and Representation on the Early Modern English Stage*. Ed. Bryan Reynolds and William N. West. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. 53-72.
- Bevington, David. *Action is Eloquence: Shakespeare’s Language of Gesture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- . Introduction. *Antony and Cleopatra*. William Shakespeare. The New Cambridge Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- . Introduction. *The Tragedy of King Richard the Second* by William Shakespeare. *Shakespeare’s Histories, The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Ed. David Bevington. New York: Pearson Longman, 2003. 740-44.
- Blackfriars Backstage Pass: Actor Scholar Council on *The Comedy of Errors*. *American Shakespeare Center*. American Shakespeare Center. 1 February 2011. Web. 5 March 2011.
- Blair, Rhonda. “Cognitive Neuroscience and Acting: Imagination, Conceptual Blending, and Empathy.” *TDR: The Drama Review* 53.4 (Winter 2009): 93-103.

- Boal, August. *Theatre of the Oppressed*, 3rd ed. Trans. Charles A. McBride, et al. London: Pluto Press, 2000. 168.
- Bradley, David. *From Text to Performance in the Elizabethan Theatre: Preparing the Play for the Stage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Brown, Pamela and Peter Parolin. Introduction. *Women Players in England, 1500-1600*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005. 1-24.
- Bulwer, John. *Chirologia and Chironomia*. London: 1644. Early English Books Online.
- . *Pathomyotomia: Or, a Dissection of the Significant Muscles of the Affections of the Minde*. London: 1649. Early English Books Online.
- Butler, Martin. *Re-Presenting Ben Jonson : Text, History, Performance*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Carnegie, David. "Actors' Parts and the 'Play of Poore.'" *Harvard Library Bulletin*. 30 (1982): 5-24.
- Chalmers, David. Foreword. *Supersizing the Mind: Embodiment, Action, and Cognitive Extension*. By Andy Clark. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. ix-xvi.
- Chambers, E.K. *The Elizabethan Stage*. Vol. 2. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1923.
- Clark, Andy. "Minds in Space." *The Spatial Foundations of Language and Cognition*. Ed. Kelly S. Mix, Linda B. Smith, and Michael Gasser. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. 7-15.
- . *Supersizing the Mind: Embodiment, Action, and Cognitive Extension*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- "Conference History." *American Shakespeare Center*. American Shakespeare Center. 2011. Web. 21 May 2011.
- Cook, Amy. "Interplay: The Method and Potential of a Cognitive Science Approach to Theatre." *Theatre Journal*. 59.4 (2007): 579-94.
- . *Shakespearean Neuroplay: Reinvigorating the Study of Dramatic Texts and Performance through Cognitive Science*. Cognitive Studies in Literature and Performance Series. Ed. Blakely Vermeule and Bruce McConachie. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010.
- . "Wrinkles, Wormholes, and *Hamlet*: The Wooster Group's *Hamlet* as a Challenge to Periodicity." *TDR: The Drama Review* 53:4 (Winter 2009): 104-19.
- Crane, Mary Thomas. *Shakespeare's Brain: Reading with Cognitive Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

