



## BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Woods, Gillian and Dustagheer, S. (2017) Introduction: Stage directions and Shakespearean theatre. In: Woods, Gillian and Dustagheer, S. (eds.) Stage Directions and Shakespearean Theatre. London, UK: Bloomsbury Publishing, p. 1. ISBN 9781474257473.

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/20628/>

*Usage Guidelines:*

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html>  
contact [lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk](mailto:lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk).

or alternatively

Introduction

*Thunder and Lightning. Enter Ariell (like a Harpey) claps his wings  
upon the Table, and with a quient device the Banquet vanishes.*

(Shakespeare 1623: B1r)

In Act 3, Scene 3 of the Folio text of *The Tempest* Prospero's servant Ariel makes a fantastical appearance via a stage direction. The play's Arden editors, Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan, note that 'the spectacle that follows visually alludes to the *Aeneid*, reminding us of the classical imagery of this moment in the play (Vaughan and Vaughan 2011: 3.3.52.1*n*). This collection's front cover represents the stage direction as realized in the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse in 2016: Pippa Nixon's Ariel in descent from a trap above the stage, with wings of tawny brown canvas, a bright gold star emblazoned on his chest, his hair slicked back and his cheeks covered in shining metallic powder.

Working through this one example we encounter the myriad forms of a single stage direction and the many agents who may be involved in its representation and realisation. The stage direction is both text and action: it can be read, interpreted, edited, glossed, heard, seen and made. Stage directions are produced by the pen of the playwright, or others involved in the making of performance and text (the bookkeeper, the printer), the mind of the reader, the notes of the editor and, of course, on the stage of the playhouse in the rehearsals of the theatre company, in the bodies of the actors and in the sensory experience of the audience. Stage directions may exist in all these arenas, or may be missing in action: realized on stage but absent in the text, or vice-versa. Stage directions mutate in their different forms. Ariel's '*Harpey*' is the movement of the actor, the wings, the cosmetics (stage); it is the six-letter type created by the First Folio compositor (text); it is the classical reference noted by the editor for the reader

(edition). Stage directions function and are experienced in all these realms and at various times: when the play was first staged; when it is staged currently; and when we open our First Folio and/or Arden edition to read, to examine or to realize it as students, as literary scholars or as theatre makers. Stage directions are thus fundamentally mutable, enigmatic and various.

Figuring out how to analyse stage directions is challenging, not just because of their metamorphic forms, but also because their origins are felt to be uncertain. It is widely assumed that the direction featuring Ariel's harpy is provided by the play's scribe, Ralph Crane, rather than Shakespeare (a view challenged by Bruster, below). Questions of authorship and provenance arise because the stage directions for any given Renaissance play survive only in incomplete form. Instructions to enter and exit the stage, produce props, create sound-effects, and mount visual spectacles, were spread across several different documents, including the playbook, backstage plot and individual actors' parts. The playbook (sometimes anachronistically referred to as the 'promptbook') was the company's fullest copy of the play-script, containing all the actors' speeches and many of the stage directions. By contrast, the backstage plot provided only the bare structure of the play, listing when actors needed to enter a scene (along with some of the props they should take), and indicating through horizontal lines when the stage should be cleared (Stern 2009: 201-31). Actors' parts were specific to a particular character and contained all of his/her dialogue and two or three cue-words, but not other characters' speeches. The part also contained stage directions relevant to the actor using it, possibly in more precise positions than in the playbook, but space was not wasted through the detailing of 'stock' gestures (Palfrey and Stern 2007: 31, 22). Unfortunately, only eighteen manuscript playbooks, six backstage plots and one professional English part have survived. But analysis of them suggests that playing companies felt no need to standardize their multiple performance documents to ensure that, for example, every exit was recorded in a part *and* the backstage plot *and* the playbook (Werstine 2013: 208). The composers of printed plays (the form in which about 98% of extant English Renaissance drama survives) did not consult all of these sources, which were nevertheless

necessary for performance in early modern theatre. Small wonder modern scholars and editors find the stage directions in surviving plays ‘inadequate’ (Thomson 1988: 88): amongst other difficulties, exits are often inconsistently registered. Other, less obviously absent, stage directions might also have become lost in transition.

