Shakespeare in Present-Day British Theatre: Where Text Meets Practice

Tobias Andrew Giles Wright

Girton College

Faculty of English
University of Cambridge

This dissertation is submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

December 2019

Declaration

This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text.

It is not substantially the same as any that I have submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for a degree or diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text. I further state that no substantial part of my dissertation has already been submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for any such degree, diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text. It does not exceed the English Faculty's prescribed word limit.

Thesis Abstract

Shakespeare in Present-Day British Theatre: Where Text Meets Practice
Tobias Andrew Giles Wright

An actor today, beginning rehearsals for a Shakespeare play, is faced with the challenge of diachronically assigning character-based acting techniques to a rich network of dramatic rhetoric. This challenge begins in the early stages of rehearsal work and is carried through to the projected onstage performance of a 'character'.

The first part of the thesis outlines a specific twentieth century development in character-based techniques, focusing on the director and theorist Konstantin Stanislavski. A revisionist view of Stanislavskian practice is offered, returning to the theorist's own writings to establish differences with the American Method. The thesis then turns to prominent directors in British theatre (working since the second half of the twentieth century) who have developed discrete post-Stanislavskian techniques that enable actors to address the question of character 'motivation'.

The second part of the thesis centres on an account of workshops that I have conducted with professional actors. These workshops provided the opportunity for practical application of the theories discussed in Part One. In each case the analysis of theories and text was greatly informed by details provided by the actors in the workshop/interview process.

Part One of the thesis offers the following: (i) a revised view of Stanislavski, and redefinition of what might define a post-Stanislavskian practitioner; (ii) a historical account of the late-twentieth century technique of 'actioning' – and certain parallel techniques in the actor's application of an 'objective'; (iii) a definition of the term 'dramatic rhetoric' and an indication of how the rhetoric of Shakespeare's style (his *elocutio*) might inform an actor who seeks to apply character 'objectives'; (iv) an account of approaches made by practitioners at the Royal Shakespeare Company and at Shakespeare's Globe to interpret the stylistic qualities of Shakespeare for performance.

Part Two of the thesis details my programme of practical workshops, based on certain categories of Shakespearean speech that create the greatest challenges for character-based acting techniques. These are: (i) the soliloquy – discussing the question of the addressee and the potential for meta-theatre; (ii) passages of *enargeia* – that is, rich descriptions of offstage action; (iii) repartee – where rich rhetorical dialogue poses a challenge to present-day naturalistic delivery.

As result of this thesis, my primary proposal is the development of a theatre practice that encourages significant features of Shakespearean *elocutio* to form the basis of inspiration for the application of post-Stanislavskian techniques. In this manner, a close analysis of the *elocutio* of texts may be transferred into a dramatically engaging performance for a present-day audience.

Contents

Foreword

Choice of Core Text

In the workshops I chose to use, as a core text, *RSC Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007). This edition represents a consistent editorial approach across the plays through the specific filter of the 1623 First Folio. I believe, for the purposes of my comparison across various plays, that this represented the most stable 'control' source, which allowed for comparison on a case-by-case basis, where each specific extract was concerned. All Shakespeare quotations and citations in this thesis are taken from the RSC edition of the *Complete Works*, unless otherwise stated.

Where I refer to Shakespeare's First Folio, I cite the *Bodleian First Folio: Digital Facsimile of the First Folio of Shakespeare's Plays* (London: Printed by Isaac Jaggard and Ed. Blount, 1623), Bodleian Library, Arch. G c.7.

In the workshop study, I make frequent use of quarto variants and period texts of the plays. Use of the Folio text is certainly not born out of singular devotion to a specific source, and I therefore also regularly consult a range of modern editions.

Quotation

Unless otherwise stated, any italics and capitals used in direct quotations originate in the source material.

References

Referencing in general conforms to the MHRA Style Guide. To minimise references, I have used the suggested method of placing the page numbers of consecutive references to the same source in brackets within the body of the text.

Spelling

When quoting from period sources, I have modernised alphabetic convention (specifically regarding the interchanges between the letters 'u'/'v' and 'i'/'j').

I favour the spelling of the name 'Stanislavski' throughout this thesis. However, I use the spelling 'Stanislavsky' if it is within another author's quotation or spelt this way as a book's author or title.

Terminology

I use the term 'actor' throughout as a non-gendered word.

Acknowledgements

production of *Arden of Faversham*. This process gave me additional inspiration for my work on *enargeia*. I am similarly indebted to Lyn Darnley, who also invited me to attend a workshop with various voice coaches at the RSC.

I would like to offer particular thanks to Marina Tarlinskaja, who was generous, insightful and enthusiastic in her email responses to my various questions on Shakespearean metre. I deeply appreciated her correspondence. And I am extremely grateful to my supervisor, Raphael Lyne, who has always been considerate of my unusual decision to use participant actors. Raphael has been swift to offer feedback, has given up an uncommon amount of time to discuss the project and has shown patience and optimism towards my research throughout.

Finally, I would like to express thanks to all of my family and friends who have offered support during my project, and to my parents in particular, who deserve more gratitude than can be confined to the page and whose help has been the very definition of unconditional.

I would like to dedicate this thesis to Barbara Giles (1929-2015).

Participating Workshop Actors

Actors have been selected to represent something like a cross-section of professional British theatre practitioners – a group typical to a London rehearsal room. The actors were chosen to represent those with a range of professional experience at leading British theatre companies (the Globe, the Royal Shakespeare Company and the National Theatre were of specific interest), and those who have graduated from leading drama schools. The study did not seek to characterize any company or drama school as engaging in a typical 'approach', where it has been evident throughout that individuals at any one of these leading institutions work in incredibly nuanced ways. Indeed, none of the actors referenced a company 'banner' when citing influences on their working practice – instead mentioning the names of individual directors or coaches.

The significant bulk of the actors consulted have had experience at one of Shakespeare's Globe, the Royal Shakespeare Company, or the National Theatre (in the cases of Dickon Tyrrell, David Sturzaker, Mark Quartley, Ruth Sillers, Brian Martin, Jo Herbert, Sarah Ovens, Brian Ferguson, and Debra Penny). Other members of the group (such as Molly Vevers and Heather Long) represent recent drama school graduates and actors in the early stages of their career – whom I have previously worked with on a range of productions (such as Sophie Dickson and Darrel Bailey). The workshops were recorded, to create transcripts for thesis citation. All of my participant actors gave consent for the workshops to be recorded and they were fully aware of the context of citation in the thesis.

I am also very grateful to Daniel Ward and James Corscadden, who were both involved in preliminary workshops relating to Seneca and Shakespeare, which helped to inform my approach to the full programme of practical research.

Workshop Key

The number denoting each workshop refers to the chronology of the research. Full details (with dates and locations) are listed in the bibliography. Workshop numbers, Shakespeare extracts of focus and participants are listed below.

Soliloquy Workshops:
W1: *Macbeth* (II.i.40-71).
Participants: Dickon Tyrrell, Darrel Bailey and Sophie Dickson.

W2: *Romeo and Juliet* (III.ii.1-34).
Participant: Sarah Ovens.

W3: *Othello* (I.iii.372-393); (II.i.270-296); and (V.ii.1-22).
Participant: David Sturzaker.

Enargeia Workshops:
W5: *Antony and Cleopatra* (II.ii.222-276); and *Romeo and Juliet* (I.iv.55-97).
Participant: Brian Ferguson.

W6: *Hamlet* (IV.vi.149-68); and (II.i.81-105).
Participant: Debra Penny.

W8: *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (II.i.82-118); and (II.i.158-273).
Participants: Brian Martin and Ruth Sillers.

Repartee Workshops:
W4: *Much Ado About Nothing* (I.i.80-98) and (IV.ii.260-320).
Participants: Jo Herbert, David Sturzaker, Darrel Bailey and Sophie Dickson.

W7: *Richard III* (I.ii.68-210).
Participants: Sarah Ovens and Mark Quartley.

W9: *Twelfth Night* (I.v.123-222); and *The Tempest* (III.i.26-109).
Participants: Heather Long and Molly Vevers.

Introduction

In this thesis I examine the interaction between a present-day theatre practitioner and the Shakespearean text. The specific meeting place is the early stages of rehearsal, with an express focus on the application of text-orientated techniques in British theatre. I chose this setting as it represents the closest moment of direct textual analysis for an actor today. This particular, early rehearsal, practical context is commonly referred to in the theatre industry as 'table-work'[1] and it reveals the extent to which directors and actors use text-orientated techniques in their resourceful joint endeavour to stage Shakespeare. The chief question that I investigate is how an actor today seeks to establish the meaning of a given extract of Shakespeare text and how they then seek to communicate this successfully via a modern acting technique. Throughout, this thesis regards Shakespeare predominantly from the perspective of a present-day British theatre practitioner. The research takes place within the field of present-day Performance Studies.

In terms of practitioners, my subjects of study were actors and directors and I limited myself to techniques and rehearsal contexts that are representative of present-day practice in Britain. For my study of directors, my core primary sources are theatre manuals that have been published by leading industry figures. Amongst these sources, I was predominantly searching for the best examples of Shakespearean manuals and I gravitated towards sources that demonstrated a clear sense of a practitioner's text-orientated technique. This thesis was always intended to demonstrate these theories in action, through a practical engagement with actors. Thus the second half of the thesis details the series of practical workshops that I conducted with actors, which were all designed to directly investigate specific directorial approaches, as gathered from the body of manuals. In this manner I was able to interrogate the methodologies of leading directors, whilst also creating a

---

[1] This process is commonly, but certainly not exclusively, applied by directors. Approaches to table-work also vary considerably. See Chapter Two.

second primary source of material: audio recordings and written transcripts of the practical workshops. The first half of my thesis considers the theoretical basis of the general practice under consideration, specifically questioning: (i) the origins and development of certain text-orientated theatre techniques (which I will come to label as 'post-Stanislavskian'); and (ii) issues pertaining to an actor's search for authorial guidance, especially relating to a sentiment of Shakespearean 'authenticity'. The second half of the thesis then turns to the directorial theories in practice, via the programme of workshops that I conducted.

In conducting the theatre workshops, I drew from my own experience of professional rehearsal rooms. I graduated from the Royal Central School of Speech and Drama (where I trained in playwriting) and since then I have written and/or directed a number of plays for professional production at a range of venues, from a variety of fringe theatres to the Old Vic. I have worked in diverse practical contexts, from historical verse drama to contemporary verbatim, and from large proscenium arch staging to intimate, immersive presentation. Previously I have taken part in directors' courses at the Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC) and Shakespeare's Globe, as well as the Royal Court Young Writers' Programme and Studio Invitation Group, amongst many other industry courses or workshops. These courses have contributed to my wider awareness of present-day Shakespearean practice and the present-day dynamic between playtext and actor.

In choosing to focus on the early stages of rehearsal, I was aware that I would also be creating something of a historical snapshot of the present. This presented a number of difficulties, not least because I am (along with my recruited practitioners) so entrenched in present-day practice that it is difficult to extricate myself and interpret techniques with that sense of historical distance that can only be afforded retrospectively. To account for this, I sought to create a history of the evolution of certain important, contemporary, text-orientated techniques. It became apparent that the most accurate and representative way of contextually situating these techniques was to describe them as developments of a broadly 'post-Stanislavskian' origin that relate (in varying degrees) to the significant extended influence of the Russian

theatre director and theorist Konstantin Stanislavski, 'the father of twentieth-century Western acting.'[2] Stanislavski is undoubtedly the single most commonly-cited figure across the many drama-related talks, seminars, and masterclasses that I have attended, and he transcends the boundaries of drama schools and institutions. However, at an early stage of research it became quite clear that the term 'Stanislavskian' was also most commonly being associated with a bastardisation of the man's own theories, and one that had become so diffuse as to make the term almost meaningless. To be 'Stanislavskian' has become a byword to describe actors living through the exact real-life circumstances or emotions of a given scene, eschewing a theatrical interpretation of 'given circumstances' (to be defined in Chapter One) and certain necessities of theatrical mimesis. Stanislavski's principles were in fact born out of theatre (albeit as a reaction to a previously much more affected style of acting on the Russian stage), and they were always designed to support the performance as a theatrical event. For this reason, one of the new pieces of knowledge that this thesis aims to contribute is a revisionist view of Stanislavski. The basis of Chapter One is a clarification of Stanislavski's theories in their own terms. This trajectory is continued in Chapter Two, where I assess the development of resultant post-Stanislavskian theories.

In Chapter Two I focus on the core group of practitioners whose techniques would be central in my workshop series. I thus detail the development and history of a family of contemporary theatre techniques that fall under the umbrella term of 'actioning'. Actioning is a technique that is widely taught in British drama schools and something that has scarcely been written of in widespread publication. Nick Moseley (currently Principal Lecturer in Acting at the Royal Central School of Speech and Drama) has described it as 'probably the most firmly established of all early rehearsal processes within the British theatre'.[3] My history of actioning in this

---

[2] Rhonda Blair, 'Image and action: Cognitive neuroscience and actor-training', in *Performance and Cognition: Theatre Studies and the Cognitive Turn*, ed. by Bruce McConachie and F. Elizabeth Hart (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), p. 167.
[3] Nick Moseley, *Actioning and How to Do It* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2016), p. vii.

thesis is the first extended history written on the technique.[4] In broadening the discussion of actioning from its strictest form of application (in the exclusive use of transitive verbs)[5] to a wider 'family' of techniques, I assess the practice more fully in its historical and practice-based context, whilst I also include a more thorough and representative group of practitioners than one might have otherwise considered.

Whilst reassessing Stanislavskian foundations, I also had to establish what the stylistic authorial features of importance were for an actor today, faced with the rehearsal of a Shakespeare text. This was aided by my core practitioner sources: the directors' manuals and the recordings and transcripts of my workshops with professional actors. These gave me a representative sense of textual features that are frequently held to be 'authorial' today, which could be compared with similar assessments made by literary scholars. For example, where actors make claims to seeking metrical clues in a given text, I could draw from research in the field of metre.[6] Having established the theoretical origins of both the post-Stanislavskian techniques of today's actor and the 'stylistic' guide of Shakespeare (as playwright), I could then apply the theories in practice, during my theatre workshops, with a considered sense of context.

The driving motivation for this thesis was born of a sense of practical necessity. There continues to be a vast appetite for Shakespeare productions in British theatre, whilst Shakespeare is also a significant presence across British drama school training. Yet, through my encounters with Shakespearean pedagogy, I consistently observed a direction of training that had become skewed towards a misrepresentative orthodoxy. Too much coverage was generally being given to 'Shakespeare's punctuation'. In addition, it is common to encounter two well-intended, but misleading, interpretations of iambic metre: (i) where it is seen to be of a uniquely Shakespearean conception (rather than an earlier phenomenon that had become a dramatic convention by this period); and (ii) where actors are encouraged

---

[4] Moseley provides a brief contextual note on the history of actioning in his book, p. vii-xi.
[5] See Chapter Two.
[6] See Chapter Three.

to deliver lines to conform to a 'model iambic pattern'. The disposition of my thesis, by contrast, is to focus on aspects of metrical nuance or variation, chiefly because it best serves contemporary character technique, whilst also enabling a more accurate insight into Shakespeare's distinct and ever-evolving style (which of course changes relative to stage of career, genre and specific dramatic context). In Chapter Three I consider what stylistic features can best serve the Shakespearean connections that an actor makes today.

Primarily this thesis is designed to improve the quality of textual interaction, from the perspective of a present-day actor, in a Shakespearean rehearsal room. It is envisaged as a first wave of engagement, that chiefly brings together the dramatic assessment of a Shakespearean text with the rehearsal practice of leading post-Stanislavskian practitioners. Beyond this, I naturally hope that it can also provide those early-modernists who hold significant interest in present-day theatre productions with a useful insight into the context of theatre practice today. By considering the texts in the context of present-day theatre rehearsal, one gains specific insights and can appreciate for example how even the most diegetic moments can serve a mimetic performance. It is also possible to use Shakespeare and Stanislavski as similar figureheads that allow for synecdochical dispersal; concerns with Shakespeare can be directed towards the style of other Renaissance playwrights, where Stanislavskian motifs provide a springboard to other present-day theatre techniques.

Above all, actors are resourceful and, by necessity, positively disposed towards the words of the script with which they are working. The full extent of this professional context is often overlooked by those who invoke the practice of actors without close first-hand consultation. This dynamic is illustrated by Nick Moseley, who describes to the actor the nature of engagement with a given text:

> You have to start from the assumption that every line or 'thought' in the text, whether or not the playwright consciously intended it, is in some way uniquely significant. There are no 'throwaway' lines – every single line of a text must contribute in some way to the overall story you are telling, because if it doesn't it is

a waste of your time and that of your audience. Drama is not real life – it is a distillation of life, and your job as an actor is to make sure that not a single moment within that distillation is wasted.[7]

Moseley's writing directly reveals the level of attention being paid by present-day actors (in the context of British drama training) towards details of a text, as a 'living analysis of the possible intentions of the playwright'.[8] This is a mechanism by which an actor can always be resourceful in producing a performance, regardless of the quality of writing. Ideally, of course, one would hope to analyse a text that has been authored by a playwright who is finely attuned to theatrical crafting. And this calls into question many factors, such as the notion of the 'conscious' skill of the playwright, as well as the production context and the myriad diachronic factors with which this is associated.[9] However, the key point of departure for this thesis is that one can expect actors working in British theatre today to have a considerable affinity with text-orientated acting techniques. It is necessary to make this defence in relation to inaccurate perceptions of post-Stanislavskian practice or notions of present-day acting techniques being centred on features that serve chiefly as being external to (or distantly projected from) the text.

Beyond my primary field of engagement, and the strictly practical, central sources of present-day theatre director manuals, I also draw inspiration from recently published material in the wider fields of Shakespeare studies and performance studies. One can turn to various areas of specialism, from the growing contemporary field of cognitive studies, to areas of analysis based on the context of Renaissance theatre practice.

The work of W. B. Worthen is especially useful in giving definition to the overall field of engagement. He is notably conscious of the sheer scope of present-day Shakespearean performance and the diverse pragmatic landscapes which present themselves today. Worthen sets out certain parameters, describing the relationship between the 'two sometimes antagonistic disciplines' of 'Shakespeare Studies' and

---

[7] Moseley, p. 138.
[8] Moseley, p. viii.
[9] See the discussion of Evelyn Tribble's research, later in this introduction.

'Performance Studies'. The former is constructed through 'centuries of textual scholarship' and thus is 'perhaps constitutively dismissive […] of Shakespeare onstage', where the latter is 'engrained with a disciplinary suspicion of the regulatory work attributed to writing […] and the archive in performance', perhaps becoming 'constitutively dismissive of dramatic theatre.'[10] He is also consistently aware of 'evolving ideologies of performance'[11] and his account is much more progressive than mine can hope to be, as he discusses performances that are constructed at a considerable remove from the Shakespearean text altogether. He acknowledges that some of the performances that he has investigated might 'not be universally recognized as closely enough motivated by Shakespearean script to be legitimately performances "of" Shakespearean drama at all'.[12] Worthen works within a very broad framework of contemporary performance, discussing just how far the 'event of performance'[13] may move away from the 'theatre of the book';[14] an example production, manifestly removed by some distance from the Shakespearean dialogue of its source text, is Punchdrunk's immersive Manhattan production of *Sleep No More*[15] (which was inspired by *Macbeth*). In doing so however, Worthen draws upon Hans-Thies Lehmann's work (originally published in German, in 1999) that established the terminology of a 'postdramatic theatre';[16] where 'dramatic theatre' serves as a 'specific genre of performance in which written texts are assigned a perdurable function, and sustain a specific ideology of performance in the

---

[10] W. B. Worthen, *Shakespeare Performance Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), p. 2. Further references to Worthen relate to this text, unless otherwise stated.
[11] Ibid.
[12] Worthen, p. 24.
[13] Worthen, p. 3.
[14] Worthen, p. 4.
[15] This premiered in March 2011. In 2016 Punchdrunk also opened a production of *Sleep No More* in Shanghai. Both productions continue to run in their fictional 'hotel' settings.
[16] Hans-Thies Lehmann, *Postdramatic Theatre*, trans. by Karen Jürs-Munby (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006).

reproduction of textual mimesis',[17] 'postdramatic theatre' is distinguished by a contrasting 'conceptual shift from work to event'.[18]

For all of its contemporary utility, one problem with the term 'postdramatic theatre' is found in its grouping of previous eras under the umbrella term 'dramatic theatre', without adequately distinguishing production contexts. As Worthen remarks, 'Lehmann, like others, mistakes' an 'insistent rhetoric of textual fidelity', a sense of 'scriptural determination' with the mechanics of 'how theatre actually uses writing in practice'.[19] The individual actors working within a London company during the Renaissance were learning their roles according to their individual part texts which were 'hardly vehicles of the "whole" of the plot'.[20] By contrast, present-day companies today commonly rehearse with a corporate sense of the 'whole', but this creates another variation of tensions between the realms of 'dramatic theatre' (and its textual integrity) and 'postdramatic theatre' (with a professional focus upon the anticipated event of the production). This dichotomy is especially profound where Shakespeare is concerned. In the chapters that follow, I will investigate text-orientated techniques that are applied by present-day actors, documenting a series of attempts to establish a framework of character. In this manner, close reading is not being used as an exclusively literary-critical tool but is instead indicative of practical context. A present-day actor's sense of 'character' is being revealed by technique.

There is a natural tendency to emphasise modern stage developments and the clear 'rethinking of the functioning of writing in performance' that is commonly witnessed, where writing serves as 'one instrument among many in making performance'.[21] However, this also comes with a tendency to overstate the idea of a performance 'text' historically being 'fixed' in a manner that is not nearly as stable as practitioners or literary critics often wish to imagine.

---

[17] Worthen, p. 4.
[18] Lehmann, p. 61.
[19] Worthen, p. 7.
[20] Worthen, p. 6.
[21] Worthen, p. 23.

As inspiration for my investigation of present-day technique, I have been able to turn to the Renaissance research of Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern, who regard the actor's part script optimistically, as a 'primitive technology' that demands, in its 'practical facility', a 'concentration of effect', where such additional 'communicative economy' could not have been achieved with a 'full text' of the script.[22] For Palfrey and Stern, the Renaissance 'actor's part' serves as 'a basic building-block of Shakespeare's craft',[23] and this part-based construct corresponds closely at times with the approach of certain post-Stanislavskian techniques today. There is a similarity across eras, in an actor's attempt to find smaller moments of transition within their own part. However, where the Renaissance actor's sensitivity to 'verbal nuance' allowed him to pick up 'each emotional transition', today's actor can be said to find, in the verbal nuance, the key to unlocking a specific 'motivation'. One specific iteration of this is enacted by 'actioning' techniques, which are at a considerable remove from any previous era's focus on emotion. Palfrey and Stern describe a Renaissance acting practice that is either 'occluded or invisible' when approached in relation to 'a full play-text', and that can only be 'brought to light by reading in part-form'.[24] And thus they focus on the 'cued part', placing as far as possible the sense of a '"whole" play under erasure' by comparison.[25] For actors today, practice combines solo, part-based analysis – even indicated in the mere acts of text preparation, such as an actor highlighting their individual lines – with considerable rehearsal engagement in a collaborative knowledge of the full text. This will be discussed in relation to the context within which an actor develops consideration for a specific role. Yet in terms of an anticipated performance output, Palfrey and Stern arrive at a very similar position to that commonly held by theatre practitioners today. They state that 'the actor is only alive if the part seems – to him and to the audience – to be happening for the very first time', as the 'promise of a

---

[22] Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern, *Shakespeare in Parts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 2.
[23] Palfrey and Stern, p. 3.
[24] Palfrey and Stern, p. 9.
[25] Ibid.

cue or the shape of line' reaches its 'final *irrecoverable* embodiment in speech' onstage.[26] This vision of performance is certainly not confined to the category of a 'dramatic theatre' context that only regards the potency of performance in relation to its interpretation of text.

Whilst I am influenced by the work of Palfrey and Stern, and part-based implications, my own thesis is in no way an attempt to reconstruct the Renaissance playing company dynamic, nor does it strive to re-enact some kind of fixed meaning of a Shakespearean 'truth'. The research priority has always directly related to present-day staging. To this end, the work of Abigail Rokison was a natural stimulus for the early stages of my research.

Rokison considers the culture of our contemporary Shakespearean theatre manuals, where practitioners have written such manuals 'to provide actors with guidance on performing Shakespearean drama' with a specific eye for the 'establishment of principles of Shakespearean verse speaking on the modern British stage.'[27] She draws from 'performance practice and drama training'[28] and her work influenced, in this manner, the departure point for my own research. However, there are significant differences between our areas of focus. Firstly, where Rokison concentrates on the nature of an actor's delivery of verse in terms of its direct rhythmic projection to an audience, retaining its verse qualities and avoiding the 'danger of sounding like prose',[29] I instead look at the 'actions' that an actor today might assign to verse features, anticipating a less metronomic sense of rhythmic delivery. I attempt to link Shakespearean verse variations with a contemporary performance output; I do not make the same distinction as Rokison about how the verse line should specifically sound when performed, instead focusing on the 'motivation' that is established. Secondly, in terms of practitioner techniques, I also venture beyond the strictly Shakespearean. Like Rokison, I use the significance of

---

[26] Palfrey and Stern, p. 492.
[27] Abigail Rokison, *Shakespearean Verse Speaking: Text and Theatre Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 1.
[28] Rokison, p. 2.
[29] Rokison, p. 26.

Peter Hall and John Barton (and their respective manuals) to investigate the foundation and reach of the early Royal Shakespeare Company. However, the largest influence that I draw from contemporary practitioners comes from a group of directors who together offer a fuller representation of the post-Stanislavskian landscape of British theatre. In regard to 'Stanislavskian' approaches to performance, it is worth noting that (unlike many other academics) Rokison indicates an awareness for a greater range of discussion; for example, she specifically mentions the distinct American development of the 'Lee Strasberg method style of acting'.[30] Rokison is informed by her own direct experience of the theatre industry, having previously worked as a professional actor and having trained at LAMDA (the London Academy of Music and Dramatic Art) in the 1990s.[31]

My assertion is that actors today, whilst having distinct Shakespearean training (in areas such as metre), still apply the same general context of 'characterisation' across genres of script. That is to say, when they talk of playing a 'character' in a play, the way this 'character' is approached in terms of rehearsal technique relates largely to the post-Stanislavskian context of the era in which they are working. For this reason, it was important for a large degree of my research to be orientated towards an investigation of this context.

I also choose to look at different verse features to Rokison. Her study provides a corrective to the disproportionate (and often erroneous) attention that is given by 'directors, voice practitioners and actors' to the 'relatively small area of textual interpretation' that is represented by Shakespeare's lineation and punctuation.[32] She also pays especially close attention to Shakespearean instances of 'shared line' and 'short line' usage.[33] This particular focus allows Rokison to highlight common misconceptions in present-day practice, to critique specific misleading approaches that have been promoted by practitioners such as Peter Hall and to call into question the degree of 'authorial' cult status that surrounds

[30] Rokison, p. 29.
[31] Rokison, p. 10.
[32] Rokison, p. 178.
[33] Rokison, p. 181.

Shakespeare's First Folio. In my analysis I turn specifically to features that have the highest incidence of occurrence (as supported by metrical analysis)[34] in Shakespeare plays, which are also commonly the most significant area of investigation for present-day actors.[35] For example, most prominent amongst these features are verse variations, specifically Shakespeare's use of trochaic inversion at the start of verse lines and his use of feminine endings at the close of a line. These features are found across speech forms (from soliloquy to dialogue) and are very commonly encountered whenever one makes a selection of a Shakespearean extract. As will be discussed, and as might be expected, the frequency of all variations increases as Shakespeare's career progresses.[36]

The application of present-day techniques in this thesis is indicative of how actors attempt to fashion 'character' by creating something of a cognitive network. But this network extends far beyond the individual and the clues of a given text, to the collaborative company, the theatre space and its architecture, and to the audience itself. In this manner, I draw from Evelyn B. Tribble's work, where she has accounted for the collaborative endeavour in relation to cognition, specifically the production of theatre as an event of 'distributed cognition'. She describes the 'early modern theatrical system' as a functional 'triad of insides, objects and people',[37] where we encounter the meeting place between practitioners' internal neuro-biological mechanisms (evidenced by processes of 'memory, perception, and attention'), their 'material tools […] and environments', and their 'social systems'.[38] Tribble embraces the fluidity of the boundaries between each of these three areas, but finds that the interplay is crucial in giving 'a satisfactory account of the early modern

---

[34] See Chapter Three and my discussion of Marina Tarlinskaja's work.
[35] As supported by coverage given by professional actors in my workshops. See Chapter Three.
[36] See the data represented in Tarlinskaja's appendix to *Shakespeare and the Versification of English Drama, 1561-1642* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014). Henceforth, footnotes referenced as 'Tarlinskaja' alone pertain to this monograph.
[37] Evelyn B. Tribble, *Cognition in the Globe: Attention and Memory in Shakespeare's Theatre* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 7. All further footnotes referencing simply 'Tribble' refer to this text.
[38] Ibid.

theatrical system.'[39] This model for a collaborative process, and a distributed cognition across a production company, can equally be applied to the present-day and clarifies some of the variables that were under investigation in my workshop programme.

We might consider the principal conditions that have changed since the Renaissance. In terms of the given 'text', actors are naturally used to having a knowledge of the full play, rather than just the designated part script for their role. Rehearsal time is greatly enlarged, where today a professional production would typically be afforded a four-to-five week minimum time period, compared to a Renaissance context of little or no formal rehearsal.[40] Where Tribble has highlighted the 'crushing mnemonic demands'[41] upon actors in the Renaissance, we cannot find those demands replicated on the same scale today. Most professional Shakespeare productions today do not require the same degree of 'cognitive thrift', owing to today's much lower rate of production turnover. Features of the playtext that may have served as important mnemonic mechanisms in the Renaissance, much like the cue dynamic of the part scripts (as analysed by Palfrey and Stern), do not have the same resonance for a present-day actor. Thus, the actor today will approach the text with a degree of resourcefulness, possibly using those Renaissance features in a new manner to facilitate their performance. However, where the present-day actor has significantly gained in rehearsal time, they have naturally lost the access to the author that Shakespeare's own company would have had, and any benefits of the 'smart space'[42] that would have been created by the original company's collaboration. The 'actorly competence' that a Renaissance player drew upon, in the fashioning of a role of 'rhetorical and psychological complexity' was aided by the degree of 'knowledge and practice' that he could 'accrue from working in a single

---

[39] Ibid.
[40] Modern rehearsal patterns can also be significantly longer, within the order of many weeks/months, if one cites the practice of certain companies, like the RSC or Cheek By Jowl.
[41] Tribble, p. 20.
[42] Ibid.

company', with the gift of proximity to the original author.[43] By contrast, for the present-day practitioner, it is common for considerable rehearsal time to be spent just unpicking the text or establishing the performance implications of certain textual features. Yet, Shakespeare or otherwise, present-day practitioners will spend at least a month in rehearsal, followed by (comparative to their Renaissance counterparts) many more days (or indeed weeks, or months) in a production run of a single play; this we can attribute to significant differences in the performance industries of the given periods. My research takes account of the significant differences of the 'cognitive ecology'[44] that one encounters in this diachronic fashion.

Companies today tend to orientate themselves around a specified director (unlike the Renaissance companies who had no "master-director")[45] and it is unusual (although not altogether unheard of) for the practitioners to be a long-standing ensemble.[46] Whilst some of these factors may appear as self-evident, I am obliged to highlight them to draw attention to the parameters of the research. This thesis is chiefly engaged with actors working in present-day Britain. Priority is given to current theatre practice. In writing my history of post-Stanislavskian dramatic developments, I note how methods used in British drama training (as conveyed by my workshop actors) can appear distinct from those of other present-day contexts and general misconceptions of 'Stanislavskian practice', the American Method offering a key example of comparison.[47] This is compounded by the issues relating to the practical skill-set of a given modern actor. Tribble cites, for example, the contemporary research of Tony and Helga Noice and on this basis describes the scenario of modern 'actors […] often working with [more modern] texts that eschew the sort of surface verbal features that make pre-modern texts amenable to

---

[43] Palfrey and Stern, p. 5.
[44] Tribble, p. 22.
[45] Tribble, p. 20.
[46] Again, there are exceptions. Select examples (amongst many) of significant long-term ensembles are served by: Michael Boyd's 2008 RSC Histories Cycle; and Sam Mendes' 2009-2012 transatlantic collaboration between the Old Vic, the Brooklyn Academy of Music, and Neal Street (entitled 'The Bridge Project').
[47] See Chapter One.

memorization (e.g. rhyme, rhythm, alliteration)'.[48] This is certainly true of the formal texture of most contemporary drama texts. However, this cannot be said to represent the limits of an actor's experience or engagement. The practice of the actors of my workshops (in addition to the wider context of their training in leading British drama schools) was consistently orientated towards those very 'surface verbal features' that one encounters in Renaissance drama.

My thesis is positively disposed towards the attempts that are made by theatre practitioners today, usually in good faith, to stage Shakespearean drama that bears a significantly close relationship to a version of Shakespearean textual 'origin'. Practitioners are commonly resourceful in their approach to derive as much meaning and purpose as possible from Renaissance words, in the face of many other competing creative possibilities – possibilities which could readily include a general departure from the Renaissance text altogether. My thesis in the most part is limited to Shakespeare because it is indicative of the theatre industry phenomenon of specifically Shakespearean practice and pedagogy; drama school applicants are tasked with the preparation of Shakespeare monologues, their training will prepare them in commonly held views about Shakespearean technique and then, as graduates, the most likely Renaissance casting that they will have to prepare for will be a Shakespearean role. Furthermore, whilst many of the textual features under discussion may be found in other Renaissance drama, Shakespeare's prolific works provide wide-ranging representation of all the most important features, with the most nuanced suggestions of a role's 'interiority'.

The dominant approach of the present-day actor is centred on the construct of a given 'character'.[49] Naturally, there is considerable historical fluctuation with such a concept, both in terms of changing societal perceptions of selfhood and (more crucially) in terms of the theatrically staged image of selfhood. Terminology shifted during the Renaissance. The term 'acting' developed in usage during the sixteenth

---

[48] Tribble, p. 11.
[49] William B. Worthen, *Shakespeare and the Authority of Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 110.

century: where it had initially referred more commonly to the '"action" of the orator' (based on a gestural display), by the early seventeenth century it referred to the 'prerogative of the common players' and their performed gestures;[50] the player's action came to 'physiologically' represent 'the externalization (acting) of internal feeling (passion).'[51] Simultaneously, the appearance of a new term, '"personation", suggests that a relatively new art of individual characterisation had begun to develop'.[52] Thomas Heywood, in his well-known apology for his art, refers to an actor's requisite ability 'to qualifie everything according to the nature of the person personated',[53] via a medium of 'well spirited action'.[54] Whilst 'action' in this period was represented by the 'paralinguistic language of gesture',[55] research in Renaissance gestural language, as recently exemplified in the work of Farah Karim-Cooper, has suggested that such gestures were 'fundamentally varied'[56] and cannot be assumed to have been 'homogenous' across the various commercial playhouse contexts of London in that period.[57] Yet, for the supposed variety in performed outcome, we find consistent evidence in Renaissance drama that the 'cue script' of the individual actor provided the stage player with a 'complex guide to personation', where it represented the 'changing "passions" of the characters.'[58]

'Character' throughout my thesis is not based on expressly real-world investigations of selfhood – that is, selfhood as it relates to the world outside of the theatre rehearsal room (be they, for example, in the fields of psychology, neuroscience or sociology, amongst others). Undoubtedly such investigations would serve as the rich material for countless alternative theses. 'Character' is assessed throughout this thesis (by limitation and also practical necessity) in the context of

---

[50] Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 118.
[51] Palfrey and Stern, p. 313.
[52] Gurr, p. 118.
[53] Thomas Heywood, *An Apology for Actors* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1612), C4r.
[54] Heywood, B3r.
[55] Gurr, p. 119.
[56] Karim-Cooper, Farah, *The Hand on the Shakespearean Stage: Gesture, Touch and the Spectacle of Dismemberment* (London: Bloomsbury, Arden Shakespeare, 2016), p. 78.
[57] Karim-Cooper, p. 107.
[58] Tribble, p. 85.

theatre practice and my specific field of focus. As one might imagine, the term 'character' serves as a reliable and instant shorthand in a rehearsal room setting. Whilst commonly a participant of the workshops would ask questions pertaining to *their* character under investigation, none of my participants posed the general broad question, 'What do we actually mean by the term character?'. Nor would one expect it of a present-day theatre setting. This is indicative of the apparent stability of the term, as well as the common practical boundaries. The context of a rehearsal framework is that all participants are working from a shared understanding of such a term, in the light of practical considerations such as limited rehearsal time. My proximity of cultural context with the actors makes it very difficult to extract myself from certain temporal and spatial limits of present-day rehearsal practice. Thus, for the purposes of my practical field of study, I relate 'character' to the imposition of a post-Stanislavskian framework. 'Character', in this thesis, is represented by various post-Stanislavskian techniques and wider practices (which will be discussed), such as 'actioning'[59] – a contemporary technique that will be important throughout the study. In post-Stanislavskian discussion, we will also witness the value in referring to the performer as an 'actor-character' (to apply a term used by Mike Alfreds)[60] who navigates their way through a script in terms of discrete moment-by-moment motivations, conscious of their place within the macroscopic context of a given play, the performed outcome being rooted in the embodiment of a series of actions (expressed in voice and/or gesture).

By approaching 'character' this way – as something essentially being constructed via a framework of text-orientated rehearsal techniques – I am consciously drawing from the dynamic of what Evelyn Tribble refers to as the production's 'cognitive ecology'. This brings into key consideration the nature of the actor's relationship to their 'text'. For example, the present-day actor, in using a highlighter pen to promote the significance of their own lines (for mnemonic

---

[59] See Chapter Two.
[60] Mike Alfreds, *Different Every Night: Freeing the Actor* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2007; repr. 2013), p. 51.

purposes) or in learning their lines and getting 'off book' with their script in isolation from the company, in some ways is engaging with the playtext in a manner that seems to echo the Renaissance player's part-based approach (given the practices explored by Palfrey and Stern). Similarly where the script is then divided into discrete rhetorical units by today's post-Stanislavskian actor, for the purpose of 'actioning', there are parallels to the Renaissance player's analysis of a part for its shift in 'passions' – even though one can reasonably conclude that Renaissance passioning would have had a very different performance output to post-Stanislavskian actioning. However, the significant difference is that the actor today commonly has a developed understanding of the 'full' text of the play in question, as is emphasised by the common post-Stanislavskian use of 'character lists';[61] these lists include the descriptions of the actor's character but as spoken by other characters in the play, whilst the actor's character is offstage. In this manner, the actor on today's stage is moving between 'texts',[62] and potentially having to grapple with varying degrees of character 'self-consciousness'.

In order to bridge key stylistic features of a Shakespeare text with present-day, post-Stanislavskian acting techniques, I propose assessing a text for its qualities of what I will term 'dramatic rhetoric'. In using the term 'dramatic rhetoric', I am also deliberately suggesting a revision of the principle of 'dramatic action', which is a common term of art that is regularly propagated in dramatic practice today (and often with considerable utility, especially for playwrights). The 'dramatic rhetoric' of a scene could be said to be its persuasive purpose, as a staged event. Renaissance drama offers an especially rich range of rhetorical techniques, but an assessment on particularly *dramatic*-rhetorical terms reveals how, at any given moment, the actor-character is given a specific purpose to their speech, in consideration of the wider staging context of this speech (most especially the relationship of their words to onstage addressee or audience). Dramatic rhetoric can also be divided into

---

[61] See Chapter Two for discussion.
[62] See Chapter Four and Andrew Gurr's discussion.

increasingly small units of text: a portion of a speech, a phrase, a word, even a metrical foot or single syllable.

My proposal of a dramatic rhetoric is born out of my reaction to the prevalent use of the concept of 'dramatic action', which is commonly applied in drama workshops and seminars and taught in vocational courses in Britain today. 'Dramatic action' has no fixed definition and traceable contemporary origin as such; it seeks its loose origin in Aristotle's *Poetics* and the notion of a play having a taut, unified plot.[63] The term 'dramatic action' is used today to identify how a scene contributes to the wider drama of the play. Like dramatic rhetoric, it can also be divided into increasingly small segments, down to the individual words of a character's speech. The actor Brian Ferguson described the link between dramatic action and the requirement for a 'fully-fleshed-out character […] to have needs and reasons for speaking […] that work with the rest of the play.'[64] For this reason, it has chiefly become a tool pertaining to a writer's craft of script editing. A playwright might return to a scene, questioning how far each moment of dialogue contributes to the plot of the play, and accordingly remove any unwarranted moments of indulgence. The term has also come to be used by directors or dramaturgs who might edit a script for rehearsal, following similar principles.

The notion of dramatic rhetoric better accounts for the stylistic choices of a Renaissance playwright, whilst anticipating the best-suited application of present-day acting technique. To give one example, the actor who steps onstage to enact the Chorus of Shakespeare's *Henry V* is – in terms of plot alone – speaking from outside the play. He is preparing the audience and setting the scene so that the context of Agincourt might be brought to life. However, in purer theatrical terms, the play has in fact already begun. The dramatic rhetoric of the actor-character is actually pivotal, he needs to persuade the audience to allow the play to happen; if his speech is not convincing then he will undermine the efforts of the entire theatrical production. A

---

[63] '[…] tragedy is a mimesis of a complete […] action […]' – Aristotle, *Poetics*, in *Classical Literary Criticism*, ed. by D. A. Russell and Michael Winterbottom (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), p. 60.
[64] Brian Ferguson, W5.

general notion of dramatic rhetoric, as exemplified onstage by a post-Stanislavskian technique such as actioning, can especially serve as an elegant response to converting seemingly descriptive (diegetic) text into an enacted (mimetic) theatre event. By contrast, if one is solely governed by consideration of dramatic action, especially when faced by the unique degree of challenge posed by the richness of Renaissance drama, then one becomes confined and fails to unlock the potential of staging. A doctrine of dramatic action could regard various extended moments of soliloquy, vivid descriptions of offstage events and lengthy sections of heightened repartee as being dramatically deficient, in terms of a conspicuous and efficient contribution to plot. This judgement may then impact upon the dramaturgical approach to the text being performed (including potential cuts), or the manner in which rehearsal room techniques are applied.

Dramatic rhetoric allows for greater nuance, embracing texts that are written with a wider technical range. In this way, soliloquies, passages describing offstage acts, or dialogue rich in non-naturalistic rhetorical effects can be embraced as quintessentially dramatic in their task, where a filter of dramatic action might reject such passages as a failure of dramatic purpose. Dramatic action would ignore the Chorus' words of *Henry V* as extraneous to plot, where dramatic rhetoric sees them as theatrically vital. Dramatic rhetoric is usually directed at another actor-character onstage. However, actor-characters can often be tasked with a soliloquy or an address of an offstage figure; the dramatic rhetoric is then directed at this object instead, but still with equally persuasive purpose. The purpose might even be a case of a character affirmation – an ontological quest, trying to persuade the audience of their own existence as an entity.

Whilst my assessment is especially conditioned by a response to a culture that permeates the current climate of dramatic writing practice in Britain, it takes on a specific importance in relation to a Shakespeare text. However, I would also assert that dramatic rhetoric should be commonly considered regarding the staging of our contemporary plays. This thesis does not have the adequate capacity to extend to new-writing trends but, as one indicative example, if one considered the programme

of a typical new-writing fringe festival in British theatre today, one would be sure to encounter countless examples of monologue plays, staged with direct-audience address. One constantly witnesses dramatic rhetoric in action and for this reason, as well as its Shakespearean prominence, it is a significant issue for contemplation.

Lorna Hutson has investigated how Shakespeare's 'revolutionary dramaturgical deployment of "circumstances"' enabled his audience 'to imagine and argue about his "characters" as though they existed autonomously, […] independent of the composition of the plays'.[65] For Hutson, this imaginative impetus almost amounts in too much of a deception, in so far as certain literary critical fields are concerned. But within my field of analysis such an imaginative deception is the focal professional practice in question. Actors, by necessity, have to devise resourceful and creative techniques to fashion, from their part, their contribution to the creation of a 'character', within the parameters of the phenomenological event.[66] It seems a reductive truism of performance practice to state this, but it is a field with notable contrasting priorities at times to the domain of literary-critical analysis. This thesis is an investigation of how the actor's creative licence with the text technically manifests itself, where a solely literary-critical approach cannot fully recognise the notion of 'character' within the same practical parameters.

Hutson cites 'circumstances' in their Renaissance context, serving as 'topical aids to the composition of persuasive arguments in the interests of narrative intelligibility and poetic power.'[67] Drawing from their classical heritage, as represented in Quintilian, such circumstances can be described as features such as 'motive, time, place, opportunity, means, [and] method'.[68] But, most importantly for today's actor, these same circumstantial features are the very areas that we will see

---

[65] Lorna Hutson, *Circumstantial Shakespeare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 1. Further references to just 'Hutson' relate to *Circumstantial Shakespeare*, unless otherwise stated.
[66] See Leanore Lieblein, 'Embodied Intersubjectivity and the Creation of Early Modern Character', in *Shakespeare and Character: Theory, History, Performance, and Theatrical Persons*, ed. by Paul Edward Yachnin and Jessica Slights (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), p. 127.
[67] Hutson, p. 2.
[68] Ibid.

being probed by post-Stanislavskian techniques, whilst of course serving the differing purpose of constructing a present-day dramatic rhetoric.

One of Hutson's lines of circumstantial questioning asks what the 'dramatic status' is of 'events that are said to occur elsewhere than onstage during the course of the action', pondering if they can 'be said to "happen" in the play?'.[69] This question is placed within the context of conventions of structuralist narratology, specifically the theoretical division of the 'sjuzhet' (the narrative shape) and the 'fabula' (the strict chronological sequence of the described events, independent of narrative structure) of any given story.[70] Accordingly, Hutson unpicks the dramatic presentation, the dramatic 'sjuzhet', from details of the 'fabula' that remain offstage. In doing so she discusses how 'certain kinds of dramatized stories require the techniques of reporting action from what we might call the "unscene" [and the] extramimetic'.[71] The notion of the 'unscene' was something of extended interest in my workshop investigations. In Part Two, my turn towards workshops on *enargeia* (vivid description) evidences the nature of the contextual distinction that can be made between the onstage event and the vivid description of the offstage. The field of professional acting also chiefly indicates how the structuralist boundary between 'sjuzhet' and 'fabula' can be levelled by a present-day technique such as 'actioning', which is equally applicable to both narrative filters. For the onstage actor the key significance is the live contingency, performing in front of the live audience and, to that end, the enargeic speech is every bit as 'onstage' as any other variety of speech.[72] For Hutson, Shakespeare's treatment of 'extramimetic'[73] features exemplifies 'the creativity of neoclassical experimentation'.[74] She champions the manner in which the 'fabula' can project an 'impression' of a 'temporally, spatially,

---

[69] Hutson, p. 7.
[70] Ibid. Where 'sjuzhet' can also be referred to as 'discourse' or 'récit', and 'fabula' can alternatively be referred to as the 'story' or 'histoire'.
[71] Hutson, p. 8.
[72] I use the adjective 'enargeic' throughout this thesis. Cf. the alternative, 'enargeitic' – Lorna Hutson, 'Forensic Aspects of Renaissance Mimesis', Representations, 94 (2006), 80-109, p. 101.
[73] Hutson, p. 9.
[74] Hutson, p. 10.

and psychologically coherent world',[75] as served by 'the resources of the rhetorical and dialectical invention of circumstances'.[76] Hutson describes the very 'matter of the *psychologizing* of dramatic action' and how, beginning with the play *Gorboduc*,[77] English dramatists began to understand that 'what matters in a dramatic narrative may not be action itself, but the way in which the action (whether enacted or reported) is construed by […] *dramatis personae*'.[78] And this is the very manner in which I believe a present-day appreciation of dramatic rhetoric (as distinct from dramatic action), served by an application of post-Stanislavskian (text-orientated) techniques, can unlock the potential of a Shakespeare playtext on our contemporary stage (within its specific theatrical ecology).

Literary criticism has moved through various trends in relation to the interpretation of 'character'. Hutson in particular remarks on a trend in 'older liberal humanist criticism' to make specific claims about the '"universality" of the psychic structures' that one might find in a given work.[79] She questions why such an 'inferential procedure' is rarely scrutinized, unlike the practice of certain movements, such as 'structuralist reduction' or 'poststructuralist cultural materialism', which have plotted such a course,[80] in questioning the 'limitless autonomy and plenitude to "character".' However, Hutson does champion the function of 'rhetorical and dialectical invention', as applied by the neoclassical Renaissance playwrights, noting how they fashioned a 'dramatic language replete with arguments perpetually inviting the inference of *causae* […] – motives, intentions, or purposes'.[81] In this manner they arrived at the 'means by which psychological causation' could be 'inferred from speeches in the play'.[82]

---

[75] Hutson, p. 12.
[76] Hutson, p. 13.
[77] First performed in 1561. Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville, *The Tragedie of Gorboduc* (London: William Griffith, 1565).
[78] Hutson, p. 27.
[79] Hutson, p. 14.
[80] Ibid.
[81] Hutson, p. 20.
[82] Ibid.

'Character' in my study is not being filtered as if through a historical, literary '"character appreciation"'[83] (the kind that validates or fashions a sense of morality for the reader of a text). The filter, within my field of study, is much closer to the 'analytical category of "character"', as applied in very recent times within the field of Shakespeare criticism, relating to 'the history of collaborative theatrical practices' detailed by aspects such as 'company structure', the 'part-based conception of the playtext' and the 'contingencies and ruptures of embodied rehearsal and performance'.[84] The distinction I make is to consider post-Stanislavskian techniques (and their development) and today's context of theatre production in Britain, in order to establish what 'character' can mean in the early rehearsal room engagement of an actor. Finally, to this end I move away from Hutson's interpretation of the 'performance' as something that 'merely *interprets* from hints written into the text',[85] where the disposition of my analysis instead regards the text as one component in a 'productive rhetoric' (of the kind proposed by W. B. Worthen)[86] which includes the agencies of actors, as well as spectators. The fulfilment of a dramatic rhetoric is the culmination of the triangulation of a playwright's text, the onstage actor and the theatre audience.

'Actioning', as a post-Stanislavskian example, illuminates how actors today can resourcefully overcome challenges posed by the rhetorical, circumstantial framework of Shakespeare's drama. It can serve as a missing technique to address the gulf that Lorna Hutson has outlined, between diegesis and mimesis, because 'actioning' categorises the descriptive as staged action.[87] In return therefore, actioning serves to illuminate the mimetic potential of the Shakespearean text.

The second half of my thesis serves as an extended account of my programme of workshops with professional actors, which I devised and directed in

---

[83] Hutson, p. 15.
[84] Hutson, p. 16.
[85] Hutson, p. 18.
[86] Worthen distinguishes 'interpretive rhetoric' from 'productive rhetoric'. Worthen, p. 7. In doing so he draws from figures such as Hans-Thies Lehmann (Worthen, p. 7), Robert Weimann (Worthen, p. 18) and Jacques Rancière (Worthen, p. 28).
[87] See Chapter 6.

order to assess directly the methods of my post-Stanislavskian group of directors. The directorial methods (introduced in Chapter Two) and the Shakespearean stylistic features (discussed in Chapter Three) converged in these sessions.

Each of the nine workshops lasted approximately three hours and was governed by close textual analysis. I chose rehearsal-orientated techniques as the core analysis – rather than documented performance itself – as they represented the closest moment of engagement between the actor and the written text. To test the strength of the connection between stylistic elements of Shakespeare's rhetoric and present-day acting techniques with greatest scrutiny, I decided to select three categories of speech that could present the greatest challenge to an actor today. The three categories that I chose were: the soliloquy (Chapter 5); passages of vivid description of an offstage event (Chapter 6); and richly rhetorical repartee (Chapter 7). I drew from various literary critics to assess the parameters of each of these broad categories of dramatic rhetoric, and compiled material that would provoke discussion with actors. Each workshop was directed towards a distinct feature within the selected extract(s), either based on an aspect of Shakespeare's own style or inspired by the interpretation of a given 'post-Stanislavskian' director. I assessed all of the extent manual material of my selected post-Stanislavskian directors and exhaustively searched through any of their specifically Shakespeare-related exercises. I directly applied as many of these exercises as possible to a workshop analysis. In addition, I began each workshop by asking participants a series of informal survey questions on their past experience of Shakespeare texts and their wider acquaintance with 'post-Stanislavskian' techniques.[88] Their responses to these questions (as well as the workshop investigations proper) significantly informed and supported my wider research, which is why I also make frequent citation of the actors to this effect in Part One.

---

[88] See Appendix E: Actor Survey.

In terms of textual selection, prior to each workshop I consulted extant quarto variants of the selected Shakespeare extract(s), to compare with the Folio.[89] I noted any textual differences, and hand-annotated a printed copy of the extract(s). I also consulted a range of modern editions of the extract(s), to compare with my 'control text' (the *RSC Complete Works*); I frequently used the individually printed plays of the Arden and Oxford series. In order to anticipate an efficient discussion of any verse-related issues, I also marked any significant verse variations in the extract(s). I was mindful to select variations of most common frequency (as influenced by the analysis of Marina Tarlinskaja) and also verse features that would commonly draw the attention of an actor today (being guided by the comments made by actors).[90] Variations of priority were: lines that began with a trochaic inversion (what Tarlinskaja refers to as 'rhythmical italics');[91] lines that ended with extra syllables (mostly of the 'feminine ending' convention); and lines that contained caesuras. In addition to an analysis of verse variation, I also wrote a précis of each play under discussion for the actors to consult with ease if necessary, allowing for any extract(s) to be more fruitfully considered within a play's wider dramatic context.

For each workshop I made audio recordings and I transcribed these in full, fashioning the workshops into core primary 'texts'. In the chapters which follow, quotations are taken directly from my transcriptions. All of my workshop actors were fully aware of each audio recording that was being made, gave consent to be recorded, and were informed of the use of citation in this thesis. In addition to workshop transcriptions, I have on a small number of occasions supplemented my own produced material with pertinent, brief references to other testimonies from prominent actors, as may be found in text, audio, or video media online.

One of the most important methodological values that emerged from the workshops was that they mirrored a genuine industry-level of time constraint. To cite

---

[89] *The Bodleian First Folio: Digital Facsimile of the First Folio of Shakespeare's plays* (London: Printed by Isaac Jaggard and Ed. Blount, 1623), Bodleian Library, Arch. G c.7. <http://firstfolio.bodleian.ox.ac.uk>
[90] In both cases, see Chapter Three.
[91] Tarlinskaja, p. 3.

an example, Rob Swain (theatre director and Professor of Theatre Practice at Birkbeck) offered a detailed breakdown of his schedule for a typical Globe production, during a Directing Studio which I attended at Shakespeare's Globe.[92] He suggested a maximum of five weeks' rehearsal time as his basis, with *The Tempest* as an example production, and ascertained that were he to direct the play (using the 75-page Penguin edition as his main source), he would have approximately two hours of rehearsal time to invest in a given page of the text.[93] By comparison, my workshop on Juliet's 'Gallop apace' soliloquy (which equates to a single page in its Penguin edition)[94] lasted three hours (including the opening acting survey).[95] Thus the degree of attention that my workshops could give to a specific extract was occasionally greater than that which might be afforded by a present-day rehearsal.

As a theatre practitioner I would keenly highlight that, whilst the version of present-day Shakespeare production represented in my thesis is that which one would most commonly encounter professionally, there are various alternative professional production approaches. Just taking one example performance subfield, I acknowledge that one of the most rapidly growing areas of theatre development today is beyond the hold of textual orthodoxy. The growth of the 'immersive' theatre industry represents an example of what Worthen has referred to as 'evolving ideologies of performance'.[96] Companies such as Specifiq, Colab Factory, Parabolic Theatre, Rift and Les Enfants Terribles are indicative of this growing practice in Britain,[97] where a specific overlap between the Shakespearean and the immersive is perhaps most famously represented by Punchdrunk's *Sleep No More*.

I have restricted myself to directorial manuals that can be readily applied to Shakespearean rehearsal practice. As such manuals are commonly produced at the

---

[92] Rob Swain, 'A Director Prepares' – this talk formed part of the Directing Studio at Shakespeare's Globe, 6 May 2017.
[93] Ibid.
[94] William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet,* ed. by T. J. B. Spencer (London: Penguin, 1967, repr. 2005), pp. 66-7.
[95] See W2, in Chapter Five.
[96] Worthen, p. 2.
[97] Specifiq hosts a large London 'meet-up' group where immersive companies and practitioners congregate. I have attended recent meetings of the group.

culmination of a career, my directorial choices are dated to a specific period. If I were alternatively to select directors that best represent contemporary trends in theatre practice at leading companies (such as the RSC or Shakespeare's Globe), I would choose the more recently established figures of Polly Findlay, Blanche McIntyre and Simon Godwin, as well as emergent directors, such as Ned Bennett or Lynette Linton.[98] However, the selection I have made allows a certain degree of historical perspective, as well as also acknowledging pedagogical cross-over. For example, 'actioning' might be regarded in nascent context as having a distinctly 1970s spirit of approach. Yet it is only historical distance that has, over the last decade, elevated it to a very current sense of 'syllabus' status across leading British drama schools.

One natural extension of my thesis would be of course to consider the post-Stanislavskian techniques that I have discussed in stricter relation to their more common bedfellows, that is twentieth and twenty-first century drama texts. This study is, after all, restricted to Shakespeare. Similarly, I acknowledge that my directors of choice have tended to restrict manual examples to well-trodden extracts from Shakespeare, and a much wider Shakespearean discussion could be provoked. My hope would be that further investigations of both the post-Stanislavskian and Shakespearean stylistic elements of my thesis could be expanded beyond my first-wave account, where I have brought together practitioners (like Hall and Barton with the post-Stanislavskians) and textual application (as in Shakespeare and the techniques of 'actioning') for the very first time.

This thesis is a first-wave attempt at linking post-Stanislavskian techniques with discrete aspects of Shakespearean style, where approaches of Shakespearean acting manuals today can frequently be either inconsistent or misrepresentative, or indeed inaccurate, in their interpretation of features as reliably 'authorial'. The connection I promote is between stylistic elements of Shakespeare and versions of

---

[98] Bennett (who is yet to stage a professional Shakespeare production) is nevertheless an example of an 'upcoming' director attaining consistent critical acclaim, most prominently at the National.

actioning, however, I would hope that this study might encourage similar engagement, but in other areas. Contemporary investigation might select writers with close affinity to the origins of actioning, such as Howard Brenton, Timberlake Wertenbaker or Caryl Churchill. Alternatively, one might assess the challenge of applying actioning to a specific device, such as *enargeia*, and choose writers such as Harold Pinter, Jez Butterworth or Lucy Kirkwood. To expand the study across Renaissance practice, one could investigate how author-specific stylistic features compare, in relation to a post-Stanislavskian application. One might consider, for example, the specific challenge of applying present-day techniques to the emphatic Marlovian line,[99] or how a quest for motivation might be served by John Ford's idiosyncratic use of italics.[100] Many new approaches and techniques in a rehearsal context could emerge, relating to both the present-day and the Renaissance (as being staged today).

My thesis is segmented in the following manner. In Chapter One I highlight what Stanislavskian practice can be said to mean on its own terms, offering a revisionist view of older established views (drawing significantly on the more recent translations made by Jean Benedetti). In Chapter Two I define the origins of post-Stanislavskian practice in British theatre. I select a specific range of directors for consideration and discuss the developments of a family of text-orientated directorial techniques that broadly fall under the umbrella term of 'actioning' (which has become a major area of influence in present-day drama training). I offer the first ever extended history of this development, where no such record currently exists in print. In Chapter Three I turn to Shakespeare and discuss the features of his writing that might offer the most valuable (and reliable) suggestion of authentically 'authorial' clues. I was influenced by both leading Renaissance scholars and also trends amongst current theatre practitioners. Palfrey and Stern have written of the 'specific directions for acting contained within the cued actor's speeches', discussing

---

[99] See Chapter Three.
[100] See T. J. B. Spencer, 'Introduction', in John Ford, *The Broken Heart*, ed. by Spencer (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980), p. 3-4; and Derek Roper, 'Introduction', in John Ford, *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, ed. by Roper (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1975), pp. lxii-lxiv.

examples such as 'midline switches, movements between verse and prose, full line and short line, blank verse and couplets'.[101] My study especially focuses on those features that occur with greatest frequency, as well as those which are most commonly cited for use by actors (not including common inaccurate appropriation, such as in areas of 'authorial' punctuation). A key consideration is how the 'meaning' of a line of text is determined not simply by semantics alone but also by verse-form. In Chapter Four I consider the nature of 'Shakespearean' theatre ecology in present-day Britain, specifically focusing on leading organs, such as the post-war foundation of the Royal Shakespeare Company and the (re)build of Shakespeare's Globe. The chapters of Part One collectively offer the origins of post-Stanislavskian and Shakespearean theories that are of direct practical value to a rehearsal room.

The workshops of Part Two serve as a direct application of directorial techniques. In part, techniques were selected from an exhaustive overview of everything written on Shakespeare by the directors of my selected group, but this was also supplemented by the use of other representative techniques (where previous, directly Shakespearean application had not been undertaken). Directors are often paired together in the workshops, which allows for a certain synthetic reading of techniques, a comparison and contrast to be made between practitioners. In practical application of the theories of Part One, I emphasise the value of pursuing what I would call 'dramatic rhetoric'. Such a term is not represented by literary-rhetorical interpretation,[102] but it is a present-day concept of integrated practice, best represented by the techniques of the directors in my post-Stanislavskian group. The application of dramatic rhetoric represents a new way of conceiving the task of the present-day actor. Rokison has described the 'modern tendency' to link the metrical structure of a scene to character motivation as being 'unhistorical', as the Renaissance actor, working from a part script, would not have been able to appreciate the 'metrical relationship of his lines to those of the other characters'.[103]

---

[101] Palfrey and Stern, p. 12.
[102] See Chapter Three for examples of this kind.
[103] Rokison, p. 183.

Where Rokison is sceptical about the context of the Renaissance part-based approach allowing for the text to provide, in this manner, '"clues" about a character's feelings and motivations',[104] Palfrey and Stern instead describe an image of part texts that 'Shakespeare filled […] with all kinds of "directions" for […] performance'.[105] They find in parts cues for 'direct shifts in mind, focus, emphasis, or body' and features such as 'transitions […] from one emotion or passion to another'.[106] In defence of an actor's solo-work potential, my workshop studies of soliloquies and enargeic speeches provide strong examples of moments where an actor today has to analyse a monologue speech and derive character motivation in the absence of a dialogue dynamic. Where I turn to repartee and the 'actioning' of dialogue, however, the concerns of character relationships grow in significance, and I turn to the issue of an actor's limitations of character knowledge.

In my approach I recognise the diachronic gulf between Renaissance player and present-day actor. However, I also assert that I am not attempting to resurrect original practices. Instead, I look to embrace the resourcefulness of actors today, whilst investigating the collaborative background to the cognitive ecology of present-day theatre production. Nevertheless, it is not an aim of this thesis to create a reduction to a singular theory of approach. Instead, dramatic rhetoric should be seen as a framework whereby actors can intimately respond to something of Shakespeare's authorial style, whilst fulfilling the crucial dramatic demands of present-day staging.

---

[104] Rokison, p. 125.
[105] Palfrey and Stern, p. 4.
[106] Palfrey and Stern, p. 12.

Part One

'Post-Stanislavskian' and 'Shakespearean' Theories

Chapter 1: Stanislavski and the British Stanislavskian

The workshops of this thesis assess the early stages of rehearsal and an actor's first attempts to fashion 'character' in response to Shakespeare's text. Text-orientated rehearsal techniques offer a glimpse into the wider post-Stanislavskian theatre culture in which the present-day actor is embedded, where such 'cultural and material' surrounds are 'crucially important' in determining how such 'mechanisms work in any particular historical moment.'[107] Any diachronic analysis comparing Renaissance and post-Stanislavskian techniques faces the significant obstacle of a gulf of theatrical performance contexts and wider socio-historical contexts. However, this is the self-same obstacle that faces present-day practitioners in the rehearsal room and is one that has to be overcome with as much success as possible, often in a comparatively short timeframe.

In this chapter I will discuss the origins of Stanislavski's influential acting techniques in their own terms and account for the context of their influence on British theatre in the twentieth century, whilst outlining the simultaneous developments in Britain that made its theatrical culture so ready for Stanislavskian reception. In this way I will consider historical developments that have led to present-day practice, to assess more precisely the post-Stanislavskian techniques as mechanisms for the contemporary 'actor-character.'

The theorist/director Konstantin Stanislavski (1863-1938)[108] looms large in the midst of any survey of twentieth century drama. He is commonly regarded as not only codifying theatre practice as it existed, in early-twentieth-century Moscow – his first written attempt comes with the unpublished *A Draft Manual* (1906)[109] – but then continuing to inspire generally, or to influence directly, swathes of performers,

---

[107] Tribble, p.12.

[108] As I chiefly refer to Jean Benedetti's translation, I will use his spelling of 'Konstantin Stanislavski'. Other footnotes and bibliography entries differ; I will always retain the spelling of the name as it appears in respective source texts.

[109] Jean Benedetti, 'Translator's Foreword', in Konstantin Stanislavski, *An Actor's Work: a Student's Diary*, trans. and ed. by Jean Benedetti (London: Routledge, 2010), p. xv.

theatres and teaching institutions. His approach has been dubbed the 'air we breathe in contemporary theatre', by Adrian Noble (a former Artistic Director of the Royal Shakespeare Company).[110] The late Jean Benedetti, the renowned Stanislavski scholar (and former principal of Rose Bruford College),[111] reminds us that the codification is broadly reduced to what might be called (in Stanislavski's own terminology) a 'psycho-physical technique' for acting, which is often generically referred to as the 'system'.[112] Stanislavski's influence is directly referenced across acting media – as far as the adoption of what might be called Stanislavskian techniques is concerned; there is considerable evidence and citation to regard him (both in print and in received pedagogy) as one of the foremost theorists in acting (from theatre, through to the recorded media) in the twentieth century. Fresh generations of present-day practitioners show an undiminished appetite for Stanislavskian readings, whilst being potentially at an increasing distance from the source material today, over one-hundred-and-fifty years since the theorist's birth. The source material itself needs to be addressed, in an attempt to define Stanislavski closer to his own terms, before considering the range of potentially contradictory practices now grouped under the vast umbrella of 'Stanislavskian' practice.