- Davis, Philip. *Shakespeare Thinking*. Shakespeare Now! Series, Ed. Simon Palfrey and Ewan Fernie. Continuum: London, 2007.
- Donaldson, Ian. "Looking Sideways: Jonson, Shakespeare and the Myths of Envy" In *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New Directions in Biography*. Eds. Takashi Kozuka and J.R. Mulryne. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2006.
- Dusinberre, Juliet. Appendix 3: "Ben Jonson, *As You Like It*, and the 'War of the Theatres.'" *Twelfth Night* by William Shakespeare. The Arden Shakespeare, Third Series. London: Cengage Learning, 2006. 368-73.
- . "Pancakes and a Date for *As You Like It*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 54.4 (2003): 371-405.
- Ekman, Paul. *Emotions Revealed: Understanding Faces and Feelings*. London: Phoenix, 2003.
- Elam, Keir. Introduction. *Twelfth Night* by William Shakespeare. The Arden Shakespeare, Third Series. London: Cengage Learning, 2008. 1-153.
- . Appendix 1: "The Text and Editorial Procedures." *Twelfth Night* by William Shakespeare. The Arden Shakespeare, Third Series. London: Cengage Learning, 2008. 355-79.
- Engle, Lars. Introduction. *The Revenger's Tragedy. English Renaissance Drama*. Ed. David Bevington, et al. New York: W. W. Norton, 2002. 1297-1302.
- Fauconnier, Giles and Mark Turner. *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books, 2002.
- Ferri, Francescam, et al. "When Action Meets Emotions: How Facial Displays of Emotion Influence Goal-Related Behavior." *PLoS ONE* 5.10 (2010): 1-8.
- Foakes, R.A. "The 'Part' of Orlando in Robert Greene's Play *Orlando Furioso*." Digital Essays. Henslowe-Alleyn Digitisation Project. Web. 5 June 2011.
- Folkerth, Wes. *The Sound of Shakespeare*. Accents on Shakespeare Series. London: Routledge, 2002. 106-12.
- "A Funeral Elegy on the Death of the Famous Actor Richard Burbage Who Died on Saturday in Lent the 13<sup>th</sup> of March 1618." *Theatre in Europe: A Documentary History: English Professional Theatre, 1530-1660*. Eds. Glynne William Gladstone Wickham, Herbert Berry, and William Ingram. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 181-83.
- Gallagher, Shaun. "Understanding Others: Embodied Social Cognition," *The Handbook of Cognitive Science: an Embodied Approach*. Eds. Paco Calvo and Antoni Gomila. London: Elsevier Science, 2009. 437-52.
- Gallese, Vittorio. "The 'Shared Manifold' Hypothesis: from Mirror Neurons to Empathy." *Journal of Consciousness Studies*. 8.5-7 (2001): 33-50.

- Gayton, Edmund. *Pleasant Notes upon Don Quixot*. London, 1654. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 12 February 2011.
- “gesture” 3b. *Oxford English Dictionary*. Web. 12 May 2011.
- Girard, René. *A Theatre of Envy: William Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Gosselin, Pierre, Gilles Kirouac, and François Y. Doré. “Components and Recognition of Facial Expression in the Communication of Emotion by Actors.” *What the Face Reveals: Basic and Applied Studies of Spontaneous Expression Using the Facial Action Coding System (FACS)*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Ed. Paul Ekman and Erika L. Rosenberg. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. 243-270.
- Grainger, Jonathan, Maryline Nguyen Van Kang, and Juan Segui. “Cross-modal Repetition Priming of Heterographic Homophones.” *Memory and Cognition* 29.1 (2001): 53-61.
- Gras, Henk. “*Twelfth Night, Every Man Out of His Humour*, and the Middle Temple Revels of 1597-98.” *The Modern Language Review* 84.3 (1989): 545-64.
- Greene, Robert. *The historie of Orlando Furioso, one of the twelue pieres of France As it was plaid before the Queenes Maiestie*. London: 1594. *Early English Books Online*.
- Greg, W. W. *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931.
- , ed. *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: “The Battle of Alcazar” and “Orlando Furioso.”* Oxford: Malone Society, 1922.
- Grote, David. *The Best Actors in the World: Shakespeare and His Acting Company*. London: Greenwood Press, 2002.
- Gurr, Andrew. Introduction and Textual Analysis. *King Richard II*. The New Cambridge Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- . *The Shakespeare Company, 1594-1642*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- . *The Shakespearean Stage: 1574-1642*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Gurr, Andrew and Mariko Ichikawa. *Staging in Shakespeare’s Theatres*. Oxford Shakespeare Topics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Hattaway, Michael. “Dating As You Like It, Epilogues and Prayers, and the Problems of ‘as the Dial Hand Tells O’Er’.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 60.2 (2009): 154-67.
- Hill, Thomas. *The Contemplation of Mankinde, Contayning a Singuler Discourse after the Art of Physiognomie, on all the Members and Partes of Man, as from Heade to the Foote, in a More Ample Maner than Hytherto Hath Been Published of Any*. London: Seres, 1571. *Early English Books Online*.