Awareness of these fractured textual origins causes stage directions to be viewed with suspicion. Editors frequently move and remove, augment and invent stage directions with latitude not exercised in relation to a play’s speeches, and without always making such interventions clear. Judging by their treatment, stage directions are perceived to lack the authority of other parts of the play. The authorship of stage directions is often assumed to be more uncertain than the words given to actors to speak. But this distrust might stem not so much from direct evidence of problematic provenance, as from critics’ preference for the ‘literary’ language of speeches over the shifty idioms of stage directions, which slip awkwardly between fictional and technical terminology. Indeed, William B. Long argues that manuscript playbooks – our most direct witness to early modern playhouse practice – reveal that theatrical personnel intervened in scripts less often than we might expect: ‘A 2,500-line playbook might bear twenty-five theatrical alterations, or ten, or none’ (1999: 416). There are some instances, of course, where stage directions have been retrospectively added to the play-text for theatrical purposes: a bookkeeper adds a direction for ‘Hoyboyes’ to clarify the playwright’s call for ‘Loud Musique’ in the playbook of *Charlemagne or the Distracted Empreror* (1999: 423-4). But there is also evidence of bookkeepers making some ‘textual’ changes too, as in the manuscript of *Thomas of Woodstock*, where Long detects a bookkeeper ‘filling in [...] a *lacuna* left by the playwright’ and changing a word (1985a: 105). So stage directions are not the only parts of the text subject to ‘non-authorial’ influence. And when stage directions are altered by theatrical personnel the change often concerns bibliographical location rather than staged action. Paul Werstine demonstrates that bookkeepers would copy (abbreviated) stage directions to different parts of the manuscript, moving them from the right margin to the left, or ‘from the tops of versos to the bottoms of

preceding rectos' (Werstine 2013: 158-160). Thus these rearrangements served not to change the function or timing of stage directions, but to make them more noticeable to the user of the playbook. Having scrutinized such evidence, Long concludes: 'So infrequently do theatrical alterations occur that if a stage direction exists in a late sixteenth- or early seventeenth-century play text, manuscript or printed, it is most likely a playwright's' (1999: 417).<sup>i</sup> In other words, the provenance of stage directions is not that much more uncertain than other parts of a play-text.

Nevertheless, trusting that a stage direction is 'most likely' written by (one of) the play's author(s) does not resolve the problems it presents. Long also suggests that the presence of a stage direction in a playbook or printed text is no guarantee that the instruction was enacted in early performances. He points out that extant manuscript playbooks indicate that experienced playwrights tended to write far fewer 'advisory directions' (detailing matters such as expression and gesture) than amateur dramatists, presumably because they knew actors were best placed to make decisions about performance technique (1999: 417). Since these same playbooks also show that bookkeepers did not concern themselves with correcting every inaccuracy in a script or recording every stage action, they are not exact reports of what happened in a performance. Just as players would have necessarily ignored one of the two stage directions requiring Anselmus to die in *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* manuscript playbook, they could also disregard directions found in other playbooks that did not suit their professional needs.<sup>ii</sup>

Thus a stage direction might be authorial but not performable, or, at least, not performed. If we assume that stage directions are quintessentially theatrical – that they are parts of the play-text that point most clearly to its embodiment away from the page, on the stage – then we are left with an interpretive problem. What is the significance of a stage direction that might not have made it to the stage? In this way, stage directions foreground the familiar ontological difficulties – and pleasures – of plays. Is 'the play' best conceptualized as the work imagined by its authors, unchained by theatrical practicalities? Or, given its *raison d'être*, is the truest form of the play a performance? If so, which one: the first, the most recent, or the one