Stanislavski's core influence in print is derived from the dissemination of his work in two volumes, *An Actor Prepares* and *Building a Character*, as translated into English by the American, Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood. The collaborative project of a first volume began in 1929, before finally being published in 1936.[113] To complicate matters, Stanislavski had simultaneously been working with Lyubov Gurievich on a Russian edition, which was eventually published in 1938. Benedetti has indicated the specific struggles that Stanislavski faced in articulating certain theories in a Russian publication, as 'pseudo-Marxist Soviet psychology […] did not recognize the existence either of the subconscious or of the Mind' (xvii). The terminology did not exist, in this era, for some of Stanislavski's key concepts, such

---

[110] Adrian Noble, *How to do Shakespeare* (New York: Routledge, 2010), p. 243.
[111] Benedetti was also the founding patron of Rose Bruford's Stanislavski Centre.
[112] Benedetti, p. i.
[113] Benedetti, p. xvi.

as notions of what might today be called 'non-verbal communication' and 'body language' (xvii). As a result, the closing chapters of the English and Russian editions contain marked differences – the latter being worded to appease readers in the author's homeland. It is also worth noting that, like many theorists and practitioners, Stanislavski constantly revised and developed ideas throughout his career. In this manner, meeting Stanislavski on his own terms is dependent upon the era of our meeting. As Benedetti reinforces, 'There are several Stanislavskis, depending on who you're talking to and when they worked with Stanislavski.'[114]

At the start of *An Actor's Work*, Stanislavski defines the basic goal of an actor as being '*the creation of the life of the human spirit in a role and the communication of that life onstage in an artistic form.*'[115] His belief is that if an actor is technically 'experiencing' (19) a role, then this will be the best way of achieving such a goal. To clarify this, Stanislavski provides a useful range of categories of acting, but his first warning of note is that 'it is only in theory that art can be divided into separate qualities,' where 'reality and practice' creates a 'mix [of] all manner of schools […]' (35).

Stanislavski's division of styles is primarily used to suggest a hierarchy in mimetic quality. At the very foot of this ladder we find a style of performance that resists being labelled as a category of acting altogether, in its failure to embrace basic requirements of theatrical audience engagement. Tortsov – the character of the theatre director who serves as Stanislavski's mouthpiece throughout the fictionalised diaries – labels this as 'exploitation of art' (34). During one of the acting classes, the character Varya Veliaminova[116] enacts a scene whilst being entirely preoccupied by her show of personal beauty. Tortsov reacts by describing 'people who want to

---

[114] Jean Benedetti, quoted by Aleks Sierz, *Jean Benedetti on Stanislavski*, online audio recording, TheatreVoice, 14 May 2007 <http://www.theatrevoice.com/2189/jean-benedetti-on-stanislavski/#.Um8JLxZbylk> [accessed 21 July 2016].
[115] Konstantin Stanislavski, *An Actor's Work: a Student's Diary*, trans. and ed. by Jean Benedetti (London: Routledge, 2010), p. 19. All further footnotes referencing simply 'Stanislavski' will pertain to this frequently cited source.
[116] Benedetti follows Hapgood's lead in giving first names to the actors, who otherwise take pure aptronyms or Cratylic names, such as – in translation – 'Brainy', 'Fatty', and 'Prettyface'. Benedetti, p. xxi-ii.

exploit' the theatre simply 'to make a career for themselves.'[117] At this level the performer is not even seen to be engaging in dramatic acting at all.

The next level above the 'exploitation of art' is described as 'ham acting'. In this instance, Tortsov speaks of an actor using 'human clichés', '"common" or "traditional" clichés which have neither been polished nor adapted for the stage.' The illustration he gives is an actor who chooses to play 'a savage' by 'prowling about baring [his] teeth' and 'rolling the whites of [his] eyes'. These 'clichés' (examples here of unsavoury, anachronistic racism) in this case are drawn from some shared cultural stock, but one that is attributed to all of the society in which Stanislavski lived – not just the acting community (33-4).

At one higher remove from this, one encounters the variety of acting that Stanislavski refers to as the 'stock-in-trade'. The distinction between 'ham acting' and 'stock-in-trade' being that the latter is regarded as using *theatrical* clichés, which are preferable to 'common' clichés, in that they come from a heritage of stage adaptation (27). The stock-in-trade offers a pale 'imitation, a resemblance to […] supposed outer results' (28). However, Stanislavski affords it more respect than his initial taxonomy might seem to suggest, as stock-in-trade clichés are at least orientated towards theatrical engagement. Their coverage is broad, involving concerns of 'the voice, diction', specific 'tricks for walking' and 'formal tricks for displaying all possible human feelings and passions' (29). With this comes a catalogue including: clichés of character types 'from different strata of society (peasants spit on the ground […whilst] aristocrats play with their monocles)', tricks specific to 'historical periods' (such as 'operatic gestures for the Middle Ages'), and tricks specific to theatrical presentation (such as 'a special way of bending the body towards the audience during asides') (29).

The 'string' of clichés culminates in 'a kind of ritual by which an actor illustrates every role' (29). An additional stimulus would then be layered above these clichés, in an attempt to 'move an audience': an 'actors' emotion' that is neither

---

[117] Stanislavski, p. 35.

'genuine emotion, [n]or genuine, artistic experiencing', but is instead 'an artificial stimulation of the periphery of the body' (31). Stanislavski's preference would be that this variety of actor exchanges these 'tricks' for the 'vital, genuine experiencing' of creative acting – incorporating, in essence, a more nuanced variety of character psychology. He maintains that where a few of these clichés retain 'a certain theatrical effectiveness […] the overwhelming majority of them are in such bad taste they are offensive' (29). Tortsov speaks of the stock-in-trade as being pervasive in opera, ballet and neo-classical tragedy. However, it is also key to recognise that it holds great appeal for an 'artistically naïve' theatre audience, 'satisfied with crude imitation' (31). On these terms it seems quite possible for an audience, well-versed in theatrical cliché, to respond best to techniques of the stock-in-trade, as they are the recognised clichés of *perceived* successful acting.

At the very highest rung, however, the hierarchy reaches a level where the 'psychological life'[118] of a character has been constructed with such 'meticulous honesty' (20) that the actor is truly engaging in the '*art of experiencing*' (16). At this point, the actor will feel so closely aligned to their concept of the character that they will be experiencing their own feelings as being 'parallel' to those of the character. Furthermore, where an entire play is acted in this mode, 'every moment of [the character's] life on stage will evoke corresponding personal experiences' (20). In the context of an extended run of performances, the actor must attempt to 'experience feelings analogous' to those of the character, 'each and every time' that the play is performed (19). It must be noted that Stanislavski is still speaking of the experiencing of the actor as taking place on analogous ground to that of the projected character; that is to say, the process is still being discussed in *mimetic* terms. This is a crucial distinction to retain, where supposed Stanislavskian approaches of some later practitioners argue for the highest distinction of acting being an attempt at an absolute union between the emotions of the actor and those of the projected character. If this union were to be pursued fully, the distinction of using a technique

---

[118] Stanislavski, p. 19.

might be altogether lost, the actor in fact '*playing on gut instinct*' (21). Here they would encounter the danger that, as they are acting on 'inspiration alone', they might reconnoitre 'the dead spot in the acting, the places', where emotions lie 'which have not been personally experienced' (22).

For all his categories, Stanislavski is sympathetic to the realities of practice. He recognises that his taxonomy is theoretical: in every performance alongside 'moments of real experiencing, there are moments of mere representation, stock-in-trade, ham and exploitation.' Yet, he still divides acting modes into 'two basic schools of thought': (i) '*the art of experiencing*' – the highest achievement in acting; and (ii) the other modes, which serve '*the art of representation*' (35).

Towards the close of his cataloguing of acting styles, Stanislavski restates the acting pinnacle: to create '*the life of the human spirit of a role*' but in a manner that offers '*physical embodiment in an aesthetic, theatrical form*' (36). Once more, he stresses the complementary, holistic process between the perceived psychology of the character and the actor's need to embody the role *theatrically*. Indeed, it is important not to dismiss the physical dimension of Stanislavski's studies, given the extent to which he is chiefly (perhaps misleadingly) championed for the psychological content of his work; his overall goal of an integrated psycho-physical technique is often lost. The best route to achieving this balance is in '*experiencing a role*'[119] – what Benedetti calls playing 'the cause, not the effect' onstage.[120] For example, an actor would not aim simply to cry onstage, but would instead seek to experience the root cause of the tears. It is perhaps the Stanislavskian priority of 'experiencing' that can, these days, be said to precede a direct reception of Stanislavski's words, where it is made manifest in the practical pedagogy of various drama schools, or where it is adapted in present-day theatre manuals. In this way 'experiencing' might become a grand, yet misleading, synecdoche for the body of Stanislavski's work, which otherwise has a broad holistic framework.

---

[119] Stanislavski, p. 19.
[120] Jean Benedetti, quoted in the aforementioned TheatreVoice interview, conducted by Aleks Sierz.

Stanislavski coins the term of 'psychotechnique' as the process by which an actor can 'arouse and involve the creative subconscious by indirect, conscious means' (17), yet his fictional Tortsov also warns the acting students that the 'inner experience' must be embodied 'physically', where to 'be able to reflect a life which is subtle and often subconscious, [the actor] must possess an exceptionally responsive and outstandingly well-trained voice and body [...]' (20). Indeed, if we read Stanislavski's core work in the light of his original intention (as a single body of work, rather than two volumes) then we might acknowledge that the comprehensive Stanislavskian technique can indeed best be described as 'psycho-physical technique'.[121] The first volume offers the technique of developing psychological objectives, drawn out from a drama text, where the second volume prioritises physical techniques – both volumes serving to complement one another, following Stanislavski's holistic approach to acting. Had the texts been published as the intended single volume, the false sense of division might not exist. Two events intervened to prevent the swift publication of the second volume: Stanislavski's death, and the Second World War.

When Stanislavski died, in 1938, there were barely two chapters of completed material for a second volume, 'although the overall contents of the book were clear' and there were 'a number of fragments of varying length' to provide for a completed manuscript.[122] The Second World War delayed the amalgamation of these materials. Prior to Benedetti's translation, there were three versions of a second volume in existence: a 1950 English translation, based on content supplied by Stanislavski's son Igor; a 1955 Russian edition (as the third volume in an eight-volume collection of *Collected Works*), which included additional archive material; and a newer 1990 Russian edition, again expanded (and part of the then nine-volume edition called *Selected Works*).[123]

---

[121] Benedetti, p. i.
[122] Benedetti, p. xix.
[123] Ibid.

Even when consulting the more extensive Russian editions, Benedetti realised the extent of editorial work that would have to be done, in order to produce a second volume 'in accordance with Stanislavski's wishes' as a book 'of practical use in actor training, to be used in conjunction with Part One'. He removed the many repetitive passages, specific Russian-language-based references, and joined two sections (on 'Singing and Diction' and 'Speech and its Laws').[124] Benedetti combined this second volume with the first, forming *An Actor's Work*. Notably, Benedetti's version comes with the strong endorsements of directors Declan Donnellan and Katie Mitchell (who both sit on the advisory board at the Stanislavski Centre), and its quality of translation has been praised by the academic Maria Shevtsova. She states that 'readers who cannot access Stanislavski in Russian' can 'discover him at long last', where his reputation is otherwise 'marked by numerous misunderstandings.'[125]

Contrastingly, it is important to note that Hapgood's English translations displayed a tendency to use 'abstract' terms on occasion, replacing Stanislavski's 'home-grown' terms. What Stanislavski intended as the rather imprecise 'Bit' of text became translated as the more technical 'unit'.[126] This small detail has had a profound effect on the synthesis of Stanislavski's theories into practical techniques, and the present-day rehearsal room will often be the site of practitioners looking for forensic details of unit division in the text being studied. Where such a practice can have great utility in a present-day context – applying both contemporary understanding of psychology and an intense consideration of the text on its own dramatically rhetorical terms – one must be careful to cite the partitioning of the text as only Stanislavskian in its general spirit, where Stanislavski did not want the application of a practice to be regarded on scientific terms.

---

[124] Benedetti, p. xix-xx.
[125] Maria Shevtsova, 'Review of *My Life in Art* and *An Actor's Work* – by Konstantin Stanislavski, translated Jean Benedetti', *TDR*, Vol. 54, No. 1, Spring 2010, pp. 172-4.
[126] Benedetti, p. xix.

The American 'Method'

One of the biggest complications in the present-day dissemination of Stanislavskian techniques is found in the association that is made with the American adaptation known as the 'Method', which provoked the growth of 'American psychological realism'[127] in actor training. Lee Strasberg, its founder,[128] clearly claimed the origin of the 'Method' as 'a continuation of and an addition to Stanislavsky's system'.[129] There are clear benefits in such supposed provenance; Strasberg himself unabashedly manipulated potential obfuscations as, 'like the Bible, Stanislavsky's basic texts on acting can be quoted to any purpose' (42). Hapgood had noted Stanislavski's fear of publishing a written record of his practice, lest it 'assume the aspect of some unalterable grammar, […] a kind of Bible',[130] yet this fatefully came to pass, Strasberg directly proclaiming Stanislavski's teachings as the 'grammar of the dramatic art', which became known as 'the system'.[131] Thus, against authorial intention, Stanislavski's writings have assumed the status of an elevated acting manual, attracting theatrical apostles (often self-proclaimed) to claim an ancestral descent. Strasberg's attachment is given some pedagogical weight, as he was himself taught by Richard Boleslavksy and Maria Ouspenskaya; both of these teachers had been members of the Moscow Art Theatre and had worked with Stanislavski's theories. Strasberg notes that the first 'coherent presentation of Stanislavsky's system [and…] the first precise examples and descriptions of Stanislavsky's actual procedures in a simple and clear form' were presented during Stanislavski's lecture series, at the Moscow Opera Theatre, in 1920 (55). In such a manner, his apostolic succession is claimed.

---

[127] Blair, p. 169.
[128] Lee Strasberg, *A Dream of Passion* (London: Bloomsbury, 1988). Strasberg directly coins the label for his approach: 'The work which I represent can now legitimately be called the Method.' p. 84.
[129] Strasberg, p. 6. I retain Strasberg's spelling of 'Stanislavsky', where I quote directly from his text.
[130] Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood's 'Explanatory Note', in Constantin Stanislavski, *Building a Character*, trans. by Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood (London: M. Reinhardt, 1950) p. 1.
[131] Strasberg, p. 52.

There are many points of contention here. Firstly, Stanislavski produced a much greater written record (three substantial volumes on acting, not including autobiography) than Strasberg did and, within this body of work, Stanislavski's suggested system offers a much more holistic approach to acting, significantly covering the physicality of an actor's expression, as well as the seemingly more ground-breaking attempts to train an actor's psychology. The received perception of Stanislavski's writings is that they exclusively endorse the concept of the actor working in a direction that Adrian Noble calls 'the inside out'[132] – that is, working from the notion of a character's internal psychology to anticipate externally represented action. However, there are many oppositional moments, theories and practices in his works to be uncovered.

One finds particularly in the second volume of Stanislavski's works (contrary to the received culture of his teachings) examples of working 'from the outside in'[133] (the method that Adrian Noble otherwise associates with Greek mask-practice). In his fictionalised drama school, students and director create a compelling Socratic dialogue. The class is trained in exercises relating to 'external trifles',[134] in order to witness that whilst 'external characterization can be achieved intuitively', it can 'also be [created] by means of purely technical, mechanical, simple external tricks' (9). Yet, Stanislavski's Tortsov adds the vital proviso that 'while [the actor] is making this external research he must not lose his inner self' (10). In this manner, he undermines the notion of an actor modifying his own psychology to become more fully the character, instead prioritising theatrical *mimesis*.

Many present-day practitioners regard the American Method's mythical, self-proclaimed Stanislavskian lineage as an unquestionable truth;[135] although there are

---

[132] Noble, p. 244.
[133] Noble, p. 243.
[134] I quote here from Hapgood's translation of Stanislavski's second volume, *Building a Character*, p. 7. (The equivalent section of Benedetti's combined translation is 'Year Two: Embodiment'.)
[135] Daniel Day-Lewis appears to support such an evolution of the Method: 'I went to the Bristol Old Vic Theatre School; my training there was the basis of it, the Stanislavsky School, which then developed into The Method.' 'Transcript: Daniel Day-Lewis on The Andrew Marr Show', transcript of broadcast interview, BBC, 27 January 2013 <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/entertainment-arts-21139066> [accessed 28 February 2013].

prominent revisionists, such as the directors Declan Donnellan and Katie Mitchell. Indeed, the actor David Sturzaker (during our workshop) remarked how Stanislavski and the Method are 'often thought of as the same thing', where it is valuable to acknowledge that 'there is a clear distinction.'[136] The reception of the Method has far-outgrown the figure of Lee Strasberg, or the record of his writing (published very late in his life). A cultural perception is that the Method's origins represent a Stanislavskian totality, rather than an aspect of technique. Furthermore, the Stanislavskian sense of 'experiencing' is arguably being misconceived as an actor's direct personal reaction. It does not help that the Russian term for 'experiencing' (*perezhivanie*) was commonly translated as 'emotional identification', rather than signifying a process filtered by the dramatic prerogative of make-believe, which Stanisklavski referred to as the magic 'if';[137] it refers literally to '"living through", not "living", the role'.[138] Stanislavski refers to 'Given Circumstances': the character's hypothetical scenario, as outlined by the playwright, which provide the window – as Tortsov proclaims – to 'what Pushkin calls "the truth of the passions" or, at least, feelings that seem true' (54).

Beyond this, the Method's own reception has not evolved cleanly from Strasberg's definition.[139] Strasberg does not quite represent the entirety of the Method; contemporaneous practitioners were developing similar techniques of the Method. Uta Hagen is a prominent example, her popular book, *Respect for Acting* offering an earlier written record than Strasberg of the term '"method" acting';[140] although the chain of Hagen's tuition suggests strongly that she is the acolyte. Brief illustration illuminates the pedagogical co-evolution of the Method that Strasberg and Hagen undertook. Both Hagen and Strasberg joined their respective pedagogical

---

[136] David Sturzaker, W3.
[137] Stanislavski, p. 49. Tortsov demonstrates the 'if' by getting a student to drink a glass of water, and then telling them the water has been poisoned.
[138] Blair, p. 184.
[139] '[…] it is worth questioning whether there is such a thing as the "system",' as then propagated by the American Method, 'or whether it has become one of the most influential myths of the modern theatre.' Jane Milling and Graham Ley, *Modern Theories of Performance: from Stanislavski to Boal* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000), p. 4.
[140] Uta Hagen and Haskel Frankel, *Respect for Acting* (New York: Macmillan, 1973), p. 5.

New York acting studios in the same year, 1948[141] (in Hagen's case, it was the Herbert Berghof Studio; in Strasberg's case, it was The Actors Studio – founded in 1947 by Elia Kazan, Cheryl Crawford, Robert Lewis and Danny Mann).[142] However, it must be recognised that Strasberg's exercises can be traced back to work conducted at the Group Theatre (1931-41).[143] Harold Clurman was one of the co-founders of the Group Theatre (along with Strasberg and Cheryl Crawford), and it was Clurman who refused to allow Uta Hagen to 'accept a mask' when directing her in a role in 1947 (thereby persuading her to engage in Method acting techniques).[144]

Uta Hagen speaks of the term 'substitution', whereby the actor should substitute from 'own experiences and remembrances, through the use of imaginative extension of realities, and put them in the place of the fiction of the play' (34). She suggests that this transplanting of a remembered life event applies itself technically 'to an individual moment in a play when the given material fails to stimulate [the actor] sufficiently' (35). One great danger with this approach is that it can diminish the responsibility of the actor to understand the playwright's text on its own terms. The actor Dickon Tyrrell suggested that such techniques of the American Method offer an 'emotional filter, not an intellectual one', which means – in a Shakespearean setting – that all 'muscularity with the language is lost'.[145] Similarly, Cicely Berry (the renowned Voice Director of the Royal Shakespeare Company) described how being 'verbally explicit was the least important consideration' of Method training.[146]

Hagen illustrates how she used the technique for the role of Blanche Dubois, in *A Streetcar Named Desire*;[147] she had no reference point from life to apply to her scenes with her character's sister, Stella – having had no sister of her own. Instead,

---

[141] Both facts are claimed on the respective websites: <http://www.hbstudio.org/about.htm> and <http://theactorsstudio.org/studio-history/> [both accessed 28 February 2013].
[142] Actors Studio origins are found in: Jack Garfein, *Life and Acting: Techniques for the Actor* (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2010), p. 26.
[143] <http://theactorsstudio.org/studio-history/> [accessed 28 February 2013].
[144] Hagen and Frankel, p. 8.
[145] Dickon Tyrrell, W1.
[146] Cicely Berry, *The Actor and the Text* (London: Harrap Ltd, 1987; rev. Virgin Books, 1993; repr. 2006), p. 42.
[147] *A Streetcar Named Desire*, dir. by Harold Clurman (American Tour, 1947).

by 'substitution', Hagen used her 'relationship to a girl who "felt" like a younger sister',[148] when trying to enact comparable emotions for Blanche in the play. She also advocates two other techniques, linked to substitution. The first is the use of 'emotional memory', that is to say the 'recall of a *psychological* or emotional response to an event' from the actor's own life (46). To trigger this, Hagen recommends use of a '*release* object' (48), which the actor associates in real life with said specific emotion. The second more specific substitution is that of 'sense memory', whereby the actor attempts to recall specific 'physical sensations' (52) from life. Similarly, both emotional memory and sense memory techniques are fully endorsed and discussed in Strasberg's work.

Stanislavski did reference both of the terms himself. He recognises '*Emotion Memory*' as following the example of French psychologist, Théodule Ribot (1839-1916), who had previously referred to it as 'affective memory'.[149] Stanislavski further makes the distinction of 'sensory memory', as seldom having much of a purpose for acting, but serving a 'secondary role' (202). He sees the latter as independent of the experience of Emotion Memory, and pertaining to a recollection of sensory experience, rather than an emotional one. However, Stanislavski does not appear to advocate the concept of substitution of emotions. Instead, he applies Emotion Memory more discretely to the magic 'if' and 'Given Circumstances' of the play. That is to say, the actor will draw from own remembered experiences of something closer to the hypothetical scenario. At other times, the process is simply a case of the actor remembering how he felt whilst acting out the hypothetical scenario for the first time, in an attempt to recapture the freshness of the experience. Strasberg and Hagen offer direct illustration of what Noble has termed working 'from the inside out' – and both apply (what might be more accurately called) the American Method; Stanislavski's system of work, by comparison, can be argued to be much more focused on the given specifics of a drama text.

---

[148] Hagen and Frankel, p. 39.
[149] Stanislavski, p. 197; p. 677.

Finally, it is important to acknowledge how contentious Strasberg's practices often seemed amongst his own contemporaries. Both he and the Method are inextricably associated with the aforementioned Actors Studio. However, his practice there was considered controversial even in its own time. The theatre director Jack Garfein (who was admitted to the Actors Studio in 1955) has written of the problems faced when 'Strasberg […] encouraged actors to go after emotional or sensory results without any regard to the meaning of a text',[150] under the 'false presumption that these were the techniques that led to great acting' (36). Strasberg had initially been invited to run classes simply owing to the overwhelming schedule demands on Elia Kazan, but with 'the strict proviso that he was not to use any so-called Strasbergian exercises' (27). Kazan shunned the practical application of techniques such as emotional memory, writing in the *Tulane Review*, 'How can an actor playing Macbeth stop in the middle of a performance to think of something in his life to bring on tears?'[151] The American Method does not represent Stanislavski in clear terms; it has its own muddied origins, and only portrays a portion of the nuances of training at the Actors Studio.

<u>British Developments</u>

Present-day British theatre abounds in trends that might be deemed 'post-Stanislavskian'. It is worth briefly acknowledging that these practices have diverse origins that, whilst sharing a common spirit with Stanislavski, should not be solely ascribed to him. Other significant shifts in performance styles either predated him, or – at the very least – developed through coincidental co-evolution. In terms of British Shakespearean performance, we find early-twentieth-century trends that prioritise the spoken word over grandiose gesture, which we might initially wish to attribute to grand Stanislavskian influence. However, we would be overlooking Harley Granville-Barker, who oversaw what Christine Dymkowski refers to as 'one of the

---

[150] Garfein, p. 29.
[151] Kazan, in Garfein, p. 35.

first true'[152] repertory systems at the Royal Court, using a 'real ensemble company' (31) between 1904-7, before directing landmark productions of *The Winter's Tale* and *Twelfth Night*.[153] He brought the actors nearer to the audience, 'abolished pictorial scenery', 'restored the full text' – against Victorian convention – and promoted 'rapid natural speech' (11). Richard Eyre (Director of the National Theatre 1987-1997) refers to Granville-Barker as 'the unsung genius of twentieth-century British theatre'[154] and recounts the legend that the director wrote on an actor's dressing-room mirror the phrase, 'Be swift, be swift, be not poetical' (5). John Gielgud spoke of him as 'a wonderful conductor of an orchestra' who 'knew exactly what not to bother with.'[155]

Beyond direction alone, and his famous *Prefaces to Shakespeare* collection, Granville-Barker was also deeply influential in both the foundation of the Royal Court and the beginnings of the movement to found the National Theatre. His potential over-reaching influence on both British new writing and the presentation of the classics is therefore of extraordinary significance. In this particular example, Shakespeare in Britain was already moving down the road of what later would be seen as stylistically Stanislavskian, or at least it was paving the way towards a ready reception of Stanislavski's theories. Between 1912 and 1914, Granville-Barker embarked on a series of famous Shakespeare productions at the Savoy Theatre, which 'consciously intended to demolish nineteenth-century conventions and also to replace them with a new tradition.'[156] He was greatly influenced by the minimalist design practices of Edward Gordon Craig, who had briefly collaborated with Stanislavski at the end of 1911, on a Russian production of *Hamlet*.[157] The director

---

[152] Christine Dymkowski, *Harley Granville Barker: A Preface to Modern Shakespeare* (London: Associated University Press, 1986), p. 11.
[153] Both at the Savoy Theatre in 1912.
[154] Richard Eyre, *Talking Theatre: Interviews with Theatre People* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2009), p. 4.
[155] John Gielgud, quoted in Eyre, p. 5.
[156] Dymkowski, p. 31.
[157] See Arkady Mikhailovich Ostrovsky, 'Stanislavsky meets England: Shakespeare, Dickens and Byron at the Moscow Art Theatre and its First Studio, 1898-1920' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 1998).

Peter Brook speaks of Gordon Craig as 'the person who swept scenery off the stage', whose approach became 'the influence penetrating the whole of twentieth-century theatre'.[158]

In a letter to the *Daily Mail*, on 26 September 1912, Granville-Barker declared that he was greatly influenced by both Gordon Craig and the director William Poel[159] - the latter had shown the younger Granville-Barker (as an actor) 'how beautiful in its variety, Elizabethan blank verse might be when tongues were trained to speak and ears acute to hear it.'[160] Granville-Barker's productions were a testing ground for two experimental areas: a more minimalistic use of scenery and something approaching – for that era – a more naturalistic delivery of Shakespearean verse. One example of a more liberated approach to the text was his reluctance for actors to arrive at rehearsals 'off book' (that is, having committed the text to memory).[161]

Whilst Gordon Craig provides evidence of an international move towards minimalism, verse development seemed a domestic, British preoccupation. In Russia, Stanislavski in fact regarded metre as a significant barrier to unlocking a correct character psychology. Arkady Ostrovsky provides an immensely useful translation, quoting directly from Stanislavski, who stated that metre can 'accustom an actor to incorrect psychology and false reflex. An actor can repeat words for hours with no meaning, only for the sake of the sound.'[162] Naturally though, for a Russian-language production, it would have made little sense to preserve an English metre; just as, in the Elizabethan age, playwrights had struggled to fit translations of Seneca's Roman drama to an English-vernacular metrical framework. Ostrovsky tells us that, for his production of *Much Ado About Nothing*, Stanislavski used the long-standing, standard Russian translations, as produced by Andrei Ivanovich Kroneberg

---

[158] Peter Brook, quoted in Eyre, p. 24.
[159] See Chapter 4 for details of Poel's influence on Peter Hall.
[160] Granville-Barker, quoted in Dymkowski, p. 32.
[161] Dymkowski, p. 33.
[162] Quotation originally from Constantin Stanislavsky, *Stanislavsky repetiruet: zapisi i stenogrammy repetitsii*, ed. I.N. Vinogradskaia (Moscow: STD, 1987) (p. 38) – in Ostrovsky, p. 35. Cf. Chapter 4, and Peter Hall's contrasting views on verse delivery.

in the 1840s. Whilst Stanislavski replaced archaic images or obscure puns with contemporary Russian ideas, the formal verse framework was being echoed to a certain extent; these translations replicated Shakespeare's division of prose and verse.[163] It takes a bold director indeed to work in a foreign vernacular metre. A contemporary example is served by Declan Donnellan who, Maria Shevtsova has noted, has worked in French alexandrines (for French-language productions).[164]

Granville-Barker used his famous Savoy Theatre Shakespeare season to develop the approach to verse delivery. As significant as an influence as Poel had been, he had had a disconcerting habit of arranging his cast as an 'orchestra', by specific pitch or timbre of voice, seeing actors as various orchestral instruments. Rehearsal would then dictate a pattern of vocal melody, which he would expect the actors to learn. Granville-Barker's approach was to prove much more freeing for the actors, and this was complemented by a lack of dictated 'blocking' (that is stage positioning) – which was quite unusual for the era. Additionally, his work also portrayed a tonal shift that might seem almost contemporary. Dymkowski regards his approach to the direction of Malvolio, as a seriously-portrayed character, as particularly groundbreaking. *The Nation* newspaper regarded the character as a 'tragic comedian'.[165] By comparison, one could leap forward to the recent past, and Maria Shevtsova's interview with Declan Donnellan. She similarly lauded Donnellan for establishing a tragic Malvolio, and he explained the practice, whereby an 'actor needs to experience the situation from within […and] allow the audience to have an ambivalence towards the action.'[166] For Donnellan's Cheek by Jowl company, Malvolio was most likely a result of the actors 'keeping their distance from their parts', so that they could 'look outside themselves towards the targets aimed for by their characters.'[167] Techniques might have historically evolved, but we can perhaps

---

[163] Ostrovsky, p. 24.
[164] Maria Shevtsova and Christopher Innes, *Directors/Directing: Conversations on Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), p. 68.
[165] Dymkowski, p. 54.
[166] Declan Donnellan, in Shevtsova and Innes, p. 74.
[167] Shevtsova and Innes, p. 69. Donnellan's 'target' technique will be discussed in Chapter Two.

question what it means to be theatrically ground-breaking in any specific historical moment.

In one sense, the influence of Graville-Barker's direction was short-lived; his work abruptly ended with the outbreak of the First World War. He did oversee another Shakespeare play, a 1940 production of *King Lear* at the Old Vic, but his later Shakespearean work is best represented by his *Prefaces to Shakespeare.* However, Dymkowski emphasises Granville-Barker's influence in continuing dramatic pedagogies, as passed down through the genealogies of the acting community:

> It was only after the war, when actors who had worked with Barker became directors themselves, that his ideas became firmly established as the prevailing mode.[168]

Granville-Barker left an extraordinary legacy, not just in his playwriting, direction and scholarship, but in his key involvement in the establishment of three core British theatres: the Royal Court Theatre, the National Theatre and the Royal Shakespeare Company. These establishments would all be at the heart of mid-twentieth century developments.

Following the Second World War, Britain (with all its socio-economic complexities) underwent a large cultural shift. Michael Billington (the theatre critic) and Colin Chambers (variously a critic, dramatist and professor of drama) have both written of the significance of an event in February 1948: the British Theatre Conference – a four-day meeting that would 'completely regenerate British theatre.'[169] Five-hundred delegates met in London, representing a wide range of practitioners from 'London and regional theatres, drama schools […] training colleges [and] national institutions, such as the actors' union Equity'.[170] For

---

[168] Dymkowski, p. 77.
[169] Colin Chambers, 'Developments in the profession of theatre, 1946-2000', in *The Cambridge History of British Theatre, Vol 3, Since 1895*, ed. by Baz Kershaw (Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 377.
[170]Ibid.

Chambers, this meeting built upon a wartime surge in cultural interest, and channelled 'Labour's nationalisation programme', which 'offered the promise of significant state funding for the arts.'[171] Billington further speaks of the 'crusading idealism' that can be said to have emerged, even though evaluation of the era of austerity and emergent nationalisation draws such a range of historical opinion: 'an extraordinary mixed picture in which rapid political advance coexisted with the survival of certain pre-war values.'[172] It was in '1945 [that] the Arts Council – an extension of the wartime Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts – dispensed its first public funds' (7).

Chambers sees the 1948 Conference, chaired by J.B. Priestley, as having passed an 'astonishing array of far-sighted resolutions: on strengthening the Arts Council, establishing a national theatre […] reforming […] licensing regulations […ending] censorship – expanding drama in education, […] improving professional training and – most contentious of all – regulating entry and re-entry into "the profession" through training or apprenticeship.'[173] Yet the years following the Conference saw a great loss of momentum, before an eventual 'rolling back' of state patronage during the Thatcher government (378).

However Billington, like Chambers, regards the resolve of the Conference (and the era in general) to be of a much further-reaching consequence than any shortfall in implementation. He states that by the end of the 1940s, 'artists and institutions [had] grasped the need for urgent change.'[174] Consequently, a framework was established for: the building of new theatres, the development of arresting new writing,[175] the introduction of new concepts of drama school training, and a culture of professional apprenticeship – complemented by the (what is now regarded as almost mythic) repertory system. A robust pedagogical network emerged in post-war Britain – from the formalised theory of drama training, through to the actor's

---

[171] Ibid.
[172] Michael Billington, *State of the Nation* (London: Faber and Faber, 2007), p. 42.
[173] Chambers, p. 377.
[174] Billington, 43.
[175] Samuel Beckett's *Waiting for Godot* (with its English-language premier in 1955) and John Osborne's *Look Back in Anger* (1956) are commonly cited as especially pivotal plays in this regard.

apprenticeship quest for the Equity card – providing the perfect soil for the sowing and reaping of post-Stanislavskian practices.

<u>Renaissance Connections</u>

Throughout theatre history, we witness attempts to diachronically link acting techniques with a performer's real life 'experiencing' – the very techniques that American Method practitioners have interpreted from their Stanislavskian lineage. One particularly famous example is the citation of the tragic actor Polus of Athens (fourth century BC), who is similarly referenced by both English Renaissance poets and twentieth-century Actors Studio practitioners.[176] Tiffany Stern has referred to Richard Brathwait's retelling of the story (in 1635):

> [...] remember, how Polo the tragedian, acting the part of Electra upon the Stage; and being mournefully to bring in the bones of her brother Orestes in a pot, hee brought in the bones of his owne Sonne lately buried, that the sight of them might wring forth true tears indeed; and by their passionate presentment of them, act it more feelingly: for objects of Ocular passion cannot chuse but worke in the actors person.[177]

In this example, we find Classical evidence of the same technique being applied that Stanislavski referred to as '*Emotion memory*'.[178] More specifically, Polus' object to achieve this 'Ocular passion' (as Brathwait terms it) is precisely channelled through what Uta Hagen has labelled a 'release object'.[179] Yet, as the word 'ocular' is associated with the realm of the physical and the sensory, both Stanislavski and Hagen would regard this as subtly distinct from the process of emotion memory.[180]

---

[176] Renaissance figures: Richard Brathwait, *The Arcadian Princesse,* quoted in Tiffany Stern, '(Re:)Historicizing Spontaneity: Original Practices, Stanislavski, and Characterisation', in *Shakespeare's Sense of Character: On the Page and From the Stage*, ed. by Yu Jin Ko and Michael W. Shurgot (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), p. 104; Charles Fitz-Geffry, 'Compassion towards captives' (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, for Edward Forrest, 1637), p. 25.; Cf. Garfein (as a member of the Actors Studio), p. 51.

[177] Brathwait, in Stern, '(Re:)Historicizing', p. 104.

[178] Stanislavski, p. 197.

[179] Hagen and Frankel, p. 48.

[180] Stanislavski, p.

Stanislavski referred to 'sensory memory'[181] as being 'independent' of 'experiences in our Emotion Memory' (200); Hagen described 'sense memory' as pertaining to '*physiological* sensations (heat, cold, hunger, pains, etc.)', where 'emotional memory' referred to 'the recall of a *psychological* or emotional response to an event […] which produces sobbing, laughter, screaming, etc.'[182]

In a further diachronic discussion, Stern questions how far the display of '"spontaneous" emotions in performance' might in fact have an 'early modern heritage', and thereby predate Stanislavskian teaching.[183] Stern cites the early modern usage of the word 'passion' and the fact that acting was often called 'passioning' or 'passionating' in this era,[184] drawing from the priest and philosopher Thomas Wright, who proclaimed that 'the passion which is in [a speaker's] brest is the fountaine and origen of all externall actions.'[185] Even where the 'passions' perhaps served more as Renaissance 'humours', extended quotation from Wright can allow for further potentially Stanislavskian analogy:

> […] as the internal affection is more vehement, so the externall perswasion wil be more potent: for the passion in the perswader seemeth to me, to resemble the wind a trumpeter bloweth in at one end of the trumpet, & in what maner it proceedeth from him, so it issueth forth at the other end, & cometh to our eares […].[186]

We encounter a possible proto-Stanislavskian argument for holistic acting: a clear stipulation that internalised passion ought to influence the 'externall' physical expression.

For all these comparisons however, each era of acting has its own very discrete style of performance outcome. It seems unlikely that the performances of Polus, later Renaissance 'passionate presentment' and mid-twentieth century acting

---

[181] Stanislavski, p. 203.
[182] Hagen and Frankel, p. 46.
[183] Stern, '(Re:)Historicizing', in *Shakespeare's Sense of Character*, ed. by Yu Jin Ko and Michael W. Shurgot, p. 102.
[184] Stern, '(Re:)Historicizing', p. 103.
[185] Thomas Wright, quoted in Stern, '(Re:)Historicizing', p. 103.
[186] Thomas Wright, *The Passions of the Minde in Generall* (London: Miles Flesher, 1630; repr. London: University of Illinois Press, 1971).

could be regarded as stylistically akin in their staged outcomes. Wright's 'trumpet' analogy strongly suggests a gestural rhetorical element of performance that would have been at great odds with the style of acting that Stanislavski was hoping to cultivate, those centuries later. Academics have naturally attempted to speculate on what the gestural staged outcome would have been, and whether seemingly 'stock gestures' may have been executed or received in a more 'nuanced' manner than we may imagine.[187]

A popular figure of citation is the Renaissance physician John Bulwer, whose studies of oratorical gesture contain helpfully detailed illustrations.[188] The prevailing sentiment is that there was a close correspondence between the enacted passion and a performer's specific hand gesture, but with evidence of 'rich variety' in execution.[189] In Bulwer's work we find the intriguing distinction of 'two kinde of Actions' being expressed by hand gesture: one 'that Nature by passion and ratiocination teacheth; the other, which is acquired by Art.'[190] It may be an anachronistic comparison, but if we assess Bulwer's actions in Stanislavskian terms, the gestures fall either into the category of 'ham acting' (in the first case, of real-life cliché) or stock-in-trade (in the second case, of performance cliché). However, Bulwer did add that an 'Oratour' should 'observe both the Naturall and the Artificiall' with the addition of 'a certaine kinde of art to the Naturall motion'.[191] This phrase is suggestive of what Stanislavski described as 'actors' emotion'.[192] Whilst such a performance falls short of Stanislavski's highest distinction of acting as 'experiencing', the described techniques suggest an outcome at the very highest level of 'representational' performance.[193] It is important to stress however, that Bulwer does not solely describe gesture as an externalised performance; he describes how the 'gestures of

---

[187] Tribble, p. 14.
[188] Gurr, p. 120; Karim-Cooper, p. 77; Lieblein, p. 127.
[189] Karim-Cooper, p. 108.
[190] John Bulwer, *Chironomia*, in *Chirologia: or the Naturall Language of the Hand* (London: Thomas Harper, 1644), Cautio III., p. 132.
[191] Bulwer, Cautio III., p. 132.
[192] Stanislavski, p. 31.
[193] Stanislavski, pp. 19 and 149.

the *Hand*' are 'prepar'd in the Mind, together with the inward speech', which 'precedes the outward expression.'[194] The direction of expression works (to use Noble's definition) 'from the inside out' – the psychological is generative of outward gesture.

We can only speculate as to what the staged representation would have looked like; indeed, Bulwer's catalogue of hand gestures may appear, to a modern eye, more suggestive of mime as a representation of theatrical shorthand.[195] It is important to emphasise the specific limitations of Bulwer as a source: (i) the *Chirologia* was written many years after our Shakespearean sources of consideration (in 1644); and (ii) it was intended as a guide 'not for the stage but for the orator.'[196] But suggestions of a connection between the Renaissance stage and oratory is nevertheless of considerable use. Oratory manuals are, after all, sources orientated towards the performance of rhetoric and they evidence that the connection in this era between 'manual gestures and the passions underpinning them is fundamental to drawing out the desired emotional responses from audiences.'[197] Furthermore, as an anonymous writer (by the initials T.G.) describes in 1616, 'as an Orator was most forcible in his ellocution; so was an actor in his gesture and personated action.'[198] It is reasonable to highlight the Renaissance player's association with the representation of emotion in this manner. For all the anachronistic nuances, Renaissance theories of passionating and certain select Stanislavskian aspects (that most inspired the cultivation of the American Method) share a key disposition, both practices converging on the notion of experiencing *emotion*, both in terms of the actor's sensation and their performed expression.

Many twentieth-century acting techniques continued to favour the ancient dichotomy of body and mind – where, as Bruce McConachie states, modern

---

[194] Bulwer, Cautio XXIX, p. 142.
[195] Gurr, p. 121.
[196] Ibid.
[197] Karim-Cooper, p. 75.
[198] The broader context is that T.G. views the player with contempt for the immorality of the display. [Thomas Gainsford, as TG?] *The Rich Cabinet* (London: Printed by I. B. for Roger Jackson, 1616), Q4r; See Gurr, p. 118.

cognitive science no longer recognises the Cartesian division, but instead acknowledges that the mind is embodied.[199] McConachie describes a recent movement among certain acting teachers to adopt the term 'bodymind', under the influence of cognitive science (2). In a certain sense, this may seem to strike a chord with Stanislavski's original intention of creating a psycho-physical, holistic framework of acting techniques, whilst one must also allow for the complex nuances of translation. Maria Shevtsova, for all her praise of Jean Benedetti's Stanislavskian translations, has spoken of translation dangers. She finds that Benedetti 'too frequently' uses '"mind" for Stanislavski's *dusha* (meaning both "heart" *and* "soul") as well as for *dukh* ("spirit")', with the misleading implication 'that Stanislavski envisaged the actor as more rationally driven and in-the-head in his/her practice than is implied by his continual emphasis on the actor as a constantly developing emotional and spiritual being'.[200] For McConachie, even progressive practitioners (like Stanislavski), who have sought out such a psycho-physical duality, 'have not always found locutions that avoid the [old] dichotomy.'[201] Stanislavski's support for a holistic approach is clear, but the journey of development in theatre technique has certainly been complex.

The significant problem however, with a direct adoption of terms from cognitive science, comes with the presupposition that acting methods should focus on an *exact* replication of human behaviour, rather than a dramatic mimesis – which is cultivated to respond to the demands of a theatre space (a basic example being actors speaking with vocal projection). Added to this is the implication that techniques must address mental and physical concerns simultaneously. Certain practitioners may favour rehearsal techniques that target smaller aspects of a performance in isolation, anticipating the eventual creation of a multifaceted stage character.

[199] Bruce McConachie, *Theatre and Mind* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), p. 1.
[200] Shevtsova, 'Review', p. 173.
[201] McConachie, p. 31.

The next chapter outlines my selection of a group of post-Stanislavskian theatre practitioners and we will see, throughout the thesis, that a concern for specifically *dramatic* mimesis is their priority. Where previous research has attempted to link select Stanislavskian techniques of 'emotion' with Renaissance 'passionating', my study will make a diachronic link in terms of shared dramatic-mimetic values. In other words, rather than focusing on transhistorical concepts of selfhood, I will prioritise transhistorical theatre techniques that serve character in a specifically dramatic context.

Leanore Lieblein has spoken of the process by which the 'person personated became, in a sense that both early moderns and we today might understand, a character.'[202] Renaissance drama was moving away from the 'Theophrastan' notion of character, previously symbolic of the 'crafted artefact' – an archetype that could not function as a representation of a person who recognisably 'exists in the world'.[203] Lieblein finds a diachronic respect for 'character' being the outcome of the phenomenology of dramatic performance: 'the product of a physically informed communication that results from the actor's embodiment and the spectator's experience of the person personated.'[204] The actor's anticipation of an audience reception and the eventual delivery of this 'intersubjective communication' is pivotal;[205] the character only finally arrives 'in the presence of an audience', as 'mediated by the imagination and body of an actor'.[206] It is 'as if the Personator were the man Personated', wrote Heywood.[207] And here, the words '*as if*' carry crucial weight, in allowing the 'actor's body' to be distinguished 'from his mask' and his

---

[202] Lieblein, p. 117.
[203] Lieblein, p. 121.
[204] Lieblein, p. 118.
[205] Lieblein, p. 132.
[206] Lieblein, p. 122.
[207] Thomas Heywood, *An Apology for Actors* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1612); repr. (New York: Garland, 1973), C4r. See Robert Weimann, 'The Actor-Character in "Secretly Open" Action: Doubly Encoded Personation on Shakespeare's Stage', in Paul Edward Yachnin and Jessica Slights, eds, *Shakespeare and Character: Theory, History, Performance, and Theatrical Persons* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), p. 182; Lieblein, p. 117; Gurr, p. 118.

'art' to be held at an 'ethical distance from the person he personates.'[208] This is where one can return to the future figure of Stanislavski, and his key principle that acting should serve 'the creation of the life of the human spirit in a role and the communication of that life onstage in an artistic form.'[209] Here, the phrase 'onstage in an artistic form' carries a similar weight that also exemplifies the priority of theatrical context. Neither Heywood nor Stanislavski relinquish the professional responsibilities of a *theatrical* mimesis.

In interpreting 'character', commonly one considers a conflict at two extremes: (i) posed by a literary formulation, 'character' being a 'by-product of editorial attentions', and (ii) 'character' as problematically universal, timeless construct of dramatic mimesis, presented with 'fully imagined psychological depths'.[210] In response to this 'dual inheritance', Robert Weimann has used the term 'actor-character' in relation to Renaissance practice, to highlight how one should consider the layers of agency between the performer and the role that they are playing.[211] He describes how such a figuration 'thrived on a doubleness in (im)personation'[212] and gives particular focus to the metatheatrical. A particularly vivid example is served by the 'tripartite projection' that would have resulted from the actor Will Kemp playing the personated character of Falstaff who is, in turn, playing the additional 'personated figuration' of the King.[213] Weimann makes reference to Julian Hilton, who has described performance as 'simultaneously representation and being',[214] where 'representation' is the actor's attempt to 're-present' the 'speech, thought, and action' of a 'given dramatic figuration', whilst 'being' is the theatrical parameters of the actual performance, constituted of the 'material, visible, and audible display' of the actor's own body onstage.[215] The term

---

[208] Lieblein, p. 129.
[209] Stanislavski, p. 19.
[210] Hutson, 'Forensic Aspects', pp. 81 and p. 83; cf. Weimann, p. 177.
[211] Weimann, p. 178.
[212] Ibid.
[213] Weimann, p. 185.
[214] Julian Hilton, *Performance* (London: Macmillan, 1987), p. 152
[215] Weimann, p. 179.

'actor-character' in this context thus becomes problematic in a post-Stanislavskian setting; whilst it acknowledges the nature of a simultaneous actor and character engagement, it reinforces a sense of duality – the nature of 'being' as exclusive to the performer's person. Contrastingly, if one sets aside interpretations of the American Method, one finds in Mike Alfreds' use of the term 'actor-character' a distinct nuance in terms of staged agency. Rather than the term suggesting layers of agency, it represents the simultaneous joint agency of both actor and character, where they share an identical onstage 'action'. This is the distinction that is central to the post-Stanislavskian practitioners that follow in the second chapter. We will witness how, in applying techniques such as 'actioning', post-Stanislavskians deliberately dismiss any focus on the direct production of emotion, instead favouring techniques related to a character motivation.

Chapter 2: British 'Post-Stanislavskian' Practice

In this chapter I will discuss the emergence of post-Stanislavskian techniques in British theatre, building upon Chapter One and my discussion of Stanislavski's principles on their own terms. Firstly, I will establish the identity of a group of practitioners that could be seen as representing post-Stanislavskian developments. Secondly, I will clarify the specific text-orientated techniques that evolved amongst this group and thereby explain how such a family of techniques (albeit applied by individuals with considerable nuance) fall under the umbrella term of 'actioning'. These directors and their various techniques (which pertain to a general spirit of 'actioning') will be the focus of the practical application in workshops, which follow in the second half of this thesis.

A number of factors were considered when selecting the figures to classify, informally, as members of such a 'post-Stanislavskian' group. Beyond the initial search for practitioners of general 'post-Stanislavskian' interest, I narrowed the selection to prioritise directors with the largest degree of experience, evidenced by volume of productions and prominence of these productions (pertaining to company/venue where the productions were staged). I then sought out directors amongst this group who had specifically created a cogent, published written theatre record/manual that would allow for my close application of techniques in a practical workshop setting. Finally, as I was naturally anticipating the meeting of post-Stanislavskian and Shakespearean practice, it was preferable if the director had, at some point, specifically applied their techniques to Shakespearean text. Informed by the above categories, the directors who stood out as key figures of interest (in chronological order of birth) were: Mike Alfreds (b. 1934); Max Stafford-Clark (b. 1941); Declan Donnellan (b. 1953); and Katie Mitchell (b. 1964).

In terms of their post-Stanislavskian credentials, most of this group had a very direct connection. Mike Alfreds describes how, when serving as the artistic director of Cincinnati Playhouse-in-the-Park, he took charge of a 'permanent

company' and 'learned painfully to deal with the challenges of several Methodised actors'.[216] In developing his practice beyond the then-conventional industry preoccupation with the 'blocking' of the actors, he responded not only to demands of collaboration with actors using the American Method, but also to the writings of Stanislavski, Vakhtangov, Tairov and Meyerhold.[217] One might expect this, given that Alfreds had already encountered the American adaptation of Stanislavskian teaching, having trained at Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh.

Of my selected group, it is Katie Mitchell who perhaps represents the most avowedly Stanislavskian practice. In 1989 she received the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust Fellowship to study directors' training in Eastern Europe, where she observed Lev Dodin (Artistic Director of the Maly Theatre in St Petersburg – who had trained with Boris Zon, a direct pupil of Stanislavski).[218] Returning to England, she continued private training with Tatiana Olear (who herself trained under Dodin at Leningrad State Institute) and Elen Bowman (who trained under Russian émigré Sam Kogan; Kogan had been taught by Maria Knebel, also a pupil of Stanislavski). In this way, Mitchell feels she is 'part of a chain of practitioners' in Stanislavskian pedagogy (230). Notably, Mitchell and Declan Donnellan stand out amongst the group as they are both members of the Advisory Board of the Stanislavski Centre at Rose Bruford College. Where Mitchell trained so closely in Stanislavskian pedagogy, Donnellan has had a very close, long-term association with Russian theatre. Donnellan's Cheek by Jowl company has produced numerous Russian-language productions (with Russian casts) and his significant theatre manual, *The Actor and the Target*, was first published in Russian.[219] Mitchell and Donnellan

---

[216] Alfreds, p. 6.

[217] Ibid. Yevgeny Vakhtangov (1883-1922) was a Russian actor/director who was himself taught by Stanislavski. Alexander Tairov (1885-1950) was a Russian theatre director who published *Notes of a Director* (1921); his practice emphasised theatrical spectacle as its own prominent artistic event, rather than something of literary nascence. Vsevolod Meyerhold (1874-1940) is a prominent figure in the realm of physical theatre, who established a training system based on biomechanics.

[218] Katie Mitchell, *The Director's Craft: A Handbook for the Theatre* (London: Routledge, 2009), p. 227.

[219] Declan Donnellan, *The Actor and the Target* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2002; rev. and repr. 2005). The Russian edition was published in 2000.

represent directors in the selected group of especially heightened Stanislavskian sensibilities.

Max Stafford-Clark is the one figure in the group who makes no claim to Stanislavskian training. Indeed, of the directors in this group his career has been the most domestically based. And yet, he serves as the most important figure of the group, in terms of his inception of the technique of 'actioning', as a significant post-Stanislavskian tool. One might debate whether this is ironic or whether it is in fact due to his pedagogical distance from the source that he had a heightened capacity, a specific vantage point of insight, to apply a post-Stanislavskian spirit of engagement within the context of post-war British theatre. Regardless, his early development of 'actioning' is key, and will be explored later in this chapter.

Each of the directors in my selected group has produced work in leading British theatres. In addition, most have founded prominent theatre companies, and in the *modus operandi* of these companies one can often find evidence of the nascence and the development of the directors' individual styles and techniques. Each personality can become open to caricature: Mike Alfreds as the actors' director; Stafford-Clark as the director of new writing; Declan Donnellan as the internationalist ensemble director; and Katie Mitchell as a leading auteur director. But behind each crude reduction, there is a truth that is vivified by the detail of nuanced technique. At each turn, whilst assessing developments in specific relation to British theatre, it is important to highlight the great extent to which the directors in my chosen group have been significantly influenced by international theatre, whilst indeed themselves exporting their practice with notable international renown. British post-Stanislavskian developments are both as domestic and internationalist as the mixed term suggests.

Following his training and directing in America, Mike Alfreds brought his ideas back to Britain, teaching at the London Academy of Music and Dramatic Art (LAMDA). He was also strongly influenced by Philip Hedley (who introduced Alfreds to techniques from East 15 Acting School along with those practised by Joan Littlewood at her famous Theatre Workshop at the Theatre Royal in Stratford) and

William 'Bill' Gaskill (a founding director of the National Theatre in 1963 and later artistic director of the Royal Court, between 1965 and 1972). After this, Alfreds became director of the Jerusalem Khan theatre (1972-5), where he was inspired by the 'Israeli tradition of immensely long rehearsals, inherited from […] Russian theatre'.[220] As a result, Alfreds fashioned a directing process of long rehearsal periods, anticipating long-duration tours and an eventual company dynamic that would become key characteristics of the new theatre company, Shared Experience, which he launched from the Crucible Theatre in Sheffield (with the help of Artistic Director, Peter James) in 1975. Alfreds ran Shared Experience for thirteen years, having launched the company with a mission to produce theatre 'without any design or technology', performing 'in any space […] offered', with 'actors and audience sharing the same evenly lit and totally emptied space'.[221] Alfreds cemented his conviction that actors alone were the primacy of good-quality theatre.[222] Later in his career he then took on further work at the National Theatre, before running the touring Cambridge Theatre Company (1991-9).

Max Stafford-Clark began his theatre career in 1966, when he became an associate director (and then Artistic Director, 1968-70) of the Traverse Theatre, Edinburgh.[223] In 1974 he founded the theatre company Joint Stock with Bill Gaskill (the same aforementioned figure of influence for Alfreds), who had recently completed his period as artistic director at the Royal Court. At the heart of Joint Stock's work was a workshop-based research period, whereby production team, playwright and actors would develop a piece of new writing in response to various research tasks. Prominent collaborations took place with the playwrights Caryl Churchill, David Hare and Howard Brenton.[224] Stafford-Clark then served a considerable period as the Artistic Director of the Royal Court Theatre (1979-1993).

---

[220] Alfreds, p. 9.
[221] Shared Experience is still running today, steered by a group of artistic associates; Alfreds, p. 10.
[222] Alfreds, p. 12.
[223] Maeve McKeown, 'Max Stafford-Clark: Education Resource Pack' (Out of Joint, 2008) <http://www.outofjoint.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/Max-Stafford-Clark-Workpack.pdf> [accessed 14 May 2016].
[224] Ibid.

He oversaw notable new-writing collaborations, especially with Caryl Churchill, on *Top Girls* (1982) and *Serious Money* (1987), and with Timberlake Wertenbaker, on *Our Country's Good* (1988).[225] After leaving the Royal Court, Stafford-Clark worked with the Out of Joint Theatre Company (which he founded in 1994) – a 'national and international touring theatre company dedicated to the development and production of new writing' (4). In addition, he has directed for the National Theatre and the RSC.

Declan Donnellan's work with Cheek by Jowl represents an especially close interaction between the British theatrical establishment and international theatre. Donnellan co-founded the company in 1981 with Nick Ormerod (the theatre designer, b.1951)[226] and became an associate director at the National Theatre in 1990,[227] with the company winning a number of Olivier awards. But Cheek by Jowl is perhaps best known for its work in large-scale international work, which is its 'company speciality'.[228] Michael Billington has written of Cheek by Jowl swiftly establishing itself 'through its rigorous visual simplicity and eclectic Europeanism', where 'its repertoire embraced Racine, Corneille, Ostrovsky, Sophocles and Calderón'.[229] Typically, the company favours a rehearsal period of six or seven weeks, during which time Ormerod designs the show,[230] whilst always seeking to create work that is 'entirely centred on the actor, and the relationship that the actor achieves with the audience' (80), in a manner that can be readily toured internationally, and that allows the words of the text to appear 'spontaneously born' (85). There are striking similarities between Alfreds and Donnellan both in terms of the long-duration rehearsal and the primacy of the type of actor-audience relationship that they both advocate. Recent Cheek by Jowl productions have included *The*

---

[225] Max Stafford-Clark and Maeve McKeown, *Our Country's Good: Page to Stage* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2010), p. 6.
[226] Maria M. Delgado and Paul Heritage, ed., *In Contact with the Gods? Directors Talk Theatre* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996)*,* p. 80.
[227] Ibid.
[228] Ibid.
[229] Billington, p. 319.
[230] Delgado and Heritage, p. 83.

Revenger's Tragedy in Italian (2018) and a collaboration with Moscow's Pushkin Theatre, on a Russian-language version of *Measure for Measure* (2013), which came to the Barbican (where Cheek by Jowl is an Associate Company).

Along with her international (and particularly Stanislavskian) training, Katie Mitchell has also become increasingly associated with work on the continent, which now includes a significant number of opera credits. Mitchell began her career assisting at the RSC in 1987 and formed her own company, Classics on a Shoestring, in 1989. Her work in British theatre includes productions at the Royal Court and the Royal Opera House, but she is probably best known domestically for her work as associate director at the National Theatre (during the artistic directorship of Nick Hytner), which ended in 2011. The majority of Mitchell's recent productions have been staged abroad, focusing on projects in European theatres (most in France and Germany), to the extent that she has even been described as an 'exile'[231] from British theatre. However, she has occasionally returned to Britain during this period, credits including: her German-language *Ophelias Zimmer* (a *Hamlet* 'spin-off' play), which transferred from Berlin to the Royal Court in May 2016; Sarah Kane's *Cleansed* (National Theatre, 2016); and Alice Birch's *Anatomy of a Suicide* (Royal Court, 2017). Amongst my selected group, Mitchell is the most likely figure to be regarded as an auteur; one finds basis for this in her directorial techniques and her distinct Stanislavskian interpretation. This contrast becomes clearer if one now turns specifically to the written manuals of the directors for consideration.

The texts written by this group of directors represent some of the most widely-known and well-regarded direction handbooks being consulted in Britain today. They may largely be written as culminations of careers' worth of work, as products of distinct eras, but they have all been published comparatively recently and thus greatly influence emerging directors today. The frequency of reprinting is just one indication of their ever-replenishing shelf-lives.

---

[231] Matt Trueman, 'Katie Mitchell: I was uncomfortable coming back to work in the UK', *Stage*, 26 February 2016 <https://www.thestage.co.uk/features/interviews/2016/katie-mitchell-i-was-uncomfortable-coming-back-to-work-in-the-uk/> [accessed 14 May 2016].

All four of the cited figures are of further interest to general, post-Stanislavskian practice. The development of a family of 'actioning' techniques begins in earnest with Max Stafford-Clark, who offers the first representation of the technique of 'actioning' in print. However, one has to search carefully to discover and assemble Stafford-Clark's first descriptions of the 'actioning' technique, as they are not to be found in a singular, comprehensive volume; the best material discussing his seminal technique of 'actioning' is found in a peculiar source. In 1988, Stafford-Clark revived George Farquhar's 1706 play, *The Recruiting Officer* (in repertory with the response play, *Our Country's Good*) at the Royal Court. Given his previous focus on new-writing, it was 'the first play in over ten years' that he had directed without the aid of a rehearsal-room dialogue with a living writer.[232] As a response, Stafford-Clark began a series of letters to the long-deceased George Farquhar, explaining his own working process. This strange epistolary document now serves us as an implicit manual of Stafford-Clark's practice, where we find the first explicit reference to the technique of 'actioning'.

Beyond this, a book was commissioned to commemorate the tenth birthday of the Joint Stock company (in 1984), and produced by Rob Ritchie (the Literary Manager, and later Associate Director, of the Royal Court Theatre, from 1979-1984).[233] This book provides a wider account of the Joint Stock working process, cast lists, brief details on individual plays produced, and extended interviews with a range of company participants. And further retrospectives have since been published,[234] along with various educational resource packs (partly being testament to Stafford-Clark being regarded as a key practitioner on the AQA GCE Drama syllabus).[235]

---

[232] Max Stafford-Clark, *Letters to George* (London: Nick Hern Books, 1989; repr. 2012), p.2.
[233] Rob Ritchie, *The Joint Stock Book: The Making of a Theatre Collective* (London: Methuen, 1987), p. 7.
[234] See: Max Stafford-Clark and P. Roberts, *Taking Stock: The Theatre of Max Stafford-Clark* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2007); Max Stafford-Clark and Maeve McKeown, *Our Country's Good: Page to Stage* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2010).
[235] McKeown, p. 2.

Of the group, Mike Alfreds has contributed the most in print. Since retirement, he has published two significant theatre manuals. My study will confine itself to his first manual, *Different Every Night: Freeing the Actor*, which is central to two topics of discussion: (i) Alfreds' style of direction; and (ii) the relationship between actors and directors.[236] It is more extensive, in technical scope and volume, than the publications of the other 'post-Stanislavskian' directors, and by 2013 it had already reached its fifth reprint. Alfreds' second manual, *Then What Happens? Storytelling & Adapting for the Theatre*, addresses the nature of adaptation for the theatre, using non-theatrical source material that is well-suited to the realm of dramaturgy.

In *Different Every Night*, Alfreds discusses his use of post-Stanislavskian theory at length, linking specific techniques and exercises to Stanislavskian taxonomy, before considering a director's preparation of a drama text, followed by the collaboration with actors from rehearsal to production. A broader Stanislavskian framework narrows itself in the application of an actor's series of motivations. He also refers to these as 'actions', and they are similar to (and yet distinct from) Stafford-Clark's use of the 'actioning' process. This will be explored in further detail later in the chapter.

In Declan Donnellan's widely-known publication *The Actor and the Target*, we trace the development of his unique technique. This manual was first published in Russian (in 2000). However, it had had a long gestation: the theatre publisher Nick Hern originally commissioned Donnellan to write a book as early as 1988.[237] Donnellan felt that a 'reworking' of his original Russian text would 'fulfil [his] promise' to Hern; he did, however, include further exercises in the English version, along with a chapter on blank verse – which is especially useful when applying Donnellan's techniques to Shakespeare.[238] The original English publication of 2002

---

[236] Alfreds, xvii.
[237] Donnellan, p. vii.
[238] Ibid.

was itself further-revised for republication, following the influence of various translations of Donnellan's book.

Donnellan offers a unique interpretation on the application of a character's purpose of speaking. He has coined an acting technique known as 'the target', and he denies that this has a shared status with other terms such as 'motivation' or 'intention' or 'objective'.[239] Nevertheless, I argue that the spirit of its application calls for its inclusion within the extended family of post-Stanislavskian actioning. In the broadest sense, Donnellan's 'target' is the external stimulus that provokes such a thing as a character's motivation to come into being. This distinction, in comparison to the 'actions' favoured by other directors, will be addressed further in this chapter and then illustrated in the accounts of the workshops with professional actors.

The most recently published of the manuals is Katie Mitchell's *The Director's Craft: A Handbook for the Theatre*, which details her working practice. The final chapter gives detailed origins for her techniques, which she describes as mostly originating 'from Konstantin Stanislavsky's teachings, mediated by a secondary interpreter'.[240] She is especially influenced by what she calls Stanislavski's 'later work on physical actions' (227). She replaced her initial interest in 'psychology' with practice based on the 'physiology of emotions', later focusing her work on an actor's 'expression of an emotion' being 'legible to the audience'. To this end she advocates that actors either do this internally, 'by recalling [said] emotion [from…] their own lives […]' or 'from the outside, by an almost clinical reconstruction of what the body does when a particular emotion hits it' (232). As we will come to see, with the discussion of actioning that follows, this predominant focus on emotion places her techniques in opposition to those commonly regarded as 'actioning'.

Mitchell's manual is especially broad, relating to the totality of a theatre production, covering the production crew and the atmosphere of a rehearsal room. Mitchell outlines how her 'most essential directing tool' (56), as inspired by Tatiana

---

[239] Donnellan, p. 27.
[240] Mitchell, p. 2.

Olear, is the division of a play into 'events'; where an 'event' is defined as 'the moment in the action when a change occurs and […] affects everyone present' onstage (55). Prior to rehearsals, having divided a play into 'events', Mitchell identifies 'intentions' for each character, where the '"intention" […] describes what a character wants and whom they want it from', and it can 'only change at events […]' (62). Problematically, although Mitchell states her techniques 'can be applied to any material' (2), her illustration is limited to Chekhov's *The Seagull*, and the manual is dominated by a process that starts with the more macroscopic concerns of Stanislavskian 'given circumstances'. Unlike the manuals of Alfreds and Donnellan, Mitchell's text does not apply directorial techniques to Shakespeare. It is entirely reasonable for Mitchell to choose to illustrate her process via a single text but, coupled with the macroscopic nature of her use of 'given circumstances', there is little that one can take from the manual to inform a close-reading scenario. Furthermore, Mitchell's directorial career has, perhaps unusually, seldom travelled in the well-trodden Shakespearean direction.

Significantly, Mitchell has only ever directed one Shakespeare play, *Henry VI Part 3* (at the RSC in 1994).[241] And, although Mitchell has stated that she enjoys reading the plays as 'fantastic poems with lovely moments of naturalistic live action', she has revealed that she has problems with Shakespeare's plays being too long for her dramaturgical taste and containing language that is alien to modern ears. She finds British audiences particularly protective towards classic texts and therefore hostile towards the more significant reworking that she would favour.[242] By contrast, Alfreds and Donnellan have worked on a considerable number of Shakespeare productions. Alfreds described the opportunity of directing at the rebuild of Shakespeare's Globe as a particular highlight of his late career, humbly stating that it allowed him 'to begin to learn about Shakespeare'. There he relished a theatre relationship with 'audiences that exercised their right to be part of the

---

[241] Charlotte Higgins, 'Katie Mitchell: British theatre's queen in exile', *Guardian*, 14 January 2016 <https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2016/jan/14/british-theatre-queen-exile-katie-mitchell> [accessed 14 May 2016].
[242] Ibid.

performance'.[243] Owing to Mitchell's personal position on Shakespeare and the approach of her manual, I judged that it was unwise to forge a link artificially in my table-work sessions with actors. Other manuals were demanding attention.