- Hogan, Patrick Colm. *Cognitive Science, Literature, and the Arts: A Guide for Humanists*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- de Houwer, Jan. "Priming (affective)." *The Oxford Companion to Emotion and the Affective Sciences*. Eds. David Sander and Klaus Scherer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Hutchins, Edwin. *Cognition in the Wild*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995.
- Jackson, MacDonald P. Introduction. *The Revenger's Tragedy* by Thomas Middleton. *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*. Ed. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. 543.
- Jonson, Ben. *Every Man Out of His Humour*. 1600. The Revels Edition. Ed. Helen Ostovich. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.
- Jorgensen, Paul. "'Perplex'd in the Extreme:' The Role of Thought in Othello." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 15.2 (Spring 1964): 265-75.
- Joseph, Bertram. *Acting Shakespeare*. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1969.
- Kanelos, Peter and Matt Kozusko. Introduction. *Thunder at a Playhouse: Essaying Shakespeare and the Early Modern Stage*. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2010.
- Kinney, Arthur. *Shakespeare and Cognition: Aristotle's Legacy and Shakespearean Drama*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Knutson, Roslyn. *The Repertory of Shakespeare's Company: 1594-1613*. Fayetteville: The University of Arkansas Press, 1991.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993. Reprint 2003.
- Langhans, Edward. "A Restoration Actor's Part." *Harvard Library Bulletin*. 23 (1975): 180-85.
- . *Restoration Promptbooks*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1981.
- . "Trico's Part in *Ignoramus* by George Ruggle" Transcript. Appendix E. *Restoration Promptbooks*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1981. 509-13.
- Lidell, Scott K. "Grounded Blends, Gestures, and Conceptual Shifts." *Cognitive Linguistics* 9.3 (1998): 283-314.
- "light, adj.1." VII.22. OED Online. March 2011. Oxford University Press. 18 April 2011.
- Lopez, Jeremy. "Imagining the Actor's Body on the Early Modern Stage." *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England: An Annual Gathering of Research, Criticism and Reviews*. 20 (2007): 187-203.

- Maguire, Laurie. *Shakespearean Suspect Texts: The 'Bad' Quartos and Their Contexts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Marcus, Leah. "The Two Texts of *Othello* and Early Modern Constructions of Race." *Textual Performances: The Modern Reproduction of Shakespeare's Drama*. Eds. Lukas Erne and Margaret Jane Kidney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. 21-36.
- Marino, James. *Owning William Shakespeare: The King's Men and Their Intellectual Property*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- Mazzio, Carla. "Acting with Tact: Touch and Theater in the Renaissance." *Sensible Flesh: On Touch in Early Modern Culture*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003. 159-86.
- McConachie, Bruce. *Engaging Audiences: A Cognitive Approach to Spectating in the Theatre*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.
- McConachie, Bruce and F. Elizabeth Hart. *Performance and Cognition: Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn*. Routledge: New York, 2006.
- McDonald, Russ. "Jonson and Shakespeare and the Rhythms of Verse." *The Cambridge Companion to Ben Jonson*. Ed. Richard Harp and Stanley Stewart. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. 103-18.
- McMillin, Scott. Introduction. *Othello* by William Shakespeare. The New Cambridge Shakespeare: The Early Quartos. Ed. Scott McMillin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- . "The Sharer and His Boy: Rehearsing Shakespeare's Women." *From Script to Stage in Early Modern England*. Ed. Peter Holland and Stephen Orgel. London: Palgrave, 2004. 231-45.
- McMillin, Scott and Sally-Beth MacLean. *The Queen's Men and Their Plays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Menzer, Paul. *The Hamlets: Cues, Qs, and Remembered Texts*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2008.
- . "That Old Saw: Early Modern Acting and the Infinite Regress." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 22.2 (2004): 27-44.
- Neill, Michael. "Opening the Moor: Death and Discovery in *Othello*." *Issues of Death: Mortality and Identity in English Renaissance Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997. 141-67.
- Newman, Karen. "'And wash the Ethiop white': Femininity and the Monstrous in *Othello*." *Fashioning Femininity and English Renaissance Drama*. Women in Culture and Society Series. Ed. Catharine R. Stimpson. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991. 71-93.