(subjectively judged) best? The reason there is no satisfactory answer to these questions is that ‘the play’ is all of these forms of itself; it is constantly on the move. Stage directions highlight the ways that a play is stretched between text and performance. Just as it is not always clear that a stage direction was performed in early modern playhouses, neither is it altogether certain whom it was written for. A direction such as ‘*These speeches are severall kinds of distractions and in the action should appeare so*’ in Webster’s *The White Devil*, sounds very prescriptive: a clear-cut instruction about how the actors should deliver their lines (Webster 1612: Kr). But as an experienced dramatist by 1612, Webster would, according to Long’s logic, know that actors could be trusted to interpret play-scripts. Indeed, Anthony Hammond contends that Webster added extra ‘elaborately descriptive directions’ to *The White Devil*, specifically for the printed version of the text; the stage directions direct the readers’ imaginations rather than the actors’ actions on the stage (1992: 73). In some ways, then, this stage direction makes the text more ‘literary’, more usable for readers looking at a page rather than a stage. However, such ‘page’ directions simultaneously insist on the theatricality of the play, speaking of a performance accessible only in the mind (*‘in the action should appeare so’*).<sup>iii</sup> The direction pinpoints the contradictory nature of a play which is always in some sense incomplete: as text it lacks performance; but as a performance it is only ever one manifestation of the multiple possibilities of the text.

In this collection we propose that, far from invalidating stage directions’ significance, these complications of provenance and purpose are provocative starting points for investigation. Recognizing that stage directions speak to different people (bookkeepers, actors, readers) in different ways helps us to gain a firmer grasp of the various ways in which plays make meaning. In fact, we suggest that stage directions take us to the heart of *how* meaning is made in plays precisely because they foreground the dynamic between text and performance. Thus on one level they simply point to the very practical business of production. For instance, stage directions indicate that a theatrical tragedy is not only created through a plot that pitches a protagonist against the social order, or through speeches musing on the profundity of the human condition,

but also in physical actions that register violent upheaval ('The battell enters, *Richard* wounded'), sound effects that create a sense of scale ('*Sound a flourish with drums*'), and bloody spectacle that makes the fatal trajectory of the story visceral ('*Enter Giouanni with [a] heart vpon his Dagger*').<sup>iv</sup> But in their ambiguously theatrical and readerly purpose, stage directions also remind us of the multiple modes in which plays make meaning. In *The Thracian Wonder* (1661), a play perhaps falsely attributed to Webster and Rowley, one stage direction bluntly instructs: '*A mad Dance, they dance off*' (Dv). Theatrically speaking, this instruction is simultaneously prescriptive and permissive: if they pay attention to it, actors should comport their bodies in a specific manner ('*A mad Dance*'), but how they interpret that requirement is left open. Exploring the theatrical demands and options presented by stage directions obviously provides a fuller insight into the play's performed meaning. However, the bald idiom of the stage direction also has an impact on readers. In this example, the unruly gestures implied by the instruction '*A mad Dance*' are at odds with the concise proportions of the stage direction itself; the sense of disjunction is appropriate to the event described. Of course, not all stage directions generate equivalent experiences for spectators and readers.<sup>v</sup> But by lingering on stage directions, rather than skimming over them to reach the less conceptually awkward speeches, we can gain a fuller understanding of how a play works, in both its textual and theatrical forms.

Similarly, the category is most revealing when we acknowledge that the label 'stage direction' points to a variety of activities, ranging from the basic ('*Enter*', '*Ent.*') to the spectacular ('*A hand from out a cloud, threateneth a burning sword*'), and from technical instructions about space and material properties ('*there is a sad Song in the Musicke-Roome*', '*A Bed thrust out vpon the Stage*') to acting directions governing gesture and expression ('*She playes the vixen with euery thing about her*').<sup>vi</sup> These different forms are all loaded with meaning. '*Enter*' and '*exit*' might seem like drably functional instructions, but they direct the traffic of the stage and provide the structure upon which the play hangs. As such, they can elucidate a play's thematic concerns. For example, the interplay between public and private realms in a domestic tragedy such as *Arden of Feversham*