Of the texts discussed, those by Alfreds and Donnellan offer the most promising material for use in Shakespearean practice today. Indeed, they both make strong use of specific Shakespeare extracts in their manuals. As discussed, the texts pertaining to Stafford-Clark are restricted to the crucial, seminal details on the beginnings of the technique of actioning. To this end, Alfreds and Donnellan became the explicit core modern practitioners of influence throughout my workshop series. They both encourage an application of discrete techniques that most readily address the dramatic rhetoric of a given playtext. Their techniques formed a practical colloquy with the 'Shakespearean' concepts of Peter Hall and John Barton, and the techniques pertaining to dramatic rhetoric (which will be discussed in Chapter Three). It must also be highlighted however that, as Stafford-Clark is the forefather of actioning, he is implicitly present throughout any workshop application of strict, transitive verb actioning (which will be explored later in this chapter).

One similarity between Alfreds and Donnellan is that each of their companies focused on long-scale theatre rehearsals. They both also favour small units of characterisation technique that attach themselves to phrases or words within a single line of text. Perhaps this post-Stanislavskian approach could only have flourished in such an environment, with long-term directorial autonomy – and indeed, where perhaps company-based practice was easier to sustain and Arts Council funding might have been more readily attainable.[244] It is this stylistic nuance that also makes the texts of these practitioners manifestly different to those of other theorists, who tend to write about rehearsal processes in much broader terms. Freelance directors, working with shorter rehearsal schedules, might find much less freedom to apply something like the comprehensive, painstaking 'actioning' processes – as favoured by Stafford-Clark and Alfreds, or indeed the 'target' approach of Donnellan.

---

[243] Alfreds, p. 11.
[244] A view offered by the actor Debra Penny, W6.

It is also important to note how closely Stafford-Clark and Alfreds are associated with directing new writing projects. The 'actioning' techniques that they developed were designed to address (and were born out of) close engagement with a playwright's text – in their experiences, through direct face-to-face collaboration with a writer in the rehearsal room. Indeed, playwrights were often deeply integrated into the company models, being central to the sourcing of material for a new company project. Perversely, the focus on living writers makes such directors ideal for the reanimation of a classic text. The idea of applying such 'actioning' techniques to the stylistic markers of a Shakespearean text might therefore be regarded as a fitting enabler of an anachronistic collaboration that must take place in the rehearsal room today.

I now turn to the specific text-orientated techniques that have been developed by this group of directors. Their post-Stanislavskian credentials and the promise of practical application will be initially illustrated, which will in turn set the course for the engagement with extracts from my practical workshop series.

'Actioning' and related 'post-Stanislavskian' techniques

Throughout theatre history, discourses on acting have centred on an actor's clear portrayal of (and an audience's facilitated reception of) a specific emotion.[245] But where we now turn to British post-Stanislavskian techniques, we discover manifest distancing from direct displays of emoting. Alfreds bluntly states that 'an actor *cannot play* an emotion', in the sense that emotion is instead '*an outcome*' of an actor's pursuit of a specific objective. The actor's priority is to try and 'genuinely […] affect' their scene partner, whilst 'allowing themselves to be affected by their partner's responses'. From this performance dynamic, 'feelings will quite naturally be aroused without any conscious effort.'[246] Post-Stanislavskian techniques

---

[245] See last section of Chapter One. For further on the transhistorical performance of emotion: cf. Lieblein (p. 125); Alfreds (p. 91).
[246] Alfreds, p. 92.

commonly focus on the specificity of the given 'intention'[247] or motivation of an actor-character in any given moment of a play. The actor-character's attempted progress through the play will be demonstrable to the audience, where the phenomenological nature of the theatrical event itself will result in a variety of audience responses in the reception of a staged character, and the emotions that may be said to have been displayed/experienced. In such rehearsal techniques we find a clearer insight into an actor's functional preparation, in the wider context of acting techniques considered as a process of '"doing" rather than "being".'[248] From this common Stanislavskian origin, we can outline the development of the widely-known contemporary British theatre technique called 'actioning', which became central to many of my Shakespeare workshops. The technique is first applied in rehearsal and we will witness how it closely addresses the relationship between the playwright's text-as-written (the *énoncé*) and the actor's performance of the words (the *énonciation*).[249]

Actioning has become a common place technique in contemporary British drama training (as referenced by many of my workshop actors)[250] and the breadth of its influence is also revealed by the common recognition amongst my actors of the well-known publication of a specific thesaurus, which provides a list of 'actions' (posed as transitive verbs) that an actor might select to play.[251] The late Stephen Jeffreys has referred to the 'classic book' in the posthumous publication of his guide to playwriting, which is indicative of the cross-pollination of the technique.[252] Whilst my study was confined to actors, 'actioning' now permeates wider British drama

---

[247] Moseley, p. 7.
[248] Blair, p. 171.
[249] To use terminology favoured by the French linguist Émile Benveniste. See Weimann, p. 181.
[250] Ovens (W2), Sturzaker (W3), Martin (W8), Vevers and Long (W9) all made statements to this effect.
[251] Marina Caldarone and Maggie Lloyd-Williams, *Actions: the Actors' Thesaurus* (London: Nick Hearn Books, 2004).
[252] Stephen Jeffreys, *Playwriting: Structure, Character, How and What to Write*, ed. by Maeve McKeown (London: Nick Hern Books, 2019), p. 168. The book is selected in his annotated 'Recommended Reading', along with Stafford-Clark's aforementioned *Letter's to George*, p. 264. *The Actors' Thesaurus* is similarly included in Chris Foxon and George Turvey's *Being a Playwright: A Career Guide for Writers* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2018), p. 253.

training and practice, to the extent that future research might well consider the impact upon playwrights who are deliberately anticipating this degree of an actor's rehearsal room engagement, in the writing and editing of their plays.[253] In spite of the above, very little has been written about this popular technique and I seek to uncover its origins, and the differing applications of practitioners, before illustrating how the technique was applied, in my practical workshop series.

The key link between Stanislavski and actioning is a distancing from the practice of emoting. In spite of the common misconception, the spirit of Stanislavski's writings heralds a departure from heightened emoting; he was, after all, reacting to the grandiose, gestural acting style that he felt was prevalent in late 1800s Russia. Recalling his categories of acting, Stanislavski states that if an actor is to 'force' his feelings, it 'only leads to the most repulsive kind of ham acting'. His advice is that an actor should therefore 'when choosing an action, leave [their] feelings alone' (42). 'Passions', he feels, are not playable for actors: the 'mistake' that was being made by 'most actors' is that they thought 'not about the action but the result' (144).[254] This pivotal move, away from emoting, has inspired today's post-Stanislavskians and is manifest in the 'actioning' technique.

In the Stanislavskian context, 'action' has a basis that is both 'mental and physical',[255] where Stanislavski drew from concepts of ancient drama – the Greek term *drama* representing 'an action being performed', as 'corresponding' to the Latin word *actio* (39). We note how this contrasts with the instruction of the Renaissance player. Whilst a sense of 'action' was central to performance, forming the key 'addition' to the other five canons of rhetoric,[256] the term 'action' primarily referred to 'gesture and facial expression', where 'pronunciation' was used for the 'enunciation of words, and the musical cadence in which they were spoken' – each

---

[253] One might make comparison to units of the actor's part being generative, becoming the 'basic building-block' of Shakespeare's craft. Palfrey and Stern, p. 2.
[254] Cf. Moseley, p. 7.
[255] Stanislavski, p. 40.
[256] Lieblein, p. 121.

aspect arguably being 'separately evaluated by the audience.'[257] In Stanislavskian terms, the 'action' is the simplest reduction of the task performed by the actor-character at any given moment,[258] it can be either an achievable task of 'an outer nature'[259] (such as turning a light switch on or off, or a fist banging a table),[260] or a task of an 'inner nature' (such as one character wanting to 'intimidate' another).[261] Naturally, as gestural, 'outer nature' actions tend to be easier to determine, early rehearsal tends to focus on subtext and actions of 'inner nature'.

The general spirit of actioning is derived from Stanislavski's 'Method of Physical Actions',[262] which Bella Merlin has defined as the actor's attempt to find a 'logical line' or 'score' of individual actions through a scene.[263] This is of greater relevance to my investigation of British post-Stanislavskians than the other core component of Stanislavski's approach, that of 'Active Analysis' – 'an holistic system' that aimed to 'integrate body and mind, and most importantly *spirit*' (5). Moseley has described this alternative technique of Active Analysis as postponing 'engagement with the word of the text until the actor is physically and emotionally immersed in the imagined world of the play […]'.[264] By contrast, Stanislavskian actions allow for a study that is intensely text-orientated, allowing us to engage with performance in terms of an 'actor-character', where such a question of agency 'wants attention as never before'.[265]

The broader family of 'actioning' techniques prioritises what Bella Merlin calls the 'physical action' over the 'physiological activity' and the resultant 'emotional state'.[266] She recognises this core to actioning, whilst drawing from the

---

[257] Tiffany Stern, *Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), p. 73.
[258] Cf. Sonia Moore, *The Stanislavski System: The Professional Training of an Actor* (London: Victor Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1966), p. 26.
[259] Bella Merlin, *Beyond Stanislavsky: The Psycho-Physical Approach to Actor Training* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2002), p. 17.
[260] Moore, p. 26.
[261] Merlin, p. 17. Cf. Alfreds, p. 72; Cf. Moore, p. 26.
[262] See Alfreds, p. 37.
[263] Merlin, p. 4.
[264] Moseley, p. 8.
[265] Weimann, p. 191.
[266] Merlin, p. 14.

philosopher William James, and his 1884 essay, 'What is an Emotion?' – which had 'apparently influenced' Stanislavski's later practice.[267] Merlin echoes James' example of the 'external stimulus' of human beings. In the late nineteenth century the 'commonly held' view was that if one encountered a strong stimulus, such as a bear in the woods, then it would chronologically follow that one would 'feel afraid' first and, resultantly, 'run' away. However, James postulated that the order was in fact reversed: encountering a bear, one's first response is to run. Shortly thereafter the emotions of 'fear' are then assimilated and recognised. Merlin restates the sequence has having four stages: (i) initial '*stimulus*'; (ii) '*physical action*'; (iii) '*physiological activity*'; and (iv) the manifestation of an '*emotional state*'.[268] In this sense, 'physical action' is a common Stanislavskian denominator in many stated post-Stanislavskian techniques. Alfreds summarises the issue more simply. He states that, beginning with an objective, the actor-character then performs a given action and it is this action that will then result in the experience of an emotion; at its 'simplest, the Stanislavski '"system"' is characterised by the chronology of 'WANT, DO, FEEL.' If the logical chain of 'actions' is constructed, then an actor may be fortunate enough to display a sign of the complementary emotion.[269]

Present-day Actioning

Today's incarnation of 'actioning' began with Max Stafford-Clark (working with the Joint Stock Theatre Company), and Nick Moseley offers a concise description of the technique's common present-day function. An actor 'in the early stages of rehearsing' divides their lines into 'separate phrases or thoughts' and assigns each thought with 'an "action verb" which expresses the underlying intention of the line'. The actor will then 'attempt to speak and act' each thought 'in the manner of the chosen verb'. Traditionally, the chosen action is represented strictly by

---

[267] Mitchell, p. 231.
[268] Merlin, p. 14.
[269] Capitals are taken from the text. Alfreds, p. 42.

a 'specific transitive verb'.[270] Throughout my workshops, I will refer to this (most common) form of actioning as 'strict actioning'.[271]

Stanislavskian practice is for action to be 'usually directed towards the on-stage partner' or create 'an effect on the partner',[272] hence the reason that transitive verbs are so closely associated with actioning. One core principle, as outlined by Alfreds, is that actors will be 'active' in their performance, rather than 'demonstrative'.[273] Actions are in effect 'what characters *do to try to achieve their objectives*'; they are the means by which the character can change their '*current situation.*'[274] In attempting to achieve such an objective, the actor-character will commonly also be trying to '*change the other characters*' onstage – what Alfreds calls '*the event of the scene*' (49). By actioning, actors can avoid potential 'preoccupations', such as impressing the audience with 'aspects of their performance: their ability to communicate difficult texts, their capacity for expressive emotion, [and] their "comic timing" […]'.[275] There is a particular risk in Shakespearean acting for a style where an actor solely demonstrates that they have a comprehensive grasp of editorial footnotes; Alfreds refers to the reductive, 'crude convention […for actors] in the case of sexual jokes, to clutch their groins […]' to convey the simple bawdy context to their audience (119). Whilst actioning responds to *dramatic* delivery, it is still primarily regardful of the playwright's text. As Nick Moseley reasserts, the actor has to start from the 'assumption that every line or "thought" in the text, whether or not the playwright consciously intended it, is in some way uniquely significant'.[276] Actioning innately demands that actors 'interrogate the text in minute detail in order to find the right verbs to express [the]

---

[270] Moseley, p. vii; Caldarone and Lloyd-Williams, p. xv; Stafford-Clark, *Letters*, pp. 66-7; Alfreds, p. 72.
[271] See Soliloquy One and Two for an illustrated application.
[272] Merlin, p. 17.
[273] Alfreds, p. 65.
[274] Ibid.
[275] Ibid. Cf. Stanislavski on the 'exploitation of art', in Chapter One.
[276] Moseley, p. 138.

interpretation of each thought' (ix). In this manner, actioning is fundamentally responsive to the nuances of dramatic rhetoric.

Post-Stanislavskians are especially indebted to Stanislavski in one key approach: the division of a text (and individual roles) into smaller 'units of action' for analysis.[277] This practice in contemporary rehearsal rooms could arguably be described as the biggest element of Stanislavski's theatrical influence, as it has become so commonplace. Where 'unitting' responds to moment-by-moment shifts in character, it also functions as the process by which an actor today can come closer to a Stanislavskian aim for the 'experiencing' of a role. Stanislavski described an 'actor/role' as having a 'linear thrust of inner drives', as made up – on the macroscopic level of the entire play – by what he referred to as a 'throughaction'.[278] The 'throughaction' was seen as divisible into segments, which Stanislavski labelled by the loose, colloquial term *Kusok* – translated often as 'Bit' (682). He described such 'Bits' of text as 'areas through which the fairway' of the character's throughaction 'passes' (139). Notably, Katie Mitchell has remarked how the word 'beat' has become commonplace in 'textual analysis in the Western theatrical tradition' due to 'an error in pronunciation'; Stanislavski referred to the 'subdivisions of units' using the English term 'beads' and 'legend has it that Richard Boleslavsky (who taught Stanislavsky's system at the American Laboratory Theatre in the 1920s) had such a strong Polish accent that his students misheard the word "bead" as "beat".'[279] The word 'bead' is much more suggestive of a linked chain of events. Stanislavski would carefully label such 'bits' in rehearsal, with an appropriate name (often a simple noun), as the 'correct title' would reveal the inner 'Task lodged inside it'. By increments, the actor has arrived at the smallest units in the broader psycho-physical process, in order to identify the 'right psychological state' (147).

---

[277] Cary M. Mazer, 'Historicizing Spontaneity: The Illusion of the First Time of "The Illusion of the First Time"', in *Shakespeare's Sense of Character*, ed. by Yu Jin Ko and Michael W. Shurgot (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), p. 88.
[278] Stanislavski, p. 312.
[279] Mitchell, p. 226.

Importantly, each Task is 'invariably be defined by a verb' (148), and thus we find ourselves very much in the realm of proto-actioning.

From the wider concerns of 'Given circumstances' (imposed by the logic of the play's setting and events) and the 'magic "if"' (of the hypothetical scenarios described in a script), the actor has then constructed a pathway for their character's journey through the play. Such a chain of logic is the essence of the majority of Stanislavski's work in his seminal first volume, and it is a fundamental influence on our contemporary post-Stanislavskians. Stanislavski's 'throughaction' finds prominent later echoes in what Mike Alfreds refers to as the 'through-line' which enables the actor to link 'all the character's scenes and behaviour with a dramatic logic'.[280] He illustrates by the examples of: *Oedipus the King*, where Oedipus' 'through-line' would be 'to discover the cause of, and therefore end, the plague in Thebes'; and *Hamlet*, where the eponymous hero's 'through-line' would be 'to avenge his father's death' (56). In the work of Stafford-Clark, the Stanislavskian 'throughaction' can be similarly equated to the term 'superobjective', which Stafford-Clark defines as the 'main goal' of a character 'over the course of the whole play, from which their other behaviour will spring'.[281] As the 'unitting' approach of the three directors is thus close enough to be labelled as a common technique, I will henceforth favour the term 'throughaction' (where a general term is needed) – as it retains a cleaner semantic link with the original concept of 'action'.

It is important to briefly point out that, whilst I regard Stafford-Clark's term 'superobjective' as equating with Stanislavskian 'throughaction', Alfreds uses the same label for a separate purpose; Alfreds' 'super-objective'[282] refers to the most 'comprehensive of all in the hierarchy of objectives' – the character's 'overarching drive through life', which extends, that is, 'beyond the duration of the play'. Where '*through-lines define plot*', '*super-objectives define character*'.[283] For example, Oedipus' 'super-objective' is 'to (be seen to) be a powerful and responsible ruler'

---

[280] His alternative term for 'through-line' is '*the play objective*'. Alfreds, p. 56.
[281] Stafford-Clark, *Letters*, p. 44.
[282] Hyphenated, in Alfreds' case.
[283] Alfreds, p. 58.

(60). In the play, *Oedipus the King*, this super-objective then becomes manifest in the hero's through-line, to end the city's plague. Indeed Alfreds observes such an effect replicated macroscopically in any 'good play' – where 'the sum of [all the] characters' super-objectives reveals the play's super-objective.'[284] He warns, however, that an individual's super-objective is 'not playable' in itself, as it is 'too generalised', offering a 'world-view and values' that may be 'unconscious' to the character themselves.[285] Whilst the actor may be aware of such a super-objective, acting technique must be focused on actions or scene objectives.

Where we consider the play itself in this macroscopic manner, we may also invoke Stanislavski's notion of the 'Supertask of the writer's work', which 'draws together each and every Task, and stimulates the creative efforts of the inner drives and the Elements that comprise the creative state of the actor-role'.[286] The Supertask represents a grander authorial philosophy or purpose. For example, Stanislavski takes Fyodor Dostoyevsky's novel, *The Brothers Karamazov* and suggests that Dostoyevsky, throughout life, 'looked for God and the Devil in people'; he speculates that it was this 'search for God' that 'drove' him to write the novel. It is this drive that is thus defined as the 'Supertask' of the work, and Stanislavski believes that 'it is towards [such a projected Supertasks that] the actor should direct his creative efforts' (311). Amongst my post-Stanislavskian practitioners and my workshop participants there was no extended concern for anything akin to a writer's 'Supertask'. Heather Long mentioned that she had often formerly attempted to seek a 'total truth' for a given play; she would try to respond to the question, 'What was the intention of the writer?' However, she now prefers focusing on contemporary reception, in working with directors who prioritise how the play might 'speak to an audience now'.[287] Whilst it is useful to acknowledge Stanislavski's 'Supertask' sentiments, they were not notably expressed amongst my workshop participants. The closest contemporary approach to a 'Supertask' is perhaps represented by Katie

---

[284] Alfreds, p. 61.
[285] Ibid.
[286] Stanislavski, p.307.
[287] Long, W9.

Mitchell, who will list 'simple facts about the writer's life' and attempt to discover 'what was happening in the writer's life at the time' of writing, in order to identify 'ideas that underpin the text'.[288]

In present-day practice, we witness clear areas of divergence from Stanislavski's own practice. One must be wary of making too fundamental a connection and thereby undermining more recent theatrical development. Indeed, Stafford-Clark himself exemplifies the ambiguity, in his acknowledgement that (unlike my other post-Stanislavskian directors) he has never directly studied Stanislavski, but he feels confident in describing actioning as a 'Stanislavsky-based working method'.[289] Stafford-Clark's intuition is indeed supported by Stanislavskian sources on their own terms. In the 'unitting' of a text and in the desire to focus on the intention of an action, rather than its result, we see two clear areas of accord between Stanislavski and the post-Stanislavskians. Whilst, as stated by Caldarone and Lloyd-Williams, contemporary actioning 'comes from Stanislavski'[290] as an antecedent, it has evolved in its own specific context, and one should be cautious of describing it too directly as Stanislavski's own technique.[291] However, it is also 'impossible […] to "action" a text effectively without having first undertaken a range of Stanislavsky-derived processes and exercises'.[292]

Arkady Ostrovsky's research can be used to make a close connection across eras; he has made rare English translations of brief excerpts from Stanislavski's 'unpublished production plans',[293] from which we may infer how significantly Stanislavski's approach changed across the Shakespeare productions that he directed. I have discovered evidence, in Ostrovsky's translations, of a very strong affinity between the directing technique that Stanislavski develops and contemporary post-Stanislavskian actioning. The notes for his earliest Shakespeare production, *Much*

---

[288] Mitchell, p. 47.
[289] Max Stafford-Clark, *Letters*, p. 66.
[290] Caldarone and Lloyd-Williams, p. xii.
[291] Moseley, p. vii.
[292] Moseley, p. 3; Cf. Caldarone and Lloyd-Williams, p. xiii.
[293] Ostrovsky, p. x.

Ado About Nothing, appear preoccupied with archaic notions of blocking.[294] In directions for Benedick in the Second Act of play, anticipating Beatrice's arrival,[295] Stanislavski's suggests that the actor-character 'foppishly turns around on his heels' upon seeing Beatrice, before assuming 'a sentimental pose'.[296] By the time Stanislavski came to direct *Hamlet*, his developed style shows evidence of a broader spirit akin to actioning. Stanislavski writes first-person notes for the response to the question from Polonius, 'How does my good Lord Hamlet?'[297] His suggestion is for the actor-character of Hamlet to play: 'I wish to get rid of an unexpected interlocutor'.[298] At this moment of his career, Stanislavski's notes are only the smallest remove from assigning Hamlet a present-day version of an 'action', such as 'I dismiss you'. Ostrovsky's translated extract contains fifteen other notes for this scene and in all of them Stanislavski writes from a first-person perspective, with a similar proto-actioning dynamic.[299] It is striking that Stanislavski writes in such a way, and the evidence offers a robust defence of an association between Stanislavski and the practice of actioning. However, I will continue to favour the label 'post-Stanislavskian', in relation to contemporary actioning, as I believe it allows the fullest appreciation of shifting theatrical contexts.

The most common model for post-Stanislavskian actioning is found in the practice of Max Stafford-Clark. He begins rehearsals with immediate actioning, working 'line by line' with actors, anticipating three weeks of rehearsal to 'action' the entire play.[300] He moves from the macroscopic downwards, from 'superobjectives' to 'objectives for a scene', and finally to the level of '"actions"'

---

[294] *Much Ado About Nothing*, dir. Konstantin Stanislavski (Society of Art and Literature, Moscow, 1897. The rehearsal notes date from 1896; the production was staged in early 1897.

[295] Stanislavski himself played Benedick in the production. Cf. William Shakespeare, *Much Ado About Nothing*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, II.iii.174-5.

[296] Konstantin Stanislavsky, 'Director's plan of *Much Ado*' (1896), Moscow, Moscow Art Theatre Museum (MXAT), Stanislavsky Archive, MS K.S. 18906, fol.71v, trans. in Ostrovsky, p. 32.

[297] William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, II.ii.178.

[298] Konstantin Stanislavsky, 'Actor's plan of *Hamlet*' (1910), Moscow, Moscow Art Theatre Museum (MXAT), Stanislavsky Archive, MS K.S. 18871, fols 39v-41v, trans. in Ostrovsky, p. 100. These rehearsal notes date from 1910; the production was eventually staged in January 1912 (O.S. December 1911), at the Moscow Art Theatre. Hamlet was played by Vasili Kachalov.

[299] Ibid.

[300] Stafford-Clark, *Letters*, p. 49.

(66). He does not seek to impose a 'rigid working method', aiming instead to 'establish a common language' (70). The entire early 'actioning' process is notably static table-work, where later staging concerns cannot yet 'intrude' upon close textual 'analysis' (70). As the given scene is read aloud, the actor first announces their respective action (which they would have determined prior to the read-through), 'before actually reading the line' (68). The process is likened to a 'first-stage rocket' that is 'designed to fall away once the scene has been launched into orbit'.

Both Stafford-Clark and Alfreds, like Stanislavski, warn against actors playing an outcome, where they should instead work through an actor-character's modus operandi; an actor should not favour the 'the result of the intention' over 'the intention itself'. For example, in playing a character who is 'boring', a 'bad' actor would misguidedly focus on the result, the display of 'being boring' (66-7). Instead, it would be better to focus on a specific action (e.g. 'to educate' or 'to inform' other characters about his interests). It is 'the other actors in the scene' who have the duty to 'play the response' – they then create the judgement of boredom, as it is 'not for the protagonist to act a judgement on himself' (66-7). Likewise, if an actor must play a character who lies, Alfreds advises that the actor must play the strategy 'to effect the lie', rather than playing the general state of lying. For example, if pretending that they were at home the previous night, the actor should instead play the action 'to assure' his partner that he was at home (73).[301]

Variations in practice do emerge however, where Alfreds' develops a form of actioning that is distinct enough from 'strict actioning' to warrant individual investigation – especially as so little commentary on actioning currently exists.[302] Firstly, Alfreds suggests caveats to a blanket practice of strict actioning (based upon exclusively transitive verbs). As the actor should not focus on the outcome of the action, but the process of persuasion, verbs should not be considered 'playable' that automatically presume a result has been achieved. For example, the actions 'to seduce', 'to convince,' or 'to surprise' are, as David Sturzaker has similarly warned,

---

[301] Throughout this thesis I will represent actions as verbs in the infinitive.
[302] See Repartee One for a detailed investigation.

'dependent on [the partner's] reaction'.[303] It is preferable to play the *attempt*. A character *wishing* 'to convince' another might select the action 'to beg' the partner, as a clearer action that aims for the same objective.[304] As Caldarone and Lloyd-Williams state, the 'text is re-active', and thus offering adequate room for the other actor's response is essential to the task.[305]

Predictably, verbs of 'emotional states of being' (such as 'hate' or 'love') also pose problems, as actors are straying into the territory of emoting. Instead, the actor-character might seek 'to declare' his love, or 'to reveal' his hatred – rather than playing the emotion itself.[306] Beyond these stipulations, Alfreds' approach is however comparatively flexible. He does not insist that the selected verbs are strictly transitive, as long as the chosen action is 'played transitively' in spirit. The key is that the action is played 'for *the benefit of* and *to* the other actor-characters in the scene' (73). The workshops that follow will illustrate the various applications of 'strict actioning'[307] and 'Alfreds actioning',[308] allowing for comparison and contrast to be made. The main point of divergence is that Alfreds, from the outset of rehearsal, encourages actors to action a text whilst performing on their feet. We will see the emphasis that this brings to a reactive dynamic, as opposed to more common sedentary table-work.

Where Alfreds' adaptations should still be considered an identifiable form of actioning, Declan Donnellan has developed a new form of post-Stanislavskian technique that requires unique classification. If we recall Merlin's sequence of human reaction, Donnellan's technique seems to isolate the initial stimulus that provokes an actor-character. In effect, he therefore strikes at the moment that precedes action. Donnellan proposes that an actor-character should always be

---

[303] Sturzaker, W3; the position was echoed by Molly Vevers, W9.
[304] Alfreds, p. 72.
[305] Caldarone and Lloyd-Williams, p. 5.
[306] Alfreds, 73.
[307] See Soliloquy One and Two.
[308] See Repartee One and Two.

provoked by (and react to) a 'target'.[309] He stipulates six 'rules' that define 'the target' and govern its application:

> 1.There is always a target (19).
> 2. The target always exists outside [the actor-character], and at a measurable distance (20).
> 3. The target exists before you need it (21).
> 4. The target is always specific (23).
> 5. The target is always transforming (24).
> 6. The target is always active (25).

Thus, at every moment of the play, an actor-character is striving to bring about a change to their onstage situation – but rather than focusing on an 'action' per se, the actor-character focuses on the external target which has *provoked* action. As the drama progresses, the 'target' incessantly morphs into different manifestations.

Donnellan specifies that 'the target' is not 'an objective, nor a want, […] nor an intention, […] nor a motive.' Instead, he believes 'motives arise from the target', as an explanation of 'what the target has made [an actor-character] do' (27). Donnellan illustrates an example 'target' in contrast to a 'motivation'. In the midst of *Romeo and Juliet*, Juliet's motivation is 'to sleep with Romeo'. The alternative approach, using Donnellan's 'target', is for the actor-character to see the vision of 'a Romeo she needs to sleep with' (27). Donnellan's technique is certainly as reactive as other post-Stanislavskian approaches. Whilst it represents a slightly more radical approach, one that is unique and is by definition not the same technique as actioning, it warrants consideration in the workshops that follow.[310] Owing to its proximity to shared Stanislavskian origins, whilst 'the target' is not a form of actioning, I determine that it should be considered within the broader 'family of actioning' (as a general umbrella term), even if it is a distinct technique.

It must be noted that post-Stanislavskian practitioners often represent an idealised example of a practice, where it seems exceedingly rare to encounter other directors who use actioning in quite such a relentless manner, across an entire text.

---

[309] Donnellan, p. 19.
[310] See Soliloquy One.

Dickon Tyrrell remarked that he had only once worked with such a director, but that the experience had provided him with a 'fantastic structure' to his work and had proved 'one of the best jobs' that he had ever undertaken.[311] David Sturzaker worked with the director Maria Aberg, who employed table-work for 'at least two weeks' at the start of rehearsals for *The White Devil*,[312] and regularly discussed actioning 'throughout the text'.[313] And Debra Penny participated in similar extended table-work during rehearsals for a revival of *Our Country's Good*,[314] which was inspired by Max Stafford-Clark's original direction (even though he was not involved in the given production).[315] However, such instances are rare.

Actioning is more commonly used as an 'occasional tool',[316] especially in precise moments when a director is 'unsure' of the clarity of an actor's performance.[317] David Sturzaker enjoyed working with the director Simon Godwin,[318] who applied actioning when required for extra specificity or when an actor 'needed a bit of help in interpreting a line'.[319] Sarah Ovens encountered the occasional use of actioning with the director Roxana Silbert,[320] but finds directors more widely use the technique as 'an option, rather than a die-hard rule'.[321] Ovens personally actions a text intermittently, when 'struggling to make sense' of a specific line, but she avoids an incessant application for fear that it 'blocks' her acting.[322] Similarly, Debra Penny would resort to the technique when 'in trouble' in order to 'turn the scene upside down, because things aren't working'.[323] Heather Long stated that she will now 'only action lines' whenever she feels that she is resorting to 'just

---

[311] Tyrrell, W1.
[312] *The White Devil*, dir. by Maria Aberg (RSC, 2014).
[313] Sturzaker, W3.
[314] *Our Country's* Good, dir. by Nadia Fall (National Theatre, 2015).
[315] Penny, W6.
[316] Sturzaker, W3.
[317] Ferguson, W3.
[318] *Richard II*, dir. by Simon Godwin (Shakespeare's Globe, 2016).
[319] Sturzaker, W3.
[320] *Measure for Measure*, dir. by Roxana Silbert (RSC, 2011).
[321] Ovens, W2.
[322] Ibid.
[323] Penny, W6.

playing the intonation' of a line, rather than a specific meaning.[324] Similarly, she recognised a problem where superficial semantics may not provide the actor with the full purpose of a line:

> The minute you actually try and say it in your own words, you realise you've got the gist […] but you don't have it in expression – it's a different thing to comprehend something, cerebrally, and understand it enough to ask someone something […].[325]

Most commonly the technique is utilised in moments of specific uncertainty, but one unusual exception was mentioned by Molly Vevers, who has witnessed actioning during auditions – specifically in the case of the director, Gray McLaren, who asks actors to sit 'in a circle […and] try […] a specific action' for segments of a text. Vevers felt well-grounded in the practice, having trained under writer/director Iain Heggie, who used to run 'army drill actioning' sessions – long improvisations where he would 'shout out actions' for the students to act.[326]

Actioning is usually taught and applied today quite specifically in relation to contemporary drama texts; Brian Martin remarked that he had never seen the technique applied 'during Shakespeare rehearsal'.[327] As highlighted earlier however, Stanislavski developed his similar methods in response to the demands of Shakespearean practice. Whilst I acknowledge that the technique is not commonly associated with present-day Shakespearean rehearsal, I felt that actioning was the technique that best represented a present-day actor-character approach, whilst being supported by the context of Stanislavski's original Shakespearean engagement.

One area of endless fascination is distinct Shakespearean poeticism. Russ McDonald's work has discussed the complexities of such 'poetic language' that, on the one hand is 'concerned with more than meaning'[328] – distraction being a core

---

[324] Long, W9.
[325] Ibid.
[326] Vevers, W9.
[327] This was seconded by Ruth Sillers, W8.
[328] Russ McDonald, *Shakespeare and the Arts of Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), p. 54.

'essence of poetry'[329] – yet, on the other hand is still 'performing semantic work', where 'virtually every word […] is embedded in discursive networks that contribute texture and complexity to the phrase […] or play.'[330] The linguistic territory is more complex than most present-day drama. Debra Penny instinctively felt that Shakespeare's poetic qualities presented obstacles to actioning, where just 'one sentence' can suggest a broad range of meanings.[331] Elsewhere, Brian Martin mentioned the influence of a dramatic pedagogical 'theory that in Shakespeare there is no subtext'; if all of Shakespearean characters explicitly 'say everything that is on their mind', there seems a diminished role for the 'extra hidden meaning'[332] revealed by actioning. This study does not make such a neat binary division between surface semantics and subtext. As will be seen in the next chapter, I will regard meaning to be equally derived from both semantics and the dramatic-rhetorical form of the speech. Actioning is chiefly associated with subtext (as a tool to reveal clarity), however, actions are still functioning on the level of the obvious and mundane; actors simply do not need to resort to actioning in this instance, as the text's meaning is already clear.

In this context, one must take note of the fact that Stanislavski's development is evidenced specifically across the rehearsal of Shakespeare productions. Mike Alfreds and Declan Donnellan provide rare manual examples of a practice that directly applies post-Stanislavskian techniques with Shakespearean text (even though the spirit of such an engagement is found in many other practitioners). However, such an approach can be defended with clear reflection upon Stanislavski's own practice. In his research, Arkady Ostrovsky confronted the common assumption that 'Stanislavsky's system […] can only be applied to the realistic plays of realistic plays of Chekhov, Gorky and Turgenev', where 'in fact, nothing could be further from the truth.' The actors of the Moscow Art Theatre did not need a new 'system' to appreciate Chekhovian characters. It was in fact 'symbolist drama and poetic

---

[329] McDonald, p. 55.
[330] McDonald, p. 56.
[331] Penny, W6.
[332] Martin, W8.

tragedies' that required the creation of new techniques, and the 'system emerged' in order to 'achieve the same degree of truth in [such writers as] Shakespeare.'[333] One finds, in its very nascence, that Stanislavskian practice is grounded upon Shakespearean demands.

Notably, amongst my workshop actors there were figures who already specifically advocated Shakespearean actioning, and frequently actors expressed a desire to have the rare experience of working with a director who uses actioning throughout rehearsal, in its comprehensive form. Dickon Tyrrell was a prominent example, as a highly-experienced Shakespearean actor who commonly utilises actioning; prior to attending our workshop, he had been using the *Actors' Thesaurus* as a 'wonderful energiser' during Globe rehearsals.[334] Heather Long (a more recent drama-school graduate) had also previously felt the need to action extensively, whilst performing the role of Helena in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*; it had enabled her to discover variety in Helena's speeches, which can otherwise become 'one long moan'.[335] In addition, Brian Ferguson believed that Shakespeare's language is often performed without 'enough actioning behind it', in the general terms of providing 'actioning or objective' to a speech.[336] He felt that whilst persistent actioning, in early rehearsals, might risk 'cutting off a lot of possibilities […] for [later…] discovery',[337] there was certainly a requirement for its use as an occasional tool. Ferguson specifically favoured Alfreds' version of actioning, as the application of actions 'on their feet' would encourage a much more dynamic engagement.[338]

Post-Stanislavskian techniques naturally contrast in discernible ways with contemporaneous Shakespearean practice. Evelyn Tribble has emphasised how modern methods may 'pre-suppose a deep knowledge of the whole of the play',

---

[333] Ostrovsky, p. 73.
[334] At the time he was rehearsing *Measure for Measure* (dir. by Dominic Dromgoole, Shakespeare's Globe, 2015). Tyrrell, W1.
[335] Long, W9.
[336] Ferguson, W5.
[337] Ibid.
[338] Ferguson, W5.

especially 'other character's actions and reactions'.[339] This is certainly true where one considers the difference between modern rehearsal schedule and the limitations that would have been placed upon Renaissance rehearsal (where, for example, an actor might not have been clear of his addressee, whilst learning his role in private instruction).[340] Catherine Belsey has described the 'precariously unified protagonist of Renaissanace drama' and the gap between the 'subject of the enunciation and the subject of the utterance' (the latter as 'defined in the speech'):[341] 'the "I" cannot be fully present in what it says of itself'.[342] Thus, Belsey discusses the notion of a 'silent self [that is] anterior to the utterance'. Where actors today consider the rich details of a fuller, published text (rather than a part script), we may recognise the benefits and perils of such additional knowledge.

We see this especially in the widespread use of 'character lists' by present-day actors. Such a usage, commonly regarded as being post-Stanislavskian,[343] generally involves the actor filtering an entire playtext to create three lists: (i) statements their character says about him- or herself; (ii) statements the character says about other people; and (iii) statements other people make about the character.[344] Mike Alfreds advocates using two additional lists: (i) 'facts about the character'; and (ii) 'imagery that is used by the character or by others to describe the character'.[345] Character lists are a form of 'homework' for the actors prior to rehearsals, establishing basic character facts that can then recede in importance, once the actor gets to 'to know [their] character more'.[346] Seven of the (fifteen) workshop actors mentioned that they frequently used these three lists – often with the caveat that it would be contingent on the text (and director) with which they would be

---

[339] Tribble, p. 11.
[340] Stern, *Rehearsal*, p. 64.
[341] Catherine Belsey, *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and difference in Renaissance Drama* (London: Methuen, 1985), p. 48.
[342] Belsey, p. 49.
[343] Sillers, W8.
[344] The lists as independently described by actors, and also found in Alfreds, p. 206.
[345] Alfreds, p. 206.
[346] Penny, W6.

working.[347] Debra Penny even asserted that she would use the same process when preparing a script for an audition.[348]

Heather Long warned that in using such lists extensively, an actor might establish 'more awareness than that character would have' about their own life details, potentially leading the actor away from the natural 'naivety [of their] character'.[349] However, the lists may be considered as a good indicator of post-Stanislavskian character construction, in contrast to the naturalism of the American Method. Where Method approaches might be seen to over-intellectualise the notion of character consciousness, and distract from the task in hand, character lists in fact constantly remind the actor of the conflict between the anticipated demands of the theatrical ecology in which they will perform and the live function of an actor-character. Actioning, in its similar way, asserts performance function over a generalised assimilation of being (which excludes the performative), whilst prioritising – especially in its Alfredian development – the importance of real-time dialogue reactions.

---

[347] As cited by: Vevers, Long, Quartley, Sillers, Martin, Penny and Ovens.
[348] Penny, W6.
[349] Long, W9.

Chapter 3: Shakespeare's Style (as *elocutio*)

We now consider the features of a Shakespeare text that are most useful and pertinent to an actor in rehearsal today. In doing so, we can lay the foundation for the Shakespeare workshops, where the rhetorical unit, as used by Shakespeare, can be aligned with a post-Stanislavskian unit, allowing for attempts at actioning. Theatre practitioners are tasked with responding to the notion of 'what makes Shakespeare Shakespeare',[350] in relation to other drama texts; typically, they will have trained within a wider pedagogical context that considers skills specific to Shakespearean acting, often exemplified by a certain industry orthodoxy (especially concerning versification). This chapter will investigate the stylistic nature of the Shakespearean dramatic rhetoric, which so commonly inspires present-day rehearsal.

Russ McDonald has championed Shakespeare's 'style' as the 'primary determinant of [his] theatrical success',[351] by which he means his specific 'control of language' – as distinct from the 'plot, characterization, [or] theme' of his plays.[352] In McDonald's description of 'Shakespeare's brilliant […] talent for arranging words into meaningful patterns',[353] we find similarities with rhetorical *elocutio* – the 'theory of style', which Cicero regarded as the 'adaptation of suitable words and sentences to the topics so conceived'.[354] Similarly, Heinrich F. Plett has foregrounded the 'theory of style' as the key link 'between rhetoric and poetics'.[355] But in McDonald's separation and reduction of character, where 'psychological insights' are 'merely a collection of verbal signs', there is the risk of distancing *elocutio* (as an almost exclusively literary conceit) from characterization altogether.

---

[350] McDonald, p. 2.
[351] Ibid.
[352] McDonald, p. 1.
[353] McDonald, p. 2.
[354] Cicero, *De Inventione*, trans. by C.D. Yonge (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853), I.vii. Cf. *Ad C. Herennium de ratione dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium)*, trans. by Harry Caplan (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1954; repr. 1964), II.i.3.
[355] Heinrich F. Plett, 'The Place and Function of Style in Renaissance Poetics', in *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. by James J. Murphy (London: University of California Press, 1983), p. 356.

One loses sight of the agency of an actor and the fulfilment of a staged 'character' in the presence of an audience, where reception is key to dramatic rhetoric.

From Shakespeare's era onward, actors have consistently searched for guidance from the playwright's *elocutio*. Palfrey and Stern speak in terms of a playwright who 'had to encode in the roll stylistic signs to direct and orientate his actors',[356] where such signs serve as 'prompts for action'.[357] The resultant Renaissance action would have been manifest in a suitable choice of 'gesture and facial expression', which would have been coupled with the correct 'pronunciation' of the words[358] – where today actioning represents an appropriate correspondence between the dramatic rhetoric of a text and the chosen action verb.[359] However, today's actor can reliably infer details from exactly the same stylistic prompts as established in Shakespeare's *elocutio*; Nick Moseley details how 'each thought will have its own action',[360] which draws obvious parallels with what Palfrey and Stern have described as the 'basic congruence of thought to line' in a Renaissance player's part.[361]

Shakespeare's *elocutio* represents a 'specifically *dramatic* prosody'.[362] My workshop actors referred to the commonly held notion of Shakespearean 'clues' in the text.[363] These are not mere instinctive actor suppositions – they represent detailed textual engagement. Actors emphasised Shakespeare's use of features such as: metrical variations;[364] the inversion of the iamb;[365] antithesis; repetition; monosyllables;[366] lineation; verse/prose transitions;[367] line endings;[368] caesuras (as

---

[356] Palfrey and Stern, p. 328.
[357] Palfrey and Stern, p. 327.
[358] Stern, *Rehearsal*, p. 73.
[359] Moseley, p. 8.
[360] Moseley, p. 7.
[361] Palfrey and Stern, p. 346.
[362] Palfrey and Stern, p. 329.
[363] Tyrrell, W1; Sturzaker, W3; Ferguson, W5; and Vevers, W9; cf. Barton favours the word 'clue', as 'we cannot always be a hundred per cent certain that we are analysing the verse rightly' – John Barton, *Playing Shakespeare* (London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, 1984; reissued with DVD 2009; repr. 2014), p. 32.
[364] Sturzaker, W3; Martin, W8.
[365] Quartley, W7.
[366] Sturzaker, W3.

'internal stage directions');[369] 'vivid and colourful' language;[370] rhyme;[371] and 'shared' lines.[372] George T. Wright has spoken of the 'human feeling […] involved in [metrical] structures',[373] and my workshop actors likewise identified the importance of metrical variations in their indication of a 'character's state of mind'.[374] The actor can begin to 'perceive, experience and possess a "reality"', through the prosody of his part,[375] as metrical features help to establish the dramatic rhetorical 'units' of his speech.[376] Literary critics, historians of drama and theatre practitioners all converge upon a specific subset of rhetorical features (which includes syntax, figures and tropes). This subset can reasonably be described as representative of Shakespeare's *elocutio*.

The argument follows that Shakespeare's plays were 'written for oral rhetorical delivery.'[377] Yet, the Renaissance player's role in this process is debated. Andrew Gurr has highlighted the differences across theatre company practices in this period, describing the training of boy players (in the post-1599 boys companies) as 'more academic' than that of the 'professional adult players'.[378] The boys' training was in the 'declamatory arts of rhetoric, specifically pronunciation and gesture,' where Gurr regards the 'classical learning' of the adult players in Shakespeare's company as 'deficient' by comparison, with their lack of 'schooling' or formal 'training in rhetoric'.[379] By contrast, Palfrey and Stern interpret the performance of rhetoric much more widely, incorporating the dramatic artistry and reception on playhouse-specific terms. They thus argue that 'every actor was a trained rhetorician, irrespective of education', by virtue of the fact that 'every part he received was an

---

[367] Vevers, W9.
[368] Quartley, W7.
[369] Tyrrell, W1
[370] Ferguson, W5.
[371] Martin, W8.
[372] Quartley and Ovens, W7.
[373] George T. Wright, *Shakespeare's Metrical Art* (London: University of California Press, 1988), xiii.
[374] Sturzaker, W3; Martin, W8. Cf. Palfrey and Stern, p. 346.
[375] Palfrey and Stern, p. 329.
[376] Palfrey and Stern, p. 328. Cf. Chapter Two.
[377] Palfrey and Stern, p. 331.
[378] Gurr, p. 115.
[379] Ibid.

assemblage of tried and trusted rhetorical figures.'[380] He might therefore have assessed the role for 'two broad rhetorical forms': first, its 'many figures of speech' and second, '"tropes" in which the words "turn" from the customary to the novel', as with a metaphor.[381] They may even have come 'to identify', in particular devices of *elocutio*, the specifics that defined '*their* type of character.'[382] Given their rich range of analysis, it would not be unreasonable to regard present-day actors in this latter sense, as rhetoricians-in-practice, drawing from a Shakespearean training that places emphasis upon textual features – even if one should occasionally question the 'Shakespearean' orientation of some present-day training.[383]

Whilst a playwright's use of figures, tropes and metre is best represented by the subcategory of *elocutio*, one must remember the broader context of a Ciceronian '*ars rhetorica*' that includes four other subcategories:[384] Invention (*inventio*), Arrangement (*dispositio*), Memory (*memoria*) and Delivery (*pronuntiatio*).[385] It is very common for *elocutio* to be uniquely advanced, as McDonald has done. Heinrich F. Plett has suggested that it is 'scarcely an exaggeration to say that the Renaissance was as much a renaissance of style as of anything else'.[386] But Quentin Skinner has argued for greater coverage of other subcategories, warning against a reduction that interprets *elocutio* as the sole constituent of '"Shakespeare's rhetoric"'.[387] He gives particular consideration to 'the place of *inventio* and *dispositio* in the construction of judicial arguments' in Shakespeare,[388] where he describes how a specific 'forensic eloquence' is exemplified by the '*genus iudiciale*' of rhetoric (1). It is similarly possible to expand upon specific dramatic concerns, whilst highlighting all five parts of rhetoric. Palfrey and Stern posit that the five parts together 'encapsulate the basic progress "through" an actor's part, first as constructed by the dramatist, then as

---

[380] Palfrey and Stern, p. 331.
[381] Ibid.
[382] Ibid.
[383] See Chapter Four.
[384] Quentin Skinner, *Forensic Shakespeare* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2014), p.2.
[385] Cicero, *De Inventione*, I. vii.
[386] Plett, 'Style', p. 357.
[387] Skinner, p. 4.
[388] Skinner, p. 6.

appropriated by the actor.'[389] At a further remove, we may note an affinity between a present-day actor's grasp of a 'character arc' across an entire play, as inspired by Stanislavskian 'throughaction', and rhetorical *dispositio* (arrangement). A similar relationship is echoed in an actor's consideration of Stanislavskian 'Given Circumstances'.[390]

This study prioritises the context of a present-day rehearsal. To this end, the notion of the stand-alone rhetorical speech, whether indicative of public oratory or ceremonial (*epideictic*) speech, no longer holds quite its traditional grip on an actor. Actioning, for example, focuses practitioners on the persuasive potential of each 'thought', eschewing the histrionics of the set-piece speech by necessity. Indeed, the very notion of a character delivering set-piece speeches appears dated to many practitioners today. Heather Long spoke of the importance during a soliloquy of the character having the 'need to work something out' in real-time communication with an audience.[391] And John Barton referred to the necessity to 'always look for the story-line in a long speech',[392] using the example of Henry V's address at Harfleur[393] – where the language 'is heightened because of [Henry's] intention, not because it is a set speech' (58). Drawing from the considerable evidence provided by my workshop actors, the opinions of notable rhetorical scholars, and contemporary Renaissance sources, it is reasonable to prioritise the dynamic of rhetoric at a more microscopic level. To this end, *elocutio* manifestly represents the best dramatic-rhetorical link between Shakespeare's text and the post-Stanislavskian actor-character. One is naturally wary of what James J. Murphy describes as the 'scholarly sin […] of synecdoche', in assuming that any one rhetorician represents an entire art.[394] And one must not allow for a focus on a specific rhetorical device to divorce

---

[389] Palfrey and Stern, p. 331.
[390] See Chapter Two.
[391] Long, W9.
[392] Barton, p. 57. Cf. Chapter 5 and soliloquies.
[393] William Shakespeare, *The Life of Henry the Fifth,* III.i.1-34, in the *RSC Complete Works*.
[394] James J. Murphy, 'One Thousand Neglected Authors: The Scope and Importance of Renaissance Rhetoric', in *Renaissance Eloquence*, ed. by Murphy, p. 23.

us from the 'matter it deals from'[395] – a charge George K. Hunter has submitted against Sister Miriam Joseph's famous study of Shakespearean rhetoric.[396] However, it is reasonable to make a 'spirited defence' of a focus on *elocutio* and its specific 'rhetorical figures', given that such a practice clearly mirrors the many Renaissance sources that 'did just this.'[397]

Rhetorical concerns have broad application. Paul Oskar Kristeller has described the impact upon 'the art of persuasion, of the probable argument, of prose style and composition, or of literary criticism', where each category has found prominence in a 'different period or context'.[398] However, the influences upon Renaissance rhetoric were distinctly Roman and Ciceronian. Whilst developing new manuals and distinct theories in the English vernacular, writers built upon strong classical bedrock. This is represented in the immensely popular work of Thomas Wilson,[399] who consciously echoed Cicero, in defining 'rhetorique' as 'an Arte set foorth by utteraunce of words', serving 'an artificiall declaration of the mynd […]'.[400] Cicero had spoken of 'artificial eloquence', as the explicit duty to 'speak in a manner suitable to persuading men'[401] – an orientation shared with the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, as a treatise on the 'Theory of Public Speaking'.[402] The Ciceronian tradition (which commonly includes Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* and the anonymously written *Rhetorica ad Herennium*)[403] served as a basis for a didactic, Renaissance humanist education that prioritised the 'pursuit of eloquence'.[404] Quentin Skinner has discussed the influence of typical educational 'rhetorical

[395] G. K. Hunter, 'Rhetoric and Renaissance Drama', in *Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. by Peter Mack (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), p. 104.

[396] 'One of the classic studies' of Shakespeare's use of rhetoric – McDonald, p. 37.

[397] Hunter, 'Rhetoric', p. 104.

[398] Paul Oskar Kristeller, 'Rhetoric in Medieval and Renaissance Culture', in *Renaissance Eloquence*, ed. by Murphy p. 1.

[399] *The Art of Rhetorique* went through eight editions between 1553 and 1585, where 'only four of the twenty English manuals were printed more than twice in the sixteenth century' – Peter Mack, Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 76.

[400] Thomas Wilson, *The Art of Rhetorique* (London: George Robinson, 1553; repr. 1585), B. p.1.

[401] Cicero, *Inventione*, I.v.; cf. Murphy, p. 20.

[402] *Herennium*, I.i.1, p.2.

[403] See: Kristeller, p. 3; John O. Ward, 'Renaissance Commentators on Ciceronian Rhetoric', in *Renaissance Eloquence*, ed. by Murphy, p. 126.

[404] Ward, p. 127.

instruction'[405] and has determined instances in which Shakespeare either 'quotes directly' from Ciceronian works or from 'contemporary neo-Ciceronian' writers, such as Thomas Wilson (3). He thus illustrates 'the extent to which Shakespeare's dramaturgy […] is classical and humanist in its intellectual allegiances' (3). In various ways these influences found exposure in a dramatic context, both as manifest in Shakespeare's own stylistic imprint but also in the anticipated performance of the player.

Abraham Fraunce highlights the distinction of 'rhetorike' as 'An Art of Speaking', where it is composed of 'two parts, Eloqution and Pronuntiation'[406] – 'Eloqution' specifically referring to the writer's input, in the 'ordering & trimming of speech'.[407] This is itself represented by two areas. The first is 'Congruitie', defined as 'that which causeth the speach to be pure and cohaerent' – performed 'either by Etimologie', the 'affections of severall words', or by 'Syntaxis, which dooth orderly conjoyne them together.'[408] The second is 'Braverie of speach', as manifested in two forms: 'Tropes, or turnings', 'when a word is turned from his natural signification, to some other'; and 'Figures or fashionings',[409] which are regarded as 'a certeine decking of speach, whereby the usual and simple fashion thereof is altered and changed to that which is more elegant and conceipted'.[410] Fraunce stresses that 'a Trope is of single wordes', where a 'Figure' refers to words as 'coopled and conjoined'.[411] It is the 'Pronuntiation' of the rhetoric that then represents the agency of a given speaker, and their 'fit delivering of the speach already beautified.'[412] Where techniques of performance and the expectations of an audience reception change markedly across era, the playwright's original, encoded *elocutio* remains comparatively rooted in its original context.

---

[405] Skinner, p.1.
[406] Abraham Fraunce, *Arcadian Rhetorike* (London: Thomas Orwin, 1588), Book I, Cap. 1. A2.
[407] Ibid.
[408] Ibid.
[409] Ibid.
[410] Fraunce, Book I, Cap. 12.
[411] Ibid.
[412] Fraunce, Book II, Cap. 1.

One can follow Joseph's definition of distinct schools of Renaissance rhetoricians: Thomas Wilson may be regarded as a member of a so-called 'Traditionalist group', inspired by the *Progymnasmata* of Aphthonius and the works of Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1560);[413] George Puttenham (1529-90) finds himself amongst the 'Figurists' – rhetoricians inspired by Joannes Susenbrotus (1484/5-1542/3);[414] and Fraunce appears to build upon a culmination of a growing 'Ramist' tradition – as derived from the principles of French rhetoricians Pierre de la Ramée (1515-1572; alternatively known as Petrus Ramus) and Omer Talon (c.1510-1562; alternatively known as Audomarus Talaeus). But it is this Ramist iteration that is especially useful in isolating the key concerns of theatrical production. Ramists separated *elocutio* and *pronuntiatio* from the other parts of the original Ciceronian rhetorical grouping of five (which were re-categorised as belonging to the realm of 'Logic');[415] in his *Rhetorica*, Talon described rhetoric as the '*ars bene dicendi*',[416] as represented by the two parts of 'Elocutio, & Pronuntiatio' (otherwise known as) 'Actio'.[417] Fraunce does not explicitly refer to his French scholastic antecedents himself, but his work clearly echoes this useful Ramist revision. For actors today, the dramatic rhetoric of a playwright is evidenced by his use of tropes, figures and metre, and these form the basis of small unit divisions within the text,[418] which can in turn influence the selection of a given action.

There are those who find less value in the Ramists; Brian Vickers has described them as 'the least interested in stressing the imaginative potential of

---

[413] Miriam Joseph refers expressly to the 1542 edition of the *Progymnasmata* (as translated by Agricola and Cataneus, ed. by Lorichius) and Melanchthon's works: *Institutiones rhetoricae* (Haganoa, 1521); *Elementa rhetorices* (Wittenberg, 1531); and *Erotemata dialectices* (Basel, 1521). Joseph, *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language* (London: Hafner Publishing Company, 1947; repr. 1966), p. 13.

[414] Namely, his work *Epitome troporum ac schematum et grammaticorum et rhetoricorum* (Zurich, 1540). Joseph, p. 14.

[415] Cf. Gavin Alexander, 'Introduction', in *Sidney's 'The Defence of Poesy' and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. by Alexander (London: Penguin, 2004), p. xxxvii.

[416] Omer Talon, *Rhetorica* (Paris: Steph. Prevosteau, 1599), Cap. 1.

[417] Talon, Cap. 2.

[418] See Chapter 2, and the notion of 'unitting'.

rhetoric', amongst 'Elizabethan rhetoricians.[419] Vickers prefers writers such as Peacham, who granted 'tropes' with 'emotive power';[420] Peacham spoke of tropes giving 'pleasant light to darke things', moving 'affections', and leaving 'a firme impression in the memory'.[421] However, the lack of colour in the Ramist manuals' approach to *elocutio* is more ideal in the context of a post-Stanislavskian rehearsal, as it allows for a functional reduction of the text to a network of units and actions, free from more florid distraction.

My thesis prioritises rhetoric in its dramatic capacity, as the persuasive event. There are certain implications. Firstly, rhetorical techniques are being extended beyond the realm of oratory, to the domain of theatre. Secondly, I claim it is possible to link the playwright's *elocutio* directly to the selection of post-Stanislavskian 'actions'. And, thirdly, audience reception is anticipated as a requisite in the phenomenological triangulation of the performed 'character'.

In the first instance, it is not too controversial to associate a rhetoric that originates in oratory with the dramatic stage. George K. Hunter has described how the construction of rhetorical arguments was 'as valuable a training for a dramatist as for a lawyer', the difference being that the '"proof" that a play moves towards is not a legally defined statement of guilt or innocence […], but rather a discovery that the truth of the norms that are present is always compromised by the qualities of human behaviour.'[422] Hunter highlights the prominence of 'persuasion' in drama, relating to the personated character on the stage being judged by approved standards.[423] However, he recognises that Renaissance drama tends to 'stop short of the determination that only one defined truth can really be true at the end of the

---

[419] Brian Vickers, *In Defence of Rhetoric* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), p. 327.
[420] Vickers, *Rhetoric*, p. 325.
[421] Henry Peacham, *The Garden of Eloquence* (London: printed by R.F. for H. Jackson, 1593), D iii, p. 13. The first edition was printed in 1577.
[422] Hunter, 'Rhetoric', p. 113.
[423] Ibid.

process.'[424] The nature of dramatic proofs will be assessed in the Shakespeare workshops of Part Two.[425]

Whilst post-Stanislavskians are tasked with the contemporary construction of an 'actor-character', I assert that Renaissance rhetoric provides rich inspiration in the division of a scene into units, and in the further assignation of actions for each separate character 'thought'. As Vickers discusses, Renaissance theorists themselves prioritised rhetoric's capacity to 'express thought or reveal the mind.'[426] We recall Peacham's description of 'Figures of Rhetorike' as 'most aptly' expressing 'the singular partes of mans mind', where the 'affections of his hearte [are] most effectuallie uttered.'[427] We must remember, however, that actors today also tend to relinquish any idealised notion of (what Hunter deems) the 'later twentieth century' literary construction of a character. Present-day drama often steers away from the literary notion of the text representing a singular 'truth',[428] especially given the nature of live performance – the 'text' itself being a variable term.[429] Instead, by actioning the text, an actor may gain both a greater sense of ownership of a role and embrace the contingency of a performance that will changes on a nightly basis. Hunter believes it is the 'power of relating action to thought that separates rhetoric from the judgments that attach to literary critical connoisseurship.'[430] In this way, actioning and rhetoric may complement each other, combining both the spirit of Renaissance practice and the 'different-every-night' perspective of Mike Alfreds' methodology.[431]

An actor's choice of post-Stanislavskian 'actions' must express a character that is, to borrow from Hunter, 'appropriate to what seems possible and desirable

---

[424] Hunter, 'Rhetoric', p. 111; cf. McDonald, p. 48.
[425] See Soliloquy Three and all *enargeia* workshops.
[426] Brian Vickers, '"The Power of Persuasion": Images of the Orator, Elyot to Shakespeare', in *Renaissance Eloquence*, ed. by Murphy, p. 417.
[427] Peacham, Title page, A.B. i.
[428] Hunter, 'Rhetoric', p. 103.
[429] Cf. Gurr and the 'maximal' text, in Chapter Four.
[430] Hunter, 'Rhetoric', p. 107.
[431] See Chapter Two.

under the given circumstances of the story';[432] it is telling that his independent use of the term 'given circumstances' is so harmonious with Stanislavskian usage. Furthermore, he asserts that the dramatist's 'persuasive means' are executed by its display of a 'polyphony of truths and standards',[433] these standards being 'held inside the emotional processes by which they are stimulated'.[434] In this manner, it seems quite promising to align the rhetorical unit with post-Stanislavskian *actio* ('doing'). Rhetoric is, to Hunter, 'a science (or art or *techne*) of persuasion [and…] of *doing* rather than knowing […]'.[435] And this corresponds precisely with the fundamental essence of post-Stanislavskian theatre, that the 'actor's art is the art of action.'[436]

Eventually the audience completes the rhetorical event in its reception, which Arthur F. Kinney refers to as 'the act of methexis', its 'complicit participation […] in actively judging a fiction'.[437] Kinney specifically cites Lyly and Sidney as authors displaying a 'reliance on a triangulation with the reader (or listener)' to establish a process of 'rhetorical disputation' – 'persuading to the credible as rhetoricians argued the probable'.[438] The playhouse may thus be seen as the perfect 'rhetorical gymnasium' – to use Hunter's terminology – where the 'oratorical muscles could be flexed and imagined as if at full power.'[439] Evidently, modern theatre practitioners also enjoy the auditorium as an arena of such triangulation. Peter Hall has described Elizabethan drama as 'a public debate with a visible audience';[440] and Dickon Tyrrell similarly speaks of the 'unique and exhausting' nature of the 'actor/audience contract at the [present-day] Globe' – one that encourages the audience to interpret 'the emotion', in response to the actor's close 'attention to the language'.[441]

---

[432] Hunter, 'Rhetoric', p. 113.
[433] Ibid.
[434] Ibid.
[435] Hunter, 'Rhetoric', p. 103.
[436] Alfreds, p. 64.
[437] Arthur F. Kinney, 'Rhetoric and Fiction in Elizabethan England', in *Renaissance Eloquence*, ed. by Murphy, p. 388.
[438] Kinney, p. 393.
[439] Hunter, 'Rhetoric', p. 116.
[440] Peter Hall, *Shakespeare's Advice to the Players* (London: Oberon, 2004), p. 58; echoed by: Martin, W8; and Long, W9.
[441] Tyrrell, W1; echoed by Sturzaker, W3.

It becomes a question of plausibility, the audience assenting that the world of the play is persuasively coherent, regardless of genre. Hunter asserts 'plays operate, like rhetoric, in a world of mere probability, in a world of verisimilitude […] not verity.'[442] This accords with A.D. Nuttall's description of Roland Barthes' 'effet de réel' – where 'things are not there [in a work] because of their truth but […] because of their "true-ish-ness"'.[443] For Hunter, the audience must 'accede to the play-with-truth' of the actors' creation, simply to fulfil their part of the theatrical 'contract of engagement.'[444] It is thus paradoxical that the moment of a play's greatest success relies on what Hunter describes as an audience – 'trained in the potentials of rhetoric' – simultaneously acknowledging 'a world of experiences that are not play, which must be defined as "real" […] and to which the theatre world bears only a referential relation'.[445]

The Significance of Verse

We now focus specifically on versification as it represents, for the present-day actor, the feature that most distinguishes the Shakespearean challenge from other areas of drama. Actors may find crucial guidance in this form of Shakespearean *elocutio* where we witness, as McDonald has stressed, the 'congruence between the semantic and the poetic unit.'[446] In Chapter Four, we will come to Shakespearean approaches to acting, in twentieth and twenty-first century contexts, but here we specifically consider the playwright's input, in Renaissance terms. We will see how important it is to judge Shakespeare in his fuller context, initially as a figure who inherits a metrical convention, but then as an innovator who develops his metrical art at a rapid pace. And throughout, an emphasis will be placed upon variation. It will be argued that it is the 'contention between the metrical beat and potential challenges to it' that fundamentally serves to 'invigorate and particularize' Shakespeare's

---

[442] Hunter, 'Rhetoric', p. 115.
[443] A.D. Nuttall, *A New Mimesis: Shakespeare and the Representation of Reality* (London: Methuen, 1983), p. 56; cf. Roland Barthes, 'L'Effet de Réel', *Communications*, 11 (1968), 84-89.
[444] Hunter, 'Rhetoric', p. 115.
[445] Hunter, 'Rhetoric', p. 116.
[446] McDonald, p. 91.

'representation of human speech', where it is impossible to substantiate any sense of a blanket iambic orthodoxy.[447]

First, we might turn to prominent metrists to define the nature of the 'accentual-syllabic' iambic pentameter that Shakespeare inherited.[448] In the early twentieth century, Robert Bridges offered a straightforward description of such a line being ten syllables long and containing five stresses, which fall 'on the even syllables'.[449] This rhythm could be notated as:

x / x / x / x / x /[450]

However, in 1966 Morris Halle and Samuel Jay Keyser created a 'sensation'[451] in their proposal of an 'abstract metrical pattern'.[452] Their formula for iambic pentameter was expressed as:

(W) S WS WS WS WS (X) (X)[453]

In the above formula, each letter represents a potential syllable. 'W' represents an 'unstressed' syllable – including 'all syllables with lesser stressed and unstressed vowels'. 'S' represents a 'fully stressed syllable'. The letters 'enclosed in parentheses' are those which 'may be omitted' by the writer, where 'each X position may be occupied only by an unstressed syllable'.[454] The above formula thus allows for common variations: a 'headless' line, of nine syllables, missing the first 'W' syllable; and hypersyllabic lines (with an unstressed eleventh or twelfth syllable). In

---

[447] McDonald, p. 99. Cf. the approach of 'iambic fundamentalist' training, in Chapter Six (W5).
[448] Alexander, p. xlviii.
[449] Robert Bridges, *Milton's Prosody* (Oxford: Henry Frowde, publisher to Oxford University, 1901), p. 1.
[450] Throughout, I will use 'x' to symbolise an unstressed syllable and '/' to symbolise a stressed syllable. Cf. Alexander, p. 311.
[451] Tarlinskaja, p. 6.
[452] Morris Halle and Samuel Jay Keyser, *English Stress: Its Form, Its Growth, and Its Role in Verse* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), p. 169.
[453] Ibid.
[454] Ibid.

addition Halle and Keyser coined a feature a 'stress maximum', indicated 'when a fully stressed syllable occurs between two unstressed syllables in the same syntactic constituent within a line of verse'.[455] One might note how this corresponds to Gavin Alexander's description of Renaissance verse development, that 'a syllable does not have to be thumped to be stressed – it just needs to bear more stress than its neighbour.'[456] Metrical stress can thus be relative.