- Niedenthal, Paula M., Anette Rohmann, and Nathalie Dalle. "What is Primed by Emotion Concepts and Emotion Words?" *The Psychology of Evaluation: Affective Processes in Cognition and Emotion*. Ed. Jochen Musch and Karl Christoph Klauer. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003. 307-33.
- Noble, Louise. "The *Fille Vierge* as Pharmakon: The Therapeutic Value of Desdemona's Corpse." *Disease, Diagnosis, and Cure on the Early Modern Stage*. Eds. Stephanie Moss and Kaara L. Peterson. Literary and Scientific Cultures of Early Modernity Series. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2004. 135-50.
- Orgel, Stephen. *Impersonations: the Performance of Gender in Shakespeare's England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Ostovich, Helen. Introduction. *Every Man Out of His Humour* by Ben Jonson. The Revels Edition. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001. 1-95.
- Ostovich, Helen, Holger Schott Syme, and Andrew Griffin, Eds. *Locating the Queen's Men, 1583-1603: Material Practices and Conditions of Playing*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009.
- Palfrey, Simon, and Tiffany Stern. *Shakespeare in Parts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Parker, Patricia. "Shakespeare and Rhetoric: 'Dilation' and 'Delation' in Othello" *Shakespeare and the Question of Theory*, eds. Patricia Parker and Geoffrey Hartman (London: Methuen, 1985): 54-74.
- Part of Alexander (1795). John Philip Kemble, perf. Folger Shakespeare Library. MS, T.a.10.
- Part of King John (1745). David Garrick, perf. Folger Shakespeare Library. MS, w.a.172.
- Part of Maskwell (1785). John Philip Kemble, perf. Folger Shakespeare Library. MS, T.a.8.
- Part of Touchstone (1731). Charles Macklin, perf. Folger Shakespeare Library. MS, S.a.25.
- Paster, Gail Kern. *The Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- . *Humoring the Body: Emotions and the Shakespearean Stage*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Pedicord, Harry William. "Garrick Produces *King John*" *Theatre Journal* 34.4 (1982): 441-49.
- "phallus, n." *Oxford English Dictionary*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. December 2005. Web. 28 May 2011.
- Platter, Thomas. *The Journals of Two Travellers in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England: Thomas Platter and Horatio Busino*. Ed. Peter Razzell. London: Caliban Books, 1995.
- Plutarch. *The Philosophie, Commonlie Called, the Morals*. Trans. Philemon Holland. London: 1603. 214, 1294.

- Puttenham, George. *The Art of English Poesy*. Ed. Frank Whigham and Wayne A. Rebhorn. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007.
- Rasmussen, Eric. Introduction. *The Malcontent* by John Marston. *English Renaissance Drama*. Ed. David Bevington, et al. New York: W. W. Norton, 2002. 545-49.
- Ratey, John, and Eric Hagerman. *Spark: The Revolutionary New Science of Exercise and the Brain*. Narr. Walter Dixon. Gildan Media Corp., 2008. Audible. iPod.
- Roach, Joseph. *The Player's Passion: Studies in the Science of Acting*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1993.
- Robbins, Philip and Murat Aydede. "A Short Primer on Situated Cognition." *The Cambridge Handbook of Situated Cognition*. Ed. Philip Robbins and Murat Aydede. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Roediger, Henry L. and Kathleen B. McDermott. "Distortions of Memory." *The Oxford Handbook of Memory*. Ed. Endel Tulving and Fergus Craik. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. 149-64.
- Rokison, Abigail. *Shakespearean Verse Speaking: Text and Theatre Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Rowe, Katherine. "Humoral Knowledge and Liberal Cognition in Davenant's *Macbeth*." *Reading the Early Modern Passions: Essays in the Cultural History of Emotion*. Eds. Gail Kern Paster, Katherine Rowe, and Mary Floyd-Wilson. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.
- Salgado, Gamini. *Eyewitnesses of Shakespeare: First Hand Accounts of Performances 1590-1890*. London: Sussex University Press, 1975.
- Saunders, Ben. "Iago's Clyster: Purgation, Anality, and the Civilizing Process." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 55.2 (Summer 2004): 148-76.
- Sawyer, R. Keith, and James G. Greeno. "Situativity and Learning." *The Cambridge Handbook of Situated Cognition*. Ed. Philip Robbins and Murat Aydede. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 347-67.
- Scherer, K. R., A. Schorr, and T. Johnstone, eds. *Appraisal Processes in Emotion: Theory, Methods, Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Shakespeare Searched*. Search Engine. XML Mark Up by Jon Bosak. 1999. Web. 10 May 2011.
- Shakespeare, William. *Antony and Cleopatra*. Ed. David Bevington. The New Cambridge Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- . *As You Like It*. Ed. Juliet Dusinberre. The Arden Shakespeare, Third Series. London: Cengage Learning, 2006.