comes into focus when its entrances and exits are analysed for how they produce (gendered) interior and exterior spaces. And, as Suzanne Gossett and Sarah Lewis demonstrate in very different ways below, entrances and exits are often far from clear-cut, whether in terms of their timing or the action they direct. Other types of stage directions might also affect issues such as imagery and characterisation. Thus some directions have an obviously iconic significance, as when the suicidal Hieronimo enters ‘with a Ponyard in one hand, and a Rope in the other’ in *The Spanish Tragedy* (Kyd 1592: G3v). And a play’s verbal images might be less graphically, but still significantly, informed by the visual and auditory effects signalled by stage directions: a play such as *Othello*, which offers a flickering perspective on different kinds of lightness and darkness, is illuminated by a consideration of what the stage directions say about its use of torches. Furthermore, stage directions might inform ideological interpretation too: knowing that ‘when one figure *drags* another’, it is ‘usually a male who *enters* with a female’ raises possibilities for ‘gendered readings’ of characterisation (Dessen and Thomson 1999: 75; Hirschfeld 2003: 188).

Stage directions are thus rich with interpretative possibilities. They are also eccentric. Not only is their language sometimes pleasingly (or infuriatingly) quirky, but they are also literally out of the centre: frequently positioned in the margins of play-texts, they have been marginal to scholarly concerns. Eric Rasmussen wryly observes that in modern editions:

Stage directions, quite literally, don’t count [...] convention dictates that stage directions be linked to the previous line of dialogue and that each line of the stage direction receive a decimal point, for example, 37.1. Numerically, at least, a stage direction is worth exactly one tenth as much as a line of dialogue.

(2003: 226)

This collection seeks to make stage directions count and to bring them out of the margins and to see what happens when they are placed at the centre of literary and dramatic analysis.

If the value of 'original' stage directions is decimated by the referencing apparatus, it is also compromised by the frequent addition of editorial stage directions. Where editors have discussed their practices concerning stage directions, consensus mainly lies only in a sense of dissatisfaction. David Bevington complains that decisions regarding when to supply editorial stage directions are 'haphazard' (1984: vii). Countering Margaret Jane Kidnie's recommendation for keeping editorial stage directions in the margin, to maintain a distinction between *haupttext* (dialogue) and *nebentext* (all other words of the text), John Cox calls on editors to 'reduce sharply or even eliminate completely the stage directions they add to early texts' (Kidnie 2000; Cox 2004: 178). But few if any editors can resist the pressure to clarify the problems presented by early texts (illustrated by Gossett below), that would make reading difficult for modern student readers. And sometimes editorial intervention is not so easy to detect. Leslie Thomson pointed out that Oxford's *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works* (1986) printed Folio and Quarto *King Lear* as separate versions of the same play, but 'stage directions from the one have been shifted silently into the other' (1988: 186). Furthermore, Paul Werstine has convincingly demonstrated that editorial assumptions about whether a given play derives from 'foul papers' (an author's messy draft) or a 'promptbook' (a supposedly ordered theatrical script) are flawed. Stage directions, in particular, are not a helpful diagnostic tool in this respect since the descriptive stage directions thought to indicate 'foul papers' are found in extant theatrical playbooks; those same theatrical playbooks also feature the irregularities of stage directions (such as two entrances for one character) that had been seen as a signal of 'foul papers' (2013: 132, 173). Stage directions thus help to reveal that those old scholarly categories do not hold good and editorial traditions need rethinking.

While editors have grappled with the textual origins of stage directions, theatre historians have used them as indicators of stage practice and playhouse dimensions. For many stage