Using the above formula, Halle and Keyser suggested a checklist for a given line of verse, to determine how far it adheres to the abstracted iambic schematic:

> Fully stressed syllables occur in S positions only and in all S positions
> OR
> Fully stressed syllables occur in S positions only but not in all S positions
> OR
> Stress maxima occur in S positions only but not in all S positions.[457]

Each time a criterion is not met, one could accordingly note the deviation, where a total deviation count could then give a value for something of a 'complexity rating' for the line (177-8). In discussing variation, it is natural to ask how it is 'possible that a poem contains so few "perfect" iambic lines, and yet the reader knows that the text is iambic'.[458] In some ways, Halle and Keyser responded to this need for a 'model for all lines, both "perfect" and "imperfect".[459] But it must be remembered that this tension has always existed.

As Gavin Alexander has suggested, Philip Sidney's significant response to potentially monotonous iambic pentameter was to recognise that 'the metrical system could be conceptualized independently of the words and phrases which realize it in verse.'[460] Halle and Keyser assert that they do not offer 'instructions for […]

---

[455] Ibid.
[456] Alexander, p. l.
[457] Halle and Keyser, p. 169.
[458] Tarlinskaja, p. 4.
[459] Ibid.
[460] Alexander, p. l.

recitations', but rather a definition of 'abstract principles […] whose effect on the sound of the recited verse is indirect'.[461] Marina Tarlinskaja has similarly distinguished between the metrical model and what she deems the 'actual stress'[462] of given texts – the latter being a '"neutral" oral rendering based on what a speaker knows about grammar, phonology, and the meaning of words and phrases in his language'.[463] This coheres with the Renaissance innovators who acknowledged that the 'set of rules' existed in the 'abstract', as a model to which a 'line of verse must conform rather than a way each line must sound.'[464] Just as Tarlinskaja emphasises that by 'actual' stressing she does not mean 'variants of performance by different modern actors', we will see (in the workshops to come) how actors today may attempt to avoid false orthodoxy.[465]

Where practitioners today indicate a concern for Shakespearean metre, it is representative of their wider appetite to discover, in the playwright's *elocutio*, clues that may add dimension to their role. Dickon Tyrrell stated how all Shakespearean verse should be considered 'specific'[466] to this degree, just as Brian Martin stated that wherever the 'rhythm will land' will elucidate what the 'character means.'[467] Martin spoke of the specific influence of Giles Block, the Master of the Word at Shakespeare's Globe,[468] who will typically run bespoke one-on-one sessions with actors, looking at the metre of their lines.[469] Chief importance is attributed to moments of metrical variation, which might indicate 'something happening to the character'.[470] Dickon Tyrrell offered the example of a character's psychological state be represented by an 'isolated […] eleventh beat' (as created by a feminine

---

[461] Halle and Keyser, pp. 171-2.
[462] Tarlinskaja, p. 258.
[463] Tarlinskaja, p. 4.
[464] Alexander, p. l.
[465] See especially Quartley, in Chapter Four and Chapter Seven (W7).
[466] Tyrrell, W1.
[467] Martin, W8.
[468] Block was appointed to this position by Mark Rylance (then Artistic Director) in 1999.
[469] Martin, W8. Echoed by: Tyrrell, W1; Sturzaker, W3; and Ferguson, W5. Cf. Ovens and Quartley on RSC sessions, W7.
[470] Martin, W8.

ending).[471] Such a viewpoint accords with the longstanding practice of Cicely Berry at the RSC, who suggested that a metrical variation indicates that 'something dramatic [is] happening, either within the […] play or with the feeling and behaviour of the character.'[472]

Marina Tarlinskaja's latest, comprehensive monograph represents a culmination of decades of work in her application of statistical verse analysis, the research allowing for a link to be made between complex metrical intricacies and the authorial stylistic fingerprint.[473] She has illustrated how the effects of verse technique can help us to 'interpret *dramatis personae*'[474] and, although her analysis is situated firmly in the realm of linguistics, dramatic practitioners today could benefit greatly from the influence of such authorial nuance in the selection of a motivation or action. I cite Tarlinskaja's latest work in specific depth, as it can enable a new consideration of verse concerns, in relation to practical engagement. As she situates the 'stylistic traits' of Shakespearean verse within its wider English Renaissance context,[475] drama practitioners should be encouraged to recognise the development of metre across the era, if they wish to distinguish Shakespeare's unique skill. And where previous metrical analysts have confined themselves to 'line endings' and the 'so-called "pauses" in mid-line indicated by punctuation', Tarlinskaja has searched for evidence of a greater range of features, twelve linguistic parameters, to analyse 'word and phrasal stressing and syllabic and grammatical particulars'.[476] Her entire research was undertaken by hand – as she is not satisfied that interpretive nuances of syllabic stress and syntax can presently be adequately programmed by computer – but the benefit of her industry is that others will be able to interpret her findings in

---

[471] Tyrrell, W1.
[472] Berry, p. 53; p.59.
[473] The work is 'an invaluable resource' for 'attribution research' – Peter Groves, review of Marina Tarlinskaja, *Shakespeare and the Versification of English Drama, 1561-1642* (2014), *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 66, issue 276 (Sept 2015), 775-777 (p. 776); her research offers a 'bonanza of new authorship leads' – Ward Elliot, review of Marina Tarlinskaja, *Shakespeare and the Versification of English Drama, 1561-1642* (2014), *Modern Philology*, 113, no.3 (February 2016), E152-E156 (p. E155).
[474] Tarlinskaja, p. 1.
[475] Tarlinskaja, p. 257.
[476] Ibid.

relation to her consistent set of parameters.[477]

Through such a study, we can witness Shakespeare's individual development as a playwright, whilst understanding how, at the most microscopic level, metrical choices depend upon individual moments in the local line in which they are placed. Shakespeare's style forms 'a complex relationship with the conventions of the epoch, school, and genre, which can sometimes prevail' over his individual identity. For example, Tarlinskaja notes that 'the style of early Shakespeare' is in certain ways more akin to 'older contemporaries, such as Kyd, Peele, or Greene', than it is to his own late style.[478] As McDonald has discussed, although the 'apprentice plays' display a 'metrical uniformity', with regularly end-stopped lines, Shakespeare almost immediately 'begins to undo' the 'aural imprint' with his rapid development of new variations;[479] where the early plays exhibit a 'rhythmic baseline' that exerts a 'constant and potentially uniform influence', such an effect gives way to a far greater range of 'metrical devices' which allow an actor 'greater flexibility.'[480] Aside from chronology, we also witness how the relationship of verse to character can change throughout an individual play. Taking the Shakespearean tragedies as examples, McDonald has remarked how each play 'begins by establishing a poetic baseline for the protagonist', before 'violating […the] norm as the action proceeds.'[481] Once the dramatic practitioner understands that Shakespeare's *elocutio* must be interpreted in relation to situational nuance, then any notion of a fixed, all-purpose technical orthodoxy is challenged.

If one prioritises an actor's performance outcome being a metronomic recitation of a regular iambic pattern, then one misses all of the substantive traits that allow Shakespeare's *elocutio* to serve as the basis for dramatic 'clues'.[482] It is verse variation that best serves the actor in a quest for a network of ever-changing, discrete actions. This was evidenced by my workshop actors, whilst also evoking the training

---

[477] Ibid.
[478] Ibid.
[479] McDonald, p. 95.
[480] McDonald, p. 106. Cf. Shakespeare's late verse dynamics, in Chapter Seven (W9).
[481] McDonald, p. 100.
[482] Cf. 'iambic fundamentalism', alluded to by Ferguson, W7.

context of the Lord Chamberlain's actors in the 1590s. They would have expected a 'basic congruence of thought to line' and, consequently, amidst generic 'metrical conventions' any '"deviations" stand out as clearly actable.'[483] By fully appreciating metrical variation, today's actor may find a greater range of textual performance prompts – where of course 'variation depends on a firmly established norm', as served by an iambic model.[484]

Halle and Keyser have previously spoken of such 'moments of "unmetrical" stress' as a poet's attempt 'to caricature metrically the sense of the line.'[485] But Tarlinskaja has significantly advanced the discussion, referring to the writer's deliberate use of such 'accentual "deviations"' as 'rhythmical italics' – which 'accompany and accentuate what is expressed in the line', enriching the 'verse semantics' (1). She evolved her term from James Bailey's definition of 'rhythmical figures' – which he used to refer to 'two-syllable and longer strings of deviations' from an iambic scheme.[486] When the 'rhythmical figures' of Bailey's definition are 'used to emphasize the meaning of a micro-situation' in a text, they become what Tarlinskaja calls '*rhythmical italics*' (31). Variation in metrical form is seen to collaborate, along with semantics, in forming the interpreted 'meaning' of a given line.

The greatest benefit of Tarlinskaja's latest work is that it establishes, through thorough detail and a vast data set, that poets had been moving '"objectively"' towards expressive 'rhythmical italics'. Verbs are particularly prevalent in such locations – more than double, where such metrical variation is concerned.[487] She finds countless examples of 'semantically motivated' (62) trochaic inversions, commencing with the work of the Earl of Surrey. One such example of his begins:

---

[483] Palfrey and Stern, p. 346.
[484] McDonald, p. 95.
[485] Halle and Keyser, p. 171.
[486] Tarlinskaja, p. 31. She references: James Bailey, *Toward a Statistical Analysis of English Verse: the Iambic Tetrameter of Ten Poets* (Lisse, Netherlands: The Peter de Ridder Press, 1975), p. 38.
[487] Tarlinskaja, p. 30.

'**Trembling** for age […]'.[488] In the later Renaissance the technique develops, Marlowe's '"muscular verse"' offering examples in the style of the line, '**Mounted** on steeds **swifter** than Pegasus'.[489] Even in the case of Thomas Kyd, who favoured 'adjectives and nouns with emotive connotations' for the beginnings of lines, we encounter openings with a verb of emphasis, such as: '**Strike, and strike** home […]'.[490] Clearly semantic meaning is galvanised by such an effect of versification. Tarlinskaja highlights such prevalence as part of 'the long poetic tradition' in the English language,[491] and rhythmical italics are consequently emphasised as strong mimetic devices – where many other metrists have confused the 'abstract scheme' of the metre with the 'stressing of actual lines' (270).

It is especially useful for today's actor to recognise that playwrights deliberately placed 'verbs of energetic motion' to coincide with metrical inversions (270). The mimicry of action in the verse can inspire a post-Stanislavskian search for an actor-character action. The actors of my study were very verse-conscious, in referring to their prospective character motivation. Whilst metrists and actors do not use the same terminology, they may both use exactly the same technical features of a playwright's *elocutio* to guide their interpretation.

The pivotal culmination of a metrical inversion and a verb of action is something that begins in the sixteenth century poetic rival of the iambic (where Chaucer had previously used a similar style of 'inversions' but for 'adjectives and adverbs').[492] The Earl of Surrey became, 'consciously or fortuitously', the inventor of 'de-facto rhythmical italics'.[493] Whether he intended it or not, his technique

---

[488] Ibid. Surrey's *Aeneid* (II. l.659), as quoted in Tarlinskaja, p. 46 (I retain her emphasis of bold type). See: Henry Howard, *The Second Book of Virgil's 'Aeneid'*, in *Poetical Works of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey: Minor Contemporaneous Poets and Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst*, ed. by Robert Bell (London: John W. Parker and Son, 1854), p. 164.
[489] *1 Tamburlaine* (I.ii.94), as illustrated by Tarlinskaja, p. 63; see Christopher Marlowe, *Tamburlaine, Parts One and Two*, ed. by Anthony B. Dawson (London: Bloomsbury, 2003), p. 18.
[490] Tarlinskaja, p. 63. See Thomas Kyd, *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. by J. R. Mulryne and Andrew Gurr (London: Bloomsbury, 2009), III.xiii.7.
[491] Tarlinskaja, p. 269. English iambs are seen to offer greater metrical licence than 'counterpart' metres in German and Russian, p. 7.
[492] Tarlinskaja, p. 280; p. 279.
[493] Tarlinskaja, p. 286; p. 283.

'looked like rhythmical italics and functioned like rhythmical italics'; crucially, it was interpreted thus by 'later sixteenth-century poets', definitively influencing dramatic application, in the hands of writers such as Marlowe (283).

Following Surrey's progressive reintroduction of iambic pentameter, Norton and Sackville's *Gorboduc* provided 'the first original iambic pentameter play' in an Early Modern English vernacular (52). Whilst the 'Early New English period of 1541-87'[494] was an era of growth, and the more progressive rhythmical italics had been 'consolidated',[495] dramatic verse often followed a 'rigid feet-thumping and cliché-filled rhythm', as evidenced in the work of Kinwelmarshe and Hughes. Thus the innovations of Marlowe and Kyd may seem especially striking by comparison. Tarlinskaja has spoken of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* as generating its own specific 'versification style', introducing the Marlovian practice of 'super-long words' and the 'disyllabic suffix *–ion*', which marked the 'elevated genre of tragedy' and most probably introduced – for the stage players – a 'specific declamation mode'.[496] This was complemented by (and possibly preceded by) Kyd's own use of 'long polysyllables to prompt a special "tragic" intonation at the end of his lines'.[497]

In Chapter Four we will consider the performed outcome of the Shakespearean text and discuss the issues regarding an actor's direct vocalisation of the verse (where this aspect of the actor's role is rhetorically represented by *pronuntiatio*). Naturally, present-day pronunciation may not reflect Renaissance usage. However, it is worth briefly anticipating pronunciation issues by highlighting that: (i) period pronunciation of a given word could itself vary; and (ii) what constituted a 'syllable' was itself debatable during the Renaissance. From the explicit vocalisation down to the microscopic and syllabic, in practice and in theory, Renaissance verse represents interpretive 'doubts and choices'. This is another

---

[494] Tarlinskaja, p. 66.
[495] Ibid.
[496] Tarlinskaja, p. 67.
[497] This hinges on whether *The Spanish Tragedy* predates *1 Tamburlaine*. Ibid.

reason that present-day actors might wish to avoid the constraints of Shakespearean 'verse orthodoxy'.[498]

Even in the 'texts themselves' there is indication that the 'Early New English […] stressing pattern in many words was still variable' (41). Tarlinskaja illustrates this: the verbs 'conflict' and 'contract' were both stressed on their second syllable (x/), but in their noun form their pronunciation 'vacillated' between (/x) and (x/);[499] 'French borrowings', such as '*citee, countree*, and *fortune*' are seen to have often retained their 'French way' of stress 'on the second syllable' (42); English 'compounds with derivational suffixes' (words ending for example in '-*hod/hood*, -*ful*, -*less*') are regarded as arguably retaining 'some stressing' on the suffixes, which 'retained some meaning for a long time' (43); similarly, there may be an 'optional secondary stress' on the 'native English suffix '–*ness(e)*', possibly due to 'analogy with the French '*suffix –ess(e)*'; and finally, there is a case for native English words being stressed on their second syllable 'for phonetic reasons', such as the word '*ladie*', for example (43). However, such latter examples can usually be regarded as 'remnants of stressing' (41) by the time Surrey's *Aeneid* extracts were published[500] – they are evident uses of a '"convenience" secondary stress', that helped to 'ease the poet's challenges of composition'.[501]

At the deeper theoretical level, there is even ambiguity over the definition of 'what combinations of sounds' could be 'considered a syllable in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries' (11). This discussion extends to the overall framework of supposed metrical rules, where what is requisite and what is forbidden in a given metre fluctuate through the ages. For this reason, Tarlinskaja assessed the overall frequency of devices to ascertain 'what lines were still within the orbit of a poet's metrical system' at any given time (32).

---

[498] Again, cf. iambic fundamentalism.
[499] Tarlinskaja, p. 41.
[500] Surrey's translations were actually published posthumously (Book 4 in 1554, and Book 2 in 1557), during the reign of Mary I – even though they were written during the reign of Henry VIII; Surrey had been unfortunate enough to be executed by royal proclamation in January 1547, just days before the king's own death.
[501] Tarlinskaja, p. 48.

In spite of these rich complexities, there are features in a playwright's *elocutio* that can be considered to be conspicuous and deliberate. Many of my workshop actors evidenced a search for such features, as useful rehearsal prompts for character motivation. Amongst these features, line-endings play an especially important role. Tarlinskaja speaks of three variations: 'masculine endings' (where the line terminates 'on position 10' – whether 'stressed or unstressed');[502] 'feminine endings' (formed by lines that end with eleven syllables, where the tenth syllable is 'always stressed');[503] and 'dactylic' endings (formed by lines of twelve syllables).[504] The twelve-syllable dactylic line may of course be alternatively labelled as a 'hexameter' line. However, Tarlinskaja stresses the use of dactylic line-endings for occasions where 'an afterthought' follows the 'semantic point' of the main utterance, thus creating a 'mirroring [of] the 'characteristics of English speech' (26). Famously, 'enjambments' (run-on lines) can result; both feminine and dactylic endings create adjacent verse lines that 'favour syntactic boundaries at their juncture' (27). It ought to be emphasised that enjambment also frequently occurs with masculine line-endings. Late Shakespeare sees a growth in such lines 'caused by unstressed grammatical words on syllable 10' (126).

It is easier to spot variations than to ascertain how they might influence an actor's performance. Nevertheless, Tarlinskaja suggests notable stylistic markers can be found. For example, 'compound feminine endings' – those which end on a monosyllabic word (124) – indicate 'less constrained versification' (125), and this is something that rises in *Hamlet* to 4.9% of lines. This is still outweighed, however, by the simple feminine endings (with their polysyllabic words – which form 18.4% of line endings in *Hamlet*),[505] the overall effect remains one of notable rebellion.

---

[502] Tarlinskaja, p. 124.
[503] Ibid.
[504] Ibid. More conventionally a 'dactyl' refers to a trisyllabic foot (stressed as / x x). Where syllables on positions 10, 11 and 12 are stressed in this manner (/ x x), the position 10 syllable is really forming the final syllable of an iambic foot; positions 11 and 12 could alternatively be regarded as a pyrrhic foot (stressed as x x). Tarlinskaja's label of 'dactyl' might therefore seem undesirable.
[505] Tarlinskaja, p. 125.

One feature to be wary of however is 'disyllabic variants' – as created by suffixes on certain words (such as '–*ion*' and '-*ious*') – which have previously been discussed. Tarlinskaja dismisses the common myth that such a usage is general to plays of 'archaic' authorship (27), as she could not find evidence of such usage that predates the plays of Kyd and Marlowe. She thus regards those two playwrights as inventors of the disyllabic fad – using polysyllabic words to end on position 10 of a verse line. A specific tragic 'intonation', the 'magniloquent effect of Marlowe's famous verse,' was thus created – even if it is impossible to fully understand 'how actors articulated such endings' (28). However, one might infer that the statistical drop in usage indicates that the trend swiftly 'sounded obsolete' to the Jacobean ear (56). And such a practice was also local to line endings – for example, in *1 Tamburlaine* the word 'soldiers' is disyllabic when used in the mid-line,[506] but it becomes an affected trisyllable when used to close a line: 'With twenty thousand expert **sol-di-ers**'.[507] Similarly Kyd, in *The Spanish Tragedy* favours a disyllabic suffix '-*ion*' throughout – where the end of a line is concerned. When such a suffix is placed mid-line, the suffix '-*ion*' can become a single syllable, as in: 'Did urge her re-so-lu-**tion** to be such.'[508] Not only can it therefore be misleading to apply fixed technical rules to the entire Renaissance era – or even a general smaller period[509] – but it becomes specific to a playwright, a stage of his career and even the local moment, within a line of his verse. All of the above is significant, when one considers a wider culture of dramatic verse orthodoxy, and the example of an actor today wondering whether or not a word should be pronounced as a disyllable.

---

[506] *1 Tamburlaine*, II.vi.34: 'Resolve, my lords and loving sold-iers, now'. Cf. Tarlinskaja, p. 57.
[507] Ibid. *1 Tamburlaine*, II.v.25.
[508] Quoted in Tarlinskaja, p. 58 (see cites IV.iii.178). See *The Spanish Tragedy,* ed. by Mulryne and Gurr – where the line occurs in IV.iv. (p. 121).
[509] There were other plays of the 1590s that did not follow suit. *The Misfortunes of Arthur* was 'even more rigid than *Jocasta*, written 20 years earlier', Tarlinskaja, p. 64. As the courtly audience of *Arthur* was distinct from those of the popular playhouses, such a practice is thus regarded as 'a matter of choice and style rather than a clear indication of the epoch' (Tarlinskaja, pp. 65-66). See: George Gascoigne, *Jocasta,* in *A Hundred Sundrie Flowres*, ed. by G. W. Pigman III (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000; repr. 2008); the play was co-authored with Francis Kinwelmershe and was first performed at Gray's Inn, in 1566. Cf. Thomas Hughes, *The Misfortunes of Arthur* (London: Robert Robinson, 1587; repr. by John S. Farmer for Tudor Facsimile Texts, 1911); this play also had a number of co-authors.

Where dialogue is concerned, we may encounter so-called '"split" lines' of verse, as shared between two speakers.[510] Whilst this is a notable technique in isolation, its usage across Shakespeare's plays is much less common than the other devices. In early Shakespeare it is found especially infrequently, *The Taming of the Shrew* having just 41 lines of this nature even if, at its Shakespearean height (in *Antony and Cleopatra*) it does account for as many as 18% of the lines.[511] Feminine endings, by comparison, are much more widespread, forming 13.5% of the lines in *The Comedy of Errors* and 35.6% of the lines in *The Tempest* (124). And, as for the occurrence of rhythmical italics, these are discovered at a rate of 42 lines per 1,000 in *The Taming of the Shrew* but rise imposingly to 194.7 lines per 1,000 in *Macbeth* and 206.2 lines per 1,000 in *The Tempest* (135). For this reason, in preparation for each of my Shakespeare workshops, I produced a manually marked-up text, noting the presence of feminine endings and rhythmical italics. 'Split lines' featured less frequently in my workshops, but the aforementioned study of Rokison contains such a feature as an extended consideration.[512]

Above all, one must remember that metrists are not imposing 'line readings' (the direction of actors to say lines with a specific intonation) – their theories were never intended as acting guides, but instead represent the conflict between an abstract metrical pattern and a given playwright's use of stylistic variations. The presence of prominent text practitioners at institutions such as the RSC and Shakespeare's Globe is evidence of the value that can be attributed to an interpretation of a playwright's *elocutio*. And the expertise of metrists could play a significant role in guiding text practitioners and actors towards the best-suited features of the verse. The late Cicely Berry listed key verse variations and we may note how closely her chosen features correspond with those recognised by Tarlinskaja. Berry lists: 'feminine endings',[513] 'short lines' (65), 'over-full lines' (66), 'long lines' (that is, hexameters), 'split lines' (67), 'rhyme' (73) and 'final

---

[510] See Chapter 7 of the thesis, for an extended discussion of this feature.
[511] This is using Tarlinskaja's data, to provide a consistency of comparison. Tarlinkskaja, p. 133.
[512] See Chapter 7.
[513] Berry, p. 62.

rhyming couplets' (78) as specific features of interest. It is not coincidental that we witness a convergence: my workshop actors, McDonald, Palfrey and Stern, Tarlinskaja and Berry all select the same (or very similar) features of Shakespearean *elocutio* as indicative of how 'the smallest metrical units' may 'convey the passion' of a speaker.[514] For the purposes of my workshops, I chose to focus an analysis on the most frequent markers in Shakespearean usage.

I conclude with a famous illustration, in order to illustrate the varying degrees of license that metrists permit in verse variation. In King Lear's declaration of 'Never, never, never, never, never!',[515] we are given five consecutive trochaic feet. Halle and Keyser note that 'standard theory formulates allowable deviations in terms of feet', such as trochaic inversions. However, they state that whilst such trochaic feet are 'admissible in iambic lines, they must not be consecutive,' as this would 'render the line unmetrical […]'.[516] In this manner, Lear's line might be categorised as 'unmetrical'. Tarlinskaja recognises that – in its driest reading – the line might be regarded as 'a bland "headless" line with a feminine ending'. However, she contrastingly favours the much more creative prospect that the line 'might be interpreted as five cases of rhythmical italics'.[517] In this way she brings us back to the notion of the playwright's deliberate artistry, a dramatic rhetoric that anticipates the performance of an actor and nuanced characterisation. Tarlinskaja's reading is no less interpretive than other metrists, but the volume of her data analysis,[518] her wide appreciation of the Renaissance context,[519] and her consideration of a playwright's deliberate dramatic usage are all a significant aid to theatre practitioners today, who are offered specific technical insight into Shakespearean *elocutio*.

---

[514] McDonald, p. 98.
[515] William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of King Lear*, in *the RSC Complete Works*, V.iii.325.
[516] Halle and Keyser, p. 167.
[517] Tarlinskaja, p. 135.
[518] It is a 'comprehensive work […] to be acknowledged as seminal' – R. G. Sumillera, review of Marina Tarlinskaja, *Shakespeare and the Versification of English Drama, 1561-1642* (2014), *Language and Literature*, 25 (2016), 399-402 (p. 402).
[519] […] no one is apt to survey the field as fully and carefully as she has done' – Jay L. Halio, review of Marina Tarlinskaja, *Shakespeare and the Versification of English Drama, 1561-1642* (2014), *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 67 no. 2 (2016), 266-269 (p. 269).

Chapter 4: Interpreting Shakespeare's Dramatic Rhetoric

Having discussed the pertinent features of Shakespeare's *elocutio*, in this chapter I will assess key British Shakespearean approaches to acting that developed during the second half of the twentieth century. I will relate these to two significant developments: (i) the foundation of the Royal Shakespeare Company; and (ii) the opening of Shakespeare's Globe on Bankside. In this manner I will establish something of the present-day Shakespearean theatrical ecology within which is situated rehearsal practice, and its anticipation of a performed event. I will continue to focus on text-orientated techniques, and thus illustrate how the concerns of Shakespearean *elocutio* are interpreted in contemporary rehearsal. Leading Shakespearean figures, like the post-Stanislavskians of Chapter Two, will serve important purpose throughout the workshop accounts of Part Two.

Following Renaissance taxonomy, the rhetorical event of the performance is represented by *pronuntiatio* (otherwise referred to as *actio*) – which is itself divided between '*Voyce* and *Gesture*'.[520] Performed outcomes warrant their own much larger study, and one could conduct an assessment based on voice or movement specialists; the former represented by figures such as the late Cicely Berry (voice director at the RSC from 1969-2014) or Patsy Rodenburg (Head of Voice at the Guildhall School of Music and Drama), the latter represented by renowned practitioners such as Vsevolod Meyerhold (1874-1940) and Rudolf Laban (1879-1958). However, given the early rehearsal focus of my workshops, in this thesis I continue to prioritise techniques of close textual analysis that represent the earliest engagement between actor and text, the 'table-work' period. This is naturally done in anticipation of the textual techniques represent a performed outcome, in the form of a staged actor-character.

---

[520] Fraunce, Book II, Cap.1.

<u>The RSC</u>

Close textual analysis is particularly associated with the nascent incarnation of the Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC), as represented by the practice of the renowned theatre directors Peter Hall and John Barton. Hall was the leading figure in the foundation of the RSC as an ensemble company, which received its chartered corporation name in March 1961,[521] and he was joined by Barton, who served as an associate director. Hall is especially dominant, where his later artistic direction of the National Theatre cemented his position as arguably the most influential theatre director in post-war Britain; he was at the forefront of what Michael Billington has described as the shift in British theatre from the 'haphazard chaos of commercialism towards the coherence of subsidy.'[522] And it must be remembered that, although today both the RSC and the National are perceived as 'grant-consuming behemoths and icons of Establishment power' (140), in their earliest years both theatres represented a 'theatrical idealism and youthful optimism' that had yet to take form. Hall became almost monolithic as a symbol in the establishment of both companies.

It is seemingly impossible to separate the reception of Peter Hall's writings on technique from his wider reputation. His most significant writing on Shakespearean practice was written very late in his career, in the form of his manual, *Shakespeare's Advice to the Players*.[523] It was thus arguably produced chiefly with a sense of legacy in mind, at considerable distance from his time at the RSC. By contrast, John Barton's well-known manual, *Playing Shakespeare*,[524] has a very different genesis; Melvyn Bragg commissioned a television series to investigate 'the difficulties and techniques of speaking verse',[525] working in partnership with the

---

[521] Billington, p. 133. The RSC's history dates back to the creation of the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre Ltd., incorporated in 1875. <http://www.rsc.org.uk/about-us/history/> [accessed 16 May 2016].

[522] Billington, p. 161. Cf. Chapter One on the shifting post-war landscape.

[523] Peter Hall, *Shakespeare's Advice to the Players* (London: Oberon, 2004).

[524] John Barton, *Playing Shakespeare* (London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, 1984; reissued with DVD 2009; repr. 2014).

[525] Trevor Nunn, 'Foreword', in Barton, p. viii.

RSC across a two-part masterclass, broadcast in 1979.[526] Barton led nine further workshops which became the *Playing Shakespeare* series.[527] And it is transcript excerpts from this series that serve as the basis for Barton's book. For helpful illustration, one can of course consult recordings of the televised series. However, the text also offers additional transcripts of material that was never televised – analysing Shakespeare's treatment of prose and discussing the nature of 1980s 'contemporary Shakespeare'.

Significantly, we are addressing Shakespeareans in relation to their modern contexts; Hall and Barton explicitly anticipate performance outcomes that reflect this, as opposed to 'original practice' theatre (which we will come to discuss). Hall stated that the aim is not to recreate 'authentic performance as Shakespeare would have seen it'. Firstly, language 'must change or die', and accordingly, with the 'disappearance of the original words', the form of the text will also disappear.[528] Secondly, 'performance fashions' must change, reflecting 'subtle alterations in the audience's sensibilities'.[529] Ironically, Hall's RSC practice later elicited this same form of reaction, by the time that company came to represent industry orthodoxy. Mark Rylance has more recently commented on practice at the reproduction Shakespeare's Globe (where he was Artistic Director, 1995-2005). In the interview, which forms part of a wider online Globe archive project, Rylance suggests that actors were (and are) trying 'to get clear of the very successful RSC forms of the 70s and 80s' and create something new.[530] Whilst the statement does not offer any technical specifics, it is an important source in revealing the spirit of engagement. Rylance's viewpoint is undoubtedly textured by his performances at the RSC in the

---

[526] 'Royal Shakespeare Company Masterclass', *The South Bank Show,* London Weekend Television, 9 December and 16 December 1979.
[527] *Playing Shakespeare,* nine-episode series, London Weekend Television, 29 July – 23 September 1982.
[528] Hall, p. 10.
[529] Ibid.
[530] Dan Poole and Giles Terera, 'Mark Rylance Interview', *Muse of Fire: the Resource*, online video recording, Shakespeare's Globe website <https://globeplayer.tv/museoffire?utf8=✓&per=99999> [accessed 6 October 2016]. Further references to Muse of Fire interviews have the same URL source and date of access.

late 1980s.[531] He highlights his belief in the cyclical need for change; at the end of an era 'people forget why' a specific acting style was 'natural', before young pretenders emerge and – initially to great criticism – start performing in a new style.[532]

Regardless of generational developments however, one must also recognise how seamlessly actors' careers can span across eras. Many members of Barton's workshop company – notably Ian McKellen and Judi Dench – still champion certain lessons learnt from rehearsal rooms long-passed.[533] And it is misleading to suggest that all RSC work takes place under an especially fixed banner. Actors differ significantly in their dispositions. Where Ben Kingsley has described Shakespeare's verse influencing the very 'metabolism of the listener',[534] Michael Gambon (a contemporary of Kingsley's at the RSC)[535] is nonchalantly dismissive, especially of any requirement for a specific verse technique – there is 'a beat there anyway, which you pick up if you're reasonably bright'.[536]

As Hall published his manual in 2004, at some distance from the peak of his RSC influence, we have a curious split chronology. His manual is a culmination of an extensively Shakespearean career, which also represents techniques as a form of bequeathed legacy. Hall suggests devices of Shakespearean *elocutio* serve a timeless function, in the functional nature of the advice offered to the actor, whilst he ostensibly acknowledges the necessity to respond to shifts in the fashion of outward performance style, represented by the actor's manifest *pronuntiatio*. Many of the dramatic-rhetorical features of the text have sustained across centuries, whilst dramatic-rhetorical performance style, as exemplified in a reception of 1980s RSC practice, has already become dated. There is a common industry sense of a Hall legacy of performance orthodoxy, which Rylance has referred to as Hall's 'laws'

---

[531] Dickon Tyrrell similarly spoke of how acting has probably 'moved on again' from the 'lavish 80s performances'. Tyrrell, W1.
[532] Rylance, in Poole and Terera.
[533] *Playing Shakespeare* – interviews are on the publication's attached DVD.
[534] Dan Poole and Giles Terera, 'Ben Kingsley Interview', *Muse of Fire: The Resource*.
[535] Gambon played King Lear in Adrian Noble's 1982 production.
[536] Dan Poole and Giles Terera, 'Michael Gambon Interview', *Muse of Fire: The Resource*.

about Shakespeare.[537] And in this sense, Hall's persona and promotion of a style of verse delivery have been received as immutable features – even if, at times, this contradicts his stated spirit of engagement.

Conventionally Hall and Barton are, through a 'presumption of near-identity', branded with the same RSC stamp that they both helped to forge.[538] Indeed, Hall's formidable influence often subsumes Barton's legacy, as a result.[539] However, the dispositions of each director are markedly different, as will be illustrated by the direct assessment of the their manual extracts across my Shakespeare workshops account.[540]

Hall's manual is particularly distinct from typical late-twentieth -century/early-twenty-first-century drama manuals, in that he directly discusses rhetoric in its dramatic function and he consistently responds to the microscopic mechanics of authorial *elocutio*;[541] he asserts that actors must 'understand the author's formal demands, [to] have some chance of representing them in modern terms'.[542] Consequently he discusses a broad range of features related to *elocutio*, such as: metre, caesuras, monosyllabic lines, pauses, rhyme, prose transition, and other rhetorical devices. There is a conspicuous link to dramatic rhetoric in Renaissance terms, and one finds clear similarity in the devices selected by my workshop actors (often as a result of RSC influence).[543] Furthermore, Hall's approach exemplifies a division of rhetoric in a specifically Ramist manner, as he investigates how devices of *elocutio* may inspire a precise form of vocalised performance, in the actor's *pronuntiatio*. Many aspects resonate with a Ramist approach. Hall highlights metaphor and simile, where for Abraham Fraunce

---

[537] Rylance, quoted in Poole and Terera; cf. Tyrrell, in Chapter Five (W1) and Quartley, in Chapter Seven (W7).

[538] Michael Cordner, '(Mis)Advising Shakespeare's Players' in *Shakespeare Survey Volume 66: Working with Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), (p.110-128) p. 111.

[539] See Cordner, in reference to John Russell Brown, 'Introduction', in John Russell Brown, ed. *The Routledge Companion to Directors' Shakespeare* (London, Routledge: 2008), pp.x-xi; cf. Cordner, p. 111.

[540] See Part Two.

[541] Cf. Chapter Three.

[542] Hall, p. 10.

[543] See Chapter Three.

metaphor and synecdoche were also key tropes.[544] Ramist qualities of a 'poeticall dimension' (Cap. 15), which relate to the *form* of the poetic writing in question, dominate Hall's analysis: he refers to 'the sanctity of the line',[545] verse being the cornerstone of his directorial approach.[546] Similarly, Hall discusses various forms of repetition, where the 'the repetition of words and sounds' (Cap. 16) in Fraunce's assessment pertained to the domain of 'Orators' (Cap. 15), although both sources differ in taxonomy and in their selection of figures (for example, Fraunce describes *Anaphora*, where Hall discusses devices such as alliteration).

Above all however, Hall's account focuses on the essential figure of 'antithesis', which reliably represents a key component of Renaissance rhetoric and, more importantly, Shakespeare's specific style. In the former sense this is illustrated in Fraunce's selection of the figure of *Epanados* (a 'regression, turning to the same sound'),[547] which shows shades of potential *antimetabole* (a form of *Epanodos* that is directly antithetical). In the latter sense, Russ McDonald has described how Shakespeare 'found in the Ciceronian stylists a syntactical shape hospitable to his most profound habit of mind', this habit being marked by an 'unfailing passion for antithesis.'[548] It is in the second section of his manual that Hall then provides close-readings of 'twenty key speeches' from Shakespeare, and we see detailed illustration of how a close concern for *elocutio* and its most profound dynamic of shifting, antithetical thought patterns can inspire an actor's performance.[549]

Barton's manual is similarly dominated by text-based issues, but he organises the discussion across larger topics, as representing a contrast between so-called 'objective' and 'subjective' notions.[550] In the former section, highlights include: a discussion of Elizabethan demands contrasted with those of modern acting; a

---

[544] Fraunce, Cap 2., A3
[545] Hall, p. 24.
[546] Dickon Tyrrell mentioned how Hall's work was 'all about the verse', which was 'incredibly intimidating' to experience as a younger actor. Tyrrell, W1.
[547] Fraunce, Cap. 23, D4.
[548] McDonald, p. 117.
[549] As extensively quoted in Part Two of this thesis.
[550] Barton, p. v.

comparison between heightened speech and 'naturalistic verse'; use of prose; and, an actor's direct address of his audience. In his second section, on 'subjective' matters, Barton predominantly discusses: tonal issues of irony and ambiguity; 'passion' contrasted with 'coolness'; and ideas relating to 'contemporary' Shakespeare. The resultant text is indicative of Barton's deliberative directing style, based on dialogue with actors. The 'spirit' of Barton's approach may appear more forgiving and collaborative than Hall's, where Hall might be seen as didactic or even prescriptive by comparison.

Both Hall and Barton agree that the era of acting is deeply significant, and that the style of acting will always be in flux. Hall describes the typical cycle of a 'revolution in acting style' occurring roughly 'every twenty years'; there will be a need for the 'next defining actor' to 'arrive', once a generation is replete with actors full of 'clichés'.[551] In Stanislavskian terms, one might regard the style of certain members of the older generation as then becoming 'stock-in-trade'. Barton agrees that practitioners are 'products of a particular time'.[552] Ian McKellen (speaking in the 1980s) stated that 'the style of acting against which modern actors, of whatever generation they come from, rebel, is not so much the style of the writing as the style of the actors of the previous generation'.[553] In this sense, the written-in stylistics of the dramatic text (its *elocutio*) could be regarded as fixed, where the outward performance style (the manifest *pronuntiatio*) is ever-changing, and something that we can retrospectively assign to an era.

The most important factor to consider, in terms of the context of Hall and Barton's practice, is the extraordinary theatre landscape of the period. In recognising the demands for the conception of a unique RSC 'style', we can better understand the need for rehearsal to engage in close textual scrutiny. Here I will not make an extended account of Hall's own narrative, that reaffirms a technique based upon

---

[551] Hall, p. 191.
[552] Barton, p. 7.
[553] Ian McKellen, quoted in Barton, p. 20.

'scholarly interests'.[554] Firstly, Michael Cordner and Abigail Rokison have already described such claims in detail.[555] Secondly, the claims are slightly bold to say the least, where Cordner has described how Hall 'contrives' to cite the technical basis of his practice 'back as far as 1660', creating a long pedagogical chain that reached him via the 'Poel Principals'.[556] William Poel, F R Leavis (the 'abrasive iconoclast')[557] and George Rylands – the 'senior mentor' of Cambridge University's Marlowe Society, are his three figures of influence (187). Barton, contrastingly, makes no such claims of 'apostolic succession'.[558] But Hall's account is well-served by others and, as with my post-Stanislavskian directors, I will chiefly focus on the professional theatre environment in which Hall and Barton operated, rather than extrapolate from personal pedagogical backgrounds.

When offered the directorship of the Stratford Festival in 1958, Hall responded by suggesting the creation of the RSC; he was twenty-seven and felt he had 'nothing to lose' (23) – John Barton was also a near contemporary. But they both faced the obstacle of the era's uniquely broad range of acting styles. Hall encountered 'three kinds of actor': (i) 'old boys from the past who boomed and bellowed their sonorous generalities'; (ii) the 'men of the '30s, bred on Maugham, Coward and Rattigan', who 'had a tendency to make all verse sound apologetic, like understated prose'; and (iii) 'the young actors, Method-based', of diverse accents and voices, who were products of a 'new orthodoxy' in acting, to 'be yourself at all costs.'[559] To create a coherent company approach, it was therefore critical to establish rehearsal techniques of close text analysis, whilst cultivating a specific style of verse delivery; 'the verse-speaking' defined 'the Company style' of the time.[560]Actors were encouraged to identify the rhythmic qualities of a line and find

---

[554] Cordner, p. 111.
[555] Rokison, pp. 29-35.
[556] Hall, p. 191-195; Rokison, p. 29. Cf. Chapter One, and my reference to Poel's problematic practice of actor orchestration.
[557] Hall, p. 188.
[558] Cordner, p. 115.
[559] Hall, p. 201.
[560] Hall, pp. 203-205.

'an emotion that [justified] the tempo' (37). Hall's concerns of verse delivery were focused on clarity and a consistent company practice, they did not equate to Renaissance *pronuntiatio* in aesthetic terms – with an aim to sound 'pleasant to the eares'[561] – but he gravitated towards a specific form of vocal delivery nonetheless. At the youthful RSC there were 'regular verse classes', led by Barton, Hall and others prominent practitioners – each session open to the full company.[562] Trevor Nunn agrees with Hall's assessment, that it was this 'method and principle of an approach to acting Shakespeare' which was 'fundamental' to the RSC in its foundation.[563] It is only Barton who has softened the association with a 'new style' of Shakespeare – instead favouring the notion of 'an existing tradition' being 'perhaps moved […] on a little.'[564]

Both Hall and Barton approached Shakespeare rehearsals with a primary consideration for the text, and the many aspects that stand for the playwright's *elocutio* – tropes, figures and metrical style. In this regard they can be seen as more rhetoric-orientated than many of their contemporaries. However, their dispositions were very different. Hall closes his manual stating that he remains 'very flattered' that he was once referred to as an '"iambic fundamentalist"'.[565] Barton, by contrast, begins and ends *Playing Shakespeare* with a reassurance that he does not serve as 'the high priest' whilst analysing a text.[566] He recognises that the artificial nature of the condensed workshop sessions and the need for pithy practical summary may result in his statements appearing as formulated 'rules' (193). However, he consistently emphasises that his process represents 'a way of thinking' rather than an assertion that there 'is *only* [one] way a particular speech can be done' (133).

Post-Stanislavskian developments start to become highly influential in this era. Yet for Hall, this chiefly emboldens him to stand firm against the 'elaboration'

---

[561] Fraunce, 'The Secone Booke', Cap.1.
[562] Hall, p. 203.
[563] Nunn, in Barton, p. viii.
[564] Barton, p. 207.
[565] Hall, p. 209. Cf. 'iambic fundamentalism' in Chapter Six (W5).
[566] Barton, p. 193 (cf. p. 7).

of Stanislavski's diaries in the form of the 'American Method'.[567] He claims that the Method is a 'strictly non-verbal' style of acting, an 'emotional rather than verbal' technique. Yet (with problematic overtones), he infers this based upon implications of its nascence amongst 'immigrant actors whose first language was not English' (193). Halls main frustration is that the 'Method' promoted the 'personal qualities' and 'idiosyncrasies' of the individual actor, over 'the clear speaking of a text' (197). Barton, on the other hand, like his workshop actors, appreciates the wider post-Stanislavskian influences of the era. He states:

> Our tradition is based more than we are usually conscious of on various modern influences like Freud and […] above all, the teachings of […] Stanislavski.[568]

McKellen reiterated both the above point and Barton's notion of marrying 'Two Traditions':[569] (i) contemporary acting style and (ii) the style of the Renaissance text. Unlike Hall, Barton recognises a Stanislavskian approach on its own terms, and also sees this as a significant rehearsal-room influence: post-Stanislavskian acting is one key partner in the marriage of 'Two Traditions'.

Post-Stanislavskian practice still seems to have influenced Hall to some degree. He speaks of the actor's task to discover the 'motive, the *why*' of a character – a 'creative task' that remains the actor's prerogative. And he in fact surpasses my core post-Stanislavskian directors by some distance, straying into the forbidden areas of direct emoting. He describes the actor being able to 'endorse feelings in himself which support the form that Shakespeare's text has given him.'[570] He suggests the selection of an emotion that is 'credible, and not indulgent' might regulate American-Method impropriety (22). But, by evoking 'emotion', Hall's techniques share much more with the 'American Method' than my post-Stanislavskian directors, who favour the notion that any emotion is a by-product of the actor-character's performance of an objective. Whilst Hall curiously anticipates a performance of

---

[567] Hall, p. 18.
[568] Barton, p. 8.
[569] McKellen, in Barton, p. 182; Barton, p. 6.
[570] Hall, p. 13.

emoting, his general credo is straightforward: that the 'word is the beginning', from which any character considerations are derived (55). He regards the text as 'a complex score that demands to be read as a piece of music' (18). The 'score' is a fixed pattern of 'rhetorical devices' which are timelessly 'built into the verse' (58).[571] But, once the text has been closely considered, the chosen dramatic expression demands 'reinventing by the individual actor'.[572]

John Barton comes much closer to my post-Stanislavskians in his practice. He believes modern acting can be reduced to the actor's identification of an 'intention',[573] whilst also anticipating a potential friction with literary-theoretical developments, with the implication that Shakespeare 'always has a character's conscious intention in mind'.[574] Here we find that very crux of the divide between the actor's inference, as based on a playwright's *elocutio*, and the actor's necessary performative task. Barton warns that modern theatrical '"characterisation"' originates in 'a mid-nineteenth century' usage, where the term '"character"' originates a 'hundred years earlier'.[575] The present *OED* cites 'characterisation' – in its theatrical context – as first appearing in a translation from August Schlegel; it is the English term for the German word *Charakteristik*.[576] The *OED* actually offers an earlier entry – a play by Dryden – as the first written use of 'character' for 'a person portrayed in a work of fiction'.[577] Similarly Barton states that '"motivation"' is a 'twentieth-century' term, and one that has not even entered the *OED*, in the contemporary actor's use of the word.[578] He thus submits that taxonomic concerns indicate how different the 'acting style' (of his 1980s RSC company) 'would have

---

[571] Cf. Hall, p. 205.
[572] Hall, pp. 58 and 207.
[573] Barton, p. 9.
[574] Ibid.
[575] Barton, p. 10.
[576] August Wilhelm von Schlegel, *A course of lectures on dramatic art and literature*, trans. by John Black (London: Baldwin, Cradock and Joy, 1815).
[577] 'He may be allow'd sometimes to Err, who undertakes to move so many Characters and Humours as are requisite in a Play.' John Dryden, *The rival ladies: a tragi-comedy* (London: William Wilson, 1664), Ded. sig. A2.
[578] Barton, p. 10.

seemed to the Elizabethans.'[579] But this is countered by Ian McKellen's response, that in spite of contemporary 'jargon' terms, the actors of Shakespeare's era would have been aware of the 'feeling behind […] "motivation"'.[580] Later in this chapter we will consider the relationship between Renaissance passions, as indicated by the Renaissance part script (or roll) and present-day intentions, as inferred by a dramatic character in full textual context. But at this juncture, it is important to highlight that Barton and his company were clearly conscious of post-Stanislavskian influences on their own terms, whilst engaging in continual dialogue about transhistorical Shakespearean issues.

Significantly, Barton champions a key Stanislavskian sentiment, in his dismissal of emotive acting: 'playing the *quality*' alone is regarded as 'bad acting', where 'going for the intention' is 'more interesting and alive and human'.[581] In this way, he promotes Stanislavskian 'experiencing' above emotive acting. To frame such intentions, Barton suggests – similarly to Hall – that the 'heightened speech' of a Shakespearean play 'must be something that the actor, or rather the character he's playing, *finds for himself* because he *needs* those words and images to express his intention' (18). The 'nature of the language tells us about the nature of the character', as far as one might even claim 'the language *is* the character' (59). In the nuances of *elocutio*, Barton finds the suggestion of a network of intention that might fashion a character, in the same manner as a post-Stanislavskian approach. Indeed, for Barton, this is the only way to marry the 'two traditions', of the Renaissance text and the modern actor (66).

In the Shakespeare workshops, considerable attention was directed towards an application of actioning, as it presented fresh territory for discovery, whilst also helpfully representing the wider context of present-day actor training. However, Hall and Barton were also frequently consulted, in order to reference what has become, in a slightly mythical sense, an RSC orthodoxy – the first port of call, when one

---

[579] Ibid.
[580] McKellen, in Barton, p. 10.
[581] Barton, p. 12.

considers British Shakespearean rehearsal practice. There are however clear benefits that can evidently emerge if one considers a combination of Hall's precise rhetorical focus and Barton's post-Stanislavskian disposition (to link language with intention, rather than relying upon sheer emotion). The early rehearsal room then becomes simultaneously a location of close textual scrutiny and liberated company collaboration. And such a combination would come perhaps surprisingly close to the dynamic of actioning.

'Original' Shakespeare

The second half of this chapter now turns to 'original practices' in British theatre today. The symbolic hub of wide interests in this field is largely represented by the reproduction project of Shakespeare's Globe (opened on Bankside, Southwark in 1997) and its neighbouring indoor, Sam Wanamaker Playhouse (opened January 2014) – which pays homage to the spirit of the second Blackfriars Theatre (of 1600-42).[582] The Bankside playhouses together represent a convenient way of realising the diachronic juxtaposition of 'Shakespearean' origins and the present-day practice of actors in London professional theatre.[583] The discussion takes a 'systems-based approach', considering material conditions, as well as social dynamics.[584] Naturally however, many of the practitioners and ideas discussed are by no means exclusively linked to the modern Globe.

In a draft artistic policy for Shakespeare's Globe, dated to 1988, we see how a reproduction architectural plan anticipated a new investigation of stagecraft.[585] The theatre's core identity is that it represents 'the building for which [Shakespeare]

---

[582] Julian Bowsher, *Shakespeare's London Theatreland: Archaeology, history and drama* (London: Museum of London Archaeology, 2012), p. 118.
[583] Notable recreations have also been constructed in North America, Germany, Italy, Japan and the Czech Republic. Franklin J. Hildy, 'Globe Theatre and "Essence of Globeness" Projects Since 1970', as 'Appendix One', in Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper, ed. *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), pp. 234-5.
[584] Cf. Tribble, p. 2.
[585] The draft is attributed to 'M.B.' – assumed to be Michael Birkett, who oversaw the appointment of Mark Rylance as the Globe's first Artistic Director. 'Appendix Two: A Draft Artistic Policy', in Carson and Karim-Cooper, p. 236.

wrote many' of his plays.[586] In terms of exploring the 'audience-actor relationship'
of the Renaissance,[587] an experimental spirit was encouraged. But, as the
architectural parameters were understandably conservative, the envisaged 'material
conditions' of theatre production are similarly traditional, with 'natural light' being
'the rule.' Consideration was given to the use of floodlighting, to allow for night-
time performance, where it should be general enough to cover both players and
spectators' (as opposed to the use of a theatrical lighting rig).[588] Similarly, there was
the stipulation that, 'no modern sound amplification should be used.'[589] The
exemption from this was that any recording or transmission of a Globe production
should be afforded 'all modern methods' of technology.[590]

Aside from its obvious architectural presence, the distinct production feature
of the Globe is its so-called 'shared-light'[591] ambiance, which has been
transformative in a present-day performance context (whether through natural
lighting, or by beeswax candle). Most contemporary theatres would struggle to
present Shakespearean speeches (especially soliloquies) in a way that can so readily
engage in audience eye-contact[592] - where audiences are more commonly 'hidden' in
the dark.[593] My workshop actors frequently referred to being struck by the
performance ambiance at both the open-air Globe and the candlelit Wanamaker,
where direct audience exchange is not only 'facilitated by'[594] but in fact demanded,
by the 'democratic' shared-light atmosphere.[595] As David Sturzaker revealed, it
'makes a huge difference' to be able to directly 'look [the audience] in the eye',

---

[586] Ibid.
[587] Ibid.
[588] Ibid.
[589] Ibid.
[590] Ibid.
[591] Alan C. Dessen, in his 'Ten Commandments for the New Globe' (written in 1990), suggested that
'variable lighting' (i.e. the use of any artificial theatre lighting) should be rejected as a 'false god'.
'Appendix Three', in Carson and Karim-Cooper, p. 237.
[592] Theatres can artificially address this. Brian Ferguson described playing Hamlet at the proscenium-
arched Glasgow Citizens Theatre (dir. by Dominic Hill, in 2014). He walked 'down into the audience
– for the "rogue and peasant slave" speech […] The house-lights came up' and he directly 'asked
them those questions'. Ferguson, W5.
[593] Martin, W8.
[594] Sturzaker, W3.
[595] Tyrrell, W1.

rather than 'staring out' at the stalls; the Globe's 'audience/actor relationship […]
very much encourages that interaction.'[596] This intimate dynamic will be discussed in
relation to the soliloquy workshops that follow.[597]

The scope of 'original practices' is broad.[598] Mark Rylance (the first Artistic
Director of Shakespeare's Globe) stated that there were 'three principles that Sam
[Wanamaker] was employing in the reconstruction of the Globe': the use of 'the
most accurate Research possible', with 'Materials for the building […] sourced as
accurately as possible' and the employment of 'original craft [that] would be
rediscovered and exercised in the project.'[599] This trinity, as manifest in the Globe's
architecture, can also be recognised in the general theatre practice, inspired by period
performance research, period theatre materials (costumes and props) and the craft of
period performance (perhaps influenced by part-script performance). This does not
mean to say, however, that work at the Globe was intended to pursue period
production exclusively. Rylance endorsed two 'valid experiments' at the Globe,[600]
both 'original practices' and 'free hand' work – the latter relating to 'theatre artists of
our own day' being able to 'apply their unchained modern instincts to the
building'.[601] And he found considerable cross-pollination across the two practices,
particularly evidenced by Tim Carroll. Carroll became 'the serious OP director'[602] at
the Globe, with a 'core of experienced actors [that] grew around him', yet Rylance
asserts that the particular praise garnered by Carroll's 'OP *Twelfth Night*' (2002) was
due to factors that had been 'learned or discovered' during Carroll's previous 'free-
hand' production of *Macbeth* (2001).[603]

---

[596] Sturzaker, W3; Brian Ferguson independently referred to the same ambiance, but in relation to the
Wanamaker, W5.
[597] See Chapter Five.
[598] I will later use the acronym 'OP' to refer exclusively to 'original practices.'
[599] Mark Rylance, 'Research, Materials, Craft: Principles of Performance at Shakespeare's Globe' –
from a conversation with the editors (17 April 2007), in Carson and Karim-Cooper, pp. 103-4.
[600] Represented in his era by the single, outdoor playhouse.
[601] Rylance, in Carson and Karim-Cooper, p. 105.
[602] Cf. Carroll as the self-proclaimed 'iambic fundamentalist' – Chapter 6 (W5); Echoed by Sturzaker,
W3.
[603] Rylance, in Carson and Karim-Cooper, p. 110.

A catalogue of productions at the Globe, between 1996 and 2007, reveals both the complex relationship to a variety of 'original practices' and also the theatre's degree of coverage.[604] Of the fifty-seven listed productions, only six are listed as being purely 'OP' productions (that is, with period clothing, and a strictly all-male cast). There were similarly six productions that retained 'OP' values, but with mixed-gender casting. The height of all-male casting (three productions between 2002-3) was immediately followed by a complementary use of all-female casting (but with otherwise 'OP' values, for three productions in the seasons 2003-4). Other productions contained various combinations of 'original elements', such as costume or musical score. At perhaps the most extreme end of practice, one finds productions that were performed with Early Modern Speech ('EMS') pronunciation. Tellingly, there were only two EMS productions during this period. However, it is worthwhile considering how such an approach functions, as it relates to wider intricacies regarding pronunciation.

At the Globe, the research of David Crystal has been especially prominent. He has suggested a methodology to reconstruct Shakespearean accent(s) via 'a study of rhythmical patterns, rhymes, spellings, and contemporary phonetic descriptions'.[605] Crystal transcribed *Troilus and Cressida* into EMS, for a production at Shakespeare's Globe Theatre, and highlights benefits of the process by referring to 'a great joke' in the play that nobody ever gets – when 'Thersites harangues Achilles about Ajax in Act 2: "for whomsoever he be, he is Ajax"'. As Ajax was 'pronounced like "a jakes"', there was a pun being activated on the synonym '*jakes*', meaning a 'pisshouse'.[606] Crystal states that a production in EMS can resurrect such comedy; yet, one might alternatively suspect that an audience would only laugh if they recognised the activation of such an esoteric pun. In reviving such pronunciation, although historical puns are renewed, there is the significant question of whether the

---

[604] Carson and Karim-Cooper, pp. 239-242.

[605] David Crystal, 'The Language of Shakespeare', in *The Oxford Shakespeare*, ed. by Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), p. xlvii.

[606] David Crystal, 'Saying It Like It Was: An OP *Troilus and Cressida*', in Globe Theatre Programme, 'The Persephone Projects' (2005), p. 26.

wider semantic meaning of the text becomes obscured for a modern audience. David Sturzaker, who played Troilus in the Globe's EMS production, described how the audience discovered a range of accents within the resultant, 'real mongrel of a sound' that was produced.[607] Mark Quartley spoke of his drama school experience of acting an EMS duologue, with James Norton, and the result sounding to his ear like 'a mixture between Northern Irish and pirate'.[608] It must be noted that EMS performances have never been in regular practice at the Globe, but such an approach is indicative however of the wider irresolvable question of pronunciation. This is exemplified in contrasting approaches from Barton and Hall, where each independently cites Cleopatra's use of the word 'pyramides'.[609] Barton prefers a period usage of a four-syllable pronunciation,[610] which Hall favours the alternative trisyllabic modern pronunciation, as it is less of an 'affectation' and will not obscure the 'vision of the pyramid'.[611] Beyond situational usage, neither Hall nor Barton advocate a comprehensive EMS approach.

Period research, materials and craft are all united in the work of Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern, who have approached Shakespearean stage practice from the perspective of the Renaissance actor's 'part-text' – the 'roll' of paper that constituted an actor's 'role' and contained only the lines of their own character with the briefest of cues. Their analysis attempts to regard the 'part-texts as though for the first time, as far as possible without presuppositions'.[612] From this perspective, one of the primary things that a Renaissance actor would have tried to 'identify on a part is the "passions" it contained,' (311) and the 'speedy emotional changes' (312) between said passions, which were also crucial. Where part-texts are usually referred to on a theoretical basis, the Original Shakespeare Company (formed by Patrick Tucker in 1990) used part-texts and Renaissance 'rehearsal' methods as the basis of its Shakespearean productions – a rare example of this dimension of 'original

---

[607] Sturzaker, W3.
[608] Quartley, W7.
[609] William Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, V.ii.71.
[610] Barton, p. 40.
[611] Hall, p. 161.
[612] Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern, p. 330.

practice' being staged at the Globe. However the touring company ceased visiting the Globe after Mark Rylance wrote to the company, stating its practices did not 'serve the play'.[613]

For Palfrey and Stern, on the one hand, passions became 'more than simply the units in which actors acted', serving as an alternative to 'the verb "to act"'.[614] However, 'passionating' was apparently synonymous with the more specific 'embodying of *emotion* in acting', where there was 'a semantic opposition […] at the time between "action" and "passion": "action" [being] physiologically the externalization (acting) of internal feeling (passion)' (313). We will recall how the term means something so different to post-Stanislavskians, who tend to regard emotion as 'an outcome' of an action, rather than the playable action itself.[615] As the Renaissance sense of 'action' applies to physical externalization of a role, which conflicts with the post-Stanislavskian usage of 'action',[616] for this study I have favoured the alternative Renaissance rhetoric distinction that separates the 'pronuntiatio' of a speaker – as manifest in vocal expressions and gesture – from the 'elocutio' of the playwright's text.[617]

Renaissance acting was evidently quite different in its stylistic presentation, but one core similarity exists in the technical approach of an actor to his role. The early-modern actor would have regarded the role as a collection of 'units',[618] units that were regarded as emotion-centric. But, nevertheless, said units, as signposted by segments of dramatic rhetoric, can still serve the same textual divisions today. Only, for a post-Stanislavskian actor they might signify division between 'actions'. Stylistically the outcome is quite different but, technically, the textual focus has a common source in the dramatic rhetoric of the text.

---

[613] Stern, '(Re:)Historicizing', p. 100.
[614] Palfrey and Stern, p. 312.
[615] Alfreds, p. 92.
[616] See Chapter Two.
[617] Again, I draw from Fraunce. Palfrey and Stern instead separate '"action" or "gesture" (the motion of the body)' from '"pronunciation" or "emphasis" (the movement of the voice) […]', p. 317-8.
[618] Palfrey and Stern, p. 329.

To draw inference from an 'original' source, one of course has to consider the problematic selection of such a source. Where Palfrey and Stern have focused on the text as an individual's relationship to their part, Andrew Gurr offers broader distinctions pertaining to the play as a whole. In Renaissance terms, we might thus consider the competing forms of: the playwright's manuscript; the '"maximal" text', that is the manuscript as authorised by the Master of Revels, which 'contained all that the company was allowed to speak on stage';[619] the printed texts of plays; and the 'text', as staged – where it is commonly acknowledged that 'companies routinely shortened and altered their plays for staging'.[620] Present-day practice is usually represented by a more singular choice of text, either a specific edition or a text as edited by the director (often as a composite).

Today's practitioners have a tendency to particularly revere Shakespeare's First Folio. Emma Smith has warned against a certain mythic fixation (what Mark Quartley referred to as a form of 'snobbery'),[621] where the Folio has become the 'celebrity poster-child of "original practices" theatre'.[622] Many look to Heminge and Condell's endorsement as proof of a theatrical heritage,[623] but – as Abigail Rokison asserts – their Folio dedication, as addressed to '"The Great Variety of Readers", suggests that it was perceived as a "literary" work.'[624] There is a resultant conflict between the 'literary' and 'dramatic' significance of orthography.

This is illustrated by a brief discussion of punctuation. Ruth Sillers emphasised how the 'whole sense' of a present-day actor's scripted role can depend upon the modern punctuation of their script.[625] The relationship between punctuation and Shakespearean practice is arguably overlooked where, as Dickon Tyrrell

---

[619] Gurr, p. 132.
[620] Gurr, p. 129. See specifically the supposed original company alterations to *Henry V* – Gurr, p. 135. On rare occasions the 'author-centred text and the theatre-centred text […] might coexist in the self-same document' – cf. John Lyly's work, in Andy Kesson, *John Lyly and Early Modern Authorship* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), p. 18.
[621] Quartley, W7.
[622] Emma Smith, *Shakespeare's First Folio: Four Centuries of an Iconic Book* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), p. 280.
[623] Quartley also recognised the appeal of Heminge and Condell as 'King's men', W7.
[624] Rokison, p. 51; cf. Smith, p. 237.
[625] Sillers, W8.

indicated, punctuation is often a 'moveable feast', depending on editor or director; theatre directors frequently 'do their own trims', which may or may not include punctuation edits.[626] And indeed, actors are keen to follow (and expect) directorial guidance; Ruth Sillers spoke of resolving any issues between competing source texts by directly asking the director what 'works best'.[627]

Various actors from my workshops were aided by Giles Block at the Globe, in their attempts to interpret the text, finding his guidance to be helpful – in a manner that Ruth Sillers described as 'very gentle' and 'not dictatorial'.[628] David Sturzaker, noting such advice, described the potential for punctuation to serve as 'a form of stage direction'.[629] And it is not uncommon to find other practitioners making similar assertions; Mark Quartley spoke of a RADA class visit from the actor Richard Cordery, who advised how for 'every Shakespeare [production…he] takes the First Folio' and makes 'a note of all the capitals […]' for direction.[630] Block specifically asserts (in contrast to Rokison) that the 'great difference between the punctuation in the Folio and in most modern editions is that [the] "original punctuation" is designed more for the *speaker* than the *reader*'.[631] However, such an interpretation of 'original' punctuation is problematic on two counts. Firstly, punctuation was not stable across the English Renaissance. As Crystal states, 'a sea-change' in punctuation took place 'between 1590 and 1630', where early practice was dominated by a 'phonetic/elocutional approach', aimed as a vocal guide, before there was a shift towards 'the grammatical/semantic' dimension, aimed at the reader.[632] The earlier disposition is represented in George Puttenham's invocation of classical punctuation, which is more indicative of the domain of the 'orator'[633] and represents

---

[626] Sturzaker, W3; cf. Ovens and Quartley, W7; cf. Long, W9.
[627] Sillers, W8.
[628] Sillers, W8; echoed by Martin, W8.
[629] Sturzaker, W3.
[630] Quartley, W7.
[631] Giles Block, *Speaking the Speech: An Actor's Guide to Shakespeare* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2013; repr. 2014), p. 133; p. 240.
[632] David Crystal, *Think On My Words: Exploring Shakespeare's Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p. 68.
[633] George Puttenham, *The Art of English Poesy*, in Alexander, p. 119.

various lengths of an oratorical pause: 'the shortest pause [...] they called *comma*';
the 'second they called *colon*' which 'occupied twice as much time as the *comma*';
the 'third they called *periodus* [...] or full pause.'[634] By 1623, and the Folio's
publication, punctuation had shifted towards literary usage. Rokison recognises that
whilst 'in many cases the Folio provides the earliest witness to the punctuation of the
"original text"', the 'claims that it provides an actor with a guide to Shakespeare's
phrasing [...] untenable'.[635] Through composition or editing, the punctuation was
likely imposed for the purposes of reading (26); it probably originated 'in the
printing house' and the system had 'an increasingly grammatical rather than [...a]
rhetorical' basis (76). The argument that punctuation at the time of the Folio's
printing anticipated vocal delivery – in a chiefly dramatic-rhetorical form, above a
literary system – is not well-supported.