- . *Coriolanus*. Ed. Lee Bliss. The New Cambridge Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- . *The Life and Death of King Richard the Second. Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, histories & tragedies, published according to the true originall copies*. London: 1623. Early English Books Online.
- . *The Life and Death of King Richard the Second. Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, histories & tragedies, published according to the true originall copies*. London: 1623. Internet Shakespeare Editions.
- . *Macbeth*. Ed. A. R. Braunmuller. The New Cambridge Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008
- . *Othello*. Ed. E. A. J. Honigmann. The Arden Shakespeare. London: Aden Shakespeare, 1997.
- . *Othello*. Ed. Scott McMillin. The New Cambridge Shakespeare: the Early Quartos. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- . *The Tragedy of King Richard II*. London: 1608. Early English Books Online.
- . *The Tragedy of King Richard II*. London: 1615. Early English Books Online.
- . *The Tragedy of King Richard II*. Ed. Andrew Gurr. The New Cambridge Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- . *The Tragedy of King Richard III*. London: 1597. Early English Books Online.
- . *The Tragedy of King Richard III. Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, histories & tragedies, published according to the true originall copies*. London: 1623. Early English Books Online.
- . *Twelfth Night*. Ed. Keir Elam. The Arden Shakespeare, Third Series. London: Cengage Learning, 2006.
- Slater, Ann Pasternak. *Shakespeare the Director*. Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1982.
- Sloan, LaRue Love. "Trumpeting and 'Seeled' Eyes: A Semiotics of [Eye]conography of *Othello*" *Othello: New Critical Essays*. Ed. Philip Kolin. New York: Routledge, 2002. 363-78.
- Smith, Bruce R. *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Smith, Eliot R. and Frederica R. Conrey. "The Social Context of Cognition." *The Cambridge Handbook of Situated Cognition*. Ed. Philip Robbins and Murat Aydede. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 454-66.

- Stern, Tiffany. *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- . *Making Shakespeare: From Page to Stage*. Accents on Shakespeare Series. Ed. Terence Hawkes. Routledge: London, 2004.
- . *Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . "Was 'Totus Mundus Agit Histrionem' Ever the Motto of the Globe Theatre." *Theatre Notebook: A Journal of the History and Technique of the British Theatre* 51.3 (1997): 122-7.
- Sutton, John. "Exograms and Interdisciplinarity: History, the Extend Mind, and the Civilizing Process." *The Extended Mind*. Ed. Richard Menary. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2010. *Academica*. Web. 5 June 2011. 33-81.
- . "The Extended Mind." Panel. Shakespeare Association of America Conference 2010. Chicago, IL.
- . "Spongy Brains and Material Memories." *Environment and Embodiment in Early Modern England*. Eds. Mary Floyd-Wilson and Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. 14-34.
- Taylor, Gary. "A Mad World." *The Guardian*. The Guardian, 7 June 2008. Web. 10 June 2011.
- Toole, William B. "'Iagothello': Psychological Action and the Theme of Transformation in *Othello*." *South Atlantic Bulletin* 41.2 (May 1976) 73-74.
- Tribble, Evelyn. *Cognition in the Globe: Attention and Memory in Shakespeare's Theatre*. Cognitive Studies in Literature and Performance Series. Ed. Blakely Vermeule and Bruce McConachie. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011.
- . "Distributing Cognition in the Globe." *Shakespeare Quarterly*. 56.2 (Summer 2005): 135-155.
- . "Marlowe's Boy Actors." *Shakespeare Bulletin*. 27.1 (2009): 5-17.
- Tucker, Edward F. "The Harvard Manuscript of Parkhurst's *Ignoramus*." *Harvard Library Bulletin*. 19 (1971): 5-24.
- Turner, Henry S. "Life Science: Rude Mechanicals, Human Mortals, Posthuman Shakespeare." *South Central Review*. 26.1&2 (Winter & Spring 2009): 197-217.
- . *Shakespeare's Double Helix*. Shakespeare Now! Series, Ed. Simon Palfrey and Ewan Fernie. London: Continuum, 2007.
- Tyson, Brian F. "Ben Jonson's Black Comedy: A Connection between *Othello* and *Volpone*." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 29.1 (1978): 60-6.

Weingust, Don. "Early Modern Theatrical Practice in the Later Modern Playhouse: A Brief Overview." *Thunder at a Playhouse: Essaying Shakespeare and the Early Modern Stage*. Ed. Peter Kanelos and Matt Kozusko. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 2010. 249-58.

Wilders, John. Introduction. *Antony and Cleopatra*. William Shakespeare. The Arden Shakespeare. London: Routledge, 1995.

"wit, n." I.4.b. OED Online. March 2011. Oxford University Press. 18 April 2011.

Worthen, W.B. "Drama, Performativity, and Performance." *PMLA*. 113.5 (1998): 1093-1107.

Wright, George T. *Shakespeare's Metrical Art*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Wright, Thomas. *Passions of the Minde in Generall*. London: 1604. Early English Books Online.