directions are crucial – yet often difficult, ambiguous and unreliable – evidence of what may or may not have occurred on the early modern stage. Richard Hosley famously distinguished between ‘theatrical’ and ‘fictional’ stage directions, suggesting that words like ‘above’ spoke in technical terms about the specifics of the playhouse structure, whereas references to represented places like ‘window’ or ‘study’ are fictional. Michela Calore (2000) has since shown the theatrical/fictional binary to be false, with both forms of the stage direction appearing even in the emphatically ‘theatrical’ backstage-plots. But work by Hosley (1959 and 1975), T.J. King (1971) and G.F. Reynolds (1940) lays the foundation for using stage directions as a contested body of evidence for architectural design and/or stage practice. Mariko Ichiakwa (2013) assesses stage directions to address problems such as the usage of tiring house doors, the likely location of theatrical musicians, and the removal of corpses from the stage, and Tim Fitzpatrick (2011) scrutinizes them to produce a theory about stage space.<sup>vii</sup> Analysis of stage directions makes a frequent appearance in recent scholarship on indoor theatre practice, and the research which informed the construction of the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse in 2014 (Karim-Cooper and Gurr: 2014); Martin White’s essay, below, showcases this kind of approach. Stage practice has also been excavated through analysis of stage directions, with Janette Dillon (2004) producing revealing work on early theatrical technologies and Lucy Munro (2013) vividly tracing the props used to produce such bizarrely violent stage directions as ‘*They eat each other’s arms*’ and the ‘aesthetic, sensory and bodily impact of blood and dismembered body parts in the early modern playhouse’ (2013: 77). Munro’s work forms part of an important collection by Farah Karim-Cooper and Tiffany Stern that in its discussion of theatrical effects, while not explicitly focussed on stage directions, inevitably provides insights into the intriguing demands for particular stage action.

Linda McJannet is the only scholar to discuss early modern stage directions in a full monograph. Her book, *The Voice of Elizabethan Stage Directions: The Evolution of a Theatrical Code* (1999), focuses on the emerging conventions that start to govern the form of stage directions in

the period, identifying a ‘theatrical code’ that has a particular grammar and rhetoric. All such work has been invaluable in identifying and evaluating stage directions in ways that provide insight into performance; furthermore it has translated some of the vocabulary and language of the stage direction that was once familiar to many playwrights, actors, audiences, readers and printers. However, attempts to codify stage directions as historical ‘evidence’ of theatrical practice risk overlooking the eccentricity of many stage directions and their literary and creative potential. And so, we suggest, stage directions are ripe for the exploratory, imaginative and literary re-evaluation which occurs in the pages that follow.

Underpinning the questions posed and explored by this collection is Alan Dessen and Leslie Thomson’s seminal study of stage directions, *A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama, 1580-1642* (1999). Taken from approximately 500 surviving professional plays, the *Dictionary* consists of over 900 entries of key words and phrases found in early modern stage directions. As such it is a vital research resource for editors, critics and students, as references to it throughout this collection attest. The dictionary format, however, means that the book deliberately cannot and does not provide extended investigation into the interpretative challenges produced by stage directions. As Paul Menzer and Jess Hamlet discuss below, the itemizing and categorizing of stage directions risks muffling the different idioms of their theatrical language. Needless to say, Dessen and Thomson are fully attuned to the implications of their work; indeed in his ground-breaking *Recovering Shakespeare’s Theatrical Vocabulary*, Dessen points out that, whenever we learn any language, ‘to master the dictionary definitions (or elementary vocabulary) is at best a first step’ (Dessen 1995: 44). In their introduction to the *Dictionary*, the authors invite ‘additions, corrections and comments from our readers’; the following collection takes up that invitation. *Stage Directions and Shakespearean Theatre* explores the details, lacunae and ‘what ifs’ of stage directions, often inspired by Dessen and Thomson’s invaluable work.

As a collection of essays, this volume speaks with diverse voices, and thereby responds to the heterogeneity of stage directions themselves, with their various functions and different users.

It aims to start new conversations about how and why stage directions matter. Some of these exploratory chapters thus focus on the quiddity of stage directions, investigating what the term means and the (potentially problematic) implications of creating a category with this label. Other essays analyse the usage of stage directions by particular groups, evaluating editorial practice, and identifying the often overlooked fact that readers necessarily engage with stage directions at a literary level, despite the theatrical connotations of their name. Some contributors test what happens when stage directions are foregrounded in the interpretation of drama, either by concentrating on a specific type of stage direction, or by taking stage directions as a starting point for understanding a particular play. Via different methodological approaches, each of these chapters points to the interpretive richness of stage directions, whether our field of study is bibliography or theatre history, performance or literary criticism.