Given the rich nuances of Shakespeare's *elocutio*,[636] it is curious that so
much attention is afforded to a problematic interpretation of original punctuation.
Furthermore, it has little historical precedent. Palfrey and Stern have concluded that
Renaissance 'pointing (punctuation)' could not have carried such importance for
actors, as 'all remaining parts' and 'all remaining manuscript plays' that have
survived 'are lightly punctuated'; indeed punctuation also 'varies markedly from
script to script', suggesting no industry consistency.[637] Accordingly, it is 'all the
more likely' that the actor's would have focused their 'concentration on [rhetorical]
minutiae' (322) of their parts, returning to 'the primacy of scrupulously patterned
words, of meanings weighted by rhythm as much as semantics, and of liquid
variations in both prose and verse' (324) – all being aspects of the playwright's
elocutio. And where Marina Tarlinskaja has similarly dismissed a focus on
punctuation, instead favouring an analysis of versification and syntax divisions, we
can see how certain metrical studies can usefully inform the stage actor.[638]

---

[634] Puttenham, in Alexander, p. 117.
[635] Rokison, p. 54.
[636] See Chapter Three.
[637] Palfrey and Stern, p. 318.
[638] See Chapter Three.

There was a common trend amongst my workshop actors to recognise a dichotomy between the observed verse qualities of a line and an actor's requirement to communicate a line in contemporary terms. Dickon Tyrrell referenced such a balance, stating:

> Your director's in the text with Shakespeare […] he's going to take you by the hand and explore all of those clues, before you throw them out […][639]

This was the common actor's paradox: an absolute commitment that Shakespeare's quality of *elocutio* had a profound impact on the interpretation, balanced with the practical implications of imparting a clear meaning to a modern audience. Such a 'meaning' was commonly regarded as being derived from both semantics and verse features. Debra Penny alluded to the drama school dissemination of the idea that if an actor is 'struggling with the meaning of the line, then the rhythm will help'.[640] Like Tyrrell, others typically spoke of an actor's prerogative to discard potential metrical impositions, once an informed position had been reached. Brian Martin expressed that an actor needs 'to know the rules to break them'.[641] Sarah Ovens agreed, stating it is 'great to have knowledge and to then be able to chuck it away',[642] where voice coaches generally support an actor's prerogative to accept or reject any advice freely.[643] But Tyrrell did acknowledge that the support of a 'tremendous voice department' to 'nurture the language' is still an in-house luxury of select companies (such as Shakespeare's Globe and the RSC).[644]

It is apparently rare for actors to dismiss versification altogether. This was evidenced by Mark Quartley's surprise at the approach endorsed by one actor who, visiting Quartley's student class at RADA, stated that, prior to rehearsing a Shakespeare script, he re-edits all of his lines into one 'huge bit of prose'.[645] It is

---

[639] Tyrrell, W1.
[640] Penny, W6.
[641] Ruth Sillers concurred with this. Martin, W8.
[642] Ovens, W2.
[643] Ovens, W7.
[644] Tyrrell, W1.
[645] Quartley, W7.

much more common for actor's to infer guidance from verse. Abigail Rokison is wary of practitioners who find in the verse a 'deliberate "authorial" means of guiding' an actor's delivery.[646] However, the word 'delivery' is problematically ambiguous, where Rokison uses it to mean a precise rhythmic orchestration. My actors commonly found an 'authorial means of guiding' their performance, but in the more subtly interpretive sense of a suggested *intention* for a given line (rather than a metronomic beat), which potentially has a very different performance outcome. Brian Martin stated that the verse rhythm 'influences his performance' in a subtle manner, which is then transferred indirectly 'to the audience'.[647] This clearly conflicts with the position of Palfrey and Stern, who question why a text would be written 'in verse at all', unless it was necessary for 'the verse [to] stand out […]'.[648] Accordingly, they regard 'modern acting' as softening the power of verse 'by naturalizing the way it is pronounced', where it might seem too 'similar to prose' (320-1). The evident priority for my selected actors was not that the audience could recognise whether or not characters were speaking in verse or prose, but that the audience could engage with subtleties of character in performance – as directly drawn from nuances of the playwright's metre. Ruth Sillers spoke of how an actor should 'relish' the metre, without feeling the need to 'bash people over the head with it'.[649]

Indeed, younger actors were particularly wary of an overly conspicuous declamation of lines. Quartley spoke of a specific technique that he disliked, which he called the 'Thinking Breath'.[650] He remarked that did not approve of an overbearing awareness of the verse, and demonstrated the technique by taking a consistent and pronounced pause at the end of every line.[651] Quartley found the technique more observable in 'specific actors than directors' and spoke of an older, very experienced Shakespearean actor who 'took a thinking breath after every line',

[646] Rokison, p. 11.
[647] Martin, W8.
[648] Palfrey and Stern, p. 320.
[649] Sillers, W8.
[650] Quartley, W7.
[651] Ibid.

but did so in such an accomplished manner that an audience would be 'almost unaware of it'.[652] In rehearsals, the same actor had heavily suggested to Quartley that he 'might like to think about' the placement of 'the end of the line'.[653] Sarah Ovens noted that she had encountered such a technique, participating in workshops with both John Barton and Greg Doran, but that it was certainly not enforced as a 'hard and fast rule'.[654] She remarked that in RSC sessions with voice coach Alison Bomber, the work was not directed at uniform company verse delivery, but at the light suggestion of 'really useful' features.[655]

Heather Long acknowledged that the common perception is that 'accurate' rhythmical delivery is represented by a sense of fluidity and an expression that keeps each 'thought really buoyant'; however, she finds such verse delivery merely suggests the rhythm of a pre-planned 'dance'.[656] She had previously felt pressurised to make Shakespeare's language sound 'lofty and beautiful', and was concerned that her own natural rhythm of speech would seem too 'contemporary' for the taste of many directors;[657] Molly Vevers had experienced the similar sense of unhelpful expectation that an actor should approach the delivery of a big Shakespearean speech with a specific 'verse voice'.[658] But Long promoted an approach that she suggested felt more human to her. She had been particularly influenced by a visit paid by Mark Rylance to her drama class (during her RADA training). He had stated that he would initially paraphrase a line in as 'as few words as possible', giving 'all of his focus [to] the thought'. Initially he would learn the text with these units of thought in mind.[659]

This might be regarded as evidence of an actor foregoing the potential mnemonic benefits of the verse. *Memoria*, as mentioned, is a category of classical

---

[652] Ibid.
[653] Ibid.
[654] Ovens, W7.
[655] Ibid.
[656] Long, W9.
[657] Ibid.
[658] Vevers, W9; Long concurred, W9.
[659] Ibid.

rhetoric in its own right, and something that would be deserving of its own independent study.[660] It is hard to assess the place of *memoria* in present-day Shakespearean rehearsal, as practice can vary so widely. The act of line learning is evasive to the analyst, often proving too complex 'to lend itself to the collection of experimental data' because, in the words of Lois Potter, it 'happens both in isolation and communally'.[661] Today there is considerable variation where, for example: one director might request actors to be 'off book' at an earlier stage than others; a stage manager might run lines with actors from the prompt book in the rehearsal room; or actors might meet outside official rehearsal time for a 'line run' (a common occurrence in professional fringe theatre).

Whilst my study does not focus on memorisation, there are clear technical implications of post-Stanislavskian approaches, where an actor's line 'motivation' can play 'an important factor in memory.'[662] In the application of Alfreds' actioning, for example, we will see how pairs of actors, actioning on their feet in early rehearsal, are in fact creating a cognitive network, with its shared mnemonic guidance.[663] From this, one might expand on the nature of 'situated cognition' in present-day rehearsal systems and the manner in which 'smart structures' may be constructed;[664] whereas in the Renaissance, for example, a persistent use of typecasting would have eased mnemonic demands.[665] A diachronic assessment of *memoria* might thus draw from Tribble's description of a theatrical ecology and the function of distributed cognition.[666] The Renaissance player would have 'mapped the passions onto the verbal spine of the play through gesture', creating embodiment

---

[660] See Chapter Three.
[661] Lois Potter, '"Nobody's Perfect": Actors' Memories and Shakespeare's Plays of the 1590s', Shakespeare Survey, 42 (1990), 85-97 (p. 86).
[662] Potter, p. 95.
[663] See Chapter Seven.
[664] See *Theatre, Performance and Cognition: Languages, Bodies and Ecologies*, ed. by Rhonda Blair and Amy Cook (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), p. 129; Tribble, 'Distributed Cognition, Mindful Bodies and the Arts of Acting', in Blair and Cook, pp. 133-40 (p. 134).
[665] Cf. Gurr, p. 122.
[666] See introduction to this thesis.

thus through a 'brain-hand-language system'[667] – with gesture far exceeding its 'stock' cliché.[668] Contrastingly, todays actor becomes embodied as 'actor-character' via a map of actions (manifest both vocally and gesturally).[669] And, in the case of Alfreds' actioning, such a process is all the more distributed amongst the company.[670]

Within my *elocutio*-centric study, *memoria* is chiefly represented by these additional benefits of such a post-Stanislavskian approach. Throughout Part Two I will also implicitly touch upon certain issues pertaining more closely to Renaissance *memoria*, as they contextually arise.[671] We will come to consider, for example, the particular skills of the boy players, in both their quick-wittedness and also in the requirement for a supportive cognitive space[672] – where boys within adult companies would have received instruction from their sharer to whom they were apprenticed.[673] But, in terms of this study, a consideration of *memoria* fundamentally directs us to the same present-day shared agency, as identified in the actor-character. That is to say, if an actor forgets his lines, there is a 'double loss of identity'[674] – the coherence of the stage character begins to evaporate whilst the actor is simultaneously failing 'to do the one thing essential to his profession.'[675]

In terms of verse utility, Rokison has warned firstly against practitioners who eschew 'detailed analysis of the metrical properties' altogether and, secondly, against those who might 'approach […] a role from an internal perspective – beginning with an exploration of character rather than the perceived demands of textual structure'.[676] My participating actors in fact showed significant consideration of textual structure, albeit where sample group was small and specifically populated by actors that had

---

[667] Tribble, p. 21.
[668] Tribble, p. 14.
[669] See relationship to Tribble in Chapter Two.
[670] See Chapter Seven.
[671] See Chapter Six.
[672] See Chapter Seven; cf. Chapter Two.
[673] Stern, *Rehearsal*, p. 67.
[674] Potter, p. 85.
[675] Ibid.
[676] Rokison, p. 14.

specific Shakespearean experience (both professionally and in terms of training). Typically amongst my group, there was a strong engagement in perceived authorial 'clues', inherent in the form of the text, and the anticipation of their practical implications – via a communicable exchange with a present-day audience. Rokison's dichotomy, between 'character' work and 'textual' demands, is misleading; in fact, many actors today use metrical features as an emphatic basis for the establishment of 'character'. Indeed, the majority of my consulted actors share Rokison's views on the 'verse structure [serving] as a stylistic device that enhances the meaning of the words'.[677] But, for the actors, they then see the additional, enhanced meaning as a constituent of character. Within the spirit of my study, I consistently assert the form of the text as a simultaneous partner to semantics, when establishing its dramatic implications.[678]

Significantly, Rokison warns of a 'theatrical tendency to establish rules about the delivery of particular metrical structures' without any awareness of 'authorial inconsistency', 'prosodic development' or 'ambiguities inherent in the verse'.[679] I have selected Shakespearean material and extracts from present-day manuals that will reveal, through workshops, the sheer variety and versatility of Shakespearean metre. The spirit of my study thus consistently champions (like Rokison, Tarlinskaja and McDonald)[680] a response to the 'variation' of verse,[681] over techniques of rigid orthodoxy. Throughout the workshops I will promote the case for a close attention to Shakespearean *elocutio*, in both its local dramatic-rhetorical context and in its pertinence to the wider play.

Regarding lineation, Rokison notes two problems: (i) the 'disagreement about the nature of the authorial "clues" inherent in the lineation'; and (ii) the fact that practitioners might 'mine the minutiae of the printed text for authorial clues', without adequate consideration (40). She particularly cites Cicely Berry, who she feels

---

[677] Ibid.
[678] See Chapter Three.
[679] Rokison, p. 5.
[680] See Chapter Three.
[681] Rokison, p. 12-13.

'unquestioningly accepts the editorial lineation of her copy (New Penguin) and bases her interpretation upon it' (73), which misreads 'decisions imposed by modern editors' as 'Shakespeare's dramatic intention' (77). I would emphasise that Berry does in fact acknowledge that 'punctuation marks will vary according to the edition',[682] but feels this 'does not matter', where general punctuation indicates 'how the thoughts are cut up'.[683] Patsy Rodenburg has treated punctuation in a similar manner. She suggests (like Rylance) that actors learn the text 'thought by thought, not line by line',[684] where she further asserts that divisions in thought are 'signposted by punctuation'.[685] The problems with a universal treatment of punctuation however are myriad, as previously discussed. And Rokison takes issue with this, as 'verse phrased in sentences as opposed to lines' would be 'in danger of sounding like prose', minimising the effect of stylistic deviations, so 'characteristic of [Shakespeare's] later plays'.[686] Rokison does concede however that a rigid delivery, with overly-emphatic pauses (what Quartley referred to as the 'Thinking Breath') 'might become monotonous', constrict 'dramatic interpretation' and risk 'alienating an audience' (28). Her preference therefore is that actors might 'acknowledge' the deliberate use of verse, 'whilst not allowing rigorous observation of the metre to create a tedious […] delivery or inhabit the transmission of meaning' (25). I would argue that where actors are basing choices of character 'intention' upon discrete verse features, rather than mere metronomic delivery, they are fulfilling Rokison's preference. My thesis focuses on the initial inference an actor makes regarding the meaning of his text (as influenced by features of *elocutio*). And indeed, as indicated by my workshop actors, a pronunciation-centric approach causes some contention in present-day practice. Thus the outcome of my research is selection of a technique that combines a respect for metrical nuances with a present-day attribution of an

---

[682] Berry, p. 106.
[683] Ibid.
[684] In Rokison, p. 25.
[685] Ibid.
[686] Rokison, p. 26.

intention, in the form of an 'action' which can be clearly enacted, regardless of the rhythmic pattern of the vocal delivery.

We have seen, diachronically, how Shakespearean *elocutio* can span across eras. Palfrey and Stern have illustrated how Shakespeare's chosen 'techniques' would have helped the actor 'to pace and measure the "units" of his speech',[687] and are 'best thought of as aids or adjuncts to rhetoric' (329). As the drama was written 'for oral rhetorical delivery', devices (such as figures and tropes) surpass mere ornamental use, becoming the linguistic framework out of which 'character is literally constituted', just as a part is contained by 'metrical organization' or emphasised by 'the actor's speaking body' (331). And we can reasonably consider that, by the time of the first Shakespearean performances, versification and a dramatic rhetoric would have been somewhat ingrained in practice, following the dramatic debut of English iambic pentameter, with *The Tragedy of Gorbuduc* (1561).[688]

'Unitting', in its post-Stanislavskian guise, will be further illustrated in Part Two.[689] However, in Palfrey and Stern the Renaissance parallels are clear: even where 'a single speech or dialogue enacts one overall function [such as a soliloquy]', internally we recognise it is 'constituted of numerous smaller units […]'. The shifts may represent changes in address 'from one party to another' or indeed, 'decisive shifts in tone' (349), as mediated by the 'all-important' process of the 'actor's pointing' (349). In this manner, the distance between a Renaissance actor and a present-day performer shrinks significantly. Such units can become so important within the framework of a Shakespeare speech that 'syntax *is* semantics', signifying 'changes in meaning, mood, or movement' (350). Thus, the present-day actor might be bound by the very similar technical concerns of the Renaissance actor. On the one hand, the pentameter itself provides an 'existential edge', representing characters as 'living people pressed by circumstances' (352). However, it also demands for actors

---

[687] Palfrey and Stern, p. 328.
[688] See Chapter Three.
[689] Also see Chapter Two.

to be kept 'on guard, alive to occasion and opportunity' – which is indeed concordant with the working process favoured by Mike Alfreds. Where the form of the metre is fractured, Shakespeare's techniques 'allow dramatic verse to embody an experience that is always open to accident or surprise' and 'prone to be interrupted or challenged by the fact of other minds and bodies' (352). Characters are thus produced that are 'continually defined by contingency, probation, and risk' (352).

Part Two

Shakespeare Workshop Series

Shakespeare Workshop Series: An Introductory Note

In this second part of the thesis I turn to the workshops that I directed with professional actors. Each workshop was conducted to represent the early rehearsal process, when an actor first tries to attempt a practical analysis of the given text. As the workshops functioned as rehearsal sessions, we had to anticipate 'character' as an entity that would only be fully manifest with an audience's theatrical reception. I recruited actors with an extensive range of professional Shakespeare experience, in order to apply their direct industry knowledge to the Renaissance *elocutio* in question.

The workshops were divided into the three categories of focus: soliloquy, *enargeia* and repartee. I selected these areas as they represented clear challenges to the predominant, present-day default for drama to be written in 'naturalistic' dialogue. In this manner, I sought to stress-test actioning techniques against the Shakespearean obstacles of: apparent character isolation, seemingly static description, and heightened dialogue. I begin each workshop chapter with an introductory section that outlines the broader Renaissance and present-day contexts related to the chosen mode. The chapters are further segmented according to the workshops as conducted, with chapter conclusions that detail the cumulative findings for each category. I allotted three workshops to each mode, which gave the opportunity to assess extracts from manuals from my chosen post-Stanislavskian directors.[690] In the case of Max Stafford-Clark, where no such direct Shakespearean manual extract exists, it must be remembered that his spirit of approach pervades many of the workshops, being encountered every time that I make mention to his form of strictest actioning – that being the application of a transitive verb to the text.

---

[690] See Chapter Two.

Throughout the workshops the chief features of interest, in terms of a Shakespearean authorial style, mostly fell within the category of *elocutio*.[691] My group of present-day actors most commonly commentated on verse features, such as extra-metrical lines of rhythmic variations, often in correlation with or opposition to the sense of a metrical orthodoxy (as frequently attributed to Peter Hall). Aspects of *elocutio* were thus the most applicable way to represent a sense of an authorial style.

Prior to each of my workshop extracts, I produced a hand-annotated mark-up, which noted the most significant verse features: trochaic inversions, feminine endings and caesuras. These are the most frequently cited across Marina Tarlinskaja's study of Shakespearean verse, but they also respond to the typical verse instruction that my workshop actors exemplified (in reference to their practice and training). I also emphasised how the moments of 'shift' in a Shakespearean text can establish a pivotal diachronic link for actors. I use 'shift' in the manner proposed by Palfrey and Stern who (in a Renaissance acting context) look for the 'simple and efficient' character implications of a verse line that is broken 'by discrete units of speech rather than by punctuation'.[692] They illustrate, for example, how a 'midline caesura' represents a 'prosodic shift' which 'tends to be emphatic, to herald a shift in argument or location, or offer quick qualification or modification of what comes before.'[693] Present-day actors, just like Palfrey and Stern's Renaissance model, are chiefly looking to break speeches into 'discrete units of speech'. This is the initial groundwork of actioning, which made such a post-Stanislavskian approach so ripe for consideration. In this manner, the combined influence of Tarlinskaja, Palfrey and Stern was unceasingly pertinent throughout the workshops, directly inspiring the methodology behind my textual mark-ups and selection of Shakespearean 'authorial' features.

Dramatic rhetoric serves to bring together: the discrete authorial features of *elocutio*, the process of division in an individual part (along the lines of 'shifts'), and

---

[691] See Chapter Three.
[692] Palfrey and Stern, p. 354.
[693] Palfrey and Stern, p. 355.

– importantly – the anticipation of a performed outcome. This is seen clearly throughout the workshops, where actors focused on their sense of a prospective addressee. Finally, I would also highlight that in the case of each workshop, I attempted to assimilate the methodology of the respective practitioners under consideration. The preparation of my textual mark-ups remained consistent throughout the series, however, ensuring close attention to verse variation throughout.

The playwright Howard Brenton has described the 'text of a play' as having a similar relationship to the realised 'performance' as that between a 'musical score' and 'the actual music';[694] he questions 'who in their right mind' would try to 'read a Beethoven symphony' when they could instead listen to a performance?[695] Conceding however that there must be some inherent literary value in plays, for them to have been published, Brenton makes the alternative request that, in the moment of reading, the reader should 'try not to see it performed in a theatre, but imagine it really happening' in a different mode.[696] Thus he speaks of the reader 'setting up a theatre' in their head, using 'imagination straight out of the real world',[697] in an attempt to 'see what the author was seeing as he wrote'.[698]

The spirit of my workshops offers a contrast to this literary prerogative, requesting instead that the theatre of the mind is set aside. The imaginative leap is alternatively directed at the moment of an actor's first engagement, giving oneself the agency of an actor attempting to fashion a character in a manner that will be arresting to a present-day audience. It is in this imaginative disposition, in the position of the actor-character, that we find ourselves in the rehearsal room.

---

[694] Brenton was a collaborator with Max Stafford-Clark. See Chapter 2.
[695] Howard Brenton, *Plays:1* (London: Methuen, 1986), p. vii.
[696] Ibid.
[697] Ibid.
[698] Brenton, p. viii.

Chapter 5: The Soliloquy

The soliloquy presents an initial challenge to any technique based on variants of actioning. Actioning developed as a response to the necessity, whilst in dialogue, for an actor to identify the type of effect that their character was intending to exact upon their dialogue partner. With the departure of a dialogue partner and the onstage actor-character being left in apparent isolation, we might then question the place of acting techniques that are transitive or that project in such an expressive manner. The question is how far a shift towards interiority results in a performed output that is insular. Whilst the soliloquy might be singled out as a rhetorical set-piece event (like an *epideictic*), my workshops assessed alternative attempts, via present-day practice, to regard soliloquies dramatically, within the construct of a staged character, speech units serving as the building-blocks of a *dramatic* rhetoric. John Barton suggests three essential elements in approaching the soliloquy for performance, which usefully frame many of the arguments that were advanced by my workshop practitioners: (i) the need for context – a soliloquy 'must arise out of a situation'; (ii) the need for the speech to 'have a story'; and (iii) the necessity for the actor to 'be spontaneous', making 'the language his own'.[699]

Where workshops were naturally focused on dramatic performance context, one key benefit was that my workshop actors consistently emphasised the importance of audience engagement, as juxtaposed with the soliloquising character's fictive isolation. This is an aspect that could not otherwise have been fully appreciated, from a solely literary viewpoint. Actors placed corporate audience immersion at the centre of their soliloquy practice. Throughout the workshops, they referenced soliloquies in terms of staged dialogue. As Dickon Tyrrell remarked, if the actor is 'on his own with the audience [...] perhaps there's something that has to remain [...] in dialogue as well', to allow the true 'visceral link' in the language to

---

[699] Barton, p. 95.

150

be maintained.[700] Similarly, Heather Long spoke of the need to 'work something out by communicating' with the audience, rather than approaching the speech with the preconceived 'idea of what happens when you do a soliloquy',[701] as a pre-written rhetorical set-piece. Giles Block has posed the primary question, 'who does the character believe he or she is speaking to?'.[702] We might expand this line of enquiry to assess whether a speech is one of reflexive (self-)address or, if it is not, to question (in the manner of Katie Mitchell) where the proposed addressee is located, and whether they are 'imagined, real, dead or alive'.[703] If the character is thought to be directly conversing with the audience (whilst soliloquising), we also have the intriguing prospect of blurred agent/addressee status, the 'actor-character'[704] seeing himself in the audience, addressing the audience as a form of self-projection.

In the soliloquy we witness the curious paradox of the actor-character being simultaneously at their most private and most public; both Peter Hall and John Barton have described the soliloquy as chiefly a public dialogue.[705] Hall attributes a specific strength of this engagement to theatre ecology and open-air performance, speaking of the consequent shift that followed, towards 'private soliloquy', which emerged 'when the theatre invaded smaller spaces' lit by 'artificial light'.[706] It is not clear whether Hall would include the candlelight of the Blackfriars playhouse within the same category as later gas-lit and electric-lit proscenium-arch spaces. However, David Sturzaker spoke of the comparison between today's indoor Wanamaker and the open-air Globe; the Wanamaker may be candle-lit but, like the Globe, it is still a 'shared-light space' where an actor can 'see [the] faces' of the audience.[707] Practitioners witness in both spaces the equal demand for intense audience engagement. Where David Sturzaker spoke of how 'one person in the yard can

---

[700] Ibid.
[701] Long, W9.
[702] Block, p. 80.
[703] Mitchell, p. 64.
[704] A term favoured by Mike Alfreds, which I will refer to throughout the workshops. Alfreds, p. 108.
[705] 'Every soliloquy [is] a public debate with the audience' – Hall, p. 52. '[…] it's right ninety-nine times out of a hundred to share a soliloquy with the audience' – Barton, p. 94.
[706] Hall, p. 58.
[707] Sturzaker, W3.

represent [all] the groundlings',[708] Dickon Tyrrell described the effect in terms of a technical requisite, the delivery of a soliloquy to an individual audience member serving as 'an absolute rifle shot': 'you speak to one person, you speak to everybody; try to speak to everybody, you speak to nobody.'[709] Brian Ferguson summarised the nature of the curious soliloquy paradox, citing his preparation for the role of Hamlet. Whilst soliloquies represented the character's 'most private moments', 'throughout rehearsals' he addressed any soliloquy directly either 'to the director or to people in the room', in order to anticipate eventual audience engagement.[710] In performance, during every soliloquy he would be 'looking the audience in the eye', as he felt this degree of direct audience address is where such a speech 'comes alive.'[711]

Barton's second element of soliloquy, that the actor must establish a narrative in a soliloquy and make the audience 'follow the story-line of the thoughts',[712] is echoed by many other practitioners. Cicely Berry describes such a narrative progression in terms of a developing argument, finding that 'in nearly every case [of soliloquy], the character argues his position and moves through to some kind of solution';[713] Hall similarly speaks of a developing debate that keeps 'the soliloquy active and dramatic'.[714] For Barton, this quest for narrative might draw from a traditional rhetorical structure, one that commonly resembles a tripartite debate. First, the character must respond to the 'immediate situation'. The 'bulk of the speech' is then constituted by a need to 'explore the situation', before a character is able to 'resolve' the speech – either by a satisfying 'conclusion' or a realisation 'that there is no conclusion'.[715] But there are alternative approaches to a soliloquy's narrative journey that more markedly avoid the risk of a turn towards oratory. Mark Rylance, for example, has discussed soliloquies progressing almost on geographical

---

[708] Sturzaker, W3.
[709] Tyrrell, W1.
[710] Ferguson, W5.
[711] Ibid.
[712] Barton, p. 102.
[713] Berry, p. 105; c.f. 'soliloquies […] seem to ask us for solutions' – Block, p. 79.
[714] Hall, p. 52.
[715] Barton, p. 88.

terms; he prefers 'to imagine moving through soliloquies with an audience' as if 'through a landscape'.[716] In this case, one can question whether, at the moment of the soliloquy's beginning, the actor-character should anticipate a fixed destination for the speech.

This brings us to Barton's final element of soliloquy, that the actor-character should 'fresh-mint'[717] their language, to live spontaneously through a speech, in the 'live engagement in this *telling*'.[718] Mark Rylance speaks of the 'paramount' importance of the actor 'taking an audience in the present through [the] text'.[719] As Hall states, no 'Shakespearean character should appear to know what he is going to say next' and that part of his performance 'spontaneity' is 'the invention of a text which defines his emotional state'.[720] For Hall, whilst 'rhetorical devices are built into the verse […] they need reinventing by the individual actor […]'.[721] And, where words should be instinctively born, Hall also asserts that the '*character* as well as the actor' is 'self-aware, conscious of speaking blank verse', and subsequently 'the effect' of his words.[722] Berry voices concern that the actor could become overwhelmed by the 'literary shapes' of particularly well-executed authorial eloquence.[723] The warning is that the soliloquy could become a 'passive' presentation, the 'result of [a character] *having* thought',[724] where the actor must prioritise being 'present in the action of the thoughts'; this requires the actor to allow 'the words to work on [themself]' and not acting merely 'naively surprised' by each new thought.[725]

To accommodate his three soliloquy elements, in the creation of a contextually situated, live, narratively-structured speech, Barton suggests an actor

---

[716] Rylance, in Carson and Karim-Cooper, p. 107.
[717] Barton, p. 68.
[718] Hall, p. 57.
[719] Rylance, in Carson and Karim-Cooper, p. 107.
[720] Hall, p. 58.
[721] Ibid.
[722] Ibid. Cf. Enargeia Three, on a character's 'self-consciousness' of rhyme.
[723] Berry, p. 105.
[724] Italics are my own here.
[725] Berry, p. 105.

can address the 'rhetorical rhythm of the verse' whilst having 'great spontaneity and humanity'.[726] It must be noted that such optimism is by no means a dated relic of the nascent RSC. Firstly, we find each element frequently repeated amongst my workshop practitioners, especially in response to current theatrical trends. Heather Long remarked upon the prevalent call in drama today for an actor to break the fourth wall. Soliloquy techniques match 'what's required of [the actor] in a lot of shows at the moment, because there's so much direct address.'[727] Secondly, many other strands of Shakespearean research also underscore the importance of each of these elements. The analysis of Palfrey and Stern, although within the realm of Renaissance practice, reaches similar conclusions. They discuss how a soliloquy needs to establish its own framework of 'dialogue',[728] but this is projected from the '"infrastructure" of a layered dramatic subjectivity.'[729] The prosody of the part, with moments of shifts in thought (sited on variations in lineation) creates the 'space for split minds' or 'competing agents', even where the actor-character is alone onstage.[730] They suggest the possibility for the 'current' of the 'reactivity' to 'return to the speaker',[731] in a form of self-dialogue. In the soliloquy workshops which follow, we will see how self-dialogue can in fact be projected towards the audience, with the use of present-day techniques. These techniques scrutinise the suggestion of Palfrey and Stern that 'in soliloquy there is *no* acted-upon object', and furthermore 'no shift of attention from speaker to addressee'.[732] However, the main spirit of their conclusion is concordant with the core principles of my practitioners. They chiefly establish how 'rhythmic obligations […] give Shakespearean speech much of its existential edge', creating the suggestion of 'living people pressed by circumstances'.[733] The situational context and the live nature of the speech's

---

[726] Barton, p. 97.
[727] Long, W9.
[728] Palfrey and Stern, p. 356.
[729] Palfrey and Stern, p. 370.
[730] Palfrey and Stern, p. 372.
[731] Palfrey and Stern, p. 368.
[732] Palfrey and Stern, p. 379.
[733] Palfrey and Stern, p. 352.

delivery, as championed by Barton, are thus similarly supported. And in speaking of prosody as establishing a 'micro-narrative',[734] just as Tarlinskaja has written of 'micro-situations',[735] Palfrey and Stern might be clearly seen to complement the present-day actor's attempt to establish a 'narrative' that runs through each soliloquy.[736] Each of Barton's three key soliloquy elements are echoed by present-day practitioners, whilst significant support can be found in the research of academics in the field of Renaissance prosody. Present-day acting techniques may indeed complement (deliberately or otherwise) key theories amongst historicists.

Notably, we can turn to Stanislavski, for a contrast with our present-day consensus. He did not endorse direct-audience-address, in an era where such practice had a very different theatrical context. Tortsov, his fictional director, does discuss the potential for a 'two-way communication between the audience and the stage'; he suggests that 'playing without an audience' is akin to 'singing in a room with a dead acoustic', where having a 'packed and sympathetic house' allows for a strong 'psychological acoustic' to be established.[737] However, the specific employment of direct-audience-address is rejected, where he finds such practice – as illustrated by the actors of 'French comedies' who speak straight to the house, 'boldly' and with 'great aplomb' – to be a display of 'stock-in-trade acting'.[738] It represents 'exhibitionism'. Yet, he does concede that if an actor is determined to pursue such a course, he better 'do it in such a way as to take charge of it'.[739] Tortsov prefers to regard soliloquies as a direct, literal representation of 'solitary communication, or self-communication', asking when a person might talk 'out loud' to themselves 'in real life'; consequently he struggles to 'justify onstage something which [he can seldom] justify in life'. Verse soliloquies represent an even more problematic event.[740] As a solution, Tortsov advocates the creation of a divided self; he locates

---

[734] Palfrey and Stern, p. 365.
[735] Tarlinskaja, p. 270. See Chapter 3.
[736] As further discussed throughout the soliloquy workshops.
[737] Stanislavski, p. 238.
[738] Ibid.
[739] Ibid.
[740] Stanislavski, p. 233.

one 'centre' in the actor's 'head', which 'represents consciousness', and a second 'centre' in the 'solar plexus', which represents 'emotion'.[741] However, the technical implication of how such centres might be channelled by an actor is less than clear.[742]

The concept of playing a divided self has in fact been suggested widely and across disciplines. Palfrey and Stern find evidence, in Shakespearean soliloquy, of a common use of a variety of 'switch' that is '"within" the speaker', creating a character that 'quite consciously divides *himself* up into different speaking parts.'[743] This sense of division also forms the basis of an exercise proposed by the late Frank Hauser (artistic director of the Oxford Playhouse, 1956-1973). He also spoke of a conversational dynamic in soliloquy.[744] Accordingly, he advocated that the actor should divide a soliloquy between a '"you" voice' (a 'blaming, accusing' voice) and an oppositional '"I" voice' (which is 'self-justifying' or even 'resentful').[745] As an initial exercise, he suggests an actor's addition of strategic swearwords, to make Renaissance 'derogatory language sound real'. Thus, an actor struggling with Hamlet's 'rogue and peasant slave'[746] line might state, as a *rehearsal-only* exercise, 'O! What a fucking rogue and peasant fucking slave am I!'. The line could consequently engender 'real anger and real self-disgust rather than disguised self-pity'.[747] Hauser's additional step is to combine this swearing exercise with one that explicitly splits the character voice in two, creating a 'you' and 'I' voice by changing the pronouns of a soliloquy. His edit to Hamlet's speech followed thus:

> YOU:
> *But you*
> a dull and muddy-mettled rascal, peak.
> Like a *fucking* John-a-dreams, unpregnant of *your* cause,
> And can say *fuck-all*…

---

[741] Stanislavski, p. 239.
[742] Stanislavski, p. 234.
[743] Palfrey and Stern, pp. 377-8.
[744] Frank Hauser and Russell Reich, *Notes on Directing* (London: Atlantic Books, 2003), p. 100.
[745] Ibid.
[746] *Hamlet*, II.i – I refer to the *RSC Complete Works*, where Hauser does not specify a source.
[747] Hauser, p. 99.

I:
Who calls me villain? Breaks my pate across?[748]

The combined exercise enables 'real conviction', ringing 'a true note of rage and contempt turned inward against the speaker'.[749] We see Palfrey and Stern's suggestion, that a 'space for split minds' is forged by the 'fracturing' of a line in a soliloquy, exemplified by recent practitioners.[750] The actor will of course eventually have to return from the rehearsal-room exercise and map the shifts of a divided character voice back onto Shakespeare's text. In contrast, the techniques explored in my workshops are all focused on precise features of Shakespearean *elocutio*, which can anticipate the audience interaction that will eventually arrive, at the moment that the stage event supplants the sense of a written text.

In present-day practice it is common to represent such a divided interiority by projecting externally towards the audience. Mark Rylance's experience of the Globe led to him appreciating 'the audience as other actors', where 'anything they did' functioned as the response of 'another player on the stage'.[751] In moments where the character 'has divided into two', Rylance saw the audience serving as the character's 'conscience or […] soul', becoming 'that part of [the character] that is so silent and very rarely speaks back, that you long for some guidance from […].[752] Peter Hall similarly interprets the audience as the character's 'alter ego' – in a rare example where one might bracket the practices of Rylance and Hall together. Hall's implication, however, results in a more inflexible actor-audience relationship; if the audience is cast as the 'alter ego', there is 'no character' therefore 'who lies in

---

[748] Hauser, p. 101. Cf. *Hamlet*, II.ii.497-503, in the *RSC Complete Works*; cf. F1: 'Yet I, | A dull and muddy-metled Rascall, peake | Like John-a-dreames, unpregnant of my cause, | And can say nothing […] Who calles me Villaine? Breakes my pate-a-crosse?' – *Hamlet*, II.ii, in the *Bodleian F1*.
[749] Hauser, p. 102.
[750] Palfrey and Stern, p. 372.
[751] Rylance, in Carson and Karim-Cooper, p. 107.
[752] Ibid.

soliloquy because he is talking honestly to the audience […]'.[753] This sense of
character honesty will be explored in the workshops.[754]

In spite of Stanislavski's personal suspicions, directors of my selected post-
Stanislavskian group overwhelmingly endorse direct-audience-address. Max
Stafford-Clark made the initial suggestion that it would be perfectly possible to use
'actions' with an audience specifically in mind, proposing that an actor could use
quite general, loose terms – where the character in question 'engages' or 'alerts [the]
audience'.[755] Actioning will feature particularly significantly across my soliloquy
workshops, where it explores how present-day techniques can turn the self-reflective
into active stagecraft. More nuance by Mike Alfreds, who envisages a sliding scale
of theatre styles, from the 'presentational' to the 'representational',[756] seeking to
identify where a production might sit in terms of 'actuality'.[757] Varieties of audience
relationship are possible:

> Do they become eavesdroppers […]? Do we acknowledge their presence? […] Does
> each character have a private relationship with the audience […] shared in
> confidential asides and soliloquies […]? […] do characters talk to an audience with
> the full awareness of the others? Or is it the actor rather than the character who
> communicates with the audience?[758]

He submits that the audience can be 'endowed' with a variety of roles as: 'confidant,
sympathiser, judge […]' or, indeed, 'someone to be challenged'.[759] This calls into
question the perspective of the engagement: whether the actor is considering the
audience 'from within the reality of the imagined world' or whether they are
'complicit with a full awareness of the theatrical event'.[760] This latter positioning

---

[753] Hall, p. 58.
[754] See Soliloquy Three and Iago.
[755] , *Letters*, p. 84.
[756] Alfreds, p. 256.
[757] Alfreds, p. 255.
[758] Alfreds, p. 256.
[759] Ibid.
[760] Ibid.

allowing, for example, the metatheatrical version of Iago that was established in my soliloquy workshops.[761]

However, like Stanislavski, Alfreds warns against any acting style that is preoccupied with the notion of directly 'affecting the audience'.[762] One example is where an actor tries to impose their 'ability to communicate difficult texts',[763] dramatic interaction being stifled by their attempts to demonstrate that they understand all the editorial footnotes. Another unhelpful style is favoured by actors who focus on 'their capacity for expressive emotion', or their '"comic timing", [...] charm, […] vitality, [and] wit of their choices' – decisions that Alfreds describes as 'totally the wrong […] objectives'.[764] Whilst Alfreds generally promotes the application of direct-audience-address, he warns against the 'demonstrative', favouring 'active' performances.[765] The 'demonstrative' actor is concerned chiefly with the audience reaction; the 'active' actor might address the audience, whilst still prioritising their smaller objective (their 'action'), at a specific moment in the scene.[766]

Regarding Katie Mitchell, it is significant that her single production of a Shakespeare play resulted in her having 'the audience cast as unacknowledged eavesdroppers'[767] – with Mitchell herself regarding '40 per cent of the play' to be in the 'form of direct audience address'.[768] Mitchell's appraisal of Shakespeare seemingly contrasts with her analysis of wider drama – where she finds instances of direct-audience-address to be 'very rare'.[769] The brief consideration given to monologues in her manual is perhaps misleadingly straightforward; she closes by

[761] See Soliloquy Three.
[762] Alfreds, p. 65.
[763] Ibid.
[764] Ibid.
[765] Ibid.
[766] Ibid.
[767] Paul Taylor, 'An Eye for the Small Print', *Independent*, 9 August 1994 <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/theatre--an-eye-for-the-small-print-katie-mitchell-has-chosen-to-cut-her-shakespearian-teeth-on-henry-vi-part-3-paul-taylor-analyses-a-young-directors-decisionmaking-process-1382536.html> [accessed 11 May 2016].
[768] Ibid.
[769] Mitchell, p. 64.

suggesting the character needs simply to find out what they want of the addressee, and then the actor needs to 'practise imagining [said] person or […] people'.[770] As will be seen, it can be much more complicated to establish simple character intention, and give definition of the addressee, when investigating a Shakespeare soliloquy.[771]

Declan Donnellan's discussion of soliloquies follows the trend of his overall manual – which is the actor's pursuit of the 'target'. He also holds great enthusiasm for the potential of direct-audience-address in Shakespeare, as illustrated by the example he cites from Romeo's proclamation:

> But, soft, what light through yonder window breaks?
> It is the east, and Juliet is the sun.[772]

Donnellan states that at this moment the actor 'addresses the audience directly'.[773] Like Alfreds, he cautions that the 'actor who describes merely emotes and shows', but the scope of his interpretation seemingly allows for a greater licence than might be permitted by others. Even if the 'line may refer to Juliet', it can 'only be "about" whoever [Romeo] is talking to'[774] and thus the line is really '"about" the audience'.[775] Whilst this might appear a controversial choice, Donnellan is not basing his decision on literary specifics, but on the discrete application of his technical 'target'. He questions what the visual provocation is for the actor at this point, and reasons that he might see 'a dull, passionless audience', which would 'force Romeo to kick-start [the viewers'] prosaic imaginations into appreciating the full splendour of Juliet'.[776] Juliet is clearly the focus of the metaphor, but the

---

[770] Ibid.

[771] Mitchell's approach was certainly regarded as a success by Peter Holland, as the production of *Henry VI Part 3* 'superbly demonstrated the high standards […] with which Mitchell approaches all her work' – Peter Holland, *English Shakespeares: Shakespeare on the English stage in the 1990s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 202.

[772] William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, II.i.47-48.

[773] Donnellan, p. 68.

[774] Donnellan, p. 69.

[775] Ibid.

[776] Ibid.

externalized action of Romeo/the actor could be compellingly focused on the audience itself. 'Romeo,' Donnellan concludes, 'is trying to change the audience's perception of Juliet […] If [the actor] plays this line to be "about" Juliet then the energy will snap like elastic […].'[777] Donnellan reasserts that all 'text is a tool to change what the target is already doing', and to this extent, the actor 'needs to work on what Romeo imagines that the audience is thinking'.[778]

From the perspective of 'actioning', a strict application would use the audience as the object of a transitive verb. This would allow for considerable variation, if one envisaged the audience (like Giles Block does) as potentially being cast as 'different characters at [different] times' within a play.[779] However, the range of techniques developed by post-Stanislavskian directors allows for the tantalizing prospect of making a speech both reflexive and expressive simultaneously, in its projected audience address: the gathered throng of the playhouse serving as the character's teeming brain, where the text itself offers details on a character's nuanced psychology. One thing that emerges from more recent theatre approaches is a common consensus in the use of direct-audience-address and a sense of augmented intimacy, in a given character's reliance upon soliloquy communication. However, any Shakespearean soliloquy study needs to account for a range of dramatic rhetorical contexts. The key questions posed may be pivotal, but the answers can be hard to ascertain. Heather Long recognises that the 'biggest challenge […] in Shakespeare [is] to know why', in the first instance, a character is soliloquising.[780] As Dickson Tyrrell similarly explains, the soliloquy should not be regarded, in its present-day staging, as an isolated, set-piece 'part of a Classical text' – where such attribution becomes 'a real curse' for actors. He will always question 'why […] Shakespeare [has] given this soliloquy to this actor' in this moment.[781] The following workshop accounts investigate this moment, channelling present-day dramatic

---

[777] Ibid.
[778] Ibid.
[779] Block, p. 80.
[780] Long, W9.
[781] Tyrrell, W1.

concerns through the three broad elements suggested by John Barton: (i) an actor-character's situational context, (ii) the narrative progression of their speech and (iii) the live moment of the performed event.

Soliloquy One: Action and Target – Macbeth's Dagger

The extract chosen for this workshop was Macbeth's 'dagger' speech.[782] The extract was read by Dickon Tyrrell and discussed with the actors Darrel Bailey and Sophie Dickson.

The first workshop aimed to give initial definition to two of the core post-Stanislavskian practices from my selection of directors: (i) 'actioning' in its most common form, as derived from Stafford-Clark (and being orientated strictly by transitive verbs); and (ii) Donnellan's use of the 'target'. I chose this specific extract for the very reason that it offers a clear illustration of a target, in this case the illusory dagger (in all its shifting implications) provides the external stimulus that could provoke an actor-character's motivation.[783] The two techniques are offered up for comparison, highlighting the distinction between the 'target' as the source of provocation and the 'action' as the actor-character's intention in a scene. The illusory dagger serves Donnellan's target technique particularly clearly. If we recall, the target must be external to the actor, and at a 'measurable distance'.[784] It 'exists before'[785] the actor needs it; Macbeth discovers the dagger hanging in front of his eyes. The target is also 'specific' (22), in its form as a dagger, but is capable of 'transforming' (23), in its potential. It is also 'active' and 'always mutating' (24), provoking new action from the actor in question. Furthermore, Donnellan notes that the target 'can be real or imaginary, [and] concrete or abstract'. Here Shakespeare is indeed providing the actor with a target that is 'imaginary' yet 'concrete', in the presence of the illusory dagger. Just as Donnellan illustrates his use of the 'target' in relation to *Romeo and Juliet*, where Romeo must convince the audience that Juliet is

---

[782] William Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, II.i.40-71. The mark-up text of the speech is found in Appendix A, at the end of this section.
[783] In Donnellan's manual, Shakespeare is assessed exclusively in regard to an extended analysis of *Romeo and Juliet* – see Soliloquy Two.
[784] Donnellan, p. 20.
[785] Ibid.

worthy of being seen, here Macbeth similarly 'may ask us'[786] (the audience) for assurance, to confirm that he is not alone in the dagger vision.

Analysing the very first line of the speech, actors immediately began referring to primary concerns about the staging of a soliloquy. Dickon Tyrrell referred to Macbeth's 'need to talk to the audience' at this point. Whilst in an acting context this may seem an uncontroversial observation, it is important to restate in relation to alternative literary-critical readings that may overlook such a direct interaction.[787] Sophie Dickson posed a similar question, but with reference to a larger post-Stanislavskian framework, 'what crucial point in [Macbeth's] super-objective' is calling for a soliloquy?[788] Tyrrell found the speech to be an immediate 'invitation to imagination';[789] as Macbeth questions if he sees a dagger (II.i.40), the more important distinction to make is that he is asking the audience directly, 'if *they* see [the dagger] too'.[790] From its outset this soliloquy suggests various avenues of persuasive potential.

This first line overhangs the metrical count of the ten-beat iambic pentameter line, an example of the commonly-found 'feminine ending'.[791] Concurring with my prepared hand-written annotations, Tyrrell has similarly drawn significance from the 'word "me" [being] isolated as the eleventh beat'.[792] This was indicative of the verse-orientated analysis that I would find actors using throughout the course of my workshops. Tyrrell regarded the feature as a 'lovely clue' given by Shakespeare to the actor, and worthy of specific focus;[793] this echoed and embodied Tarlinskaja's definition of 'rhythmical italics' as 'deviations from the metrical scheme [which]

---

[786] Block, p. 80.
[787] For an extended analysis that promotes soliloquies quite differently, see James E. Hirsch, *Shakespeare and the History of Soliloquies* (Madison, N. J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2003).
[788] Dickson, W1.
[789] Tyrrell, W1.
[790] Ibid.
[791] Specifically, a 'compound' (eleventh beat monosyllable) and 'light' (unstressed syllable) variety of a feminine ending. Tarlinskaja, p. 26.
[792] Tyrrell, W1.
[793] Ibid.

enhance meaning'.[794] The uncertainty of the rhythm befits Macbeth's questioning of the illusory dagger.

The audience encounters the violent image of the dagger before its significance is clarified. A controlled tempo, building on the enjambment of the opening line, offers the crucial reveal: that Macbeth sees the handle pointing 'toward' (II.i.41) his hand, fit for grasping. Dickson stated that the 'switch from passive to active' at this moment signifies Macbeth as the agent, the designated regicide.[795] Regardless of punctuation, there is a 'definite gear change'[796] before the second hemistich of the line which provokes a dramatic response; Dickon Tyrrell sees such a 'caesura [as] within the discipline of the line', and something allowing for 'very quick' transition.[797] The transition is emphasised by the metrical irregularity that might be created by successively stressed seventh and eighth syllables:[798]

x / x / x / / / x / x

The handle toward my hand? **Come, let** me clutch thee:

Dickson compared Macbeth's lunge for the dagger to Juliet's address of the 'vial' containing sleep-inducing 'liquor':[799]

My dismal scene I needs must act alone.
Come, vial.
What if this mixture do not work all?

(IV.iii.20-22)

---

[794] Tarlinskaja, p. 29.
[795] Dickson, W1.
[796] Tyrrell, W1.
[797] Ibid.
[798] Effectively a spondee (which I emphasise in bold font), based upon Tyrrell's reading of the line. 'Toward' is elided to a single syllable.
[799] *Romeo and Juliet,* in the *RSC Complete Works*, IV.i.95.

She found, in both examples, that the caesura functioned as a device of 'balancing', the actor-character weighing-up, in the moment, 'the situation' that surrounds them.[800]

Darrell Bailey saw Macbeth's move to 'personification' and *apostrophe*, as a transformation indicative of a soldier's frame of reference, the dagger as 'a person' now functioning as something 'more than just a tool', something that serves as an 'extension […] another part of himself'.[801] Whilst addressing the dagger with the 'intimate'[802] term of 'thee', Macbeth is also creating a counterbalance with the isolated 'me' of the opening line. The two hypermetrical words create an unusual couplet, but one that Dickon Tyrrell asserts will hold significance for 'the audience's ear'.[803] In terms of the Donnellan target, Macbeth has sought clarification from the audience regarding the dagger, before realising it is signalling him as the murderer-designate. Now he seeks to embrace the dagger as his partner in crime – his accessory in both senses. The dagger keeps morphing in significance.

The workshop simultaneously attempted to ascribe 'actions' to Macbeth's lines (using transitive verbs), to see if the technique could respond to the dagger's shifting provocation. Tyrrell questioned what it is that Macbeth would 'want to do to the audience' at the start, reasoning that he seeks *to recruit*[804] them, in order to verify his vision. Some debate followed regarding the second line. It had already been discussed that the dagger (as the target) is now given extra definition – Macbeth is 'being more specific about the image' and the positioning of the handle.[805] Both Bailey and Dickson felt a new distinct action would conflict with the enjambment of lines. To assuage the two positions, it was felt that something of a 'sub-action' might be employed, acknowledging the fluid rhythm, whilst allowing Macbeth *to enlighten*[806] the audience about the purpose of the recruitment: he now has the status

---

[800] Dickson, W1.
[801] Bailey, W1.
[802] Ibid.
[803] Tyrrell, W1.
[804] For clarity, I will express actions suggested by the workshop as infinitive verbs, and in italic type.
[805] Tyrrell, W1.
[806] Ibid.

of prospective assassin. In this manner, Shakespeare's patterns of thought were not only suggestive, but then subsequently responsive to actioning.

When Macbeth begins his *apostrophe* to the dagger, the line itself gifts the actor with a resonant verb of choice: 'clutch'. However, Dickson remarked how even this can be open to ambiguity, 'clutch' representing an 'embrace' or alternatively a bid 'to control', as with a 'wild animal.'[807] Tyrrell considered the prospects of 'clutch' serving as Macbeth's 'embrace' of a lover,[808] but felt the tone in the line was suggestive of 'desperation'. Dickson felt this represented Macbeth's attempt in 'possessing his own emotion' and 'taking control of his thoughts'; the dagger is something he wishes to actively clutch, rather than merely 'imagine'.[809]

Macbeth continues *to acknowledge*[810] the vision stating, 'I have thee not, and yet I see thee still' (II.i.42). There is audible balance here: this is this first model iambic pentameter line of the speech, and also one delivered in monosyllables. Tyrrell finds monosyllables serve as an invitation that the actor 'can slow' his pace of delivery.[811] There is a risk that Macbeth could seem passive at this moment, in his inability to obtain the dagger. For Bailey, this is indicative of Macbeth, the soldier, who has the clear impulse to act but, finds the projected 'result' tantalisingly 'beyond his comprehension'.[812] However, Dickson believed the significance of the line's close suggests Macbeth's continued attempt to assert 'mental control' over the chase; in this manner the dagger, as a 'target', is animalistic and Macbeth's address serves as the warning, 'I've still got you in my sight'.[813] Indeed, the senses of sight and touch anticipate the drive of the lines to come:

> Art thou not, fatal vision, sensible
> To feeling as to sight? Or art thou but

---

[807] Dickson, W1.
[808] Tyrrell, W1.
[809] Dickson, W1.
[810] Tyrrell, W1.
[811] Tyrrell, W1. Cf. Peter Hall: monosyllabic lines 'always indicate a slowing up [...]', p. 35; cf. John Barton: '[…] monosyllables [are] always good counsel not to rush it', p. 98.
[812] Bailey, W1.
[813] Dickson, W1.

> A dagger of the mind, a false creation,
> Proceeding from the heat-oppressèd brain?
>
> (II.i.43-46)

Macbeth's literal questioning may again be tonally supported by rhythmic italics, if the actor chooses a resonant trochaic inversion at the start of the line ('**Art** thou');[814] Shakespeare creates a question, instead of the alternative statement: 'Thou art not, fatal vision, sensible'.

The actor is faced with two consecutive questions, yet he cannot fall into the trap of treating them both as the same repeated rhetorical device. 'Actioning' and the Donnellan 'target' both address this dramatic imperative in a way that conventional rhetorical taxonomy cannot. Each repetition must have a different enacted result. Tyrrell asserts that Macbeth has to 'keep [the speech] moving forward'; his process is 'not just a case of [asking] another question, but [applying] a different technique in […] questioning'.[815] For Dickson, the 'specificity' of each phrase 'is crucial' in establishing the dramatic rhetoric across potentially repetitive modes of speech.[816] Distinction can be made: in the first instance Macbeth is questioning whether the dagger is tangible, and in the second he implicitly undermines the vision as being merely a 'false creation' (II.i.45). Tyrrell described how Macbeth initially decides *to cross-examine* the dagger and then starts *to scrutinise* it – where the 'energy' that the actor would derive from such a shift is 'a lovely gear change.'[817] Fittingly, verse features signal the potential for a shift between targets (and indeed actions). Firstly, the mid-line caesura is the moment of transition, following Macbeth's first question. Secondly, the word 'but' is placed at the end of the line accentuating Macbeth's change of tone, and the dagger's new status as merely a mental projection. Dickson described a resultant Macbeth who 'is constantly reacting to himself in the moment'.[818] Tyrrell and Dickson further agreed that 'by implication' this results in

---

[814] Where pertinent, I will use bold type to illustrate a stressed syllabic beat.
[815] Tyrrell, W1.
[816] Dickson, W1.
[817] Tyrrell, W1.
[818] Dickson, W1.

'dialogue'[819] – albeit with himself. Indeed, Dickson spoke of the potential for 'actions' in soliloquies to be applied as 'reflexive' verbs, working on the speaker's projected self.[820]

The dagger is both 'fatal', as the instrument to kill King Duncan, and fateful, to draw from its Renaissance double meaning. In the archaic usage of 'sensible' (to mean perceptible), Shakespeare mixes metaphors, creating the paradox of poetic synaesthesia. In this manner, Darrel Bailey regards Macbeth as 'challenging Fate' directly.[821] Macbeth's description of the 'dagger of the mind' reminds us of his personal level of risk. At this moment, we might draw from Donnellan's 'unbreakable double rule', when considering the 'stakes' of any scene: (i) 'at every living moment there is something to be lost and something to be won'; (ii) 'the thing that may be won is precisely the same size as the thing that may be lost.'[822] The very vision that tempts Macbeth to fulfil his ambition is the same object that will make him the architect of his own downfall – in performing the ultimate transgressive act in any commonweal (regicide).

In Macbeth's invocation of 'creation' – albeit in distinguishing the dagger's fictive nature – Shakespeare draws from the lexis of the play at large. Tyrrell sees this as typical of Shakespeare's skill in 'flagging […] up' the wider context of the play.[823] The audience have just seen Lady Macbeth's invocation of spirits to 'unsex' her and 'take' the 'milk' of her 'woman's breasts' for 'gall'.[824] She aimed to destroy her faculties of 'creation', yet Macbeth is generative by comparison. As a fitting juxtaposition, Macbeth is 'talking about killing somebody, yet there's creation here.'[825] Tyrrell spoke of the potential for Macbeth's 'confidence'[826] to run out, and Dickson discussed how it seems he 'runs out of steam when he's creating'.[827]

---

[819] Tyrrell, W1.
[820] Dickson, W1.
[821] Bailey, W1.
[822] Donnellan, p. 49.
[823] Tyrrell, W1.
[824] *Macbeth,* I.v.39-46, in the *RSC Complete Works*.
[825] Tyrrell, W1.
[826] Ibid.
[827] Dickson, W1.

However, the successive enjambment of lines up to this point might make this the most rapid statement so far in this speech, which would provide Macbeth with the necessary provocation to draw his real dagger.

The illusory dagger's bogus status is initially echoed in a hypersyllabic, disruptive rhythm (the word 'creation' overhangs the metre). Technically, this is perhaps best regarded as what Tarlinskaja calls a 'light'[828] feminine ending (where 'cre-a-tion' leaves us with an unstressed beat), rather than something akin to a famous Marlovian 'disyllabic -*ion* '[829] ending (which would be delivered as 'cre-a-ti-on').[830] However, this moment of uncertainty is followed by Macbeth's concrete dismissal of the false dagger as a product of a fever. In the return to metrical regularity, the actor-character can draw confidence, expressing that the vision is, 'Proceeding from the heat-oppressèd brain' (II.i.46). Macbeth is logically questioning whether he might be going mad, which might (ironically) be a clear example of his sanity at this point. This is reinforced by his return to regular metre.

Right up to this moment, Macbeth has continued to see the vision, as emphasised by the stressed fourth beat juxtaposition with the word 'yet'. To challenge the vision, and see if it is truly 'palpable', and tangible, he now draws the actual dagger that he owns: a 'wonderfully visual moment' that takes the audience from the realm of sheer 'imagination' into the 'very potent' arena of 'visual sense'.[831] Macbeth's final action in the opening of this speech might be *to pierce* the thought of the dagger itself. As ever, the term 'action' does not necessitate a physical gesture – Macbeth stabbing at the empty void above him – but it denotes perceived psychological subtext. As the dagger is drawn, the text appears to offer an absence of

---

[828] Tarlinskaja, p. 56.
[829] Tarlinskaja, p. 26.
[830] Shakespeare used the 'disyllabic -*ion*' far less regularly than Marlowe. Marlowe, in his two *Tamburlaine* plays used the trend 13.4 and 14 times per 1,000 lines respectively, which rose further in other examples, such as the first act of *The Jew of Malta* (which contains 49.1 usages per thousand lines); by the time Shakespeare wrote *Macbeth*, he himself is using this Marlovian effect only 2.4 times for every 1,000 lines. See Tarlinskaja, p. 28.
[831] Tyrrell, W1.

four syllables – seemingly indicative of space for 'stage business' (that is physical onstage action):

> I see thee yet, in form as palpable
> As this which now I draw.
> (II.i.47-8)

Elsewhere in Shakespeare – and especially in examples of interrupted dialogue – there can be ambiguity about lineation and questions as to whether such gaps are truly 'authorial' or are the result of printing aberrations. Here, in its clear isolation (in the midst of a soliloquy), metrical absence provides the actor-character with time for emphatic gesture.

      Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern discuss the '"short" line of verse' as one of many '"deviations"'. Such deviations are highlighted as 'clearly actable', when a speech otherwise follows 'metrical conventions'.[832] In such a case they propose a 'rule of thumb' that 'any "missing" stress or syllable in the actor's iambic line implies a pause of roughly equal length.'[833] In this instance, Tyrrell believed it was 'right that there are four beats […] which […] will seem longer, if [metrical rhythm has] all been obeyed up to that point.'[834]

      In the sense of RSC 'orthodoxy' this is also supported: Peter Hall is generally wary of actors taking unnecessary pauses, but certainly favours the observation of such a 'written-in pause',[835] where John Barton similarly speaks of an 'earned pause'.[836] It seems compelling, in this instance, that the pause may directly indicate the drawing process. If this involves psychological 'action' beyond the physical gesture, the actor might follow Hall's advice to 'always know what his emotional journey is during a pause'.[837] Ian McKellen seems to concur, in his suggestion that,

---

[832] Palfrey and Stern, p. 346.
[833] Ibid.
[834] Tyrrell, W1.
[835] Hall, p. 38.
[836] Barton, p. 33.
[837] Hall, p. 39.

where the rhythm of the blank verse 'enters an actor's soul', any missing words or syllables indicate that 'the mind is going on ticking'.[838]

Macbeth finally has the actual dagger in his hand. A modern audience might find extra significance during the pause, if they encounter the sheer size of a period dagger at this point. Neil MacGregor has discussed how a Jacobean dagger – as companion piece to the rapier – was 'roughly the size of a modern carving knife', concluding that 'the dagger that hovered before Macbeth was clearly no slight weapon'.[839] For the Jacobean Macbeth, it seems that his destiny is more tangibly held at this moment, but he still has to decide if he can complete the deed.

---

[838] McKellen, in Barton, p. 34.
[839] Neil MacGregor, *Shakespeare's Restless World* (London: Penguin, 2013), p. 63.

Appendix A:

<u>Extract mark-up</u>

Macbeth (II.i.40-71)

MACBETH   Is this a dagger which I see before me,[840]   40

                  The handle toward my hand? [841] Come, let me clutch thee:[842]

                  I have thee not, and yet I see thee still. [843]

                  Art thou not, fatal vision, sensible

                  To feeling as to sight?[844] Or art thou but

                  A dagger of the mind, a false creation,   45

                  Proceeding from the heat-oppressèd brain?[845]

                  I see thee yet, in form as palpable

                  As this which now I draw.[846]   *Draws his dagger*

---

[840] Action 1: Macbeth recruits the audience.

[841] Action 1b – almost as a sub-action: Macbeth enlightens the audience that he is active – the person to use the 'dagger'.

[842] Action 2: Macbeth snatches at the illusory 'dagger'.

[843] Action 3: Macbeth pursues the 'dagger'.

[844] Action 4: Macbeth cross-examines the 'dagger'.

[845] Action 5: Macbeth scrutinizes the 'dagger' – i.e. with greater doubt / animosity.

[846] Action 6: Macbeth pierces the illusory 'dagger' / challenges it with a tangible dagger.

Soliloquy Two: Action and Target II – Juliet's Wedding Night

The analysed extract was Juliet's 'Gallop apace' speech – *Romeo and Juliet* (III.ii.1-33). The workshop was conducted with the actor Sarah Ovens. The 'actions' that were derived during the workshop are illustrated in Appendix B, at the close of this chapter. 'Actions' are again indicated by verbs in the infinitive form (and italicised, for clarity, in the body of my text).

Having defined the basic application of strict actioning and Donnellan's target, in the second workshop my aim was to expand an analysis of the two techniques, this time across an extended extract with a greater number of 'shifts' in character speech.[847] This extract was chosen because Donnellan has used it in extended discussion in his manual.[848] To embrace the culture of present-day actioning more directly, I decided to try and utilise actions as suggested by the popular and widely-consulted *Actors' Thesaurus*.[849] The introduction to the thesaurus states the 'Actioning Mantra': 'One thought. One sentence. One breath. One action'; the suggestion is that an actor chooses an action 'for each whole thought', where a 'whole thought is comprised within a whole sentence'.[850] Here I encountered a key obstacle; as previously discussed, what constitutes a 'Shakespearean sentence' is ambiguous – significant debate queries the punctuation origins of source texts.[851] None of my workshop actors recommended aligning action divisions strictly with grammatical sentence boundaries. My actors responded to Shakespearean divisions in the same manner as Palfrey and Stern, that is by ascertaining 'discrete units of speech'[852] – where syntax is semantics: 'it signifies changes in meaning, mood, or movement.'[853] Similarly, Tarlinskaja's preference is to use syntactic breaks (rather than grammatical

---

[847] Palfrey and Stern, p. 355.
[848] Donnellan, pp. 217-227.
[849] The previously cited text of Marina Caldarone and Maggie Lloyd-Williams.
[850] Caldarone and Lloyd-Williams, p. xviii.
[851] See Chapter Four.
[852] Palfrey and Stern, p. 354.
[853] Palfrey and Stern, p. 350.

sentences) as an analytical filter.[854] Thus my investigation was conducted according to the spirit of strict actioning, but as modified by syntactic breaks or speech units as a guide, rather than punctuation.

The extract represents a particular category of Shakespearean soliloquy that could be seen to centre upon a singular passion or emotion. As Sarah Ovens stated, she could 'imagine a lot of people [performing] this speech, as they do for drama school', as 'one long […] wash of excitement'.[855] The pitfall is that such a speech, which seems to have 'a similar energy throughout', could be reduced to just '*one thing*' – the performance of a singular emotion.[856] For Donnellan, at the opening of the speech, the 'situation seems clear: Juliet is impatient' – even if this adjective 'cannot be played' expressly by the actor.[857] Whilst there is clear intensity, the speech can become dangerously static, in terms of dramatic action alone; it contains over thirty lines of text that could otherwise be reduced to the singular emotion of Juliet's impatience to spend her wedding night with Romeo. Thus it is preferable to avoid emotive acting and to navigate through the speech in terms of its dramatical-rhetorical stepping-stones. Ovens found greater nuance in the speech and thus believed that actioning could be a potential tool to uncover each of the subtle, 'slight differences' in Juliet's purpose as she progresses through the monologue.[858] The workshop revealed the considerable affinity between actioning and the historical-rhetorical analysis of Palfrey and Stern, who state that often whilst a 'single speech […] enacts one overall function […] internally it is constituted of numerous smaller units […]'.[859] Donnellan notes the significant layering of adjectives in this speech, advising the actor that 'there is no such thing as a description', where apparent 'passive description is in fact always an active attempt

---

[854] 'Syntactic structuring' is consistent over time and 'is independent of later editors […]'. Tarlinskaja, p. 132.
[855] Ovens, W2.
[856] Ibid.
[857] Donnellan, p. 220.
[858] Ovens, W2.
[859] Palfrey and Stern, p. 349.

to change a perception.'[860] Donnellan's target is distinct from actioning (in identifying the stimulus, the source that provokes an actor's reaction), but both techniques result in an attempt to answer the same question: 'what change is Juliet trying to make to Night?'.[861]

The overall metre of this speech is mostly typical of Shakespeare's early usage, being overwhelmingly 'regular' and containing infrequent caesuras. However, there is a high frequency of trochaic inversion within the extract (compared to other Shakespeare plays). There are thirty-three lines of speech before Juliet expressly addresses her Nurse and, of these lines, I would make a case for eleven potential trochaic inversions. This is however consistent with the wider pattern in *Romeo and Juliet* (rather than indicating a momentary aberration on Juliet's part); Marina Tarlinskaja gives a figure of 33.2% of first syllabic position stressing across this play.[862] Nevertheless, Sarah Ovens felt that the notable trochaic inversions in this speech generate a level of 'confidence' for Juliet – a 'surety in what she's saying' and a sense of 'power'.[863]

Recalling Tarlinskaja's specific association of rhythmical italics as aids to 'emphasize action'[864] and a 'micro-situation' of 'energetic motion' (270), it is no coincidence that the majority of Shakespeare's inversions in this extract complement a verb. The words 'gallop',[865] 'spread' (III.ii.5), 'leap' (III.ii.7), 'played' (III.ii.13), 'hood' (III.ii.14), 'come' (III.ii.17;20), and the juxtaposition of 'give' (III.ii.21) and 'take' (III.ii.22) all provide emphatic syllabic beginnings to a line, with the potential to 'mimic an action'.[866] It is important to stress how this reading coheres with common *dramatic* interpretation; Cicely Berry reaches similar conclusions, seeing the opening trochee as establishing 'a kind of gallop in the rhythm of the whole,

---

[860] Donnellan, p. 223. This dramatic sensibility will be significant in the embodiment of *enargeia* – see Chapter 6.
[861] Ibid.
[862] Tarlinskaja, Table B.1, p.295.
[863] Ovens, W2.
[864] Tarlinskaja, Appendix A., p. 274.
[865] *Romeo and Juliet*, III.ii.1, in the *RSC Complete Works*.
[866] Tarlinskaja, p. 270.

which is related to the racing of [Juliet's] blood […]'.[867] Two exceptions to this trend in verbs are: the significant noun, 'lovers' (III.ii.8), and the adjectival description of Romeo as being 'whiter than new snow upon a raven's back' (III.ii.19). Tellingly this latter example is also an isolated instance of a hypersyllabic line; verse features make the image of Romeo's luminescence doubly emphatic, and a clear highlight of the speech. Within this context, it is thus comparatively easy to build a bridge between Shakespeare's vibrant *elocutio* and present-day actions that will fashion an animated 'Juliet'. The actor's search for implied actions is fruitfully repaid, where verbs of action (many of which are helpfully imperative) are so explicit in the text.

To establish a given action however, one must first clarify the object of address (the addressee). This is the first major task for any soliloquy. Whilst Sarah Ovens was primarily basing her responses upon her experience working on the RSC stage (and not at the shared-light Globe), it is significant that the manuals of Mike Alfreds and Declan Donnellan readily apply direct-audience-address, even where they are chiefly anticipating the present-day convention of a darkened playhouse;[868] tactics approaching direct-audience-address in modern theatre comfortably pre-date the reconstruction of Shakespeare's Globe. Whilst being mindful of theatre ecology, it is important to include concerns that extend beyond the architectural. Performance convention is not solely attributed to the 'material surround'[869] of the theatre, even where the shared-lighting of Shakespeare's Globe has offered the boon for such direct audience interaction to be so compellingly energised.[870]

Juliet's speech begins with clear *apostrophe* – again, a great actioning aid, as it clarifies the addressee for us. The 'fiery-footed steeds' (III.ii.1) are addressed in the second person, and this course is followed until the fourth line. 'Love-performing

---

[867] Berry, p. 60.
[868] Donnellan has never directed for Shakespeare's Globe. Alfreds has directed two productions there: *Cymbeline* (2001) and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (2002). <http://www.shakespearesglobe.com/discovery-space/previous-productions> [accessed 11 May 2016].
[869] Tribble, p. 19.
[870] See Chapter 4.

night' (III.ii.5) becomes the next addressee, as Juliet commands her to 'spread' her 'close curtain'. Juliet's sub-clause – 'that runaway's eyes may wink' (III.ii.6) – explores her wish for privacy and discretion. With this opening, Juliet is 'reaching out for an absent, transcendent addressee',[871] but at the next juncture, the search for a clear addressee becomes obfuscated. Juliet announces:

> Lovers can see to do their amorous rites
> By their own beauties, or if love be blind,
> It best agrees with night.[872]
>
> (III.ii.8-10)

The object of address seems to have changed: Juliet refers to 'night' in a divorced sense, rather than continuing to address night directly in the second person. A shift in delivery is perhaps more pointedly marked by the punctuation of the *RSC Complete Works* edition (which offers these lines as a separate sentence), where F1 presents the lines as another clause in a longer continued address, preceded and succeeded by commas.[873] Yet, regardless of punctuation variant, the syntactic suggestion of a change in focus is consistent, signalling for the actor to engage in a moment of self-address or direct consultation with the audience.

Juliet unambiguously returns to night, with her command, 'Come, civil night' (III.ii.10). This addressee is maintained with further requests/demands: Juliet asks night to 'learn' (III.ii.12) her and then to 'hood' her 'unmanned blood' (III.ii.14) with night's 'black mantle' (III.ii.15). Whilst the request/demand balance is unclear, the addressee is mostly clarified by direct *apostrophe*, where dramatic rhetoric directly serves present-day actioning. However, Juliet's declaration, 'Come night, come Romeo, come thou day in night' (III.ii.17), culminates in purposeful ambiguity of the addressee's identity. We can question how far night and Romeo are being called upon in exactly the same manner, and also the resultant meaning behind the

---

[871] Cf. Romeo and his search for 'Cupid, beauty, Rosaline'. Palfrey and Stern, p. 358.
[872] This extract (taken from the *RSC Complete Works*) is based on Q4 (of 1622). F1 reads, '**And** by their own beauties […]' – in the *Bodleian F1*. This alternative line commands more attention (whether dramatically useful or not), as a result of conspicuous accentual and hypersyllabic deviation.
[873] *Bodleian F1*.

merged 'day in night'. Is there an alliance to be sought or is the image of Romeo, 'whiter than snow', representative of his transcendence over night? If actioning, we may question if the line allows for multiple, discrete actions or whether it is more profitable to play the same repeated action, but with a transference of addressee.

At the very moment Romeo has supplanted night, Juliet swiftly returns to singular *apostrophe*: 'Come, gentle night' (III.ii.20). With this address, Juliet makes a series of requests/demands via further imperative verbs: 'Give me' (III.ii.21), 'Take him' (III.ii.22), 'cut him' (III.ii.22); Shakespeare uses three successive trochaic inversions (III.ii.20-22) – in the spirit of Tarlinskaja's analysis. Yet the anticipated prize of Romeo again leads Juliet towards overindulgence. Juliet presents the culmination of her argument to night: 'That all the world will be in love with night | And pay no worship to the garish sun' (III.ii.24-5). On the one hand, Juliet has been 'distracting' herself with images of Romeo, giving her speech 'a certain energy' – she has moved away from the intimacy of a second-person address, before returning to the figure of night.[874] On the other hand however, Juliet's larger purpose is the possession of Romeo, which overwhelms her – she has 'bought the mansion of a love' (III.ii.26) – and this creates the need for the actor to employ either a reflexive verb of actioning or a moment of direct-audience-address (III.ii.26-34). In either case, the speech emphasises further facets of Juliet's impatience.

This basic quest for an addressee highlights the nature of Sarah Ovens' concern, that a performance of Juliet in this extract might be reduced to a general display of impatience. Instead, the impatience can be approached through a series of strategic moves (a Renaissance *copia*), with different addressees in mind. The techniques of strict actioning and Donnellan's target both hold that the actor playing Juliet diligently avoid the playing of a specific emotion – in this case the 'state' of impatience.[875] But in any case, in this speech we see evidence of various emotions for Juliet: 'fear', 'anticipation', 'excitement', and the simultaneous placement of the

---

[874] Ovens, W2.
[875] See Chapter Two.

'self-destructive' with 'desire' – in her wish to lose her virginity and thereby gain erotic knowledge.[876]

Having established a chain of addressees, Ovens and I attempted to fashion an 'actioned' reading of the extract, selecting appropriate transitive verbs (using the *Actors' Thesaurus* where possible). The actions that follow are not intended to impose a singular reading of the extract, instead they represent how an individual actor might try to carve a pathway through the speech using actioning.

Our first transitive verb derived its function from Juliet's imperative 'gallop.' Her general wish may be for the sun to set but, in actioning terms, her focus is on the horses – the mythical team that drives the sun across the sky. Accordingly, we selected the verb *to gee-up*[877] (which we chose independently),[878] as we felt it satisfied the given action, whilst directly evoking the equine world. Juliet is directing the horses towards the 'lodging' of the sun god, 'Phoebus' (III.ii.2), but the image intensifies with her selection of 'Phaethon' (Phoebus' son) as her 'wagoner' (III.ii.2-3) – the chaotic charioteer of legend, who crashed the mythical horses into the earth; thus Juliet toys with potential catastrophe. Donnellan finds that Juliet 'conjures another disobeying child who was destroyed by rashness', perhaps in the knowledge that she is 'also careering hectically towards chaos, death and sterility. And she wants not to see these things'.[879] Donnellan's reading might seem to contrast with any interpretation of the speech having (at least superficially) boundless enthusiasm. However, for either approach, the alliterative whipping of the horses to the west can be seen to accentuate Juliet's heightening fervour. We assigned Juliet with a second action, *to threaten* the horses at this point. If one follows Donnellan's reading, Juliet's regret at having conjured Phaethon could serve as her motivation to change her address towards night (III.ii.5). This would be complemented by Cicely Berry's reading, where she regards the 'theme' of Juliet's speech being contained in the 'first

---

[876] Ovens, W2.
[877] All selected actions will appear in the infinitive form, and in italic type.
[878] One of only three verbs that we selected that were not suggested by the *Thesaurus*.
[879] Donnellan, p. 221.

four lines' – as common to Shakespearean soliloquy structure – where the 'word "immediately" […] sets the tone and tempo of the speech.'[880]

In turning towards night, Juliet seeks *to beg* for night to 'spread' (III.ii.5) the cover of darkness. However, in describing night as 'love-performing' (III.ii.5), Juliet might then seek *to flatter* night. This additional action attempts to make the first more palatable. These are progressive, tactical stepping-stones, where modern actioning can be used to account for complex manoeuvres in Shakespeare's dramatic rhetoric.[881] The image of 'runaway's eyes' (III.ii.6) being covered proves complicated – we might question whether they are of singular or plural ownership; F1 offers the unpunctuated 'run-awayes',[882] which does not clarify the number of the possessive.[883] Juliet is elucidating her attempt *to request*[884] of night the discretion of encroaching darkness. The identity/identities of the 'runaway' figure(s) is/are ambiguous; as a solo runaway, 'Phaethon' or 'a [generic] wanderer' have been suggested. Ovens chose the runaway to represent a singular 'passer-by',[885] who must be prevented from seeing Romeo and Juliet, so that they will remain 'untalked of and unseen' (III.ii.7).

As discussed, Juliet now moves away from night, towards an ambiguous addressee. In a moment of either self-address or direct-audience-address, Juliet proclaims that 'Lovers can see to do their amorous rites' (III.ii.8). Ovens considered this 'a personal […] wonderfully intimate moment' that the audience are being allowed to 'glimpse', and consequently questioned whether direct-audience-address might overtly undermine the subtler tone of intimacy (otherwise created by Juliet in a

---

[880] Berry, p. 131.

[881] 'Flatter' was derived from the *Thesaurus* entry for 'compliment'. Caldarone and Lloyd-Williams, p. 26.

[882] *Romeo and Juliet*, in the *Bodleian F1*, p. 65.

[883] The *RSC Complete Works* and Penguin editions favour the singular: *RSC*, p. 1712; *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. by Spencer, p. 67. The *Oxford Complete Works* refers to plural possession – p. 386.

[884] A second action that we chose as an exception to the *Thesaurus*. A strictly transitive alternative, e.g. 'to beseech' (*Thesaurus*, p. 16) would serve a stricter application. I retain this lapse as accurate witness to the recorded workshop.

[885] Ovens, W2.

moment of self-address).[886] Our reading regarded this moment as Juliet's attempt *to challenge* night. This implied sentiment would still be possible if the actor were vocally delivering the line to the audience rather than the heavens above the stage of Shakespeare's Globe; the transitive pulse of the action can still be directed at night. The lovers will provide their own luminescence.

Following a mid-line caesura, Juliet returns to night, with her *apostrophe*, 'Come, civil night' (III.ii.10). The possibilities are numerous. Cicely Berry feels the 'pulse' changes at this moment, to suit 'images [which] are very sensuous and active'.[887] For Ovens, Juliet's juxtaposition of the word 'civil' with her description of night as a 'sober-suited matron' (III.ii.11), indicated attempted 'flattery'.[888] Contrastingly, Donnellan's situates Juliet in a position of far greater anxiety, seeing her as escaping the initial implied doom of her conjured Phaethon image. Donnellan's Juliet regards night as a 'cosy aunt', who is a 'far safer' figure in being 'sober-suited and thoroughly respectable' – someone who would not 'do anything impulsive and destructive'.[889] Following workshop discussion, Ovens and I opted for Juliet wishing *to tease* night at this stage. We felt this was consistent with our 'Juliet' (who had previously threatened the horses) – a girl who is passionate and impatient, but allows this to manifest in manipulative and capricious ways. However, Ovens did acknowledge that she 'could understand' how Juliet could easily be 'read' in the manner suggested by Donnellan, as Juliet is 'venturing into something' unknown and in 'quite an obsessive' spirit.[890]

Juliet remarks 'learn me' (III.ii.12), in wishing to be taught by night. At this point 'strict actioning' reveals an enticing contradiction. Seemingly, Juliet becomes passive, in conceding her youth and wishing to attain womanhood – by consummation of her marriage. Is this submission, Juliet as a momentarily passive party, wishing to be taught how to 'win' the loss of virginity? One might make

---

[886] Ibid.
[887] Berry, p. 131.
[888] Ovens, W2.
[889] Donnellan, p. 221.
[890] Ovens, W2.

comparison with Palfrey and Stern's description of passions in 'early modern scientific thought' being divisible into 'two sets […] one drawing the spirits, the other repelling them.'[891] Whilst the nature of the passions is quite different, we found in this moment a striking problematic opportunity (that oxymoronic obstacle that encourages the resourceful actor), the actor-character potentially becomes a passive suppliant. Strict actioning of course imposes a contrary demand, that an actor should always find a strategy to make their character expressly active. As a solution, Juliet could remain an imposing, active party, by demanding that she be taught sexual knowledge.[892] Either version of a Juliet character might be created from the 'winning match' (III.ii.12) – which Donnellan highlights as the direct 'stakes' in the speech.[893]

The choices the actor takes signify the quality of Juliet's inexperience. Donnellan questions whether Juliet's reference to a 'pair of stainless maidenhoods' (III.ii.13) is a 'rare attack of naïveté' – an 'assumption' of Romeo's virginity.[894] Ovens suspects a youthful Juliet is 'experiencing things for the first time', but questioned whether this would offer the best option for the actor to play;[895] it could be 'more interesting to not think of [Juliet] as naïve',[896] recognising textual evidence for a maturity beyond her years, especially where eloquence is concerned. Our reading of Juliet retained a sense of control, seeing this moment as her effort *to dare* night to allow her to lose her virginity.

Juliet's progression continues along paradoxical lines; further imperatives suggest she retains active control, but the requests have a masochistic impulse. Juliet decides *to appeal to*[897] night to 'hood' the blushes of her inexperienced, 'unmanned blood' (III.ii.14), before she seemingly seeks *to goad* night with the image of her projected boldness and her wish to see 'true love acted' (III.ii.16). Berry regards the request for hooding as part of a completely metrically 'inverted' line, where the

---

[891] Being labelled as: 'concupiscible or irascible'. Palfrey and Stern, p. 313.
[892] Moseley allows for the action 'to submit to', p. 14.
[893] Donnellan, p. 225.
[894] Ibid.
[895] Ovens, W2.
[896] Ibid.
[897] Our third exception to the *Thesaurus*.

rhythm is 'underpinning [Juliet's] sexual arousal'.[898] Ovens stated that 'darkness will […] shield [Juliet's] embarrassment and lack of experience' until she has gained confidence. The 'simple modesty' will then be a 'pretence' by the time the 'act of sex' begins, because Juliet will by this stage really know 'what she is doing'.[899]

Juliet now turns to mixed *apostrophe*, addressing night and Romeo in close proximity, and coupling them with the use of antithesis. A non-dramatic rhetorical reading might mark the straightforward *anaphora* – Shakespeare's repetition of the imperative 'come' (III.ii.17) – and regard this as an indication that Juliet is repeating the same tone twice. However, the challenge presented by a rapid change in addressee allows for actioning to assert its value. We regarded Juliet as wishing *to lure* night at this point – anticipating a comparison between night and Romeo and the consequent elevation of her lover's glory. Actioning provides the motivationally engaged contrast: Juliet seeks *to recruit* Romeo. There may be dry surface *anaphora*, but Shakespeare's deeper dramatic rhetoric manipulates the two addressees in different ways. Actioning reveals the implicit motive, energy and action more clearly, and Shakespeare's dramatic qualities are more fully revealed as a result.

Close antithesis lends itself to Donnellan's target. We recall his 'unbreakable double rule' that: at 'every living moment there is something to be lost and something to be won', with both being equal in size.[900] Likewise, beyond any assertion of present-day practice, Palfrey and Stern similarly describe the part-based approach producing character experiences that are 'continually defined by contingency, probation, and risk.'[901] Juliet's 'thing to be won' is sexual experience and the 'thing to be lost' is virginity. However, Juliet bridges the gulf between night-personified and her Romeo. Donnellan regards Juliet as dismissing negative possibilities where, in her expression that 'she can only play a match that wins', she 'argues with all the confidence of a doubter'.[902] The resultant juxtaposition of 'day in

---

[898] Berry, p. 60.
[899] Ovens, W2.
[900] Donnellan, p. 51.
[901] Palfrey and Stern, p. 352.
[902] Donnellan, p. 225.

night' (III.ii.17) signals Juliet's wish *to adore* Romeo. We decided that, having ensnared night, Juliet could attempt *to idolise* Romeo, his love shining 'whiter than new snow upon a raven's back' (III.ii.19). Whilst both of these verbs are taken directly from the *Thesaurus*, they may perhaps stretch the action too far beyond the simple, deliberate, transitive task. Other verbs, such as 'to kiss' or 'to embrace' would present smaller concrete tasks that could nevertheless evoke a spirit of adulation.

There can be stark differences in interpretation. Donnellan consistently finds looming threat in Juliet's imagery, regarding Romeo 'upon the wings of night' (III.ii.18) as a denial of 'warm flesh', a Romeo who, being 'white', represents a naked 'corpse'.[903] For Donnellan, sex is joined by 'Death' who 'makes a grim threesome between the sheets,' the imagery culminating in the darkness of 'Matron Night' being 'metamorphosed' into a 'raven, the harbinger of evil, who will croak himself hoarse for Lady Macbeth.'[904] The trepidation of Donnellan's reading contrasts markedly with the an interpretation of this moment as an image of triumphant, incandescent love. One might draw from the common Renaissance poetic metaphor of death as the experience of sexual orgasm;[905] strikingly it will be Juliet's own 'death' that will explode Romeo into heavenly transcendence: 'when I shall die, | Take him and cut him out in little stars' (III.iii.21-2). In this case, sexual innuendo is drawn from (and supplants) the superficial meaning of Juliet's death, where Donnellan's vision of Death, by contrast, imposes upon the sexual act.

Workshop dialogue discussed Juliet's momentary potential as a courtly sycophant. At the time, we felt this specific *apostrophe* to night, and use of the adjectives 'gentle', 'loving' and 'black-browed' (III.ii.20), represented Juliet's attempt *to bewitch*. Retrospectively, I recognise this can be seen to complicate actioning, where it presupposes success (the recipient party playing the response of

---

[903] Donnellan, p. 222.
[904] Ibid.
[905] The *OED* cites the first citation as: *Much adoe about nothing* [Q1] – see *Romeo and Juliet*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, III.ii.43-4.

being bewitched).[906] The focus should be the *attempt* of the action. A verb of pursuit, such as 'to hound', might therefore have been preferable. During a soliloquy (free from an interlocutor) the problem is not made manifest, but the effect can create debate where dialogue is concerned.[907] Donnellan's inference again returns to the perilous 'double rule'. Regarding 'Night' as Juliet's target, he queries what change Juliet wishes to bring about, and if she is asking a black-browed figure to try to be 'gentle and loving too';[908] the double stakes are that 'Night' will either be 'gentle' or 'ferocious'.[909]

But Juliet certainly has the resolve to suggest solutions. Her choice of the verb 'give me' (III.ii.21) – both with its imperative mood and its metrical placement as a trochaic inversion – results in another problematic mix of request and command. We regarded this as an attempt *to bribe* night: if Juliet is gifted Romeo for her sexual fulfilment, night will be able to furnish the evening firmament with Romeo's luminescent presence. In brokering the deal, Juliet seeks *to champion* Romeo. We encounter a chain of actioning that responds to the delicate intricacies of Shakespeare's imagery: Romeo becomes Juliet's direct object (the focus of her action verb), yet night remains her addressee. Juliet's poeticism substantiates the argument she presents to night, that 'all the world' will adore her (III.ii.24) and cease to recognise the rival 'garish sun' (III.ii.25). Actioning reveals Shakespeare's purposeful ambiguity of addressee, where a mutualistic relationship between night and Romeo is the crux of Juliet's argument.

Donnellan's reading conjures a Juliet of greater anxiety, who is increasingly understanding 'the danger of her situation', which culminates in a weakening of 'resolve';[910] thus she desperately searches for 'new images to plug her leaking self-confidence' (222). Donnellan's double stakes endure throughout this speech: personified Time is 'breeding dreadful pictures' which Juliet must 'run to outstrip'

---

[906] Moseley allows such verbs, as they are played in the spirit of the attempt, not the success, p. 28.
[907] See Chapter 7 for implications in repartee.
[908] Donnellan, p. 223.
[909] Ibid.
[910] Donnellan, p. 222.

and then 'rein in' (225). Whilst impatience may have initially provoked Juliet, Donnellan finds that the 'galloping stakes' of the passage 'whip the reigns of Time' (218) from her hands as 'her fear [which] is also implicit' emerges (225).

Juliet now abandons her previous attempts at *apostrophe*. The proclamation 'O' (l. 26) establishes either self-reflection or direct-audience-address. Ovens suggested that such a direct-audience-address would be especially effective in the Globe, but warned how the mode might not naturally suit the combination of a proscenium arch and a 'dark audience' space.[911] We might recall however, that Alfreds and Donnellan developed there techniques in relation to generalised theatrical ecologies (not original practices). Juliet recognises that she has bought the deeds to the 'mansion of a love' without experiencing the physical joys of possession (III.ii.26-7), with its sexual connotation. This could be played as Juliet's attempt *to chastise* herself.

There is striking pace in Juliet's turmoil. She is concerned to exact her dues, but immediately doubts whether she will meet Romeo's expectations – she is 'sold' (III.ii.27) but 'not yet enjoyed' (III.ii.28). Shakespeare creates a balanced antithesis between Juliet's new attainment of married status and the notion that she has become property of a husband. Naturally, historical performance context significantly impacts upon the delivery and reception of such a line. However, from an actioning perspective one is required to respond to the shift created by this clause. If an actor followed Moseley's lead, they might choose a passive action, *to be physically enjoyed by* Romeo; we decided Juliet could aim *to rouse* herself at this moment. There is insecurity for Juliet, but it can be played with the active intention to change her situation – the very fundamental essence of dramatic rhetoric.

As the speech draws towards its close, Juliet directly addresses the 'tedious' (III.ii.28) nature of her 'listless'[912] impatience. There is potential for direct-audience-address as she attempts *to implore* the audience to recognise her desperation to sleep with Romeo; he represents the 'new robes' (III.ii.30) that she is desperate to wear.

---

[911] Ovens, W2.
[912] Berry, p. 131.

Juliet has been building momentum throughout the speech to reach this moment. Her final transition – with the remark, 'O, here comes my nurse' (III.ii.31) – might seem bland and expositional. However, strict actioning encourages greater character investment. Tellingly, Juliet lingers in soliloquy for one final utterance, to convey to the audience that 'every tongue that speaks | But Romeo's name speaks heavenly eloquence' (III.ii.33-4). The passage of speech may have navigated many dark turnings of threatening imagery, but at her final opportunity Juliet manages *to embrace* the image of Romeo, and this is the music that resonates at the soliloquy's close.

Appendix B:

<u>Extract mark-up</u>

Romeo and Juliet (III.ii.1-33)

Enter Juliet alone

JULIET

    Gallop apace,[913] you fiery-footed steeds,

    Towards Phoebus' lodging:[914] such a wagoner

    As Phaethon would whip you to the west,

    And bring in cloudy night immediately.[915]

    Spread thy close curtain,[916] love-performing night,[917]   5

    That runaway's eyes may wink and Romeo

    Leap to these arms, untalked of and unseen.[918]

    Lovers can see[919] to do their amorous rites

    By their own beauties, or if love be blind,

    It best agrees with night.[920] Come, civil night,   10

    Thou sober-suited matron all in black,[921]

    And learn me how to lose a winning match,

    Played for a pair of stainless maidenhoods:[922]

    Hood my unmanned blood, bating in my cheeks,

    With thy black mantle,[923] till strange love grow bold,   15

    Think true love acted simple modesty.[924]

---

[913] Addressee: the horses.
[914] Action: drive / gee-up the steeds.
[915] Action: threaten the horses.
[916] Addressee: Night. Action: beg Night.
[917] Action: flatter Night.
[918] Action: make a request of Night.
[919] Addressee: self-address or direct-audience-address?
[920] Action: challenge Night.
[921] Addressee: Night. Action: tease Night.
[922] Action: dare Night.
[923] Action: appeal to Night.

Come night,[925] come Romeo,[926] come thou day in night,[927]

For thou wilt lie upon the wings of night

Whiter than new snow upon a raven's back.[928]

Come, gentle night, come, loving, black-browed night,[929]   20

Give me my Romeo, and when I shall die,

Take him and cut him out in little stars,[930]

And he will make the face of heaven so fine

That all the world will be in love with night

And pay no worship to the garish sun.[931]   25

O, I have bought the mansion of a love,

But not possessed it,[932] and though I am sold,

Not yet enjoyed.[933] So tedious is this day

As is the night before some festival

To an impatient child that hath new robes   30

And may not wear them.[934] O, here comes my nurse,

[*Enter Nurse, with cords*]

And she brings news, and every tongue that speaks

But Romeo's name speaks heavenly eloquence.[935]

---

[924] Action: goad Night.
[925] Action: lure Night.
[926] Addressee: Romeo. Action: lead / recruit Romeo.
[927] Action: adore Romeo.
[928] Action: idolise Romeo.
[929] Addressee: Night. Action: bewitch Night.
[930] Action: bribe Night – she is tellingly using her *own* death.
[931] Action: champion Romeo – he will outshine the Sun.
[932] Addressee: self or to audience? Action: self-chastisement?
[933] Action: rousing herself? Addressee: audience?
[934] Addressee: self/audience/ Time? Action: implore?
[935] Addressee: self / audience? Action: embrace Romeo.

Soliloquy Three: Innermost Thoughts – *Othello*

This workshop analysed two soliloquies by Iago[936] and Othello's 'cause' speech.[937] It was conducted with the actor David Sturzaker.

The last of the soliloquy studies is informed by a comparison between the characters of Iago and Othello. The intention was to offer analyse two very different styles of soliloquy construction from within the same play. Iago was deliberately chosen as an example to review the received common wisdom that soliloquies represent a private revelation to the audience of a character's innermost thoughts.[938] Lorna Hutson has written of English dramatic practice serving 'to enable audiences to infer psychology […] by inventing topical and […] *circumstantial* arguments.'[939] In Othello and Iago we witness different attempts at argument construction, whilst we might also consider how successfully the *fabula* (the background story) is projected to the audience via the *sjuzhet* (the staged events of the play).[940] We will turn more specifically to described examples of offstage action in Chapter 6, however here we consider the notion of character coherence; we look for what Hutson refers to as a projection of 'psychological, as well as logical, causality in order to make sense of what is seen on stage.'[941] This is not to mean that we impose coherence as a quest for 'liberal humanist universalizing'[942] and some kind of representation of a fixed human condition. Instead, Hutson's search for the circumstantial, 'the inference of *causae* […] motives, intentions',[943] converges with a post-Stanislavskian search for actions and they complement one another in revealing the *dramatic* function of Shakespearean *elocutio*.

---

[936] The two soliloquies are to be found at: I.iii.372-393 and II.i.270-296. William Shakespeare, *Othello*, in *the RSC Complete Works*.
[937] *Othello*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, V.ii.1-22.
[938] See Chapter 5 introduction.
[939] See: thesis introduction; Hutson, p. 15; cf. Chapter 6 and *enargeia*, especially in relation to *Hamlet*.
[940] See thesis introduction; Hutson, pp. 6 and 9.
[941] Hutson, p. 12.
[942] Hutson, p.14.
[943] Hutson, p. 20.

Simon Russell Beale was a specific catalyst for this discussion. Having played Iago at the National Theatre,[944] Russell Beale has since described the character as seemingly 'the only person' in Shakespeare who breaks the 'fundamental convention' of soliloquies 'telling the truth to the audience'.[945] He feels that 'Iago lies as much in soliloquy as he does elsewhere'[946] – a position that is 'unforgivable',[947] as far as the audience is concerned. Whilst Iago declares to the audience 'reasons' behind his decisions to act,[948] he is fundamentally nonchalant; the audience can 'believe' the reasons 'if [they] want', he does not 'really care what [the audience's] attitude is' towards him.[949] Furthermore, we then question how far he believes such reasons himself. An alternative reading is that the audience is still significant to Iago; even if he is lying he cares about the audience, as far as he wishes to manipulate them. However, both of these readings rely on the consistent points that Iago is being dishonest and insincere (rather than confessional).

In the workshop, David Sturzaker was asked to consider two different readings of Iago's soliloquy at the start Act Two. The first applied received soliloquy convention, regarding Iago as sharing a genuine interaction with the audience, revealing details that he considered to be truthful. The second saw Iago as attempting to manipulate the audience, by offering a version of events, reasons to endorse his course of action – but ones which might not be heartfelt. In the first reading, the

---

[944] *Othello*, co-dir. by Peter Stein and Sam Mendes (co-production: Salzburg Festival and National Theatre, 1997-8).
[945] Simon Russell Beale, in Chris Wiegand, 'Simon Russell Beale webchat – full Q + A', *Guardian*, published online, 24 April 2014 <http://www.theguardian.com/stage/2014/apr/24/simon-russell-beale-webchat-ask-the-actor> [accessed 11 May 2016].
[946] Ibid.
[947] 'Simon Russell Beale on Shakespearean Soliloquies', taken from Series 40, Episode 4, *South Bank Show,* Sky Arts, published on YouTube, 3 July 2014 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cDPyINqK6Lo> [accessed 11 May 2016]; also echoed by Russell Beale in *Michael Parkinson: Masterclass*, Season 2, Episode 5, Sky Arts, 2014.
[948] Dan Poole and Giles Terera, 'Simon Russell Beale Interview', *Muse of Fire: The Resource*, online video recording, Shakespeare's Globe website, <https://globeplayer.tv/museoffire?utf8=✓&per=99999> [accessed 11 May 2016].
[949] Ibid.

progression of thought is sincere: Iago takes himself through his own muddled thoughts, the audience being privy to his ideas. The second reading is driven instead by a sullied intention, where Iago's purpose is to persuade the audience of his villainous cause. Russell Beale's reading offers a further, distinct version of a dishonesty. This manifestation toys superficially with the audience, without craving an enduring interaction – which perhaps ironically makes him all the more charismatic. For contrast, we assessed two alternative readings of Othello's famed 'cause' speech. The first was derived from Peter Hall's reading, and his interpretation of the components of a dramatic rhetoric. The second reading was derived from Sister Miriam Joseph's work, and her focus on Shakespeare's rhetoric in terms of larger-scale, discrete devices, more naturally suited to literary discourse.

The overall comparison between Iago and Othello – again, drawing from Joseph – had the aim of contrasting (respectively) a rhetoric of *ethos* with a rhetoric of *pathos*. In other words, investigating how plausible it might be for an actor to present an 'honest' Iago, who is appealing to the audience with such a reputation. One can then question, by contrast, how far the actor playing Othello might have earned the audience's engagement by the latter stage of the play and whether the communication is direct enough to appeal to sheer emotion. Is integrity driving Iago's purpose, where Othello's might be driven by emotion, or are there significant problems with each of those positions?

Iago

At the start of the play Iago immediately proclaims the secret of his (paradoxically) true dishonesty, the nature of his double-intent and the extent of his personally-harboured hatred of Othello. For the audience, the established dramatic irony is concise and energetic. They can begin to question what might constitute the 'native act and figure' of Iago's 'heart';[950] when will they know if he is revealing something of a true self to us if 'outward action' (I.i.63) will not provide such a

---

[950] *Othello*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, I.ii.64.

revelation? Surely soliloquy would be the natural vehicle for this? But in his early admission – 'I am not what I am' (I.i.67) – Iago creates the trappings of ontological crisis, whilst revelling in the metatheatrical event of the stagecraft, and the phenomenological role that the audience will play, in determining his 'character'. From a literary critical perspective, this moment roots Iago in the wider themes of this particular play, in contrast to the development of Othello's character. However, for today's actor, tasked with adding flesh to dramatic rhetoric, Iago cannot be simply the enigmatic personification of inconsistency. This character presents perhaps the greatest challenge in Shakespeare to the post-Stanislavskian attempt to establish a character 'throughaction'.[951] In conventional usage 'prosody [may serve to be] constructive, allowing the actor to perceive, experience, and possess a "reality"',[952] but Iago's prosody might be seen to meta-theatrically tear at the very fabric of soliloquising.

Iago presents Rodorigo[953] with the passion that is fuelling his conduct – his hatred of Othello, which is like to 'hell-pains' (I.i.163), where necessity forces him to engage Othello with the 'sign of love' (I.i.165). The audience must infer the causation of the hatred; at this stage Iago's failed attempts to secure a promotion to lieutenancy, and Othello's preferment of Cassio for the role, seem the sources of his rage. Yet Iago, dismissing Rodorigo's lack of willpower, emphasises human 'corrigible authority' (I.iii.337), which can keep the 'blood and baseness' of human 'natures' from allowing 'most preposterous conclusions' to be drawn (I.iii.339). He states that emotions, 'carnal stings' and 'lusts' are all to be pruned away (I.iii.340-1). How far does Iago follow his own proclamation and offer the audience more nuanced motivation for his own conduct? He begins his first soliloquy in a sententious tone, distancing himself from Rodorigo, his 'fool' (I.iii.372). Miriam Joseph regards this and the following 'noble generalities' as evidence of Iago's

---

[951] Cf. Chapter Two.
[952] Palfrey and Stern, p. 329.
[953] The name as spelt in the *RSC Complete Works* (as opposed to 'Roderigo').

ability to 'cleverly instill belief in his own honesty and integrity; in the very act of insinuating false suspicion […]'.[954] Iago offers his first motivation for action:

> I hate the Moor:
> And it is thought abroad that 'twixt my sheets
> He has done my office […]
> (I.iii.375-7)

As pointed out by Robert B. Heilman, it is significant that 'the hate is prior, and a motive is then discovered'.[955] The enjambment of the lineation suggests the actor-character's in-the-moment thought process;[956] the opening 'And' of the following line serves as a pregnant conjunction (one 'rarely […] used so effectively'[957]) that can bare the weight of this nascent purpose. Iago states his hatred for Othello and then details the supposedly widely-circulated rumour that Othello has been sleeping with his wife, Emilia. Regardless of the rumour's accuracy, Iago commits to continue to act 'as if for surety' (I.iii.379). He seems to neglect the tenor of the very advice that he has just given to Rodorigo.

After briefly acknowledging such a motivation, Iago devotes the rest of this soliloquy to the process of revenge. Iago operates at speed, where a caesura represents a springboard for his jump from a factual statement to the hypothesised opportunities of 'double knavery' (I.iii.383):

> Cassio's a proper man. Let me see now:
> To get his place and to plume up my will
> (I.iii.381-2)

The cause for action is clarified, where the double nature of revenge will enable

---

[954] Joseph, p. 101.

[955] Robert B. Heilman, *Magic in the Web: Action and Language in* Othello (Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1956), p. 31.

[956] Cf. Mark Quartley's warning (W7), in Chapter Four – where the RSC 'orthodoxy' of the 'Thinking Breath' can seem jarring and dated.

[957] Heilman, p. 31.

Iago to combine his two big grievances – Cassio's promotion and Othello's supposed affair – in one move. However, the mechanics of the revenge need to be determined (I.iii.383).

Resentment does not cloud Iago's judgment: he recognises Cassio's charisma, just as he understands Othello's frank, 'open nature' (I.iii.388). Yet he delights that Othello will more likely be convinced by his own apparently 'honest' argument (I.iii.389) than by Cassio's smooth disposition. 'Missing beats' in lineation suggest a brief pause (I.iii.391), as Iago then experiences his epiphany, 'I have't' (I.iii.392) – described by E. A. J. Honigmann as the 'clever slave's "habeo" of Latin comedy.'[958] The gravity of his resolve reverberates in the flourish of his concluding rhyming couplets. The arch manipulator, who grasped – mid-speech – for a process of revenge, has identified a possible course of action. The plot requires the forces of 'hell and night' to bring it to maturity, but it has at least, as far as we can tell, been 'engend'red' (I.iii.392). Iago has given us 'motivation', but not the detailed process of his revenge.

Iago forces the actor to question the soliloquy convention of honest address. Secondly, the peculiar structuring of his speech puts great pressure on any Stanislavskian sense of character *throughaction*, where he seems to have a scattered, erratic motivation. He offers fragments of information that need to be assembled. Dickon Tyrrell spoke of an actor's need to focus on 'the demands on the character in the [given] situation' of the play, dismissing the style of background character research typical of American Method practitioners.[959] His belief was that a coherent performance can be constructed by a focus on such situational demands. In turning to authorial *elocutio* or methods such as actioning, one is also complementing the position of John Barton, who states that 'the nature of the language tells us about the

---

[958] E. A. J. Honigmann, in William Shakespeare, *Othello*, ed. by E. A. J. Honigmann (London: Arden, 1997; repr. Thomson Learning, 2006), p. 161.
[959] Tyrrell, W1.

nature of the character' to the extent that 'maybe we should say the language *is* the character.'[960]

Rhonda Blair has also promoted the notion of character as a series of choices – albeit sourcing her inspiration in the view of the cognitive neuroscientist, Antonio Damasio, that 'the mind is "a process, not a thing"'.[961] We are confronted by the common gulf between the human actor and the character, as a product of phenomenological triangulation by text, actor and audience. There are helpful 'direct analogies' to be found between 'Stanislavskian and current neurocognitive terms'.[962] Fundamentally, the 'character' becomes 'a set of choices and behaviours – a process rather than a discrete entity – supported by what the actor brings to the role in terms of imagination, voice/speech, body, and intellect.'[963] The actor can discard an '"objective" authentic self' for Iago, in favour of the 'self-of-the-now' that is created 'in rehearsal or performance'.[964] And thus, it is not for the actor to worry about the purer sense of what constitutes Iago's mind.

It must be noted that Blair's response to the Stanislavskian takes place within the wider dialogue of American Stanislavskian practice, which responds to actors trained in 'typical American psychological realism'[965] and the 'kinds of US training that focus on the actor's personal "material" at the expense of imagination.'[966] She does not, for example, discard 'emotion memory and sense memory'[967] altogether, but seeks to 'manipulate memory as a tool for the actor.'[968] This is influenced by cognitive neuroscience findings relating memory processes to 'a reconstruction of facts', rather than a recollection of objective truth.[969] Blair seeks to evolve distinctly

---

[960] Barton, p. 60.
[961] Antonio Damasio, quoted in Rhonda Blair, 'Image and action: Cognitive neuroscience and actor-training', in *Performance and Cognition: Theatre studies and the cognitive turn*, ed. Bruce McConachie and F. Elizabeth Hart (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), 167-185 (p. 170).
[962] Blair, p. 178.
[963] Blair, p. 183.
[964] Blair, p. 181.
[965] Blair, p. 179.
[966] Blair, p. 181.
[967] Blair, p. 175. See Chapter One.
[968] Ibid.
[969] Blair, p. 173.

American practice, encouraging the use of what she terms 'character-memory images', a 'construction of images of the character's memories, based on information in the plays' text.'[970] Iago poses a great problem for any technique based on an American realist approach, because the notion of a stable 'character-memory image' is disrupted by his ambiguity or his deliberate manipulation of the audience. With Iago's chaotic shifts in thought, the argument that a character is the process of choices itself might be something of a liberation for an actor that would allow for a more nuanced – and no less believable – performance. Barton concludes, in his character discussion, that it 'often pays off with Shakespeare to go for each scene as it comes and commit to it totally, rather than try to iron out the inconsistencies.'[971] Similarly, David Sturzaker remarked on a commonplace rehearsal aim to focus on the 'most useful interpretation'; he believes an actor will pragmatically pursue the course that will 'yield the best results […] and tell the most interesting story'.[972]

In his second soliloquy (II.i.270-296), Iago entertains himself with the plausibility of his ruse: the insinuation of an affair between Cassio and Desdemona will be 'of great credit' (II.i.271). And we are given greater detail about Iago's potential motivation. A cluster of hypersyllabic lines (II.i.273-6) – which overstep their metrical count – reverberate with Iago's return towards passion. Othello's 'loving, noble nature' (II.i.273) is not something Iago can readily 'endure' (II.i.272). There is also an extraordinary, momentary acknowledgement of passion felt towards Desdemona: Iago states 'I do love her too, | Not out of absolute lust – though peradventure | I stand accountant for as great a sin […]' (II.i.275-7). With this, Iago returns to the peculiar allegation that Othello has slept with his wife, and that he will not be content until he is 'evened with him, wife for wife' (II.i.283). The layers of motivation become increasingly bizarre, as Iago flippantly suggests further illicit relations between Cassio and Emilia, his own 'night-cap' (II.i.291).

---

[970] Blair, p. 169.
[971] Barton, p. 65.
[972] Sturzaker, W3.

Iago's soliloquies create a provocative discourse on the nature of the credible. However, this is not within the common convention of 'honest' soliloquy. We cannot be sure of the integrity and sincerity of his thoughts, but we can be certain that he manipulates action (for other characters and the audience alike) along the lines of the theatrically plausible.

Othello

Othello's "cause" soliloquy (V.ii.1-22) offers a similar engagement in public utterance; Peter Hall regards Othello as being 'aware of his audience', and consciously 'using […] the sleeping Desdemona as the evidence of his jealousy'.[973] But where Iago gives his disjointed evidence sporadically, Othello's main intent is to present a range of evidence on concrete terms, in a mode of public debate. Hall remarks on the resonance of the single word 'cause', which comes to represent Desdemona as 'the motive, the ground […] the occasion, […] the court case [and] the legal process.' Consequently, Desdemona becomes Othello's 'apprehension, […] justification, […] disease, […] illness, [and] sickness.'[974] Miriam Joseph regards this passage as evidence of Shakespeare's late-period 'control over the medium of his art', where 'the monstrous bulk of any passion' seems 'at times almost to split the powers of language'.[975] And drawing from Hall's focus on the rhetorical repetition of the single word 'cause', a post-Stanislavskian might enjoy the opportunity 'to savour […] contradictory meanings'; the playwright's 'pace' is 'deliberate', 'monosyllables' serving as a 'means' for Othello to control 'the wild emotions inside him.'[976]

There is some level of agreement regarding monosyllabic interpretation. David Sturzaker spoke of the influence of working with Giles Block at Shakespeare's Globe and related this to Othello's 'cause' speech. He discussed how 'Giles would hold' that monosyllabic passages 'might be an indication that you

---

[973] Hall, p. 149.
[974] Ibid.
[975] Joseph, p. 262.
[976] Hall, p. 149.

might want to take your time'.[977] Dickon Tyrrell similarly described monosyllables as a 'clue for the actor', an invitation to 'slow […] down';[978] the actor can explore reasons for such potential authorial pacing, speculating on what it reveals about Othello's psychology. This is not just centric to Shakespeare's Globe by any means; John Barton, also in direct reference to the monosyllables of this speech, believes that it is 'good counsel not to rush';[979] 'each word needs to breathe',[980] so that they can 'have poetic resonance'.[981] However, Sturzaker does find that this rhythm-first approach is something an actor may wish to 'discard', if it does not 'end up being very useful', in practical application; the clarity of the play's execution always taking priority over any unhelpful imposition of technique.[982]

As noted by Joseph, Othello's next turn is towards *anastrophe*, which reverses common syntactical ordering (in a manner perhaps reflective of the exercises of *hyperbaton* in Early Modern education).[983] Confronted with the reality of a sleeping Desdemona, Othello initially resolves that he will not 'scar that whiter skin of hers than snow'.[984] Yet the contrast between Desdemona's physical whiteness – the model of chastity – and the semblance of her supposedly sullied person is enough to drive Othello's 'soul' (V.ii.1) to extreme action. Hall speaks of Desdemona's 'physical presence' being enough to restore Othello 'to normality'.[985] This is the briefest of doubts, before the 'beautiful sensuality'[986] of Desdemona's 'monumental alabaster' (V.ii.5) skin revives Othello's resolve that 'she must die' (V.ii.6). Desdemona's beauty is beyond common vitality, thus Othello's language takes the unfortunate turn towards 'alabaster' imagery, resonant of tombstone figures. This echoes similar usage in other Renaissance characters: Gratiano in *The*

---

[977] Sturzaker, W3.
[978] Tyrrell, W1.
[979] Barton, p. 98.
[980] Ibid.
[981] Barton, p. 99.
[982] Sturzaker, W3.
[983] Joseph, p. 160.
[984] *Othello*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, V.ii.4.
[985] Hall, p. 149.
[986] Ibid.

Merchant of Venice questions why a 'man whose blood is warm within' should 'sit like his grandsire cut in alabaster';[987] Webster's widow Duchess assures her Antonio of her conviction to wed by asserting that she is 'flesh, and blood', and 'not the figure cut in alabaster' that 'kneels' at her late 'husband's tomb.'[988] And, as David Sturzaker remarked,[989] earlier in his career Shakespeare juxtaposed innocence with undeserved death, by using a similar image – the villainous Tyrrell, in *Richard III*, describes the 'alabaster innocent arms'[990] of the murdered princes in the Tower.

Desdemona's body presents, for Hall, an 'agonising contradiction', being 'on the cusp of life and death'.[991] The actor-character of Othello rediscovers the beauty that ignited his passionate love, and thereby the same source of passion that motivates his violence. Joseph highlights Othello's initial conclusion – that Desdemona must die, 'else she'll betray more men' (V.ii.6) – as an example of rhetorical argument from 'antecedent and consequent'.[992] By 'arguing from a supposed consequence, Othello justifies his decision to kill Desdemona' (V.ii.160) – as a service to all men in the commonweal. The culmination, for Joseph is one of 'deepest pathos' (263), where we might see (in Othello) feelings of 'convincing genuineness' – even if 'we know he is deceived' (264). However, one must also note that Othello is employing a perverted *logos*; he starts with the predetermined resolution that Desdemona must die and then seeks to justify the judgement. He introduces the candle that lights the chamber, whilst invoking the metaphoric 'light' of Desdemona's life. Both may be snuffed out:

> Put out the light, and then put out the light.
>
> (V.ii.7)

---

[987] William Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, I.i.86; 87.
[988] John Webster, *The Duchess of Malfi*, in *John Webster: The Duchess of Malfi and Other Plays*, ed. by René Weis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), I.i.443; 444; 445, p. 122.
[989] Sturzaker, W3.
[990] William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Richard III*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, IV.iii.11.
[991] Hall, p. 149.
[992] Joseph, p. 160.

In the following rhetorical *homoeosis*, Othello uses 'first a dissimilitude and then a similitude' to emphasize the 'irrevocability' of killing Desdemona'.[993] This spans several lines, offering detailed deliberation, the uncertainty echoing in Shakespeare's hypersyllabic lines:[994]

> If I quench thee, thou flaming minister,
> I can again thy former light restore,
> Should I repent me: but once put out the **light**,
> Thou cunning'st pattern of excelling nat**ure**,
> I know not where is that Promethean heat
> That can thy light relume. When I have plucked **thy rose**,
> I cannot give it vital growth again:
> It needs must wither. I'll smell thee on the **tree**.
>
> (V.ii.8-15)

The comparison is emphasised by the equal *apostrophe* to both the candle (as the 'flaming minister') and Desdemona[995] (which would offer an intriguing mixed addressee in actioning terms).[996] Othello generates familiarity in both cases, addressing each with the nominative 'thou', before using the appropriate possessive 'thy' to refer to the 'former light' (V.ii.9) of the candle and the lost 'light' of Desdemona, that he will struggle to 'relume' (V.ii.13).

As the candle anthropomorphically shifts into a faithful ecclesiastical servant, Desdemona resembles the 'cunning'st pattern of excelling nature' (V.ii.11) – a supernaturally beautiful creation that could not be resurrected, even by the mythical powers of Prometheus himself. The pace intensifies. Successive enjambed lines allow a surety of tone to develop, and the two caesuras that finish this movement of the speech stand out more significantly by contrast; the extinguished light is balanced with the 'plucked […] rose' (V.ii.13), and what appears a final resolution is damning. The rose of Desdemona 'needs must wither', where Othello will smell her 'on the tree' (V.ii.15). Othello's abrupt dismissal may be counterpoised with his move(s) to kiss her (dependent on text/directorial resolution). This reminds him of

---

[993] Joseph, p. 143.
[994] Highlighted in bold.
[995] Cf. Hall, p. 151.
[996] Cf. Night and Romeo in Soliloquy Two.

the fragrance of her alliteratively 'balmy breath' (V.ii.16) – his supposed resolve further punctuated with the trochaic placement of 'Justice' (V.ii.17) at the start of the following line.

The figure of Justice is emphasised but, significantly – where she should ordinarily carry both the sword and the balancing scales – she is only being presented here in the guise of executioner. Othello might see his biased rhetoric as the only form of weighed judgement. He continues with his heavy, monosyllabic, supposed *logos*. Chillingly, we recognise he may have found a use for Desdemona's body after death:

> Be thus when thou art dead, and I will kill thee
> And love thee after. One more, and that's the last.
> (V.ii.18-19)

Othello presents 'neurotic contradictions' of 'horrifying' dimensions – what is 'compassionate leads to cruelty'.[997] Consequently, he might still find an act of sexual vitality brought to life with her dead body.

For Hall, the speech can only function if Othello knows 'that everything he is saying is a paradox and that the pain of the contradictions cannot be resolved'.[998] Othello's crisis can sit comfortably within the framework of the play, where Joel B. Altman describes it being 'constructed upon a series of paradoxes'.[999] Altman views the play's characters as following 'culturally ingrained habits of probable behaviour', which are 'shared by members of its audience', whilst the play 'persistently exposes the dubious credentials of the discursive system it represents'.[1000] Ontological crises are particularly acute (and indeed entirely appropriate) throughout *Othello*. Yet Hall's conclusion is that the audience 'may still be bewildered rather than heartbroken by [Othello's] credulity'.[1001] He regards the dramatic success as not

---

[997] Hall, p. 151.
[998] Ibid.
[999] Joel B. Altman, *The Improbability of Othello: Rhetorical Anthropology and Shakespearean Selfhood* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), p. 12.
[1000] Ibid.
[1001] Hall, p. 151.

dependent upon the success of Othello's rhetoric, in its traditional, oratorical currency; [1002] instead, 'by sharing his soliloquy' with the audience, Othello 'makes public the pain of this tragedy'.[1003] Overwhelmingly the thrust of the speech is towards 'irreversible' tragic action, rather than 'sentimentality'.[1004] There are 'contradictory emotions' yet, 'to some extent, the audience must share [Othello's] anguish'.[1005] In the root emotions of the language, Joseph finds the audience being permitted to 'enter with heart and mind into each character' and to 'think, feel, [and] suffer with each.'[1006] However, if we draw some distinction from Joseph's choice of 'sympathy' rather than empathy, her position is much closer to Hall's. In either case, *pathos* is still a driving characteristic of the scene.

Concluding Remarks

The first notable comparison between the use of 'actioning' and the 'target' is that both rely upon the same style of speech-unit division. Much like Palfrey and Stern's visualisation of the Renaissance actor, both techniques look to establish the crucial turns of thought.[1007] The divided units of speech then reveal the provocative target or the springboard for the transitive action. As they are not incompatible at this level, one could theoretically attempt to overlay the two techniques: one could establish the target and use this to identify the best reactive transitive verb for actioning. This could be an area for future extended investigation, beyond the scope of my workshops; it could result in attempts to develop a new form of conjoined technique. However, whilst we can safely assert that both techniques result in a *generally* externalised performance outcome (which both target reaction and action embodiment demand), there is a nuanced distinction to be found:[1008] the target

---

[1002] Cf. 'failed' attempts at persuasion, in Chapter 6 (e.g. Mercutio).
[1003] Hall, p. 151.
[1004] Ibid.
[1005] Ibid.
[1006] Joseph, p. 264.
[1007] See Appendix A.
[1008] A written description can only hope to suggest this result, rather than replicate what is indicated more clearly in physical performance.

creates a reactive actor-character (where the target serves as the initial stimulus); actioning creates an actor-character who requires/anticipates a form of addressee response.[1009] Directors might therefore choose their selection of technique accordingly. Most importantly, both techniques certainly avoid the danger of a soliloquy collapsing inwards in its interiority, thereby ensuring an engaging audience reception.

A short extract, such as Macbeth's 'dagger' speech, illustrates how it is possible for 'most of [a] speech'[1010] to be directed at a single addressee, where the addressee (in this case, the invisible dagger) can provide the actor with a range of morphing targets. This facilitates the creation of a character who 'react[s] to the changing situation'[1011] – as opposed to the perception of a soliloquy serving a singular 'function',[1012] as a fixed rhetorical event. Target usage centres on an actor's reaction to the shifting status of speech, which directly responds to variations in prosody. The practice focuses on providing an actor-character with an external impetus that is ever-changing. This can be constructed in such a manner that 'every line is taking the play forwards.'[1013] Similarly, the use of actioning also responds to the central post-Stanislavskian notion of an actor-character being in a state of constant flux, engaging in an ever-changing, live experience. For a concise extract, it is easy to apply actioning with relative clarity and elegance. However, elongated extracts may call for the identification of multiple addressees, stretching the limits of a chain of 'strict' actions, as derived exclusively from transitive verbs.

Juliet's 'gallop apace' soliloquy serves in print as an elongated description of impatience, yet at each small juncture we can search for direction for the rehearsal actor, who is tasked with navigating a strategic path through the landscape of the soliloquy. Both actioning and Donnellan's target require that the actor identifies (at each step) their addressee and the nature of their persuasive act. The simple act of

---

[1009] As it were, in 'reception' of the transitive verb.
[1010] Block, p. 80.
[1011] Dickson, W1.
[1012] Palfrey and Stern, p. 349.
[1013] Tyrrell, W1.

identifying changes in addressee provides a helpful solution, where an extended speech initially seems tonally or thematically unvarying. As a result, the speech will be constantly vibrant. The workshop indicated the nature of problematic ambiguities that can arise where the addressee is unclear or mixed, or (infrequently) where a character's engagement with an image appears to be passive. In the nuances of Shakespeare's writing we also find evidence of an intriguing use of mixed addressee,[1014] which is certainly uncommon in the actioning of present-day drama texts. However, this usage of a mixed addressee functions with its own degree of deliberate dramatic-rhetorical complexity, as evidence of the prowess that the actor-character of Juliet can enjoy in embodying Shakespeare's words. Further complication is revealed in Juliet's momentary turn towards passivity, but our workshop application of actioning indicated how such a move can be interpreted in the manner of an active performance outcome.[1015]

There are two important transhistorical comparisons to note. The network of units in the actor's part, and the 'shifts'[1016] between them, seemingly travel well through theatrical history. However, where such shifts would have signalled in the Renaissance a 'seemingly spontaneous change from one passion to another', the shifts today might encourage an actor to seek out either a new target or action. This has a marked distinction in performance output. Where the Renaissance 'writers wrote to the passions […] and players performed to them', it was also true that their 'audience watched *for* them',[1017] as 'one of the qualities […] when judging a performance'.[1018] Present-day theatre audiences do not speculate on which 'actions' have been discretely chosen by an actor. 'Actioning' is a term confined to theatre practitioners, nascent as a rehearsal technique that unlocks the text, in the express understanding that it is not the imperative purpose for audiences to be able to successfully identify which *specific* given transitive verb have been chosen; the

---

[1014] See Soliloquy Two – 'Come night, come Romeo, come thou day in night', III.ii.17.
[1015] See Juliet's attempt *to dare* Night to teach her how to lose her virginity.
[1016] Or 'transitions', from the Restoration period onwards. Palfrey and Stern, p. 312.
[1017] Palfrey and Stern, p. 316.
[1018] Palfrey and Stern, p. 312.

purpose of actioning is to create the cognitive mechanics for an actor-character, so that they are given direction in their persuasive purpose, which should then result in an engaging performance.

Secondly, a network of shifts that is orientated towards passions is the basis of fundamentally emotive acting, the actor seeing 'his role as a collection of emotional units'.[1019] By contrast, present-day actioning, when placed within a considered post-Stanislavskian context, is fundamentally based on motivation. This may or may not lead to the performance of a certain emotional state, but the core methodology is to *not* be bound by a given emotion.[1020] The action, in its post-Stanislavskian sense,[1021] is a choice of transitive verb. Likewise, if the actor choses to see the shifts as indicating changes in target, then Donnellan is suggesting a change of stimulus at each of these junctures. As a result, both actioning and target usage are directed towards an externalised performance outcome. Palfrey and Stern have given particular focus to the manner in which the usage of a 'midline switch' in soliloquy differs from that found in dialogue. They foresee that whilst 'midline switches are always provoking reactivity […] if there is no one else to volatilize, the current has to return to the speaker.'[1022] They make the distinction between the 'bracing challenge' presented to a fellow 'auditor on-stage' during dialogue and the midline shift in a soliloquy, where there is '*no* acted-upon object',[1023] the technique becoming 'haunted by the presence of whatever formerly animated' it.'[1024] In this sense the resultant outcome 'accentuates the speaker's existential isolation'; the 'primary "target" of the switch [has] momentarily [become] the audience' before 'instantaneously' returning 'with renewed intensity back upon the speaker' as the 'customary dynamism of the midline break' has been 'frustrated'.[1025] They state how

---

[1019] The 'word "passion" becomes almost a synonym for the embodying of emotion in acting […]'. Palfrey and Stern, p. 313.
[1020] See Chapter 2.
[1021] Cf. the different Renaissance sense of course, where '"action" was physiologically the externalization (acting) of internal feeling (passion)'. Palfrey and Stern, p. 313.
[1022] Palfrey and Stern, p. 368.
[1023] Palfrey and Stern, p. 378.
[1024] Palfrey and Stern, p. 379.
[1025] Palfrey and Stern, p. 378.

there is a 'mutation […] from an "external" to an "internal" mechanism'.[1026] However, the workshops have indicated how such a mechanism, in its textual appearance as an 'internal' device can be transformed into an externalised dramatic engagement with the audience.

Whilst the soliloquy certainly emphasises the metatheatrical, in the additional focus that it brings to such an agency of the audience, my workshops underscored how the performance outcome could be best regarded as one of a *projected* interiority. In present-day performance, the overwhelming result of a soliloquy's 'necessarily dialogical structure'[1027] should be an externalised engagement with the audience, even if the subject matter focuses on a character's self-reflection. My soliloquy workshops directly emphasised how the sense of an 'internal mechanism' ought to be reviewed, in the light of both actions and targets. A performed interiority is always avoided where transitive verbs are being enacted or where an actor is responding, outwardly, to the provocation of the externalised target.

Across a range of disciplines, it was possible to find common agreement on the importance of microscopic Shakespearean nuance. Tarlinskaja speaks of the 'micro-situation' created by metrical variation',[1028] where Palfrey and Stern describe a 'sensitive' Renaissance actor being able to 'identify a micro-narrative' in the part's 'employment of midline/short-line switches.'[1029] As the engagement of the actors indicated throughout my soliloquy workshops, these verse variations can similarly be central in the application of present-day techniques such as actioning or the use of targets. The stepping-stones of dramatic rhetoric can be used to traverse a specific speech, using a navigation by degrees, whereas an approach based on broader, traditional rhetorical categories may not reveal the subtler shifts of argument. The selected soliloquies from *Othello* were considered in terms of larger, traditional Greek modes of rhetoric (*pathos*, *ethos* and *logos*), as supported by a study such as Miriam Joseph's. But the dramatic complexities of each character frustrate both

---

[1026] Palfrey and Stern, p. 379.
[1027] Ibid.
[1028] Tarlinskaja, p. 270.
[1029] Palfrey and Stern, p. 365.

traditional rhetorical taxonomy and, in the case of Iago, the perceived dramatic convention. Iago's open dishonesty is a marked affront to the expected function of soliloquy in performance. Contrastingly, Othello – although maintaining candour with his audience – appears unaware of the constraints of his own faulty reasoning. Iago tests the basis of soliloquy construction to breaking point, with effervescent, meta-dramatic results. We can note similarities with the assessment that Palfrey and Stern have made, in relation to Shakespeare's earlier creation of Richard III. Their extended analysis has revealed the 'meta-dramatic playfulness' in a character who 'starts to relish' the 'irresistible' elements of his part's construction, the 'prosody [becoming] as self-dramatising' as all of the other 'rhetorical armoury.'[1030] In features such as the 'midline shift', the soliloquy might be interpreted as creating a 'magnification' of the character's 'own cognitive embodiment as the be-all and end all'.[1031] Where we apply this to Iago, he grows bigger than the play itself, eventually absenting himself from dramatic interaction altogether, in his final refusal to speak.

The workshops revealed range in both Shakespeare's soliloquies and in post-Stanislavskian techniques. As Wolfgang Clemen notes, Shakespeare's range goes beyond mere taxonomy, where categories such as '"soliloquy of reflection", "of resolution"', or '"of self-explanation"' form a 'superficial mark' rather than truly capturing the 'essence' of each speech.[1032] My first-wave analysis of practitioner manuals concurs with Clemen's notion that those soliloquies 'which have become famous for their intensity and dramatic force transcend the pattern and type.'[1033] In each example we can find the basis for an actor's unique strategy of characterisation, as founded on a complex dramatic rhetoric – one which cannot be constrained by taxonomy or broad, traditional rhetorical type. In the smaller units of the speech we seek to establish the framework for an audience debate, and this will serve the compelling live event.

[1030] Palfrey and Stern, p. 376.
[1031] Palfrey and Stern, p. 379.
[1032]Wolfgang Clemen, *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art: Collected Essays* (London: Methuen, 1972), p. 147.
Ibid.
[1033] Ibid.

Chapter 6: Vivid Description (*Enargeia*)

The second series of workshops was directed towards a specific descriptive species of Shakespeare's dramatic rhetoric that will be addressed under the umbrella term of *enargeia* ('vividness'). Throughout, the workshops used *enargeia* more specifically to refer to a staged descriptive speech that strictly relates an *offstage* event. This chapter will ascertain ways in which a passage seemingly dominated by a mode of narration (*narratio*) may actually serve as the basis for compelling onstage action (*actio*). *Enargeia* was chosen as its apparent function as description or narration might be seen especially to challenge the present-day tendency for drama to be relentlessly active, to 'show' physically onstage, rather than to 'describe'. The dramatic promise represented by *enargeia* also supports a central pillar of my argument, that 'dramatic rhetoric' might be championed over the commonplace use of 'dramatic action' (within present-day dramatic theory). The superficial 'purpose' of many a famed Shakespearean speech can often be summarised into a brief précis, in terms of raw contribution to plot development – what today might be called its 'dramatic action.' However, if an actor alternatively scrutinises the text in terms of its 'dramatic rhetoric', he can ascertain: (i) a *moment-by-moment* necessity for his character to speak the given words; and (ii) the significance of his addressee. Where the soliloquy workshops predominantly discussed the manner in which an actor today can convert a character's ostensible isolation into a dynamic dialogue with a projected 'addressee', my *enargeia* selections called upon actors to consider the presence of literal, onstage auditors. Thus the situational context of a character's given speech was placed under intensified focus. As before, the *enargeia* speeches were assessed in their microscopic construction in terms of Shakespearean *elocutio*, to see how far figures of speech and a treatment of metre can enable a present-day

actor to make choices that might complement the source text in question,[1034] whilst making the dramatic rhetoric communicable to an audience today.

On its textual surface, the descriptive language of *enargeia* may seemingly supplant the direct staging of an action, which would provide great antagonism to contemporary character acting. Yet, even where such vividness may seem reliant on narration, Quintilian reminds us that *enargeia* 'which Cicero calls *illumination* and *actuality*'[1035] makes the orator (in our case, the performer) seem 'not so much to narrate as to exhibit the actual scene.'[1036] In this sense too, a device of apparent *narratio* can transform into *actio*. The device being employed is one of Ciceronian 'Ocular Demonstration',[1037] where 'an event is so described in words that the business seems to be enacted and the subject to pass vividly before our eyes.'[1038] Thus enacting is at the heart of classical *enargeia* from the outset, which may well encourage today's actor in his attempts to regard the 'descriptive' as active. From this classical perspective, *enargeia* could be a key tool in the staged demonstration of the 'consequences of an act', with the arousal of 'indignation', or an appeal to 'pity', in the audience.[1039]

Trevor Nunn has spoken of how Shakespeare's frequently-quoted 'purple passages', which frequently feature *enargeia*, should still be seen to function as 'integrally part of the [origin] plays';[1040] beyond being 'famous' examples of verse, there are still 'demands of character and of meaning within the given scene.'[1041] Patrick Stewart has similarly stressed the importance of enacting the 'descriptive', stating that 'character always matters' and 'it's not enough to say that a speech is

---

[1034] 'Tropes' are 'changes of meaning' (such as metaphor). 'Figures' relate to 'fashionings', the arrangement of words. See Alexander, p. xxxvii; cf. Fraunce, The First Booke, A2.
[1035] In the Latin: *illustratio* and *evidentia*.
[1036] Quintilian, *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, trans. by H.E. Butler, vol. 2 (London: Heinemann, 1921; repr. 1977), Book VI.ii.32.
[1037] In the Latin: *demonstratio*.
[1038] *Ad C. Herennium de ratione dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium)*, trans. by Harry Caplan (Cambridge, Massachucetts: Harvard University Press, 1954), Book IV, LV, 68, p. 405-9.
[1039] *Rhetorica*, Book IV, XXXIX, 51, pp.357-359. Here the term being used is: *descriptio*, which seems a close sibling of *demonstratio*.
[1040] 'Royal Shakespeare Company Masterclass', *The South Bank Show,* London Weekend Television, 9 December and 16 December 1979.
[1041] Ibid.

simply choric or descriptive'[1042] – Shakespeare 'clothes the character in such rich text that an actor can find a variety of characters if he looks carefully enough' (63). Crucially this conflict was resonant in my research. David Sturzaker remarked how, encountering such *enargeia*, an actor ought to 'remember that, yes they may be – inverted commas – "descriptive passages" but nonetheless, [the actor is] talking *to* someone,' and so it is preferable to 'try to affect and change someone'.[1043] Circumstantial rhetoric thus complements the chief concern of the present-day actor, to serve a character's situational purpose.