The essays that follow explore the oddity and ambivalence of stage directions. Thus in the first section, entitled 'Taxonomy', contributors scrutinize the meanings of the term 'stage direction' and the principles behind the ways in which we classify this type of text. To begin Tiffany Stern charts the somewhat ignoble origins and history of phrase 'stage direction': coined by Lewis Theobald in 1726 as a derogatory term for non-authorial dumb shows. Stern demonstrates how the use of the term 'stage directions', and its muddled meanings across time, has hidden the variety of agents involved in theatrical production, as well as the range of authors and motivations behind these unique pieces of play text. Like Stern, Laurie Maguire also unpicks our understanding of the status of stage directions. By identifying their ambiguous role, Maguire invites us to reconceptualize stage directions, arguing that they manage the boundaries of the fictional play world and its theatrical presentation, meeting the needs of both actors and readers. The 'Taxonomy' section ends with a chapter that, in fact, offers an anti-taxonomy. In an examination of the one-off and unique stage directions of early modern drama, Paul Menzer and Jess Hamlet seek 'to push gently back against the tendency towards systemization, taxonomy, and standardization' of the stage direction. In a chapter that has a particular focus on Thomas

Heywood, Menzer and Hamlet challenge our notion of stage directions as a shared theatrical vocabulary and think about moments of difficult theatrical communication.

Stage directions on the page are central to the next section entitled 'Text' as chapters by Emma Smith and Douglas Bruster consider stage directions in the reader's imagination and in the playwright's mind, respectively. Smith suggests that, regardless of provenance, stage directions 'exist in the act of reading' and therefore function as 'snippets of narrative' that can be read productively in the context of narrative theory and reader-response criticism. With examples from across the Shakespearean canon, Smith demonstrates that stage directions can be as revealing as dialogue in terms of characterisation and literary meaning. Douglas Bruster is also interested in rethinking our understanding of what stage directions do, insisting that 'very few actually "direct". Instead, most describe and narrate'. He reads stage directions as 'instances of Shakespeare's compositional practice' and argues for a creative correlation between dialogue and stage directions.

The third section of the book concentrates on one of the frontlines of stage directions: editing. In a chapter on missing stage directions, Suzanne Gossett provides an account of the interpretative and often speculative work modern editors must undertake to create a readable and performable text. Gossett highlights the discrepancies and ellipses in the many plays she has edited over the course of her career (including work by Thomas Middleton, Ben Jonson, Richard Brome, John Fletcher and Francis Beaumont) and delineates the challenges of the editorial process. Terri Bourus' chapter likewise illuminates this process with a consideration of the text layout of early modern manuscripts and Shakespeare's 1623 Folio. Bourus contends that placing some stage directions in the margin, following manuscript, rather than Folio layout, may give editors and their readers a less prescriptive experience of stage directions. She also explores the ways editors might effectively engage with performance history to illuminate explicit and implicit stage directions.

In a section on ‘Space’, Martin White, Sarah Dustagheer and actor-director Philip Bird scrutinize some of the practical implications of stage directions. Drawing on his practice-led research at the University of Bristol’s Wickham Theatre and the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, White explores stage directions that are often misunderstood and overlooked on the page but that make sense and gain a significance in performance. In an inquisitive discussion of plays by Philip Massinger, Ben Jonson and John Marston, White also contemplates stage directions that remain confusing even when examined in practical terms. In the next chapter, Dustagheer discusses stage directions that demand the revelation of a dead body in a previously off-stage curtained space referred to as the discovery space. She argues that this seemingly simple stage direction had a rich symbolic meaning associated with post-Reformation cultural anxieties about death. In thinking about the theatrical practicalities, the chapter was conceived and created in conversation with actor-director Philip Bird who, in contributions **emboldened** throughout, offers thoughts on how the scenes may have been performed.