Present-day practice can draw significant support from Renaissance usage on its own terms; Lorna Hutson's work on the 'extramimetic' in Shakespeare, particularly in the 'dramaturgical deployment of "circumstances"'[1044] helps us to understand the factors that contribute to the situational purpose of the written role, which can in turn be enacted by today's actor-character. Hutson has discussed 'circumstances' in their Renaissance context as 'rhetorical topics' which serve to constitute various kinds of 'argument of proof',[1045] the Quintilian topics being 'motive, time, place, opportunity, means, [and] method'.[1046] However, Hutson notes that circumstances are frequently misconstrued in the degree of 'proof' with which they are regarded; they are not 'objective facts, but merely topics of probability' – consequently they are 'represented as plausibly misleading or fictional'.[1047] Thus, we would do well to scrutinise a speaker's quality of witness, in relation to the circumstances that they present. It is this vested interest, this situational purpose of a character that is often overlooked. Whilst *enargeia* can often, as the vehicle for 'reported action', be 'indispensable to the projection of the *fabula*', describing offstage events *onstage*, it can offer such an evocative vision that the 'illusion produced by circumstantial coherence is more vividly convincing than mere

---

[1042] Patrick Stewart, in Barton, p. 62.
[1043] Sturzaker, W3.
[1044] Hutson, p.1.
[1045] Ibid.
[1046] Hutson, p.2.
[1047] Hutson, p. 3.

truth.'[1048] The illusion can furnish a 'whole inferred or virtual "world" which apparently subtends the performance we watch, whilst simultaneously detailing the '*psychological causation*'[1049] of the speaker.[1050] There are of course dangers in the inference of both a 'coherent fictional "outer" world' and a coherent 'fictional "inner" world of *dramatis personae*'.[1051] In the latter case, one can risk the presumption of character as a fixed literary entity, as well as the problematic assumption of character being autonomous of context, evidence of 'universalizing'.[1052] However, for Hutson, it is possible to avoid these risks whilst still assessing the text for simultaneous 'inference of psychic structure and narrative circumstance',[1053] especially as we find the source for such constructs in the sixteenth century (both in neoclassical theory and in dramatic practice) is 'the topical invention of arguments from players' speeches'.[1054] Psychology and dramatic time and space are conjoined by the circumstantial.[1055]

From a traditionally rhetorical perspective (and not one that is expressly drama-orientated), one encounters the common problem of taxonomy. *Enargeia* is often regarded as synonymous with the labels: *illustratio*, *evidentia*, *demonstratio*, and the sub-category of *ekphrasis*, or *hypotiposis* – to name but a few. *Ekphrasis* – although often used as a straight synonym – perhaps finds itself more usefully employed where a work of art is the object of the vivid description in question. Heinrich F. Plett has discussed a range of sub-species, in his broad study of *enargeia*.[1056] Specific rhetorical labels may be largely incidental to an actor today, but it is the engagement in the process of the rhetorical analysis that is of use. The range of categories suggests the scope of the *enargeic* device, as echoed in contemporary acting practice. For the actor, each extract may well have a unique

---

[1048] Hutson, p. 4.
[1049] Hutson, p. 11.
[1050] Hutson, p. 5.
[1051] Hutson, p. 13.
[1052] Hutson, p. 14.
[1053] Ibid.
[1054] Hutson, p. 15.
[1055] Ibid.
[1056] Heinrich F. Plett, *Enargeia in Classical Antiquity and the Early Modern Age* (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

significance, local to that scene in the play and tempered by the overall dramatic context of text and production. Thus each specific dramatic extract serves unlike any other. The situational purpose of a given character remains the post-Stanislavskian focus.

Categories of *enargeia* may include: (i) the bearing of witness; (ii) the *metadramatic* event of self-conscious stagecraft, often appealing to what Claire Preston has called the 'cooperation' or 'coercion'[1057] of audience members – asked to 'piece out' the 'imperfections' of the stagecraft using their own imagination;[1058] (iii) *epilogue*, as Plett finds to be a 'recapitulation' or even 'prolongation' of the dramatic plot;[1059] (iv) *prosopopoeic* device, with an actor specifically embodying the character of a 'long dead' historical figure and 'placing him in the present';[1060] (v) *invocation*, where a character's descriptive faculty manifests a direct physical change in onstage action; and (vi) character *self-revelation*.

Perhaps the easiest category to align with modern actioning is the first category, of *enargeia* for persuasion. We note, for example, how the Friar in *Romeo and Juliet* attempts to offer the Prince an account of his 'meddling in matters of life and death'.[1061] Differing texts present alternative versions of the Friar's part: Q1 has the Friar requesting that the Prince hear him 'speak the truth' in informing 'how these things fell out';[1062] in F1 the Friar states, 'I stand both to impeach and purge | My selfe condemned and my selfe excus'd.'[1063] In the latter case, Peter Hall describes the Friar's following recapitulation of the play's action as a desperate 'attempt to shrive himself […] so that he may be cleansed of sin';[1064] Quentin

---

[1057] Claire Preston, 'Ekphrasis: painting in words', in *Renaissance Figures of Speech*, ed. by Sylvia Adamson, Gavin Alexander and Katrin Ettenhuber (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 119.
[1058] *Henry V*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, Prologue, 23. Cf. Preston, p. 119; Plett, *Enargeia*, p. 30.
[1059] Plett, *Enargeia*, p. 35.
[1060] Plett, *Enargeia*, p. 32.
[1061] Hall, p. 85.
[1062] William Shakespeare, *An Excellent conceited Tragedie of Romeo and Juliet* (London: printed by John Danter, 1597) [Q1], V.iii, K3 [p. 73]. [accessed 11 May 2016] <http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/doc/Rom_Q1/scene/Titlepage/>
[1063] William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, in the *Bodleian F1*, V.iii [p. 76].
[1064] Hall, p. 85.

Skinner meanwhile regards the speech as a technically accomplished judicial narration, which aims to prove his innocence.[1065] Whether chiefly theological or judicially forensic in its origins, a strong argument can be made for the Friar's 'plot description' speech being given full actor-character ownership as an onstage exploration of guilt and innocence.

Honest witness is of course countered by the more complex bearing of deliberate false witness. Again, we might turn to Iago, 'the very opposite of Quintilian's *euphantasiotos*, […] man of good phantasy', who instead uses his talents in *enargeia* to master the 'grotesque': a rhetoric of '*celare artem*' to conceal his machinations behind a veil of supposed honesty.[1066] Othello tasks Iago to provide a 'living reason' to suspect Desdemona's infidelity.[1067] After feigning reluctance, Iago describes how he had been kept awake at night, 'troubled with a raging tooth' (III.iii.457), and had overheard Cassio sleep-talking, proclaiming, '"Sweet Desdemona, | Let us be wary, let us hide our loves"' (III.iii.461-2). Toothache and Cassio's somniloquy provide the detail of Iago's 'plausibility'. However, Iago cannot help but embellish further, describing how Cassio took him for Desdemona – in confused arousal – and attempted to kiss him 'hard' (III.iii.464), before crying, '"Cursed fate that gave thee to the Moor!"' (III.iii.468). For the audience the dramatic irony, coupled with the risible image of Cassio's supposed nocturnal fumblings, may create a certain comic effect. But Othello's response indicates that Iago has succeeded in exploiting *enargeia* for persuasion (III.iii.469). Indeed, charismatic villainy frequently uses *enargeia* in this manner. From earlier in Shakespeare's career, we recall Aaron, in *Titus Andronicus*, and the sheer, unrelenting detail of his villainy. He describes exhuming bodies and leaving them 'at their dear friends' door', with the message carved on their skin, '"Let not your sorrow die, though I am dead."'[1068] Similarly, Tamora uses vivid 'evidence', but in a

---

[1065] See Hutson, p.60; Skinner, pp. 178-83.
[1066] Plett, *Enargeia*, p. 36.
[1067] *Othello*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, III.iii.452.
[1068] William Shakespeare, *The Lamentable Tragedy of Titus Andronicus*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, V.ii.137 and 141.

clear provision of false witness; as Lorna Hutson describes, she 're-emplots events […], narrating them so as to cast herself as victim and provoke her sons' to murder.[1069] Her '*narratio* ostentatiously stages its own rhetorical triumph of mimesis',[1070] the very environment is morphed in her description, from a woodland where 'the birds chant melody'[1071] to a location of 'unlikely ambush',[1072] a 'barren detested vale' where 'never shines the sun' and 'nothing breeds'.[1073] And Shakespeare's interest in villainous false witness endures late into his career, as evidenced by Iachimo in *Cymbeline*. Initially, Iachimo seems to convince Posthumus that he has slept with his wife, Innogen, by producing her bracelet and by swearing, his truth 'by Jupiter'.[1074] But Philario (Posthumus' host) is not convinced the particulars are 'strong enough to be believed' (II.iv.163). Thus Iachimo resorts to *enargeia* and an intimate description of Innogen's naked body:

> […] under her breast –
> Worthy the pressing – lies a mole, right proud
> Of that most delicate lodging.
>
> (II.iv.168-170)

His auditors are convinced, and little do they realise the deceitful circumstances in which such knowledge was garnered. *Enargeia*, as *evidentia*, augments the quality of the lie.

Elsewhere, *enargeia*, as a *metadramatic* function, is evident throughout Renaissance drama. Combining the views of Preston and Plett, one might speculate that, metadramatic usage could have presented 'what would [have] otherwise [been] technically unshowable',[1075] 'the stage available to Shakespeare [not being] large enough for adequate mimesis'.[1076] But a focus on this alone would give scant

---

[1069] Hutson, 'Forensic Aspects', p. 97.
[1070] Hutson, 'Forensic Aspects', p. 98.
[1071] *Titus Andronicus*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, II.iii.12
[1072] Hutson, 'Forensic Aspects', p. 97.
[1073] *Titus Andronicus*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, II.iii.93 and 96.
[1074] William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Cymbeline*, in the *RSC Complete Words*, II.iv.152.
[1075] Preston, p. 119.
[1076] Plett, *Enargeia*, p. 30.

appreciation for *enargeia*'s true value. Such metadrama is evidence of a wider, quintessential aspect of Renaissance stagecraft: the use of dramatic rhetoric to engage an audience directly, sometimes unrestrained by the fetters of what we today would term 'dramatic action'. The Chorus of *Henry V* is one of the most notable extracts providing the 'brightest heaven'[1077] of Renaissance *inventio*. The metadramatic introduction asks that a 'kingdom' be fashioned from the 'unworthy' playhouse 'scaffold'.[1078] Yet the architecture of the 'wooden O' is perhaps less important than the compact of imagination that is made, as the player directly addresses the audience: 'For 'tis your thoughts that now must deck our kings'.[1079] No amount of modern theatre lighting or scenery could fully replace such entreaty for communal enterprise.

Sometimes we find *enargeia* fulfilling a distinct function at the play's denouement. Plett feels that this serves the 'retentionality and protentionality' to strengthen the 'imaginary presence' of the plot.[1080] That is to say, in the denouement we assess the dramatic present by referring back to all that has been enacted, whilst also anticipating the closure of the play that has yet to come to pass. We think of Puck, who straddles the metadramatic gap, with one foot firmly in the realm of the play, and another toeing the edge of the stage apron. He describes the mystical territory beyond the city: how it is now the time of night that the 'hungry lion roars',[1081] the 'wolf beholds the moon' (V.i.342) and sprites begin to emerge from 'the graves all gaping wide' (V.i.350). However, within the human domain of the palace, marriage has brought concord. Puck, seemingly concerned by the play's potency of *mimesis*, reminds the audience of its mere stagecraft:

> Think but this, and all is mended,
> That you have but slumbered here
> While these visions did appear.
> (V.i.394-6)

[1077] *Henry V*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, Prologue, 2.
[1078] *Henry V*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, Prologue, 3 and 10.
[1079] *Henry V*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, Prologue, 13 and 28.
[1080] Plett, *Enargeia*, p. 35.
[1081] William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, V.i.341.

The paradox is that it is in the very moment of its evaporation that the audience may best recognise the *enargeic* shift that has taken place.

Plett suggests *enargeia* may be employed in a *prosopopoeic* mode – speaking in the voice of another persona.[1082] Shakespeare dramatises, for example, the real-life medieval poet John Gower – who is reborn from 'ashes ancient'.[1083] Gower is an intriguing example of a narrator whose reappearances introduce action that is about to be shown onstage. He also stands out as an unusual 'Shakespearean' example due to George Wilkins' co-authorship of the play.[1084] The *enargeia* behind Gower's self-conception is clear:

> […] Gower is come,
> Assuming man's infirmities
> To glad your ear and please your eyes.
> (Prologue, 2-4)

Yet, for the purposes of our workshop series, this was best considered a clear example of character-play, rather than a variation that would particularly scrutinise any potential conflict between descriptive *narratio* and an actor-character's *actio*.

In one of its most potent forms, *enargeia* can invoke the very object being described, in the Quintilian's sense of a narrative 'truth' which 'requires not merely to be told, but to some extent obtruded'.[1085] Narration becomes palpable, as demonstrated at the beginning of *Hamlet*, when Barnardo exercises his faculties of *inventio* to summon up his own ghostly description:

> Last night of all,
> When yond same star that's westward from the pole
> Had made his course t'illume that part of heaven
> Where now it burns, Marcellus and myself,

[1082] Plett, *Enargeia*, p. 32.
[1083] William Shakespeare, *Pericles*, in the *RSC Complete Words*, Prologue, 2.
[1084] Wilkins being credited with the authorship of the first half. See Bate in the *RSC Complete Works*, p. 2325.
[1085] Quintilian, Book IV.ii.64.

The bell then beating one –[1086]

And in the midst of this, with the description of the toll, Marcellus is forced to interrupt: the ghost of old King Hamlet has returned. As Plett describes it, a famed '*coup de théâtre*'[1087] is executed, along with a change in the '*status*'[1088] of the characters onstage: a '*translation personarum*';[1089] Barnardo's function is transformed instantly from controlling narrator to active, spellbound subject. Potentially, the actor's skill in description may be pitted against the technological success in staging the oxymoronic, 'lifelike' ghost.

Finally we come to *enargeia* as *self-revelation*, as exemplified by Leontes' confrontation with the 'statue' of his 'late' wife, Hermione. Plett views this as a 'masterpiece of perspective or temporal *enargeia*', as Leontes is simultaneously moved to both 'Aristotelian *anagnorisis* and *catharsis*.'[1090] This is an unusual example of onstage *ekphrasis* (if such a thing is truly possible); the object of art – the 'statue' of Hermione – is itself visible. Sculpted wrinkles convey a Hermione that is so realistically 'aged'[1091] that Leontes is forced into self-revelation and confession, with the resulting purgation of emotion. However, as the 'statue' of Hermione is onstage throughout the scene, this example takes us into the territory of players who are assisted by Early Modern stagecraft. For the sake of our workshops, we remained focused on the particular challenge of describing the purely *offstage* event.

The broad umbrella of *enargeia* principally reminds us of the meeting place between dramatic rhetoric and enacted character. Lorna Hutson has discussed the link between 'rhetorical topics of circumstance'[1092] and the successful implication of 'motive, desire, or anxieties' for the dramatis personae'.[1093] But even where we turn

---

[1086] *Hamlet*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, I.i.41-45.
[1087] Plett, *Enargeia*, p. 65.
[1088] Ibid.
[1089] Ibid.
[1090] Plett, *Enargeia*, p. 126.
[1091] William Shakespeare, *The Winter's Tale*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, V.iii.33.
[1092] Hutson, p. 43.
[1093] Hutson, p. 46.

to a source that for Hutson lacks promise, such as *Arden of Faversham*[1094] – in its modest quality of '"invention" around the topics of time and place'[1095] – one can still be optimistic in the capacity for present-day practitioners to render a successful dramatic spectacle. One such instance was exemplified in Polly Findlay's production for the RSC.[1096] The vagabond Shakebag is planning an attempt on Arden's life and bellows an invocation to darkness:

> Black night hath hid the pleasures of the day,
> And sheeting darkness overhangs the earth
> And with the black fold of her cloudy robe
> Obscures us from the eyesight of the world,
> In which sweet silence such as we triumph.[1097]

The play's treatment of the circumstantial may indeed often 'feel somewhat transparently functional',[1098] *enargeia* here offering us staged exposition, with the transition to the depths of night. The lyrical personification may also seem awkwardly placed in the mouth of Shakebag – we might question how far this mode is consistent with the rest of his part. However, in his brief descriptive transport he reveals his personal delight in the potential for villainy to triumph. Circumstance has assisted the criminal motive and the murder attempt. In Findlay's production, Shakebag had been hidden, seated secretly amongst the audience in darkness, the staging primed for the enjoyable sudden shock of his foreboding description. The staged effect revelled in the comic violence that was both circumstantial to the play *and* the character. Here was staged evidence that Renaissance *enargeia* can still be retained, and with all its vigour – where it might otherwise have been presumed that present-day theatre lighting could diminish such an effect. Descriptive words can

---

[1094] *The Lamentable and True Tragedie of M. Arden of Faversham in Kent* (London: Edward White, 1592).
[1095] Hutson, p. 46.
[1096] *Arden of Faversham* (RSC, 2014).
[1097] *Arden of Faversham,* ed. by Polly Findlay and Zoë Svendsen (London: Nick Hern Books, 2014), Scene 5, l. 1-2, p. 38.
[1098] Hutson, p. 46.

frame the situational purpose of a given character and can in turn serve as the very substance of action.

Enargeia One: A Character's Purpose – Mercutio and Enobarbus

The first workshop analysed two vivid regal descriptions: the fictional Queen Mab, as projected by the visionary Mercutio;[1099] and Cleopatra, as recollected first-hand by Enobarbus.[1100] This workshop featured Brian Ferguson.

Mercutio

In his 1725 edition of Shakespeare's plays, Alexander Pope indicated that he considered Mercutio's florid 'Queen Mab' speech to be one of Shakespeare's 'most shining passages'.[1101] Lois Potter has more specifically described how its pictorial, 'detailed evocation of small-scale effects' is representative of the 'lyricism in early Shakespeare'.[1102] However, here we question how the radiance of such a passage is best exemplified onstage – is this the *elocutio* of the playwright speaking, or can the linguistic lustre reasonably represent a character voice? In accordance with a post-Stanislavskian approach to character, Brian Ferguson suggested the 'challenge' is that the 'character can only really come to life', and become 'fully-fleshed-out', when an actor finds 'the character's needs and reasons for speaking'.[1103] This workshop sought to question how far the actor can (or indeed must) take ownership of the language within a speech of vivid description. We were searching for the coherence of character in Mercutio and Enobarbus, in the context of a circumstantial purpose.

Many literary critics have regarded Mercutio's 'Queen Mab' speech as being simply extraneous to character, taking various nuanced positions on its resultant function. Harley Granville-Barker described it as momentary 'bravura', 'as much and

---

[1099] *Romeo and Juliet*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, I.iv.55-97.
[1100] *Antony and Cleopatra*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, II.ii.222-237 (considered within the context of the longer description, up to l. 276).
[1101] Laurie Maguire and Emma Smith, *30 Great Myths About Shakespeare* (London: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 2013). p. 137.
[1102] Potter, p. 90.
[1103] Ferguson, W5.

as little to be dramatically justified as a song in an opera'.[1104] However, he felt the speech still had a broad tonal function, allowing Shakespeare 'to quicken […] the action to a pitch against which […] Romeo's first encounter with Juliet will show with a quiet beauty all its own'.[1105] In this sense, the speech represents Shakespeare's skilled *dispositio* – his sound arrangement of the larger structure. Contrastingly, for E. Pearlman the speech is 'hermetically sealed off',[1106] being 'detached in content, extraneous to plot' and suggesting a 'flat contradiction to the vectors' of Mercutio's character (336). He suggests that where Mercutio expresses 'surface cynicism' elsewhere, here he is 'overwhelmed by […] enthusiasm' (336) – which undermines his 'psychological development' (338). Pearlman does not determine this speech as having the same macroscopic, structural importance that Granville-Barker claims; he instead finds Shakespeare here transcends 'conventional conceptions of dramatic ends' (340). However, this for Pearlman confirms the extract as 'an unequivocal triumph of dramatic art', in that it serves as a 'digression that […] tugs the play into its own eccentric orbit' (339).

For others, the speech has crucial dramatic purpose. Robert O. Evans guards against any reading of 'digression';[1107] he argues that as the speech emphasises 'Shakespeare's themes' (80) it is thus able to presage the play's 'dramatic action' (86). Indeed, Mercutio's centrality to the plot has been highlighted by Adrian Poole, who has described Mercutio's dying curse as a 'malediction [which comes] true' later in the play.[1108] As Jonathan Bate has similarly stressed, the invocation of a 'plague' on 'both […] houses' (III.i.92) is 'no idle oath'.[1109] From a plot perspective Mercutio's death is, Poole states, the event that 'entirely transforms the nature of

---

[1104] Harley Granville-Barker, 'Romeo and Juliet' in *Prefaces to Shakespeare*, Vol. II (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd, 1958), p. 305.
[1105] Ibid.
[1106] E. Pearlman, 'Shakespeare at Work: *Romeo and Juliet*', *English Literary Renaissance*, Vol. 23, Issue 2 (March 1994), 314-342 (p. 334).
[1107] Robert O. Evans, *The Osier Cage: Rhetorical Devices in 'Romeo and Juliet'* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1966), p. 68.
[1108] Adrian Poole, 'Introduction', in William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. by Spencer, p. lvi.
[1109] Jonathan Bate, *Soul of the Age: The Life, Mind and World of William Shakespeare* (London: Viking Penguin, 2008), p. 13.

Romeo's guilt'.[1110] In his 'Mab' speech, Mercutio begins to instil such a spirit of foreboding, establishing the darker environment of the staged Verona.

But whilst the more recent champions of this speech support its wider dramatic purpose, we must place ourselves once more in the position of the actor tasked with performing the role today. We can attempt to find character coherence in Mercutio's purposeful use of *enargeia*; Evans interprets the 'rhetorical fireworks'[1111] of this speech as epitomizing a Mercutio who 'is, of course, mercurial' (82),[1112] in a passage of text that functions as its own 'figure of rhetoric' (84), intrinsic to the play. As Jill Levenson notes, even in his later, sombre embrace of death, Mercutio is incapable of deserting this mode of speech, brimming as it is in 'puns and other figures'.[1113] Whilst being rich and rhetorical, this language also can be seen as an integral constituent of Mercutio's character, the very source by which he can powerfully convey palpable 'disbelief and outrage' to the playhouse audience.[1114] Brian Ferguson stressed that it would be dangerous if the actor could find 'no need to speak, other than to paint a beautiful picture […]'.[1115] Even *enargeic* words must have pertinence applicable to 'character', if we draw from John Barton's statement that an actor's 'words are not to be thought of as something which pre-exists in a printed text.'[1116] Words 'must seem to find their life [in performance] for the first time'.[1117]

Firstly, tedium is no concern here. Mercutio's dismissal of Romeo's dream immediately grabs the attention of the audience, with its jocular, frivolous terms. Brian Ferguson believes contrast comes as the speech progresses, 'the warning bell

---

[1110] Poole, p. lv.
[1111] Evans, p. 81.
[1112] Naturally, following the common assignation of this speech to Mercutio, and not the bizarre attribution to Benvolio in Q1. *Romeo and Juliet*, Q1, p. 14.
[1113] Jill Levenson, 'Introduction', in William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. by Jill Levenson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 46.
[1114] Ibid.
[1115] Ferguson, W5.
[1116] Barton, p. 51.
[1117] Ibid.

kicks in';[1118] Mercutio descends into agitation, and possibly even intense despair. Within forty lines of verse,[1119] mischief has given way to malevolent intoxication – a shift Ferguson described as 'a bad trip'[1120] for Mercutio, evidenced by his evocation of warfare, sinister supernatural interventions (possibly suggestive of rape), and the pangs of resultant childbirth. Cynicism turns to fervent sincerity, and the absurdly fantastical imagery becomes the substance of genuine demonic possession, with real-life consequences. It does not matter that Mab has the fictional status as the merry midwife – giving birth to dreams – because by the close of the speech Mercutio is fully submerged in the depths of his vision, with Mab's metamorphosis into the midwife of painful human birth.[1121]

Ferguson found fragility at the core of the speech. As Mercutio is 'vulnerable in front of Romeo [and the group, it] means that they've probably seen him like this before'.[1122] The context of the others in the group witnessing Mercutio in such a 'vulnerable position […] implies a kinship […].'[1123] But with this comes a sense of neglected responsibility: they do not intervene in Mercutio's self-destructive flight of fancy. And this would be much more clearly manifest in the group dynamic of a staged production, than the words of the printed text. The group may be side-tracked or distracted, or they may indeed attempt to interrupt during the speech. Ferguson raised the prospect of a Romeo who 'unfortunately […is] too caught up in his own [preoccupation and] doesn't notice all the warning signs'.[1124] The band of revellers might be enrapt by Mercutio's speech, only to realise too late how disturbing the

---

[1118] Ferguson, W5.
[1119] The extract appears a model example of verse (as in Q1); even where F1, like Q2, prints the speech in prose (one speculates as evidence of scribal/print-shop space-saving). Cf.: *Romeo and Juliet,* in the *Bodleian F1*, p.57; William Shakespeare, *The Most Excellent and lamentable Tragedie, of Romeo and Juliet* (London: printed by Thomas Creede for Cuthbert Burby, 1599), C2 [p.17].; Q1, p. 14. Both quartos accessed online at: <http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/Library/Texts/Rom/> [accessed 9 May 2016].
[1120] Ferguson, W5.
[1121] Cf. The transition from '[…] the gay levity of the word game to a grave portent of dire events to come […]'. Evans, p. 75.
[1122] Ferguson, W5.
[1123] Ibid.
[1124] Ibid.

vision has become. Staging will reveal just how fully the vivid words are being received.

In the workshop, we 'unitted' the speech, finding three significant sections. Mercutio first introduces Mab, dismissing the fancies of imagination, in a jocular tone, emphasising her diminutive stature (I.iv.55-60). The second unit of the speech (I.iv.61-71) is rich in the vivid detailing of Mab's 'hazel-nut' chariot (I.iv.69). Mercutio elaborates the conceit, with the *anaphora* 'her' beginning six of the eleven lines of this section. The challenge for the actor is to allow each image to offer a new degree or variation of indulgence; such is the difference between a dramatic rhetorical reading and one which chiefly categorises devices by literary taxonomy. There were divergent possibilities. In the convention of rhythmical italics, Shakespeare offers key moments of variation: 'pricked' and 'made' (I.iv.68 and 70) serve as trochaic inversions, where their placement foregrounds activity within their respective lines. However, Brian Ferguson also mentioned the influence of recent work that he had undertaken with the Factory Theatre Company.[1125] He described the approach of the Factory's Associate Director, Tim Carroll – a self-proclaimed 'iambic fundamentalist'[1126] – who 'thinks that everything should be in [an] iambic [rhythm]'[1127] as it might accordingly 'open up something else in the line'.[1128] In Ferguson's words, this would encourage an actor to accentuate 'a different part' of a line or image, 'which can sometimes be useful';[1129] yet he stressed it represented an occasional exercise, rather than being a practice he would 'normally' use.[1130]

Taking one variant line as an example, a reading that registers a trochaic inversion might be stressed as:

[1125] An actor-led theatre company, founded in 2007 by Tim Evans and Alex Hassell.

[1126] Tim Carroll is an Associate Director of the Factory. He has directed extensively at Shakespeare's Globe (since 1999). Carroll gave a keynote speech at the American Shakespeare Center in 2015, entitled 'Confessions of an Iambic Fundamentalist', 'live-blog' transcript written by Molly Beth Seremet: <https://asc-blogs.com/2015/10/31/blackfriars-conference-2015-tim-carroll-keynote-address-confessions-of-an-iambic-fundamentalist/> [accessed 9 May 2016].

[1127] As cited by Ferguson, W5.

[1128] Ibid.

[1129] Ibid.

[1130] Ibid.

```
/        x    x  / x  / x   x  x  /
```
Pricked from the lazy finger of a maid   (I.iv.68)

In contrast, a 'fundamentalist' reading would read:

```
x          /    x  / x  /  x  /  x  /
```
Pricked from the lazy finger of a maid

The second reading is more focused on 'the lazy finger, […] than the [worm being] pricked'[1131] – offering a different image of emphasis. Ferguson uses the 'Factory approach', of iambic fundamentalism, as a variation tool in the early stages of rehearsal.[1132] However, in discussing iambic fundamentalism, we return to the very common danger of the trend in faux Shakespearean orthodoxy. Any nuanced metrical study reveals that variations in iambic metre are not just permissible, but in fact form a crucial aspect of Shakespeare's own stylistic fingerprint.[1133] George Gascoigne, as the first writer to establish the 'theoretical terms' of the iambic metre in English,[1134] had already lamented (in 1575) that poets had 'fallen into' the 'plain and simple manner of writing'[1135] in an iambic metre. The more skilful early professional playwrights were on the threshold of developing a dramatic versification that would in fact offer rich variation to the actor.

In the final unit of the speech, Mercutio starts to immerse himself problematically in the power of his vision. He contemplates the human effect of Mab now; she influences lovers, courtiers, and lawyers (I.iv.73-5) but the influence is malevolent, featuring 'plagues' (I.iv.77) and corruption (I.iv.83). Mercutio turns to chaotic warfare, before a final flourish, complemented by a caesura: he introduces his final conclusion mid-line, 'This is that very Mab […]' (I.iv.90). The residual significance of this speech relies on the group response and the dynamic of a

---

[1131] Ibid.
[1132] Ibid.
[1133] See Chapter 3.
[1134] Alexander, p. 407.
[1135] George Gascoigne, 'Certain Notes of Instruction', in Alexander, p. 240.

potential interruption at its close. The F1 printing ends Mercutio's speech with the end-stopped line, 'This is she.'[1136] The actor may well see this as evidence of Mercutio's invention drawing to a sharpened conclusion: Mab the 'hag' making women 'lie on their backs' (I.iv.94), pressing them and 'making them women of good carriage' (I.iv.96). However, performances often favour a strong interruption from Romeo to 'wake' Mercutio from his own reverie:[1137]

> MERCUTIO This is she –
> ROMEO   Peace, peace, Mercutio, peace!
> Thou talks't of nothing.
>   (I.iv.97-99)

Romeo's dismissal may thus be played as the 'ironic animadversion'[1138] of a concerned friend. Far from speaking of 'nothing', Mercutio's words reverberate in both form and substance, and the tremors will be felt for the duration of the play.

For the Queen Mab speech to succeed when staged, in its compelling invocation of the fantastical, the words must ironically signal a failure for Mercutio, in terms of his discrete situational purpose. Mercutio has begun this scene (his first stated appearance in the text) attempting to encourage Romeo to overcome his melancholy, whilst personally appearing impatient to attend the Capulet masque. However, he finds himself submerged in the illusory mire of his own *enargeia*. He had aimed to offer proof of the falsehood of dreams, but he instead offers his own person as an extended proof to his friends onstage (and the playhouse audience) of the power of intoxication. We witness just how 'real' the fantastical can become for a speaker and how in fact those private thoughts, 'as children of an idle brain' (I.iv.101), have much greater consequence than 'vain fantasy' (I.iv.102). The consequence is that Romeo's vision of an 'untimely death' (I.iv.115) is given greater situational coherence, the stylistic qualities (the *elocutio*) of Mercutio's *enargeia*

[1136] *Romeo and Juliet,* in the *Bodleian F1*, p. 57. This is also true of the Q2 printing.
[1137] The celebrated film adaptations of both Baz Luhrmann (20th Century Fox, 1996) and Franco Zeffirelli (Paramount, 1968) present versions to this effect.
[1138] Evans, p. 68.

allowing the portentous opening of the play's chorus to be revisited. Whilst Mercutio reminds us of the trajectory of the play's staged narrative (*sjuzhet*), his part script simultaneously befits the projection of a mercurial character. The volte-face of this speech is mirrored later, with Mercutio's instigation of the fight with Tybalt, which is an immediate and direct contradiction of his own allegation that Benvolio is being hypocritical by attempting to 'tutor [him] from quarrelling' (III.i.22). In this sense his character could appropriately be said to be consistently inconsistent. In other aspects, such as his choice of language and imagery, there is also a satisfying coherence in the role. We find, for example, the repeated strains of sexual imagery being coupled with female objectification; the *enargeic* Mab incubus is consistent with Mercutio's description of Rosaline as an 'open arse' (II.i.40), or his association of the Nurse with an 'old hare hoar' (II.iii.102). However, in the main, by indulging in the Mab imagery, the cynical Mercutio has been unmasked and revealed, through his daymare, as someone of fecund impressionability.

Enobarbus

A similar situated purpose pervades the role of Enobarbus, which is the fourth largest in *Antony and Cleopatra*[1139] and arguably provides the play's best commentary on the respective statuses of the two competing realms (of Rome and Egypt). As ever, it is dangerous to think of the character as a fixed literary entity. In the case of Enobarbus' 'barge' speech, such a risk also increases with the striking near-verbatim similarities between Shakespeare's words and Thomas North's (sixteenth century) translation of Plutarch's history (written in the first century AD).[1140] In borrowing so closely from a classical-historical source, the superficial presumption would be that Shakespeare intends to invest Enobarbus chiefly with a voice of historical authenticity – that of a man who really experienced such sights.

[1139] He has 10% of the play's lines. *Antony and Cleopatra*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, p. 2161.
[1140] Thomas North, 'The Life of Marcus Antonius', *Plutarch's Lives, Englished by Sir Thomas North*, Vol.9 (1579) in *The Temple Plutarch*, ed. by W. H. D. Rouse (London: J M Dent, 1899; repr. 1910), pp. 1-118. <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/plutarch-plutarchs-lives-englished-by-sir-thomas-north-in-ten-volumes-volume-9> [accessed 9 May 2016].

Lorna Hutson has suggested that Shakespeare (and his contemporaries) approached 'chronicle histories' with a 'mind to transforming their temporally and spatially expansive narratives into probable or provable arguments on the circumstantial topics of time and place'.[1141] Yet whilst this form of *enargeia* enriches the projection of the offstage *fabula*, it also allows us to glimpse at the 'inner circumstantial topic of causa or motive/purpose'.[1142] The wider arguments of the play then make sense 'in relation to the subjectivities – the motives and desires – of dramatis personae.'[1143] In other words, in offering us details of the 'classic seven circumstances' – the 'who, what, when, where, why, in what manner [and], with what help' – the actor can ascertain Enobarbus' more specific purpose, beyond accurate reportage.[1144] The audience has already witnessed Enobarbus' first-hand engagement with both his Roman triumvir and the Egyptian Queen, but what is his specific personal agenda in describing their meeting on the river Cydnus? As John Wilders states, on the one hand, Enobarbus 'take[s] on the role of Plutarch' with according 'open-mindedness and detachment'[1145] yet, although he is seen to act 'as a commentator' on other characters and events, his opinions are complex and 'he, too, changes his mind.'[1146] Enobarbus has to live through the consequences of his words, just as the actor (by professional necessity) has a closer visceral connection to those consequences than a solely literary interpretation would allow – such is the actor-character. As Brian Ferguson remarked, 'you find things that make it yours […] it's about […] making the language live afresh'.[1147] Evidence drawn from the overall role might direct us closer to Granville-Barker's vision of Enobarbus, as a 'victim of [the] timeserving

---

[1141] Hutson, p. 42.
[1142] Ibid.
[1143] Ibid.
[1144] Hutson, p. 57.
[1145] John Wilders, 'Introduction', in William Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*, ed. by John Wilders (London: Arden, Routledge, 1995), p. 59.
[1146] Wilders, p. 39.
[1147] Ferguson, W5.

world that he so scorns', indicated in the 'sudden collapse from cynicism to pitifulness' that he will later undergo.[1148]

Patrick Stewart illustrates multiplicity in both technique and character interpretation, where he has had the unusual opportunity of playing contrasting versions of Enobarbus in two separate RSC productions;[1149] he asserted, that there 'are many, many keys and there are many, many doors' to revealing Shakespeare's characters.[1150] In 1972, Stewart had wanted to present Enobarbus as an 'old sweat […] returning to a Rome which he felt was sterile'.[1151] In describing Cleopatra's barge, Stewart sensed Enobarbus' priority to impress upon Maecenas and Agrippa – his Roman audience – that they were 'poorer in life', for not having had his experience; yet he felt Enobarbus' hyperbole was suggestive of 'a traveller's tale', perhaps 'none of [the speech being] true'.[1152] However, in the context of the staged Rome of the 1978 production – as a state that was contrastingly 'alive' and 'youthful'[1153] – Stewart uncovered a very different Enobarbus. He recounted that his delivery was much faster, he 'felt a need to tell this story about Egypt', as if he had to impart the 'spiritual quality' of his journey.[1154] For this Enobarbus, a personal transformation had taken place when he had witnessed Cleopatra's arrival, and this in turn would have resonated with Antony's similar intoxication in the play.

Stewart's 'Second Enobarbus' chimes with Michael Neill's reading of the 'barge' speech as 'an extraordinary dramatic stroke' that 'not only […] deepen[s] [Enobarbus'] character by its quite unexpected imaginative richness' but also 'transforms the audience's sense of Cleopatra herself by her ability to evoke this

---

[1148] Harley Granville-Barker, 'Antony and Cleopatra', in *Prefaces to Shakespeare*, Vol. 1 (London: Batsford, 1958; repr. 1961), p. 452.
[1149] Patrick Stewart (conversing with Trevor Nunn), 'Royal Shakespeare Company Masterclass', Part Two, *The South Bank Show,* London Weekend Television, 16 December 1979. The productions were directed by Trevor Nunn (1972) and Peter Brook (1978).
[1150] Ibid.
[1151] Ibid.
[1152] Ibid.
[1153] Ibid.
[1154] Ibid.

response from Anthony's normally sceptical and prosaic lieutenant'.[1155] Giles Block similarly stresses how the 'vision belongs to Enobarbus' and the 'goddess-like stature' that he gives to Cleopatra clearly emphasises that she is the cause of such Roman rhapsody.[1156] In other scenes, we might regard Enobarbus as the voice of 'hard-headed satirical prose',[1157] but this speech must be considered as an equally important constituent of Enobarbus' character, where Shakespeare's style (*elocutio*) fashions nuanced shifts in personal revelation.

Whichever Enobarbus is presented (in whichever production context), the speech still culminates in one specific rhetorical move: to convince his audience that Antony will never leave Cleopatra. He may speak with hyperbole and embellishment, and this could be indicative of Enobarbus the raconteur or Enobarbus the spiritual convert. Either way, Enobarbus' purpose is an accurate conveyance of the hold that Cleopatra specifically has *on Antony*. The macroscopic placement of the 'barge speech' is pivotal: Shakespeare inserts it immediately after Antony has agreed to marry Octavia. As John Wilders describes, the effect is that we consequently 'realize that Antony will ultimately desert her for Cleopatra', giving Caesar a 'pretext to turn against him.'[1158] To judge the degree of Enobarbus' onstage success, we might then assess the tone with which Maecenas responds, ascertaining how far he retains any hope that Octavia will 'settle | The heart of Antony' as she is a 'blessèd lottery to him' (II.iii.278-9).

In isolating the famous monologue from both the play and the wider role, we undervalue its circumstantial proof. Lois Potter has discussed the nature of 'characters of the history plays' serving as 'rival historians, struggling for possession of the "true" interpretation of the past'.[1159] Certainly, the question of accurate reportage provokes Enobarbus' speech as an initial response to his auditors: Maecenas and Agrippa have heard news of Cleopatra's splendour, under a

---

[1155] I quote Neill's spelling of 'Anthony'. William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Anthony and Cleopatra*, ed. by Michael Neill (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 191.
[1156] Block, p. 332.
[1157] Michael Neill, 'Introduction', in *Anthony and Cleopatra*, ed. by Michael Neill, p. 2.
[1158] Wilders, p.41.
[1159] Potter, p. 95.

questioned assumption that it has not been fabricated (II.ii.218 and 221). It is now for Enobarbus to corroborate the evidence. As ever, Shakespeare surpasses the mere function of historical witness, giving breath and dimension to the character in all his context. The audience will be aware, for example, that Enobarbus has just been silenced. Earlier in this very scene Antony has twice commanded him to 'speak no more', dismissing him as being 'a soldier only' (II.ii.128). But Enobarbus, as the voice of plain speaking, has responded, 'That truth should be silent, I had almost forgot' (II.ii.129). Later in the play, such a dynamic again will resonate, with Cleopatra's request for silence, 'Prithee, peace' (III.xiii.14). She will not wish to hear Enobarbus' narration of Antony's shame in following her retreat from battle. Thus, when Enobarbus is offered a captive audience by contrast, he revels in his narrative prowess.

In my workshop, Brian Ferguson chose the version of a spiritually converted Enobarbus (in line with Patrick Stewart's second interpretation); he determined that 'the whole image' presented in Enobarbus' barge speech is 'so radiant' that it would be hard to configure him as a character that is 'deliberately embroidering' his description of events.[1160] If Enobarbus were to be *purposefully* unreliable, there 'would be clues in there' for the actor, where instead the 'whole image […] glows'.[1161] Ferguson regarded the image of Cleopatra's barge as being 'burned into [Enobarbus'] memory' – something of a surreal dream vision that he is still 'trying to work out'[1162] simultaneously to the live, stage delivery of his speech. The speech offered rich opportunity to provide deep-rooted character purpose, where 'the more personal' such a context is, the more a speech will be '"interesting" to watch and to listen to'.[1163]

In seeking a character ownership, we might reinterpret the parallels between Shakespeare's words and North's translation. Instead of regarding the speech as *de facto* reportage, we can seek, in Shakespeare's precise poetic additions, dimensions

---

[1160] Ferguson, W5.
[1161] Ibid.
[1162] Ibid.
[1163] Ibid.

of character. Vivid speech is the recourse, in this reading, of an enrapt Enobarbus. The very first simile is entirely of Shakespearean coinage – Cleopatra's barge was 'like a burnished throne' (II.ii.223) which 'burned on the water' (II.ii.224). And the gleaming alliteration is further emphasised by a typically period trochaic inversion – the word 'burned' beginning the line. The slightest Shakespearean addition adds vitality. For Shakespeare, the poop of the barge is specifically '*beaten* gold' (II.ii.224).[1164] In converting North's words into dramatic metre, Shakespeare places the adjective 'purple' (II.ii.225) at the start of the following line, again creating notable trochaic emphasis. But perhaps the most absorbing Shakespearean qualities are found in the arresting manner in which the entire environment of Egypt is described. Giles Block accordingly recognises the Shakespearean alterations as investing the 'bare facts [with] *life and movement*.'[1165] Shakespeare reconfigures North's historical account with personification, and a wider setting of pathetic fallacy to indulge the image. The sails of Cleopatra's barge were 'so perfumèd that | The winds were lovesick with them', (II.ii.225-6) and the silver oars caressed the water that grew 'amorous of their strokes' (II.ii.229). And the heady sensuality of the language is thus transferred to the agency of the actor-character.

The first section of Enobarbus' description can be divided neatly into two units of address. He begins with the details of the barge before – with the sensual climax of the 'amorous strokes' – moving to the person of Cleopatra. The shift is emphasised by a midline caesura (II.ii.229). Throughout the speech hypermetrical lines are abundant, although this feature is more prevalent in late Shakespeare,[1166] here it might be said to accentuate the unbounded luxury of the image itself – the words being too rich to be restrained by metre.

In the second unit, the affection that Shakespeare has germinated in Enobarbus blooms into full infatuation. North's translation uses simile to describe Cleopatra 'apparelled and attired like the goddess Venus, commonly drawn in

---

[1164] I use my own italics for emphasis. Cf. 'the poop whereof was of gold […]', in North, pp. 33-4.
[1165] Block, p. 331.
[1166] Cf. Chapter 7 and its discussion of hypermetrical lines.

picture'.[1167] When mouthed by Shakespeare's Enobarbus, the description is even more remarkable. His audience learns that Cleopatra 'did lie' in the 'pavilion' of her barge 'o'er-picturing that Venus where we see | The fancy out-work nature' (II.ii.233-4); Shakespeare's source portrait of Venus is not 'commonly drawn' by compare, but is already something which exceeds any earthly mortal.[1168] By hyperbole, Enobarbus' real-life Cleopatra is then seen to exceed an image that was already implausible.[1169] And this unit of the speech closes with a further flourish of Shakespearean *elocutio*: Cleopatra's boy attendants are depicted fanning the queen. By Shakespeare's hand, Cleopatra's radiance cannot be cooled by the fans, 'whose wind did seem | To glow the delicate cheeks which they did cool, | And what they undid did' (II.ii.235-7). Whatever it was that the attendants were doing, it only seemed to stoke the burning fires of the queen's effulgent visage.

The progress of this vivid speech, as Michael Neill asserts, 'establishes the habitually prosaic Enobarbus as one of the three great poetic voices of hyperbole in the play.'[1170] The very person that had previously been the exemplar of 'cynical disillusionment', and who had undermined 'the hyperbolic rhetoric of love' (90), now 'closely matches (and partly accounts for) the wavering pulse of the play's own judgements [...]' (92). In this specific moment, Enobarbus conveys the impressive impact that Cleopatra has had upon Antony. However, depending on the staging context, we might further question how far reliving the event has impacted upon Enobarbus himself. Shakespeare takes the scarcely-mentioned figure of North's source material and thus succeeds in turning him into a complex synecdoche for the wider drama of the play.

The extracts for both characters in this *enargeia* workshop evidence the text serving much more than just macroscopic plot development or the superficial shading of the play's tone. Both roles enliven the *fabula* (the world) of their respective plays but, in doing so, they gain personal dimension, the flesh of character

---

[1167] North, p. 33.
[1168] Cf. Block, p. 332.
[1169] Cf. Wilders, p. 140.
[1170] Neill, p. 94.

being added to their bones. They are particularly Shakespearean embellishments, which in part illuminates Shakespeare's treatment of his source material. Jill Levenson describes Mercutio as 'the character invented from a few sentences in the original narratives'.[1171] More importantly though, in seeing *how* Shakespeare augments these literary roles, we appreciate more fully the tools with which he promotes the staging of a rounded *dramatic* presence. Shakespeare gifts actors with his *elocutio*, offering a vivified language, in the form of a rhetoric that is dramatically engaging – beyond the confines of literary, 'poetic language'.[1172]

With Enobarbus, *enargeia* becomes the method of his politicking and he claims it for himself, at the expense of others. There is a brief moment when Pompey is about to indulge in *enargeia*, in recounting the tale of Apollodorus carrying Cleopatra away in secrecy (similarly found in Plutarchan source material). But Enobarbus interrupts him with controlling understatement, 'No more of that: he did so.' (II.vi.87). Whilst Enobarbus is frequently silenced by his superiors, he is always willing to speak plainly in order to control the communication of circumstantial detail. However, as Granville-Barker notes, the 'rough-tongued' and 'thick-skinned' figure will be strikingly refashioned through the course of the play, to make his exit 'sentimentally' with a 'broken heart'.[1173]

We have witnessed the variety of approaches that an actor can take, in response to textual ambiguity/possibility. Finally, in placing *enargeia* in its wider context, one can also debate contradictory experiences of the world of the play. Lorna Hutson has specifically highlighted how the 'rhetorical and dialectical *invention of arguments*' established the 'coherently imaginable dramatic *fabula*' as the 'most enduring achievement' of Renaissance dramatists.[1174] We will investigate the exploration of circumstantial argument construction more fully in the workshop which follows, but we conclude with a consideration of how far such *enargeia*

[1171] Levenson, pp. 18-19. Cf. Poole, 'Introduction', p. xxvi. Poole refers to the 'single' reference in the poem of Arthur Brooke, *The Tragicall Historye of Romeus and Juliet* (London: Richard Tottill, 1562).
[1172] Martin, W8.
[1173] Granville-Barker, *Prefaces*, Vol. 1, p. 453. Cf. Calantha's death in John Ford's *The Broken Heart* (1633).
[1174] Hutson, p. 17.

responds to the wider *fabula*. At the heart of Enobarbus' speech is his purpose to persuade a potentially tough onstage audience: Romans of Octavian loyalty. However, beneath this one also reflects upon his disposition towards Cleopatra, which is often taken at face value. We can never be certain. At the start of the play his surface semantics defend Cleopatra's affection for Mark Antony, describing her 'passions' as the 'finest part of pure love' (I.ii.140). Yet he quickly adds that she is a 'wonderful piece of work' (I.ii.144), a loaded statement that could objectify her in either extreme. Following the barge speech, he states that 'she makes hungry | Where most she satisfies' (II.iii.274), but this seduction is placed alongside a pejorative description of the queen as 'riggish' (II.iii.276) – in accordance with Agrippa's assertion that Cleopatra is a 'Royal wench' (II.ii.261).

Where Enobarbus' barge vision positively objectifies the queen as exceeding nature, he immediately concludes by objectifying her to the contrary, situating her eroticism in a baseness, which he later repeats in referring to Cleopatra as Antony's 'Egyptian dish' (II.vi.144). Indeed his problematic descriptions of Cleopatra are echoed both in *his* attitude to women elsewhere in the play – his immediate response to Fulvia's death is to describe it as a 'thankful sacrifice' (I.ii.151) – and, perhaps even more importantly, the wider misogyny at large in the play itself. It takes a famed example of metatheatre to challenge this, Cleopatra voicing her concern that she will be posthumously represented on the stage by a 'squeaking' boy in the 'posture of a whore' (V.ii.260-1). The 'co-presence of actor and character'[1175] that is emphasised at this moment allows for the values that might otherwise be projected by the play to be challenged from within.

Whilst the audience may be clear about Enobarbus' general purpose in recounting the barge episode – to persuade auditors that Cleopatra has an all-consuming control over Mark Antony – his own character's attitude to the Egyptian queen is much more enigmatic. And the deft positioning of character is beautifully situated within the wider context of a 'richly figurative play' that itself constantly

---

[1175] Paul Yachnin and Myrna Wyatt Selkirk, 'Metatheater and the Performance of Character in *The Winter's Tale*, in Yachnin and Slights, pp. 140-141.

represents an 'oscillation between […] two poles'.[1176] The variety of dramatic possibilities in the staged, embodied character of Enobarbus is what makes the potential of the written role endure.

[1176] McDonald, p.65.

Enargeia Two: A Character's Purpose II – Gertrude and Ophelia

Two *Hamlet* extracts were analysed in this workshop: Gertrude's description of Ophelia's death;[1177] and Ophelia's own description of Hamlet's transition into madness.[1178] This workshop was conducted with the actor Debra Penny.

Gertrude

Shakespeare's description of Ophelia's death is – in all its paradoxical vitality – an especially prominent example of his *enargeic* skill: one that has engendered its own rich heritage of famous artistic representation.[1179] However, there is a common notable absentee in artistic representations of the speech: the figure of Gertrude, who is of course at the very centre of this particular staged moment, as the character with the responsibility for narrating the offstage death. In this extract a specific consideration of the circumstantial becomes all the more important because of the wider judicial implication. In this context, the urgency of the variety of *enargeia* being employed draws closely from one of its (many) Latinate associations, as a device of *evidentia*. We must question the nature of Gertrude's circumstantial proof in terms of the evidence she provides, recalling of course after Ophelia's death it is revealed that the coroner ('crowner') found enough evidence to allow for a Christian burial to take place (and thus avoid a verdict of suicide).[1180] The vision that Gertrude offers us is the best glimpse that the staged *sjuzhet* can offer into the offstage event of Ophelia's drowning, in the wider *fabula* of the play. Whilst the speech is beguiling in its stylistic poeticism, its chief dramatic-rhetorical function relates to Gertrude's engagement with her audience (both onstage and in the auditorium). We question what her more nuanced purpose is, the accuracy of her report, conflicting personal interest and the reliability of her witness. We can question if Gertrude's report is one

---

[1177] *Hamlet*, IV.vi.149-168, in the *RSC Complete Works*. This passage is more conventionally listed as scene *seven* in Act Four – see Arden 3, Cambridge and Oxford editions.
[1178] II.i.81-105.
[1179] One can especially cite the Pre-Raphaelite fascination, exemplified in famed works by Arthur Hughes and John Everett Millais.
[1180] See the discussion of the gravediggers. *Hamlet*, in the *RSC Complete Works,* V,i.

of genuine first-hand witness to the drowning and, if so, why did she not help Ophelia, or seek to raise the alarm? In spite of the powerful emotive qualities of the speech, might the audience take pause to examine the role of Gertrude? Ophelia's 'clothes spread wide' in the water and 'awhile they bore her up' (IV.vi.158-9); not for long enough, one assumes, for Gertrude (or anyone else) to attempt to save her. Might a director be tempted to insinuate an attempted rescue by presenting, for example, a Gertrude who arrives onstage dripping wet?[1181]

All of this of course takes place within *Hamlet*'s wider context, as a play that is on 'both a formal and an ethical level' especially concerned with 'evidential probability'.[1182] Elsinore is the prime location for circumstantial doubt; whilst Claudius and Polonius search for the circumstances of Hamlet's madness, Hamlet is searching for the circumstantial proof of his father's assassination. Both Gertrude and Ophelia are swept up in the maelstrom. The paranoia of the world of the play is extreme and the men of the court resort to subterfuge, using Gertrude and Ophelia as agents (or indeed pawns) for intelligence gathering. In contrast to the machinations of the court, Hamlet resorts to a process that is deliberately open and public, to establish his circumstantial argument. The performance of the *Murder of Gonzago* provides the 'decisive test' in establishing the full '"circumstances" of his father's death' providing, for Hamlet at least, what seems a 'satisfactory *confirmatio* of the ghost's narrative'.[1183]

Furthermore, in order to situate a given character's context in the play, we commonly start from the written role, but in the case of *Hamlet* this construction is of course heavily dependent on the play's famed textual variations and the 'editorial' approach (one that will be conducted either entirely prior to or sequentially throughout rehearsal). This workshop thus provided an important opportunity to scrutinise the relationship between textual variation and 'character', in surveying

---

[1181] 'Some late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century productions ended this scene with a kind of tableau in which Ophelia's dripping body was carried onstage on a litter.' Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor, in William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, ed. by Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006), p. 406.
[1182] Hutson, 'Forensic Aspects', p. 100.
[1183] Skinner, p. 238.

texts of *Hamlet* to choose from, either by the selection of a discrete text or by a process of editorial conflation. Indeed, the smallest details are of greater significance in this play. Evidential minutiae call into question the character's agency and capacity as a witness. Nuances reveal the character's rhetorical strategy. An actor would ordinarily assess their situational, dramatic-rhetorical purpose, but throughout this play there is also a consistently increased tension surrounding the issue of witness reliability. It is Polonius' fear that Gertrude's assessment of Hamlet may be 'partial' (III.iii.34) that leads him to conceal himself behind the tapestry. This may colour our judgement of Polonius, Gertrude, or the world of Elsinore (or indeed all three), whilst the play at large relentlessly denies the audience concrete certainty, instead providing 'uncertain *issues of fact*'.[1184]

Debra Penny investigated various questions pertaining to Gertrude's 'character': (i) whether Gertrude has 'been told this information', if she did not see the death in person;[1185] (ii) how much Gertrude might be 'trying to protect Laertes' feelings' in her report;[1186] and (iii) if Gertrude is embellishing or falsifying details, just how 'good an actress is she'?[1187] We can question 'why […] she [would] be on the bank', whether the events were reported by an intermediary (a servant at the castle, perhaps), and whether Gertrude would be 'giving [the extract] more poetry' as 'she's trying to explain' such troubling material to Laertes.[1188] In this latter case, Gertrude would be placing extra emphasis on an elaborate description as it softens and elongates the impact of the news that she is reporting, making events 'more beautiful'[1189] than they really were. A range of choices can establish a version of Gertrude that is, by degrees, looking to assert authentic witness, or serving as an intermediary – counselling a family member in a moment of grief.

The text contains the markers of a dramatic rhetoric that will inform such choices. Commonly the bigger issues relating to source text variation would be

---

[1184] Hutson, 'Forensic Aspects', p. 102.
[1185] Penny, W6.
[1186] Ibid.
[1187] Ibid.
[1188] Ibid.
[1189] Ibid.

addressed by a director, prior to the beginning of rehearsals – although productions can differ in this respect. In the case of our workshop extract, we reviewed differences between the F1 text and the (much-questioned) Q1 text. The Gertrude of Q1 speaks of an Ophelia who arrived at the river with 'a garland of sundry sortes of floures'.[1190] Q1's Gertrude lacks the beautifying vision of the famous floral catalogue,[1191] which forms the conventional challenge, or gift, presented to an actor playing Gertrude (as drawn from the Q2 and F1 versions). The Gertrude of F1 briefly describes the location of Ophelia's death, before turning to the specificity of the garlands: 'crow-flowers', 'nettles', 'daisies' and 'long purples' are mentioned – each being rich in symbolism.[1192] Gertrude's narrative might thus be given credence (the descriptive detail asserting the fidelity of her report), but she also manages to dilute the agony that Laertes must feel, in avoiding a more brusque conveyance. Further differences (this time between the Q2 and F1 texts) influence the shading of the context.

Debra Penny referred to such differences as small 'but important'[1193] distinctions. The F1 text tells us that the 'willow' in question grows across '*a* Brooke',[1194] where Q2 offers the definitive article, '*the* Brooke';[1195] is the Gertrude of Q2 describing a very specific, well-known stretch of a river to Laertes, something placeable, which would therefore give appropriate authenticity to her description? Gertrude's definitive reference to the location asserts the immediate reality of

---

[1190] William Shakespeare, *The tragicall historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke* (London: Printed for N[icholas] L[ing] and John Trundell, 1603). [Q1] Held by the British Library, C.34.k.1 STC: 22275. H3, p. 36 <http://www.quartos.org/main.php> [accessed 17 April 2017].

[1191] One might speculate why. Regarding Q1's origins, Tiffany Stern makes the compelling argument that 'Q1 is less likely to have been taken by an actor-pirate than an audience.' Tiffany Stern, 'Sermons, Plays and Note-Takers: *Hamlet* Q1 as a "Noted" Text', in *Shakespeare Survey Vol. 66*, ed. by Peter Holland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 1-23 (p. 23) <http://libsta28.lib.cam.ac.uk:2077/cambridge/shakespeare/chapter.jsf?bid=SSO9781107300699&cid=SSO9781107300699A006> [accessed 17 April 2017].

[1192] William Shakespeare, *The Tragedie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke*, in the *Bodleian F1*, p. 276 <http://firstfolio.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/book.html> [accessed 17 April 2017].

[1193] Penny, W6.

[1194] *Hamlet*, in the *Bodleian F1*, p. 276.

[1195] The italics are my own emphasis. William Shakespeare, *The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke* (London: Printed by I.R. for N.L., 1604). [Q2] Held by the Folger Library, STC: 22276. M2. p. 47 <http://www.quartos.org/main.php> [accessed 17 April 2017].

Ophelia's drowning. By comparison, the F1 landscape of '*a* brook' could imply that Gertrude is embellishing; one would then have to ascertain whether this is born out of benevolent or ill design. This will be entirely dependent upon the 'character' that the actor and director have established for Gertrude in the wider play. The Queen in the 'Amleth' story of Francois de Belleforest's *Le Cinquiesme tome des histoires tragiques* (1570)[1196] 'definitively begins her affair with her husband's brother before the murder'.[1197] Does this moral shade in Shakespeare's source-text also fall upon his Gertrude? For Debra Penny, there is 'no reason for Gertrude to be […] evil'[1198] to this degree, especially if the witness *against* her character is itself of questionable integrity. The textual minutiae continually impact upon the dramatic rhetoric that is to be presented.

Q2's Gertrude depicts the image of an Ophelia who chants 'snatches of old laudes',[1199] as opposed to (the later) F1 use of 'tunes'. Debra Penny described the appreciable difference, 'changing [respectively] hymns to nice little ditties'.[1200] 'Laudes' is suggestive of a measured thought on Ophelia's part, her sombre preparation for 'going to her death',[1201] where 'tunes' is indicative of a more skittish disposition. Philip Edwards has described the F1 alteration to 'tunes' as 'probably an intentional simplification of the playhouse scribe.'[1202] How might we interpret agency for Gertrude in stating this word? Edwards determines that 'it is better to say that Gertrude steps out of her role to serve the purpose of the play.'[1203] Seemingly, he suggests that a separate, choric mode of speech is desirable, and indeed achievable. Such separation of language and character is oppositional to post-Stanislavskian practice; Lisa Harrow, who featured amongst John Barton's RSC troupe, was

---

[1196] It was this edition that 'Shakespeare consulted while writing his play' – John Wolfson, *William Shakespeare and the Short Story Collections* (London: Globe Education, 2011), p. 44.
[1197] Bate and Rasmussen, in the *RSC Complete Works*, p. 1923.
[1198] Penny, W6.
[1199] *Hamlet,* Q2, p. 47.
[1200] Penny, W6.
[1201] Ibid.
[1202] Philip Edwards, in *Hamlet: Prince of Denmark*, ed. by Edwards (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1985; repr. 2001), p. 212.
[1203] Ibid.

suspicious of the suggestion of text serving 'just a[s] choric speech', emphasising instead the actor's requisite work to uncover a 'character's feelings.'[1204] Further questions are posed by the textual variations. F1 describes how Ophelia 'with fantastic garlands did […] *come*' to the riverbank; Q2 by contrast finishes the line with the word '*make*'.[1205] The vision of Ophelia in F1 suggests premeditation, in the draping of symbolic garlands – a more deliberately suicidal prospect perhaps than the greater spontaneity of Ophelia's actions in Q2.[1206] The range of problems can in fact become a selection of fruitful divergent possibilities for those seeking to stage the text.

As with my other workshops, the *RSC Complete Works* (based on F1) served as my consistent control text. Applying post-Stanislavskian 'units' was comparatively straightforward. We find dramatic motivation in three distinct segments, indicated by Gertrude's use of the *anaphora* 'there' to begin successive clauses. Firstly, Gertrude describes the general setting, of the willow across a (nondescript) stream. Secondly, Gertrude details Ophelia's arrival, and the exact nature of her (premade) garlands. Thirdly, Gertrude addresses the specifics of the tragedy: Ophelia was attempting to crown the branches of the tree with the garlands, when a small branch broke and she fell into the water. In the case of this descriptive speech, it is readily possible therefore to derive a growing and strong narrative drive, bristling with 'dramatic action'.

The three segments are immediately followed by a mid-line caesura, where Gertrude chooses to address the moment of Ophelia's drowning. The agency is passed to the garments themselves – personification attributes them with the blame for Ophelia's demise – as, 'heavy with their drink' (IV.vi.164), they eventually drag Ophelia to her 'muddy death' (IV.vi.166). This emphasis in agency was evidently

---

[1204] Lisa Harrow, in Barton, p. 61 – specifically relating to Philo, in *Antony and Cleopatra*, I.i.
[1205] Italics are my own emphasis. Cf. *Bodleian F1*, p. 276 and *Hamlet*, Q2, p. 46.
[1206] Harold Jenkins favours the image of Ophelia intertwining the garlands with the willow itself – in *Hamlet*, ed. by Jenkins (London: Methuen: 1982; repr. London: Thomson, 2002), p. 374. Cf. Philip Edwards: Ophelia 'made garlands from the willow, interwoven with wildflowers and weeds' and the 'playhouse scribe' – as the source of the text – 'quite misunderstood this […]', in Edwards, p. 211.

significant (or memorable) enough to have also been retained in Q1.[1207]
Personification echoes throughout the speech: the 'sliver' of the tree that breaks is
'envious' (IV.vi.156) and the brook is described as 'weeping' (IV.vi.158). There are
three prominent moments of trochaic inversion at line beginnings: Ophelia was
'Clamb'ring to hang' (IV.vi.156) the garlands, and 'Fell in the weeping brook'
(IV.vi.158), before the garments 'Pulled the poor wretch' into the water (IV.vi.165).
With each usage, the details of *elocutio* create the enduring image of Ophelia's
garments as the responsible agents of her death. Part of Gertrude's rhetorical
purpose, is this sense, is to divest the event of human responsibility. And again, we
recall the significance of the coroner's verdict that will be reported later in the play,
especially when contrasted with the excessively damning, *onstage* judgement of
suicide, as made by the priest.[1208]

During the workshop, we found one moment amidst Gertrude's floral
catalogue that proved the most substantial challenge to a coherent dramatization.
There is clear purpose in Gertrude's botanic symbolism, yet her specific mention of
an alternative name for the 'long purples' (IV.vi.152) momentarily changes her
tenor. She describes how 'liberal shepherds give a grosser name' (IV.vi.153) to this
variety of orchid, which 'cold maids' alternatively refer to as 'dead men's fingers'
(IV.vi.154). There is marked antithesis: the lewd, slang terminology of shepherds is
pitted against the lexis of chaste virgins, who favour morbid symbolism. However,
by invoking pastoral double-entendre, Gertrude risks creating an indecorous tone that
might shatter the solemnity of her speech. Critics have offered various suggestions
for the shepherd terms that Gertrude might be referencing. Harold Jenkins mentions
'dog's cods' or 'fool's bollocks'[1209] – the roots of the 'long purple' orchid
resembling a scrotum.[1210] Close proximity of indecorous tonal shift is of course
frequently found in Shakespeare (and across Renaissance drama), but an actor today

---

[1207] *Hamlet,* Q1, p. 36.
[1208] V.i.174-182; 184-187.
[1209] Where 'cods' refer to testicles. Jenkins, p. 374.
[1210] Appropriately, 'orchid' takes its root from the Greek, *orkhis* – literally meaning 'testicle'.

would still attempt to warrant its expression from Gertrude's own mouth, and its place within her chain of discrete intentions.

For Debra Penny there were two possible solutions, either where Gertrude might feel prompted by the actor playing Laertes to elucidate on the 'long purples', or where she might be employing a tone 'that [is] ironic'.[1211] The shepherd slang presents a problem to which there is no easy solution. However, Penny felt that the currency of the maids' term was an appropriate retrospective conceit on Gertrude's behalf: she knows that, in her narrative, Ophelia is 'about to die, and they're called dead men's fingers'.[1212] And it is perhaps this predominant sense of foreboding that endures.