In the final section contributors offer discussions of stage directions in specific plays, showing how focussing on these neglected parts of the text can open up the meanings of well-known early modern dramas. Andrew Hiscock’s chapter on *Macbeth* uses Shakespeare’s tragedy as a starting point for a discussion of textual authority and provenance, before turning to questions of the performance of the ‘rich vocabulary of aural and visual signs experienced from the page and the stage’ in this play. By tracing the play’s stage directions, Hiscock provides new perspectives on the violence, imagery and soundworlds of *Macbeth*. In the following chapter Sarah Lewis homes in on one particular stage direction from John Webster’s *The Duchess of Malfi* which concerns the possibly posthumous appearance of the Duchess from her grave and the figure of Echo. The stage direction has inspired many editorial interventions which Lewis charts in order to establish the critical responses to Echo and to the Duchess over the years. This one stage direction, Lewis suggests, allows us to access ‘the central crux of *Malfi*’, as a play that engaged with ‘the destruction of the body, the voice, and individual agency’. In the final chapter

of the book Gillian Woods returns to the form of stage direction with which the collection began: the dumb show. She argues that the dumb show directions often work in a contradictory way, both helping ‘spectators orient themselves relative to the play’s fictional dimensions *and* disorient[ing] them’. The chapter culminates in a close reading of Webster’s *The White Devil* as Woods unpicks the dynamic ‘between dumb shows and main action, and stage direction and dialogue’.

None of the essays that follow see stage directions as a definitive solution to a particular theatrical or textual problem. They propose that stage directions’ mixed functions and variable forms open up possibilities for interpretation rather than resolving it. And so we ‘*Enter out!*’.

### **Primary References**

Ford, John (1633), *'Tis Pity Shee's a Whore*.

Kyd, Thomas (1592), *The Spanish Tragedie*.

Lodge, Thomas and Robert Greene (1594), *A Looking Glasse for London and England*.

Lyly, John (1597), *The Woman in the Moone*.

Middleton, Thomas (1630), *A Chast Mayd in Cheape-Side*.

*The True Tragedie of Richard the Third* (1594).

Shakespeare, William (1623), *Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories, & Tragedies*

([firstfolio.bodleian.ox.ac.uk](http://firstfolio.bodleian.ox.ac.uk)).

Webster, John and William Rowley [false attrib.?] (1661), *The Thracian Wonder*.

Webster, John (1612), *The White Devil*.

---

### **ENDNOTES**

### **Notes on Introduction**

---

<sup>i</sup> Change in theatrical practice over time perhaps alters this likelihood. Werstine shows that ‘The responsibilities of the bookkeeper seem to have undergone a considerable expansion by the 1630s’, resulting in the addition of more ‘warning stage directions’ by non-authorial hands in extant playbooks (2013: 209).

<sup>ii</sup> For more details on the uncorrected nature of early modern playbooks, including the presence of doubled stage directions, see Werstine (2013: 107-99).

<sup>iii</sup> By contrast, the words ‘A bed / for woodstock’ found in the left margin of the *Thomas of Woodstock* manuscript have the clipped tone of a stage direction, but read closely seem more likely to have been a note highlighting the property requirements of the play (Long 1985a: 107-8).

<sup>iv</sup> See the anonymous *The True Tragedie of Richard the Third* (1594: H3r); *Antony and Cleopatra* (Shakespeare 1623: xx6r); and *'Tis Pity She's a Whore* (Ford 1633: K2r).

<sup>v</sup> Genevieve Love (2000) provides a fascinating reading of how Marston’s stage directions create similar responses in readers and spectators.

<sup>vi</sup> *A Looking Glasse for London and England* (Lodge and Greene 1594: G2r); *A Chast Mayd in Cheape-Side* (Middleton 1630: K2v, [E4r]); *The Woman in the Moone* (Lyly 1597: [A4v]).

<sup>vii</sup> See also Gurr (1996) and Ichikawa (2000).

## Notes on Chapter 1