Ophelia

We should regard Ophelia's own use of *enargeia*, earlier in the play, as no mean feat: she manages to convince her father via her powers of vivid description. Polonius is the breathing personification of court intrigue, Elsinore's own Robert Cecil. He consistently serves as a 'sinister exaggeration of the forensic disposition' of the play, embodying and perpetuating the 'claustrophobic effect' of 'excessive inferential detective work.'[1213] Distrust is Polonius' default position and this sentiment commands the very beginnings of Act Two; *in medias res*, Polonius requests that Reynaldo 'make inquiry' (II.i.4) into his son's behaviour, including suspected visits to brothels (II.i.63). We also recall that, in his last onstage conversation with Ophelia, Polonius had rejected Hamlet's apparent 'vows' of love (I.iii.118) towards her as being worthless 'implorators of unholy suits (I.iii.133), concluding with a 'charge' (I.iii.139) that his daughter should not spend any further time discoursing with Hamlet. Ophelia had stated her obeyance. Polonius is not a man that is prone to trust even his own family. And yet, immediately following Reynaldo's departure, Ophelia arrives, 'affrighted' (II.i.79), and launches into her

---

[1211] Penny, W6.
[1212] Ibid.
[1213] Hutson, 'Forensic Aspects', p. 101.

description of Hamlet's madness. In this dense fog of intrigue, Polonius is – we might be surprised – immediately inclined to believe his daughter's report. Such is her visionary power, as manifest in *enargeia*, that Polonius 'does not hesitate to construe this narrative as evidence that the cause or motive of Hamlet's madness is love'.[1214] From this moment on, Polonius can claim agency for himself, as the man who has successfully diagnosed a 'case of love-madness'.[1215] He is then well-disposed during the rest of the dialogue to accept any response from Ophelia that 'confirms […] his diagnosis.'[1216]

For a literary reading, the surface semantics offer seemingly straightforward plot development, the scene's manifest expositional value being Ophelia's revelation of Hamlet's apparent mania. If we consider the revelation in terms of stagecraft however, it has supreme worth in enabling the significant *offstage* character development of Hamlet. In the previous scene, Hamlet has just mentioned that he may 'perchance hereafter' think it 'meet | To put on an antic disposition' (I.v.188-9). The timing of Ophelia's description is therefore pivotal, as it indicates that the crucial event of Hamlet's descent into this behaviour has been conducted *offstage*. This is potentially a gift for the actor playing Hamlet, offering complementary character progression without complex *onstage* transition. The Renaissance actor would not therefore have been obliged to passionate the exact moment of transition to madness and likewise, today's actor does not have to contend with a contemporary enaction, prior to Ophelia's helpful announcement. Ophelia confronts and persuades the audience with the efficacy of Hamlet's mad behaviour before the actor playing Hamlet has to contend with the challenge, reappearing onstage – to call Polonius a 'fishmonger' (II.ii.181). Shakespeare frequently turns to the *enargeic* description of the offstage as a dramatic tool to fuel audience anticipation. In *Twelfth Night*, Maria describes how (offstage) the 'gull Malvolio is turned heathen'.[1217] The audience's expectation is stoked before Malvolio eventually enters in his ridiculous garb and

---

[1214] Ibid.
[1215] Skinner, p. 150.
[1216] Ibid.
[1217] William Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, III.iii.46.

converted disposition to address Olivia with the words, 'Sweet lady, ho, ho' (III.iv.16). At the start of *Macbeth*, it is *enargeia* that asserts the hero's status as a 'brave'[1218] warrior who 'carved out his passage' (I.i.21) through the enemy until his sword 'smoked with bloody execution' (I.i.20). The actor playing Macbeth enters the stage to face an audience that is already acquainted with his supposed stature. In each case the offstage actor is gifted an introduction, but with this comes the important descriptive responsibility that is incumbent upon the *onstage* actor, directly engaged in *enargeia*.

Yet, beyond such offstage character development, there is rich potential for *enargeia* to in fact function as the very substance of an individual character response. For today's actor playing Ophelia, approaching a performance along broadly post-Stanislavskian lines, much detail lies beneath the surface. Her revelation of Hamlet's madness should not be limited to acting techniques of mere illustration. Debra Penny noted the extent to which Ophelia 'would have been terrified' by such a visit and Hamlet's apparent 'complete breakdown'.[1219] The duration of the speech may initially seem a sizeable obstacle, in elongating the portrayal of such terror; Penny felt 'paranoid – as an actor – that to the audience' the speech would simply 'be sounding like a list'.[1220] This is evident, for example, in the prominent use of the *anaphora* 'and' at the start of lines, which occurs six times in the speech.[1221] But, as three moments of *anaphora* are clustered in the last five lines, the device again proves fruitfully dramatic, indicating to the actor the precise steps of Ophelia's growing desperation. As before, the post-Stanislavskian process of 'unitting' helpfully divides the speech into smaller digestible morsels.[1222] And it was this contemporary sense of a sequential process that was exemplified in the workshop, *enargeia* functioning in this instance as a real-time, staged re-living of the described event.

[1218] *Macbeth*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, I.ii.18.
[1219] Penny, W6.
[1220] Ibid.
[1221] *Hamlet*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, II.i.86; 94; 98; 101; 102; 105.
[1222] A process Penny had encountered professionally on a number of occasions. Penny, W6.

Penny questioned whether Ophelia is recalling Hamlet's behaviour 'bit by bit, moment by moment – or whether [the speech is] the whole thing',[1223] one long outpouring (whether as a soothing unburdening of emotion or an anxious reliving of events). Units allow for discrete developments in argument. In an acute realisation of distress, Ophelia states of Hamlet:

> He raised a sigh so piteous and profound
> That it did seem to shatter all his bulk
> And end his being: that done, he lets me go […][1224]

Philip Edwards asserts that 'Ophelia discerns rightly' that the sigh represents 'Hamlet's expulsion of his past life.'[1225] The ending of Hamlet's former 'being' occurs on a midline caesura, with Ophelia launching her report into the present tense for the third occasion in this speech. She keeps reliving the moment. As a matter of consistency, I have replicated the punctuation favoured by the *RSC Complete Works* (my 'control text') – a colon in this case. However, the colon suggests Ophelia affords herself little time to dwell; F1 uses a full-stop, which might encourage a minutely larger moment of reflection.[1226] Penny felt Ophelia's anxiety had increased, this being her moment of profound realisation that 'something terrible's happened.'[1227] In this instance, we interpreted the original F1 punctuation as more applicable to our rehearsal context. The workshop emphasised the importance of the two caesuras in this speech – the first preceded Ophelia's words 'Long stayed he so' (II.i.96), as she described how Hamlet perused her face in deep contemplation. Both caesuras offer ideal moments of shifting tone, in a speech that can otherwise be overwhelmed by the white noise of unrelenting fear and confusion.

[1223] Ibid.
[1224] *Hamlet*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, II.i.99-101.
[1225] Edwards, p. 118.
[1226] *Hamlet,* in the *Bodleian F1*. Q2 offers a semi-colon here – *Hamlet*, Q2, E2. Naturally, Renaissance punctuation implications are complicated – see Chapter Four.
[1227] Penny, W6.

Whilst a range of variant readings were discussed, Penny concluded the speech is actually 'not about telling Polonius',[1228] in the sense that Ophelia's 'foreboding', re-lived experience is at least as prominent as her narrative content. Thus the key is that the audience realise just 'how terrified she feels.'[1229] By the close of the speech, Hamlet's 'perusal' of Ophelia's face has become a terrifying glimpse of obsession; Ophelia states how 'to the last' Hamlet's eyes 'bended their light' (II.i.105) upon her. Penny regarded Hamlet's stare as an intimate threat to Ophelia, which correlates with the rich and specific power that can be attributed to eyesight in Shakespeare (and indeed across Renaissance sources). By coincidence (and not design) each of my following workshop extracts will contain the use of the conceit of eyes as the site of romantic infection. In this case, Hamlet's peculiar gaze represents his new choice of outward character, whilst being the instigator of Ophelia's future grief. This offstage event might have served as a trigger event, which has also infected Ophelia with her own state of melancholy, and which will provoke the actions that she will take hereafter.

Penny suggested nuances for Ophelia's delivery. Certainly, Ophelia's scenic purpose may focus on two aims: (i) 'to persuade Polonius' that Hamlet is now mad; and/or (ii) to seek assurance from her father, in effectively asking, 'is this normal behaviour?'.[1230] However, the workshop conclusion was that the most arresting variant would be to present Ophelia as being doubly petrified: firstly, that Hamlet has become genuinely mad and, secondly, that her father will very probably not believe her report. The issue of fear being revisited, in the moment of bearing witness, served the 'actions' of our post-Stanislavskian workshop the best, in presenting the greatest individual stakes for Ophelia. In turn, it would also offer the best opportunity to make the effects of the offstage event palpable in the arena of the theatre.

[1228] Penny, W6.
[1229] Ibid.
[1230] Ibid.

The generic requirement, the scenic/plot necessity to persuade Polonius, was supplanted by a deeply consuming focus on Hamlet's madness. And this was not difficult to achieve; Penny stated how, in character, she could 'visualise [the events] very very easily', as if they were 'happening in front of [her]'.[1231] She regarded 'visualising' as the 'best way' to approach such an extract.[1232] Similarly, she also felt that Gertrude's literal address of Laertes should be more orientated towards Gertrude's own 'experience'.[1233] Speaking on Gertrude's behalf, as the actor-character, she stated:

> I should've helped […] I was so visualising that I was there – and not thinking about Laertes […][1234]

Notably, at no stage did Penny deliberately prioritise the enaction of a given emotion; emotion was instead evoked from within her, as she moved through the units of the speech, in a manner that was entirely consistent with my post-Stanislavskian practitioners.[1235] In this fashion, both *enargeic* speeches, coupled with Penny's approach, invoke the dramatic practice of mimetic reliving, rather than diegetic narrative.

[1231] Penny, W6.
[1232] Ibid.
[1233] Ibid.
[1234] Ibid.
[1235] See Chapter Two.

Enargeia Three: A Character's Purpose III – Titania and Oberon

The following workshop assessed the fairies' treatment of *enargeia* at the beginning of the second act of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* – specifically Titania's 'forgeries of jealousy' complaint to Oberon (II.i.82-118), and Oberon's ensuing plot to drug Titania on the 'bank where the wild thyme blows' (II.i.158-273).[1236] The workshop featured Ruth Sillers and Brian Martin.

Titania

Before the onstage arrival of the fairy monarchs, Puck reveals to another fairy the nature of the argument that has arisen: Titania has 'stol'n from an Indian king' a 'lovely boy' (II.i.22) who now serves as 'her attendant' (II.i.21), whilst 'jealous Oberon' wishes that the child should alternatively serve him, as a 'knight of his train' (II.i.25). Puck allows the audience to anticipate the tension of the forthcoming rulers' meeting, when the origins of the dispute will be elucidated. Importantly, in attending to Titania's speech we call into question the nature of the alleged theft, especially given her evident concern for the child's welfare. The child subplot is very much superseded by the rest of the play's affairs, chiefly concerned with the unknotting of the Athenian lovers' entanglements. However, Titania's persuasive purpose in this scene is crucial to the establishment of her character, especially in relation to how an audience will judge the deeply problematic conduct of Oberon towards her throughout the play. The resolution of the fairy rulers' dispute is only achieved via Oberon's drugging of Titania and one certainly cannot be sure that he ever responds in good faith to her request to be informed how she came to be sleeping amongst 'mortals on the ground' (IV.i.94). The common challenge in staging the play is for Titania's 'forgeries of jealousy' speech (II.i.82-118) to be given due weight, as it takes place simultaneously with the staged introduction of the fairy kingdom. Directors today, in making emphatic choices to establish their fairyland mise-en-scène, often smother Titania's purpose at this crucial moment.

[1236] *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, in the *RSC Complete Works*.

Initially, the 'forgeries of jealousy' speech might be dismissed as a lengthy description restricted to a single theme, which might seem problematic in the same vein as Juliet's soliloquy.[1237] However, Titania develops a detailed, focused argument. Ruth Sillers remarked on the clear evidence in the speech that Titania 'cares very passionately'[1238] about the wider effects of her disagreement with Oberon. Furthermore, a literary reading of the text might fall short of anticipating the dramatic potential of the speech, which only becomes truly manifest in staged crowd interaction. The fairy monarchs have entered the via separate doors, with their partisan acolytes;[1239] Titania thus has the urgent purpose, and public opportunity, to persuade. As Sillers emphasised, 'how Oberon [and the] fairies […] react'[1240] will crucially indicate the degree to which Titania's words have been successfully received, revealing the true dynamic of the fairy kingdom.

Structurally, the measured *logos* of Titania's speech enables the actor to convey intellectual reasoning, moving through a satisfying sequence of 'units' of causality. First Titania outlines the nature of her discord with Oberon; the result is that the traditional dancing of fairy 'ringlets' has been replaced by Oberon's 'brawls' (II.i.87-8).[1241] The speech then divides into two large units, each heralded by the anaphorous use of the introductory term 'therefore' (II.i.89;104).[1242] Over fourteen lines Titania vividly describes the wider effects of the fairy quarrel (II.i.89-103): from those of the natural world, through to the farming cycle, and the misalignment of the crucial seasonal rites of human society. In the third unit, Titania develops the links of causation, asserting that the 'moon, the governess of floods' (II.i.104) – one of the most potent symbols in the play – is now 'pale in her anger' (II.i.105). The

---

[1237] See Soliloquy Two.
[1238] Ruth Sillers, W8.
[1239] See stage directions: William Shakespeare, *A Midsommer nights dreame* (London: Thomas Fisher, 1600), Q1, p. 14 <http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/doc/MND_Q1/scene/Titlepage/> [accessed 9 May 2016]; c.f. William Shakespeare, *A Midsommer Nights Dreame*, in the *Bodleian F1*, p. 148.
[1240] Sillers, W8.
[1241] 'Brawls' may suggest 'quarrels'. However, Harold F. Brooks interprets this as 'deliberately ironic' allusion to alternative French dances, 'bransles'. William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. by Harold F. Brooks (London: Arden Methuen, 1979; repr. Thomson Learning, 2006), p. 32.
[1242] The word is also repeated mid-line, and mid-sentence – but not as a possible 'unit' division (II.i.94).

escalated discord is further emphasised by the trochaic inversion created by the adjective 'pale' – a rare occurrence in this speech. Towards the close, a mid-line caesura signals Titania's move to a final 'unit' of summation. We are informed:

> The spring, the summer,
> The childing autumn, angry winter, change
> Their wonted liveries, […]
>
> <div align="right">(II.i.112-4)</div>

The crucial placement of the verb 'change' (at the very end of the line) allows the actor to emphasise the transformation. From 'unit' division to the treatment of metre and placement of verbs, Shakespeare's *elocutio* reveals a strategic map for the actor's persuasive purpose. When Titania eventually arrives at the crux of her argument, Ruth Sillers finds that enjambment aids revelation, the anticipatory lineation offering a brief climatic pause as Titania states:

> And this same progeny of evils comes
> From our debate […]
>
> <div align="right">(II.i.116-7)</div>

Titania describes herself and Oberon as the 'parents and original' (II.i.118) of the 'evils' claiming, as Raphael Lyne has suggested, 'joint, parent-like responsibility […]'.[1243] Ruth Sillers regarded this as personal recognition that the 'world is being distorted and they're […] the cause of it.'[1244]

Human empathy is the very heart of Titania's speech, with wider implications for the actors. Sillers spoke of the need to establish 'how different' fairy speech is from 'the way that mortals, the humans, behave and speak', in order to determine 'how human' the actors should 'make the fairies.'[1245] Raphael Lyne proposes that for the fairies 'there is actually no problem to be solved in metaphor. From their perspective, the things that happen rarely require metaphors and similes to make

---

[1243] Raphael Lyne, *Shakespeare, Rhetoric and Cognition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 121.
[1244] Sillers, W8.
[1245] Ibid.

them comprehensible'.[1246] There is ambiguity in the established world of fairy land, 'where things may or may not be metaphorical'.[1247] Sillers questioned 'how far [the fairies] understand human emotion'.[1248] She found Puck's later proclamation to Oberon, 'Lord, what fools these mortals be!' (III.ii.115), to be evidence of how 'baffling'[1249] the human world might seem from the perspective of one fairy. However, she believed that Titania contrasts this, in her care for the human commonweal – something perhaps more readily discernible within an Early Modern context, where people were more 'allied to the land and nature.'[1250]

Raphael Lyne writes of Titania's speech being 'poised so delicately within and outside a maelstrom of agency in the unnatural-natural world.'[1251] Titania cannot make herself mortal but she does have, as Brian Martin described it, 'a conscience' about the result of the fairies' actions.[1252] Consequently, Sillers warned that a heightened portrayal of the alienating qualities of fairy behaviour might distance us from Titania's human concern. She found no evidence of arbitrary frivolity – the common shorthand for fairy behaviour – in this speech, where the import of Titania's tone suggests she is not 'frivolous at all'.[1253] The structure and substance of Titania's speech is grounded in an anthropomorphic *logos* that helps an actor to distinguish her character from the fey behaviour of the others in this scene. More widely however, both Sillers and Martin agreed that versification is a helpful acting aid: the fairies are distinguished from the mortals by the extraordinary facility of their verse-speak, which is the lived-in, quotidian reality of fairy life. Qualities of versification are, as Martin termed it, 'literal to them'.[1254] Shakespeare heightens the divide between the realms (of mortal and fairy), using the most florid aspects of human *elocutio* to serve the mundane motives of fairy domesticity.

[1246] Lyne, p. 119.
[1247] Ibid.
[1248] Sillers, W8.
[1249] Ibid.
[1250] Ibid.
[1251] Lyne, p. 121.
[1252] Martin, W8.
[1253] Sillers, W8.
[1254] Martin, W8.

The audience might not yet realise why Titania feels so involved in the world of human concerns but it soon will; this speech is the means by which Titania arrives at the more detailed description of the child that she 'promised […] she would take care of'.[1255] In the explanation of the child's origin, we see the evidence of Titania's 'very personal reason' and wider concern for the human affairs about which she is 'so passionate.'[1256] She might have a transitional status, as a fairy who can intercede in mortal affairs, but with this comes, as Sillers detailed, central requirements of character construction. Even if 'a character […] isn't human […] there are still passions and reasons and elements of […] humanity […]' to be found.[1257] One has to question how far any audience could 'care' or be invested, if the actor were to restrict a portrayal of a non-human (or non-mortal) character to the representation of 'just […] a symbol […] or a metaphor'.[1258] Martin concurred, whilst stressing the wider issue in terms of performance phenomenology, and the actor-character's live, embodied agency in human communication with the audience. Where 'every character' is established as a response to the authorship of a 'mortal person', in the embodied capacity of the actor, 'the audience needs to be able to empathise' and sense a form of human connection beyond the written role.[1259]

Titania can of course have additional appeal as a product of (and a response to) the playhouse. Sillers anticipated how 'especially somewhere like the Globe', with its groundlings in shared-light, the actor might be encouraged in 'playing down to the audience',[1260] particularly illustrated in the phrase, 'The human mortals want their winter here' (II.i.102). At this moment the actor-character can directly appeal to Oberon and the assembled fairies, indicating 'all [the] humans' in the audience as an explicit constituent in a *coup de théâtre*.[1261] And in this, we remember the

---

[1255] Sillers, W8.
[1256] Ibid.
[1257] Ibid.
[1258] Ibid.
[1259] Martin, W8. See Introduction, Chapter One and Chapter Two on 'actor-character' terminology; cf. Weimann, p. 178 with Alfreds, p. 51.
[1260] Sillers, W8.
[1261] Ibid.

significance of Titania's onstage auditors. Martin asserts that onstage relationships are established 'automatically' in performance, where it is 'much harder' to determine interlocutor dynamics by solely 'reading' the text.[1262] Sillers, in agreement, highlighted how a staged introduction of the rulers immediately conveys something of 'the past history of the characters', even though it is 'just the first time the audience have met them'.[1263]

One might turn to the work of Patrick Tucker, in specific reference to the performance context of the Renaissance playhouse. His Original Shakespeare Company used to focus on recreating Early Modern playing conditions, with limited rehearsal, resulting in extempore live response from actors onstage. His 'Tytania' performed the entire speech whilst 'she idly ground her rear into [Oberon's] groin'.[1264] Naturally, as this decision was impromptu, the actor playing Oberon 'had no idea just how long' this action would continue. Tucker remarks that 'each bawdy element was punctuated', giving 'immediacy and passion (and humour)' to a scene 'full of fun, mad moments, and agonizing truth.'[1265] However, here we find problematic record of an anachronistic 'original' practice that, through misplaced improvisation, imposed an inappropriate performance choice upon Titania's speech. There appears to have been no acknowledgement of the dramatic-rhetorical nuances that fundamentally establish Titania's persuasive purpose. If one looks at the detail of the speech and the wider context of Titania's discussion of the Indian boy, it is hard to substantiate an approach of idle bawdiness. But, given that productions strive to establish the other-worldly environment of a fairy kingdom at this point, blanket staged frivolity can pose a significant obstacle.

By contrast, our workshop anticipated the conventional, extended rehearsal period of present-day Shakespeare. With this comes a longer-term engagement between actor and text. In Ruth Sillers' analysis, Titania's words are, above all,

---

[1262] Martin, W8.
[1263] Sillers, W8.
[1264] Patrick Tucker, *Secrets of Acting Shakespeare: the original approach* (London: Routledge, 2002), p. 54.
[1265] Ibid.

testament to her 'personal' connection to the human world. The post-Stanislavskian practice of searching for units is just one method of navigating through a speech to mine for 'character', but it does directly respond to the prompts of *elocutio*, in Renaissance terms. And by Sillers' estimation, this results in a version of Titania that is driven to persuade her audience (both on and offstage) that 'there's an actual reason for [the fairies'] argument.'[1266] Titania in this moment is proof that the fairies do not have to exclusively function on an insouciant level.

Oberon

Titania's opening words serve as the provocation for Oberon's response. Where Sillers emphasised the requirement to unearth the actor-character's deeper rooted 'need to say [their] words',[1267] we might also anticipate the chain reaction of provocation and reaction, for which both dialogue partners are responsible;[1268] Titania has stoked the fire of Oberon's discontent, which then fuels his 'need' to deliver the 'wild thyme' speech. Martin warned that 'feeling and truth' is often lost, where the actor has not sufficiently ascribed either 'meaning' or 'passion' to their words.[1269] Titania's argument seems to have had little persuasive impact upon Oberon, his brusque response being a further abnegation of responsibility: 'Do you amend it then, it lies in you' (II.i.119). The conflict has sparked Oberon's passion to 'torment' (II.i.149) his queen; he presents no argument of *logos*, but instead details the process of his revenge.

In this instance, Oberon's use of rhyme is notable; Martin spoke of the speech as 'a spell that [Oberon's] casting on the audience', as concocted of Oberon's 'language, and […] rhyming couplets', with their intoxicating 'rhythm'.[1270] This complemented the interpretation of Peter Hall – who has written that Oberon 'seduces' the audience with 'beautiful lyrical verse', before twisting 'its beauty into

---

[1266] Sillers, W8.
[1267] Ibid.
[1268] Cf. 'Alfreds actioning': Chapter Two and Chapter Seven.
[1269] Martin, W8.
[1270] Ibid.

"hateful fantasies"'.[1271] Rhymes in this instance 'contribute to the mood of hypnotic incantation.'[1272] Hall asserts that the actor 'must invent the need for rhyme' and have a 'relish' for it,[1273] just as John Barton likewise suggests that an 'actor (or rather a character)' should claim ownership of his language – they must be 'his rhymes' with 'an intention behind them.'[1274]

   Mike Alfreds has discussed rhyme in its broader Shakespearean usages. He advises actors to ascertain if 'the scheme subtle or insistent',[1275] to determine how far they have to shift 'away from […] comfortable workaday naturalism',[1276] and he has a sensibility that creates confident engagement with a range of genres, most especially evident in his appreciation of the dramatic-rhetorical detail of Shakespearean text. Alfreds' approach enables actors to determine the precise pertinence, in a scene, of an effect of *elocutio*, as demonstrated in his interpretation of rhyming couplets, and the variety in their dramatic potential. Giles Block similarly describes the various dramatic functions of rhyme as: 'the language of lovers; of magical spells; of encapsulated wisdom […Or] simply […] the way someone catches up with a quick rejoinder with which to outsmart others.'[1277] Block also answers the common question as to whether characters should be conscious of their own capacity to rhyme: 'some are; but most are not'.[1278] As examples of moments of intentional rhyming he cites: Berowne's 'out-rhyming' of others, in *Love's Labour's Lost*; and Romeo's description of Rosaline to Benvolio, in *Romeo and Juliet*.[1279] But he finds in the majority of cases characters are not self-conscious of such a facility. Block describes Romeo's first glimpse of Juliet as a 'bolt from the blue'[1280] revelation – an epiphany that provokes instantaneous, subconscious rhyming. Whilst outlining

---

[1271] Hall, p. 91.
[1272] Ibid.
[1273] Nb. there is a consensus (from directors and workshop participants) that an actor should have a sense of ownership over their employment of verse. Hall, p. 42.
[1274] Barton, p. 126.
[1275] Alfreds, p. 249.
[1276] Alfreds, p. 250.
[1277] Block, p. 176.
[1278] Ibid.
[1279] Block, p. 177 and 178. The respective examples take place across the opening scene of each play.
[1280] Block, p. 181.

further, diverse forms, Block recognises the increasing sophistication of Shakespeare's late rhyme; characters start to become mistrustful the very second they find themselves uttering rhyme, where rhyme no longer represents the moment of 'wholeheartedly believing that they have the "answer"'.[1281] Rhyme is thus a multipurpose tool that must be approached within a strict theatrical context.

Oberon's rhyme, in this moment, is undoubtedly a magical invocation – this coming in the midst of Shakespeare's most-rhymed play.[1282] Perhaps the most crucial impact of rhyme in the play comes in the clarification of the fate of Demetrius, who has not been given an antidote to the love-drug by the close of the play. Firstly, as Demetrius seems no longer to have the 'compulsion to rhyme'[1283] we might regard this as a subtle indication that the effects of the drug have ceased. Secondly, Oberon personally took charge of the drugging of Demetrius, speaking his spells with an almost litigious precision;[1284] Demetrius is not under precisely the same contract of magic as the others. According to Oberon's careful wording, the spell is engineered to work upon Demetrius when his '*love* he doth espy' (III.ii.105).[1285] Thus Demetrius is not drugged to have a mistaken infatuation with the wrong woman, but instead to have 'an intensified state of his previous affection'[1286] – the sincere love that he held (and should hold) for Helena. This distinction was especially highlighted by the 2016 production at Shakespeare's Globe;[1287] the character of Helena was reimagined as a man, 'Helenus' – consequently, Demetrius ends the play by re-establishing himself in a same-sex relationship. Ankur Bahl, who played Demetrius, noted how this presentation was not 'arguing that the drug makes [Demetrius] gay' but that the drug

---

[1281] Block, p. 233.
[1282] Block, p. 189.
[1283] Block, p. 196.
[1284] Cf. Block, p. 197.
[1285] Italics are my own.
[1286] Peter Holland, 'Introduction', in William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. by Peter Holland (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 68.
[1287] *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, dir. by Emma Rice (Shakespeare's Globe, 2016).

enables him 'to recognize his natural, true love' which emboldens him to claim it and treasure it'.[1288]

Oberon has a wide-ranging facility for versification. His vivid description of the 'bank' of 'wild thyme' uses metrical emphasis for support. Martin (citing the influence of his own work with Giles Block) spoke of the verse 'very much standing for [the] character and what they are experiencing', metre thus having a 'very practical' application.[1289] By example, Oberon describes the bank as 'Quite over-canopied with luscious woodbine,' (II.i.256), where the line's feminine ending itself fittingly overhangs the expected iambic rhythm. If the actor also chooses to voice the first foot of this line as a spondee, extra emphasis is given to the abundant growth; where 'quite' is synonymous with 'completely'. Oberon speaks with great specificity, before revealing the location as Titania's sleeping place.

At this moment Peter Hall finds a significant change in mood – the speech delves deeper into 'sub-text' than might be recognised by a 'purely lyrical', 'undramatic' reading.[1290] Titania has been 'Lulled in these flowers with dances and delight' (II.i.259) – both the trochaic opening of the line and alliteration giving a vocal shading to the words. Oberon introduces the ambiguous image of a shed snake's skin. We are captivated by its iridescent, 'enamelled' (II.i.260) beauty, before Oberon's language – in the reveal of the next line – describes the perilous, 'possibly deadly'[1291] constrictive potential of the skin, being 'wide enough to wrap a fairy in' (II.i.261). The *anaphora* – beginning successive lines with 'and' (II.i.262-3) – heralds to the actor the steps of Oberon's dark design: first he will drug his wife with love potion, and then he will 'make her full of hateful fantasies' (II.i.263). His

---

[1288] Ankur Bahl, 'Can Emma Rice give one of Shakespeare's best female parts to a man?', online blog, What's On Stage website <http://www.whatsonstage.com/london-theatre/news/ankur-bahl-on-helena-a-midsummer-nights-dream_40167.html> [accessed 9 May 2016].
Ibid.
[1289] Martin, W8.
[1290] Hall, p. 91.
[1291] Hall, p. 93.

'invocation' has turned from 'beauty' to 'evil' in a 'reversal' that is 'chilling but gleeful': his revealed purpose in his speech being 'simply to torture his wife'.[1292]

The third 'unit' signals Oberon's 'particular instructions for Puck';[1293] his use of the word 'Take' (II.i.264) is doubly emphatic, being both in the imperative mood and serving as a trochaic inversion. Oberon stipulates that the drug must be given 'disdainful youth' (II.i.266), but a caesura 'indicates a further change of pace and attitude'.[1294] He is concerned to give detail: the intended target will be a 'man' dressed in 'Athenian garments' (II.i.278-9). and Puck must 'effect' the drugging 'with some care' (II.i.270). Only in the dynamic of performance can a fuller range of possibilities of playing emerge, where the speech will impact upon the audience's judgement of both Oberon and Puck. Martin notes the 'extra comedy' created if Oberon, in great distrust, 'really spells it out', only for Puck to get everything wrong.[1295] Alternatively, we may question Oberon's precision, in the specifics of the scheme: how unique is it to see such a man in Athenian garments? Again, beyond any lyrical façade, the text gives rich detail that informs the dramatic function of both speaker *and* the onstage auditor.

Martin finds in Puck the common Shakespearean potential (as an interlocutor) to serve as 'the ingénue', the audience intermediary that needs 'to be brought up to speed';[1296] the origin of the floral drug 'needs exposition' and Oberon 'makes it real by taking time to explain where it all came from'.[1297] An arbitrary introduction of a potion would create a less engaging vision of a fairy world. Even where, indeed, there is common significance in the 'love-in-idleness' (II.i.171). The *Viola tricolor* flower might have been recognisable to its audience as 'heartsease' and its supposed qualities were apparently well-known, as evidenced by John Lyly's

---

[1292] Ibid.
[1293] Ibid.
[1294] Ibid.
[1295] Martin, W8.
[1296] Ibid.
[1297] Ibid.

earlier play, *Sapho and Phao*.[1298] Sillers, whilst reading the role of Puck in the workshop, suggested a suitable additional tension, if Oberon 'knows that [Puck] has […] messed up in the past';[1299] although he may be able to circumnavigate the globe at an extraordinary pace, the 'apprentice'[1300] Puck still clearly lacks the experience and skill of his fairy king.[1301] Martin was enthused by this suggestion, and the effect it would have on the actor-character's purpose, where it would be 'hard to just accept saying something for the sake of it'. As he emphasised, there is an 'ever-inventiveness of actors' in a rehearsal':[1302]

> What was nice about Ruth's suggestion is that I'm trying to sell where this place is, or she [as Puck] doesn't get it […] Now my motivation is for Puck to understand where I'm talking about, as opposed to [just speaking] the poetic language.[1303]

Martin foregrounded the actor's capacity to 'come up with [creative] ways to give [a speech…] reason',[1304] whilst highlighting the gift of Shakespearean *elocutio*, which lends itself so consistently to dramatic outcomes. There are many different shades to Oberon's motivation, whilst the surface 'poetic language' will still be retained regardless. Once again, this reveals levels of discourse, where there may be distinctions between the superficial referent of the language and the dramatic rhetorical purpose of the actor-character.

The workshop emphasised how easy it can be to ignore Titania's argument, if the audience, like Oberon, is dismissive of its estimation. This is the position apparently taken by Harold F. Brooks, who boldly argues the case against Titania, relying disproportionately on the Indian boy's prospective benefits as a member of

---

[1298] Phao: 'I know no hearb to make lovers sleepe but Heartes ease'. John Lyly, *Sapho and Phao* (London: Thomas Cadman, 1584). Actus tertius, Schaena prima, E3. British Library online <http*://eebo.chadwyck.com/search/fulltext?SOURCE=var_spell.cfg&ACTION=ByID&ID=D0000024 6551240000&WARN=N&SIZE=99&FILE=../session/1460159814_29291&SEARCHSCREEN=CITA TIONS&DISPLAY=AUTHOR&ECCO=default*> [accessed 9 May 2016].
[1299] Sillers, W8.
[1300] Ibid.
[1301] Cf. II.i.158 – perhaps Oberon's greater facility in magic allowed him to see Cupid flying in the sky, where Puck was unable.
[1302] Martin, W8.
[1303] Ibid.
[1304] Ibid.

Oberon's train. Brooks argues it is Titania who is 'of course [...] principally at fault' and has 'got her priorities wrong',[1305] regarding Puck's fleeting words as evidence that it is 'high time the boy was weaned from maternal dandling to be bred a knight and huntsman.'[1306] He believes the 'context' of Titania's 'obstinacy' mitigates Oberon's conduct towards her, which thereby 'does not grate so much.'[1307] It is difficult to substantiate this view, given that textual evidence that Titania is the only character actively considering the boy's welfare. Her honest intent is specifically supported by her highly detailed description of the transcendent influence of the fairy kingdom upon the well-being of the human commonweal. Furthermore, one may also recall the unsavoury degree of Oberon's action, in forcibly making Titania enamoured of the zoomorphised Bottom; it is difficult to frame Oberon as a moral exemplar.

In considering Titania's argument from the prospective of the actor-character, one appreciates a fuller sense of her dramatic-rhetorical purpose. The version of Titania that emerged from our workshop was much closer to Peter Holland's interpretation, where he sees evidence of Oberon's 'sadism' being 'offset' by Titania's 'drug-induced mildness' at the play's denouement; the result being that the audience will realise that 'the spell has made her give up so easily the boy of whose significance she spoke so movingly […]'.[1308] We may question various aspects of the boy's origin – not least, to what degree the child's mother specifically requested that Titania become his charge. However, Titania's intricate description of the human commonweal may be seen as ample rhetorical *ethos* for her argument – that of the two rulers, she is the one who has the greatest discernible concern for the boy's welfare. As is often the case, the Shakespearean text poses an enigmatic and complex question for the present-day director. The play's staging will suggest the production's implied value system. As with the voiceless Isabella in *Measure for*

[1305] Harold F. Brooks, 'Introduction', in William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. by Harold F. Brooks (London: Arden Methuen, 1979; repr. Thomson Learning, 2006), p. cvi.
[1306] Ibid.
[1307] Brooks, cviii.
[1308] Peter Holland, in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. by Peter Holland, p. 216. See *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, IV.i.51.

Measure or the declamatory Kate in *The Taming of the Shrew*, the audience is potentially confronted at the close of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* with a prospect of an unsavoury submission. This earlier moment of rhetoric from Titania grounds her argument in the earthly and rational, her human empathy (via direct audience communication) excelling at the very same moment that supernatural qualities of the fairy realm are being established by the mise-en-scène. Hers is the argument of stark, candid revelation, pitched against deceptive, magical conjuration. Oberon's abrupt dismissal alone must not signal our own rejection of her argument.

The close of the play presents the audience with the prospect of a 'fairy land' reconciliation between Oberon and Titania, with a corresponding harmony bestowed upon the mortals' commonweal. However, the implication is not so superficially agreeable if the dramatic argument is regarded as a construct of *all* its rhetorical parts. In the workshop, Brian Martin spoke almost in terms of Hegelian dialectic, referring to the conclusion as the 'synthesis' stage of a macroscopic, three-act structure (of 'thesis, antithesis and synthesis').[1309] Accordingly (and in a typically post-Stanislavskian manner), he saw the play's bigger structure mirrored in this smaller scene: Titania's speech could be seen as the 'thesis', representing the 'state' of the fairy kingdom and clarifying that the child shall not be given to Oberon; Oberon's insistence that he will own the child forms the 'antithesis to this'; and the consequent 'synthesis' comes with Oberon's plan to 'bring that about'.[1310] The wider context of the play clearly reveals the problematic conclusion of a resolution by force. But, as is so frequently the case, Shakespeare has written the role of Titania to exert argumentative leverage on the audience, which is far more important than Oberon's reception of her words.

[1309] Martin cited his view being influenced by his reading of: John Yorke, *Into the Woods* (London: Penguin, 2013).
[1310] Martin, W8.

Concluding Remarks

Throughout the *enargeia* workshops, we witnessed examples of the actor-character in context. In each case agency was championed, contrasting with many literary-critical readings that either overlooked or denied the potential of the enacted role. We have seen the present-day actor's post-Stanislavskian priority – that there is always a specifically character-centric purpose in any given speech – applied in practice, highlighting the resourcefulness and dexterity of actors today. Simultaneously however, we have also witnessed the extent of the versatility of Shakespeare's text. It is not mere coincidence that time and time again the text serves contemporary techniques. It is consistently the case that the dramatic-rhetorical network, as constructed by Shakespearean *elocutio*, suggests a cognitive, real-time pathway for an actor to navigate, the role serving its purpose in the eventual phenomenological triangulation of a stage 'character'. Hutson has written of Shakespeare's dramaturgy being, in this manner, a '"circumstantial dramaturgy"', as 'external circumstances of time, place, opportunity [and] means' suggest the 'purposes and desires of the characters' which in turn promote a sense of the 'underlying, sometimes unconscious "causes" […of the] action'.[1311] The 'rhetorical topics of circumstance' provide the basis for the 'probable invention of arguments',[1312] an imaginative capacity that creates 'the subjective experience and psychological depth to which we have given the name "character"'.[1313] But of course, this textual attachment to character must be considered in terms of the contributing presence of both the other cast members and the audience, where we anticipate its manifestation on stage.

Where the soliloquy workshops investigated the isolation of the actor-character, specifically the demand for conventional dialogue techniques to be applied to an externalised performance of interiority, *enargeia* frequently called for its own

---

[1311] Hutson, p. 61.
[1312] Hutson, p. 43.
[1313] Hutson, p. 44.

specific dynamic. In the case of our *enargeia* extracts, each character finds themself interacting with a very specific staged audience, situated within the very specific context of the wider role and the wider world of the play. Superficially descriptive features could thus be interpreted as having a very active dramatic purpose of persuasion. *Enargeia* can serve a key onstage function in its design of an argument, rather than being interpreted as the divorced poeticism of a set-piece monologue. The success of each character's *enargeia* is then consequently dependent upon the reception of the other characters onstage. Undoubtedly, the projected *fabula* is well-served by vivid description, and the audience may respond to a more coherent staged world as a result: Mercutio reminds us of the perils that lurk in Verona, where Enobarbus makes Egyptian luxury tangible. However, in Shakespeare's hand the device is so nuanced that it also gives flesh to a character's motivation: Titania manifestly cares about the human commonweal and has the opportunity to unite her public audience (the divided fairy trains) in her purpose; Oberon might hope that his *enargeia* provides detail enough for Puck to execute his scheme with accuracy. Both *Hamlet* extracts contribute to Elsinore's atmosphere of intrigue, yet we also witness characters in the very midst of a complex rhetorical struggle: Gertrude has to reveal shocking news to Laertes, whilst anticipating his grief; Ophelia, in a state of deep personal anxiety, has to hope for a receptive audience from Polonius, with his distrustful disposition. We have the unifying concept of an actor-character having a specific dramatic-rhetorical purpose, but the extracts succeed regardless of a character's personal rhetorical success. We find success instead in the very fact that a recognisable attempt has been made, represented in a clear character endeavour. This corresponds closely with present-day actioning, where the audience may not be expected to identity each specific action, but it can witness that strategies are being employed with an embodied purpose.

The actor-character premise is not as restrictive as it may seem – it reveals that techniques, such as actioning, can extend beyond their expected remits. All of the examples considered in the workshops, having been drawn from or inspired by present-day practitioner manuals, are related quite specifically to issues of role

and/or character. However, in assessing the dramatic-rhetorical purpose of a broad range of characters, one can also anticipate how post-Stanislavskian techniques can exceed their initial purpose. Palfrey and Stern have remarked on the 'many parts' that we encounter in Shakespeare plays that 'have no real personality or distinctiveness, and that carry little narrative interest in or for themselves.'[1314] They find, in these 'story-telling passages', Shakespeare confronting the requirements to be 'succint, compelling, and swift', and consequently remark that such extracts still contain his 'emphatic' use of the 'midline caesura', which can helpfully herald 'a shift in argument or location', or 'a quick qualification or modification'.[1315] They cite the Chorus of *Henry V* as such a 'story-telling' extract, where textual devices in the role provide signs 'for the actor to "open out" – […] feel the physical presences, [and] renew his alertness to context'.[1316] They stipulate that this 'opening out' should not be directed at the 'character himself', but 'the bated audience, […] busily constructing in their minds what the stage will not in fact body forth.'[1317]

However, one can use post-Stanislavskian techniques to further empower this live interaction. The resourceful filter of the actor-character proposition can be used to unlock a greater dramatic potential for the Chorus. Firstly, it is helpful to the actor. Debra Penny remarked of her experience playing the chorus role of Time in *The Winter's Tale*,[1318] recalling how she deeply contemplated how 'to characterise speech'[1319] which might otherwise present itself as a divorced, choric function. What had greatly aided her was the early stage of costume design, and the costume fitting process.[1320] She remarked that rather than approaching the speech as serving a solely descriptive function, she and the director would have found 'a reason, an intention for [her] to be telling the audience…that time had passed' – it being the only way

---

[1314] Palfrey and Stern, p. 355.
[1315] Ibid.
[1316] Palfrey and Stern, p. 356
[1317] Ibid.
[1318] *The Winter's Tale*, dir. by Joanna Read (Salisbury Playhouse, 2000).
[1319] Penny, W6.
[1320] Ibid.

that she would have 'been able to go on stage'.[1321] Secondly, we can reasonably assume that a clearer character imperative will positively impact upon audience reception. Brian Ferguson proposed that in *Henry V'*s Chorus the specific 'character's need' is to make the 'play work', which goes beyond a general explanation of (or apology for) the limitations of the playhouse. The Chorus, as actor-character, is given the 'huge' task that overrides the whole enterprise. The setup that the Chorus offers is the necessary key to 'make this play a success each night.'[1322]

Techniques related to the actor-character allow actors to venture beyond the confines of obviously manifest character and to reinterpret text that otherwise seems to serve chiefly as information to be conveyed. Lois Potter has described a number of obstacles that may confront an actor, including: the 'difficulty of making purely verbal information either interesting or memorable';[1323] the problem of having lines that are not directed '*to* anyone' in particular;[1324] and examples of comic 'nonsense speeches' which act as deliberately difficult examples of runaway 'artifice'.[1325] In the first case, Potter cites York's description of Edward III's lineage, in *The Second Part of Henry the Sixth*;[1326] in the second case, Potter cites the Lord Marshal's announcements at Coventry, in *Richard II*.[1327] We note however that, as both cases have clear auditors, techniques such as actioning could readily be applied, with a clearly attributed character purpose. In the final case, Potter references passages such as Biondello's speech about Petruccio's wedding arrival, in *The Taming of the Shrew*,[1328] or the reminiscences of Juliet's Nurse in *Romeo and Juliet*.[1329] But where Potter describes such extracts as 'virtuoso' examples, comparing their 'fiendish

---

[1321] Ibid.
[1322] Ferguson, W5.
[1323] Potter, p. 93.
[1324] Ibid.
[1325] Potter, p. 91.
[1326] William Shakespeare, *The Second Part of Henry the Sixth,* in the *RSC Complete Works*, II.ii.9-27.
[1327] William Shakespeare, *The Life and Death of King Richard the Second,* in the *RSC Complete Works,* I.iii.
[1328] William Shakespeare, *The Taming of the Shrew*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, III.ii.40-52.
[1329] *Romeo and Juliet,* in the *RSC Complete Works*, I.iii.17-34.

combination of vivid detail [and a seeming] total lack of order'[1330] to the demands of a musical theatre patter song – taxing on both an actor's memory and their quest for coherence – modern acting approaches can alternatively illustrate how the presentation of character can still prevail. Regarding Juliet's nurse, Peter Hall contrastingly champions the capacity for character representation, seeing the extract as speech which fashions 'a character in recognisable flesh-and-blood terms'.[1331] It is indeed 'virtuoso' writing, but such that extravagance creates a distinctly 'garralous' character 'voice'[1332] as it 'captivates [its] audience'.[1333] In addition, it might be emphasised that the temporal references also contribute to the macroscopic time-orientated tension of the play. Even in the play's more jovial moments, the hand of time has a presence, as evidenced by Capulet's attempt to recall 'how long' it has been 'since last' he wore a mask with his kinsman.[1334] In all of the above cases the application of one of the actioning variants or a technique such as a target would help to give definition to an embodied dramatic rhetoric. Practically, this may indeed help actor memorisation (which is the main arena of Potter's discussion) but it will also help to convert speeches that seemingly function only as an 'equivalent to […] trumpet fanfares'.[1335] Certainly they can be given more direction and meaning than simply serving as examples of 'form' over 'content', which could otherwise be the risk.[1336]

In performance, *enargeia* can in fact be found increasing the grip of the actor's presence. Lorna Hutson has described how mimesis of the 'here-and-now is able, through a kind of infrastructure of varied forms of diegesis, to offer the illusion of a coherent fictive world encompassing anteriority, exteriority, and psychology'.[1337] For the actor, however, technique can penetrate right to the heart of

---

[1330] Potter, p. 91.
[1331] Hall, p. 81.
[1332] Ibid.
[1333] Hall, p. 83.
[1334] *Romeo and Juliet,* in the *RSC Complete Works*, I.iv.147-8.
[1335] Potter, p. 93.
[1336] Ibid.
[1337] Hutson, p. 21.

the projected character's psychology. Post-Stanislavskian techniques (such as actioning) reveal that, in their embodiment, actors are eschewing diegesis altogether, using the dramatic rhetoric of the role to direct themselves towards a staged, pure reliving of events. This is a truer measure of the anticipated 'contingency involved in performance'.[1338] Hutson has compellingly asserted that, in the Renaissance, dramatists came to understand 'that what matters in a dramatic narrative may not be action itself, but the way in which the action (whether enacted or reported) is construed by other *dramatis personae.*'[1339] I would suggest the amendment (drawing from the actors of my workshops) that where one considers this conveyance of action in terms of contemporary techniques (such as variants of actioning or targets), one commonly finds that any perceived diegetic restraints are removed altogether. What is 'reported' should in fact be considered, in the truest sense, as 'enacted'.

[1338] Hutson, p. 40.
[1339] Hutson, p. 27.

Chapter 7: Repartee

The previous workshops have chiefly investigated the challenges and possibilities presented by Shakespearean monologue. In this chapter the active workshop analysis turns towards dialogue, the predominant dramatic mode in both present-day and Shakespearean drama texts. As actioning developed largely in specific response to the demands of dialogue, it was useful to assess the degree to which Shakespearean dialogue might respond.[1340] In order to scrutinise Shakespearean dialogue in its most challenging form, I selected a specific stylistic variation of dialogue that most conflicts with comfortable notions of naturalism. A particular form of heightened, quick-witted Shakespearean repartee creates such an obstacle for an actor today, where the grandeur of Renaissance rhetorical devices might seem to impose upon the construction of a present-day, naturalistic manifestation of character. Such an elaborate speech pattern might be seen to more commonly align itself with the 'stock-in-trade' techniques of 'representation' that Stanislavski warned against, as inferior to the direct 'experiencing' of a role.[1341] This can also be compounded by the dynamic of the heightened dialogue, if actors are focusing on the delivery of a line in terms of a cued retort. In such a moment do naturalistic techniques of delivery conflict with techniques of comic wit? Can character nuance and subtext still be viable or is there a priority to serve a dominant mode of repartee? In these workshops the nature of the cue dynamic between actors will be called into question, drawing from the context of the Renaissance part but also utilising Mike Alfreds' particular version of an active, embodied actioning technique (as distinct from strict actioning).[1342]

The repartee workshops looked at three distinct facets of Shakespearean repartee: (i) the stylised rhetoric of verse-based repartee, as evidenced in *Richard III*; (ii) the stylised rhetoric of prose-based repartee, represented by *Much Ado About*

[1340] Cf. Moseley, *Actioning and How to Do It*. The exercises Moseley discusses are all dialogue exercises. None are Shakespearean.
[1341] See Chapter One.
[1342] See Repartee Two. Cf. actioning in the soliloquy and *enargeia* workshops.

Nothing; (iii) the dramatic dynamics of a transition between prose and verse dialogue, as indicated by an extract from *Twelfth Night*; (iv) the scale of development in verse dialogue across Shakespeare's career, as illustrated by *The Tempest*. Context remains crucial, in distinguishing the dramatic function of a section of repartee, from the play's genre, to the specific situational tone at any given moment. But, in considering the rate of Shakespeare's development of dialogue (in both prose and verse), this chapter also emphasises the important recognition of chronology in a rehearsal-room assessment of any play. If chronology is overlooked by practitioners, attempts at isolating Shakespearean technique may try to compact an entire career and oeuvre into reductive universal ideas. We will see, for example, how Shakespeare's prose/verse transitions function very differently depending on context and era.[1343]

Across Shakespearean dialogue we discover a tension between ornate Renaissance *elocutio* and present-day dramatic techniques (that anticipate naturalistic performance). By establishing the function of ornate dramatic *elocutio* on its own terms, we can assess how far present-day approaches might align themselves to the text. As my study has previously discussed verse features in depth,[1344] I will now turn specifically to the development of Shakespearean prose, in relation to ornamentation and staged repartee. Just as Shakespearean theatre practitioners today can become enrapt by the false mythology of Shakespeare as the sole innovator of iambic pentameter drama, the development of prose risks being similarly overlooked.[1345] In the development of repartee, it is important to discuss John Lyly's work (where he has faced cultural 'displacement'),[1346] in order to establish its dramatic function. In the fictional works and plays of Lyly (b.1553/4–d.1606) we witness the nascence of a specific prose style that seems to epitomise artifice over naturalism. Whilst Leah Scragg highlights that the 'fundamental elements of the

---

[1343] See Repartee Three.
[1344] See Chapter Three and the soliloquy and enargeia workshops.
[1345] Cf. Andy Kesson, *John Lyly and Early Modern Authorship* (Manchester: Manchester University Press), p. 13.
[1346] Ibid.

form did not originate with Lyly', she also contends that they 'were combined by him into the vehicle for a highly distinctive vision'.[1347] Lyly's prose literary works *Euphues, the Anatomy of Wit* (1578) and *Euphues and his England* (1579) developed a style that represented a 'flourish of ornamental mannerisms'[1348] and it had sufficient enough cultural impact for the term 'euphuism' to be coined. Andy Kesson has described euphuism as combining 'a series of rhetorical tropes' with the repetition of 'sounds, syntax and allusions', where 'word repetition, alliteration and rhyme'[1349] are common and the allusions in question are drawn from a pool of 'esoteric humanist knowledge'.[1350] Leah Scragg has given additional definition to Lyly's use of 'figures of sound', highlighting 'isocolon (the repetition of clauses of the same length), parison (similarly structured sentences) and [the general term] paramoion (sound patterning)', which includes 'assonance and alliteration'.[1351] Whilst it can be quite hard to precisely isolate a formal definition for euphuism, we find agreement on the rich scope of the umbrella term[1352] – even where Lyly's own treatment of the style 'varies across his writing.'[1353]

Euphuism had a considerable impact upon Lyly's contemporaries, who found his contribution to be 'central and revolutionary',[1354] it forming the basis of a staged repartee dynamic that will be discussed in the analysis that follows.[1355] William Webbe (in 1586), Thomas Lodge (in 1596) and Frances Meres (in 1598) all specifically elevated Lyly's status and, beyond being regarded as arguably 'the most famous Elizabethan writer in his own time',[1356] he was even equated with the level of

---

[1347] Leah Scragg, 'Introduction', in John Lyly, *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit* and *Euphues and His England*, ed. by Scragg (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), p. 3.
[1348] A.R. Humphreys, 'Appendix II: The Evolution of Wit Style', in William Shakespeare, *Much Ado*, ed. by Humphreys (Methuen: London, 1981 – for Arden 2nd Series; repr. Thomson: London, 2003), p. 225.
[1349] Kesson. p. 15.
[1350] Kesson, p. 117; Kesson, p. 16.
[1351] Scragg, *Euphues*, p. 3.
[1352] Cf. Leah Scragg, 'Introduction', in John Lyly, *Love's Metamorphosis*, ed. by Scragg (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008), p. 15; McDonald, pp. 110 and 112.
[1353] Kesson, p. 15.
[1354] Kesson, p. 6.
[1355] See Repartee Two.
[1356] Kesson, p. 3; cf. Scragg, *Euphues*, p. 18.

the Ancients[1357] – regardless of Gabriel Harvey's less representative critique (in 1589).[1358] Yet, in spite of this and a degree of print longevity – by 1630 there had been more than thirty editions of the two parts of Euphues, which were the 'literary sensation of the age'[1359] – Scragg indicates a fairly rapid shift in the reception of Lyly's style. Whilst writers had been 'intoxicated' for the 'two decades' following Lyly's euphuistic inception,[1360] the mode had 'ceased to be fashionable by the turn of the century' amongst the 'cultured elite'; instead, the literary impact at this point was being felt amongst the 'new readership' of the 'middle classes.'[1361]

There are two important features in the development of dramatic euphuism. Firstly, a full chronological analysis underscores the fact that prose was evolving *simultaneously* to verse in English literature – Kesson describes 'Tudor fiction' and 'Tudor commercial drama' as being 'coeval.'[1362] Secondly however, we also witness in Lyly's own transition, from literature to drama, how an euphuistic prose style had favourably transferred to the playhouse.[1363] The speeches of the Euphues works 'clearly look forward to the debates and soliloquies' of Lyly's drama, whilst readers will already have witnessed, in his literature, a 'capacity to write witty dialogue'[1364] – even if Lyly developed the 'stylistic games' to suit the 'different implications' of staging.[1365] Readers had associated the 'rhetorical style' of Lyly's prose fiction with 'wittiness, trickiness and verbal dexterity', but the reception of the drama text would now come via the stage player.[1366] It is also worth bearing in mind the particularly unique relationship that Lyly had with dramatic prose, as he was the 'only playwright' of this era to 'compose the majority of his works in prose'.[1367] In addition, he is 'the only early modern playwright for whom there is no direct

---

[1357] Kesson, p. 2.
[1358] Kesson, p. 5.
[1359] Scragg, *Euphues*, p. 3.
[1360] Humphreys, 'Appendix II', p. 225.
[1361] Scragg, *Euphues*, p. 18.
[1362] Kesson, p. 20.
[1363] Kesson, p. 17.
[1364] Scragg, *Euphues*, p. 15.
[1365] Kesson, p. 114.
[1366] Kesson, p. 115.
[1367] Kesson, p. 20.

evidence' of working in collaboration with another playwright. And he enjoyed 'an usual degree of control over the rehearsal, performance and publication of this plays'.[1368] All of the above suggests that one should take confidence in seeking out a genuinely dramatic utility in Lylian euphuism.

The dramatic vitality of euphuism pivots on its dynamic of 'antithetical balance'.[1369] As described by Scragg, this is created by the 'the fusion of contrasting properties'[1370] using figures and tropes.[1371] Where the style is 'dialectical [in] nature',[1372] one could argue that the resulting dramatic outcome is the creation of roles that allow actors the opportunity for greater psychological investigation, the style being a vehicle by which staged characters can be given definition. Euphuism generates constant deliberation – it serves to 'problematize' issues raised throughout the drama, 'rather than creating "ultimate truths"'[1373] – which makes it the perfect theatrical tool for Shakespeare to develop.[1374] Lyly's Fidelia, the arborified nymph in *Love's Metamorphosis*, is attacked by the farmer Erisichthon. In her elongated dying speech, she proclaims:

> Farewell ladies, whose lives are subject to many mischiefs; for if you be fair, it is hard to be chaste, if chaste, impossible to be safe. If you be young, you will quickly bend; if bend, you are suddenly broken.
>
> (I.ii.147-151)

Kesson describes how such a stylistic passage allows for the 'talkative tree' to emerge 'as a character', self-defining 'almost without meaning to'.[1375] Lyly has provided Fidelia with enough time and eloquence to weigh up certain pros and cons of femininity. In her arresting monologue, 'everything […] is geared towards

---

[1368] Kesson, p. 17.
[1369] Scragg, *Metamorphosis*, p. 17; Scragg, *Euphues*, pp. 4-5.
[1370] Scragg, *Metamorphosis*, p. 17.
[1371] Scragg, *Euphues*, p. 19.
[1372] Scragg, *Euphues*, p. 3.
[1373] Scragg, *Euphues*, p. 12.
[1374] Cf. McDonald, p. 112.
[1375] Kesson, p. 117.

eliciting the audience's interest.'[1376] Elsewhere, in the same play, dialogue is the medium for a similar euphuistic 'ambivalence'.[1377] Erisichthon, impoverished and emaciated, has sold his daughter Protea to the Merchant, who stakes his claim:

> MERCHANT   You are now mine, Protea.
> PROTEA   And mine own.
> MERCHANT   In will, not power.
> PROTEA   In power, if I will.
> MERCHANT   I perceive nettles, gently touched, sting; but, roughly handled, make no smart.
> PROTEA   Yet, roughly handled, nettles are nettles; and a wasp is a wasp, though she lose her sting.
>
> (III.ii.70-77)

Euphuism, through antithetically constructed statements, provides the single word with the capability to shift meaning;[1378] the many stylistic features turn upon 'the co-existence of contrasting properties in a single phenomenon'.[1379] The audience witnesses a discourse on the contrast between material ownership and ownership of the human spirit, which can neither be bought nor sold.[1380]

Lyly developed new modes to express 'onstage interiority'[1381] and this facility at 'representing spontaneous thought on stage' was a considerable inspiration to Shakespeare who would, as James Wallace has remarked, consequently develop characters 'who fashion themselves through choices made in the theatrical moment, rather than being presented as fixed emblems of vice of virtue.'[1382] The antithetical basis behind much of the euphuistic style functioned as a linguistic network that allowed the text of the role to enable the embodied portrayal of a deliberative character. Lyly anticipated the richness of audience reception, aiming to create staged worlds that required 'active and imaginative participation.'[1383] Helpfully, where Shakespearean euphuism likewise functions in real-time communion with its

---

[1376] Ibid.
[1377] Scragg, *Metamorphosis*, p. 17.
[1378] Scragg, *Metamorphosis*, p. 16.
[1379] Scragg, *Metamorphosis,* p. 15.
[1380] See Lyly, *Metamorphosis* (III.ii.61).
[1381] Kesson, p. 126.
[1382] James Wallace, in Kesson, p. 127.
[1383] Kesson, p. 135.

audience, this relationship also serves the application of Mike Alfreds' techniques, that are similarly orientated to the live theatrical event.[1384]

Lyly's development of nuanced interiority has been rather overlooked, as euphuism is commonly regarded as 'highly artificial' and 'cluttered with pretentious allusions';[1385] Scragg describes the obstacle of being consistently 'remote from natural speech',[1386] where 'non-naturalistic' speeches echo one another in an 'emphatically stylized process' – the resultant effect being one of dance-like symbolism, rather than a 'product of a psychological process.'[1387] However, as A.R. Humphreys argues, although the style is patterned 'like the figures in a dance',[1388] the choreography is not merely superficial (25). The euphuistic trend encouraged by Lyly reveals writers 'alertly calculating each verbal effect',[1389] where each 'utterance [must have…] poise'.[1390] In the hands of Shakespeare, euphuistic dialogue is based upon 'volleys' of repartee, the words representing the 'perceptive analyses and the sparkling rallies of active minds.'[1391] In this sense, Shakespeare develops on Lyly's euphuistic bedrock and converts it into an even more engaging, active dramatic rhetoric, a rhetoric that presents itself for ready analysis by present-day actioning. Yet, as Humphries also warns, in this duologue dance between speakers, each actor must 'whatever his alleged emotion, be self-possessed'.[1392] Today's actors might thus question whether this self-absorption is complementary to techniques such as 'strict actioning' or whether the flourishes of Renaissance dramatic rhetoric somehow inhibit a genuine engagement between actors onstage. This will be analysed in relation to Mike Alfreds' variation of actioning.[1393]

[1384] See Repartee One.
[1385] Harry Blamires, *A Short History of English Literature*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 1994), p. 111.
[1386] Scragg, *Metamorphosis*, p. 4.
[1387] Scragg, *Metamorphosis*, p. 35.
[1388] A. R. Humphreys, 'Introduction', in *Much Ado About Nothing*, ed. by Humphreys, p. 19.
[1389] Humphreys, 'Appendix II', p. 225.
[1390] Humphreys, 'Introduction', p. 19.
[1391] Ibid.
[1392] Ibid.
[1393] See Repartee One.

Shakespeare inherits a Lylian prose style which has, within its sheer ornament, a dramatic capacity. But, as argued by Russ McDonald, he 'transforms the fundamental patterns of Euphuism into a more apparently natural style', even whilst retaining the 'skeleton of Lyly's balanced sentences and his fondness for lexical repetition.'[1394] The Shakespearean application is accomplished with such 'virtuosity as to seem as natural as breathing' and, in his 'constant invention of fresh logical formulas', he arguably 'carries logical syntax even further than Lyly.'[1395] We will recall that Ben Jonson, in the First Folio dedication to Shakespeare, was inspired to describe how he had managed to 'outshine' Lyly.[1396] Whilst this may be easily overlooked today, given Lyly's diminished fame, this was clearly no small accomplishment.

Notably, we find in the development of dramatic prose considerable overlap with the features of dramatic verse. Where we return to the perspective of our present-day actor it must be noted that, in terms of dramatic rhetoric, Shakespeare's prose (abounding in tropes and figures) shares much more in common with his verse than it does with the dynamics of our naturalistic 'prose' speech, that is the default medium of most present-day drama. The prose style that Shakespeare developed was profoundly influenced by 'Ciceronian stylists', with an 'unfailing passion for antithesis'.[1397] And, just as Lyly's own prose techniques echo 'forms of verse composition',[1398] Shakespeare's use of 'logical structure, repetitive patterns, […] a distinctive vocabulary including biblical allusions […] striking similes […and] heavy […] irony'[1399] is something that spans across both his verse and prose construction. The similarity in the texture of dramatic rhetoric thus results in a similar treatment when one then seeks the technical units in the text; it becomes clear that non-metrical lines in Renaissance drama – on the whole – have much more in common with iambic, blank verse than they do with our contemporary

---

[1394] McDonald, p. 112.
[1395] Jonas Barish, in McDonald, p. 113.
[1396] Ben Jonson, in the First Folio dedication (l. 128), in the *RSC Complete Works*, p. 61.
[1397] McDonald, p. 117.
[1398] Kesson, p. 16.
[1399] McDonald, p. 126.

unencumbered, naturalistic speech. In recognising the challenge of Renaissance dramatic prose, today's actor will be better placed to establish the significance of mid-scene shifts between verse and prose.[1400]

Euphuism is a style of manifest ornament, in clear contrast with the naturalistic aims of present-day practitioners. However, if one uses acting techniques to resourcefully address such a style, one can find a sense of character 'truth' being evidenced in supposed textual artifice. The theatrical performance of an act that is regarded as genuine or truthful has remained (in all its awkward transhistoricism) a common dramatic aim throughout the ages (from Roscius and through the Renaissance to today). In the wrestle between textual ornamentation and naturalistic acting, we in fact discover a more visceral interpretation of artifice. R. Warwick Bond regards Lyly as demonstrably showing concern for 'liveliness and naturalness', remarking that, 'just as the action of the stage must be a concentrated essence of real life, so its speech must likewise be intensified, […] infused with more point and emphasis, […] wisdom and earnestness, […] than common talk can ever be' in order to 'enchain' the attention of the audience and 'distract us from the real life around us to the fictitious life of the stage.'[1401] Where Bond speaks of an 'essence of real life', his emphasis highlights the audience experience of the mimetic process of staged verisimilitude. His position on euphuistic prose is remarkably similar to Madeleine Doran's views relating to the function of Renaissance verse. Doran finds that in *Romeo and Juliet* 'the love poetry is not the "natural" language of lovers but the heightened language which speaks to the idealizing spirit of young love'.[1402] Thus, for an essential truth to be conveyed dramatically, in this Renaissance medium, the language has to be condensed or distilled, and therefore appear all the stronger for it. In this manner, euphuistic prose and verse are unified in their general function as dramatic rhetoric in Shakespeare's plays. Doran speaks of verse dialogue providing

---

[1400] See Repartee Three.
[1401] R. Warwick Bond, 'Lyly as a Playwright', in *The Complete Works of John Lyly, Volume II*, ed. by R. Warwick Bond (Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1902), p. 287.
[1402] Madeleine Doran, *Shakespeare's Dramatic Language* (London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1976), p. 12.

the 'rich poetry of passionate imagination, amplified with tropes, formal figures, and copious varying'.[1403] Harold F. Brooks similarly notes that throughout his 'lyrical' period (of the mid-1590s), Shakespeare still patterns his verse with salient 'rhetorical "schemes"'.[1404] And yet the same rhetorical patterning is found in euphuistic prose. For Bond, the very fact that euphuistic prose is 'peculiarly fitted, by its rhythmical and rhetorical qualities, to compensate for the loss of rhyme and metre […]'[1405] explains how it was the most suitable mode to 'popularize prose as the dramatic vehicle'.[1406]

[1403] Doran, p. 13.
[1404] Brooks, p. xlv.
[1405] Bond, p. 288.
[1406] Ibid.

Repartee One: Prose – *Much Ado About Nothing*

The first workshop investigated well-known extracts from *Much Ado About Nothing*.[1407] Beatrice and Benedick were played by Jo Herbert and David Sturzaker. The actors Darrel Bailey and Sophie Dickson also attended, to observe and offer commentary.

The first repartee workshop assessed Shakespeare's use of prose euphuism. In terms of dramatic rhetoric, this form of Shakespearean repartee pays particular homage to the key influence of ornamental 'Ciceronian' patterning.[1408] However, as Russ McDonald argues, whilst such a style of 'comic interplay […] depends on specious logic and rhetorical pretension',[1409] one can also be mindful of the extent of development that has occurred, Shakespeare fashioning a more 'natural style' of dialogue from the core rhetorical components. Miriam Joseph had previously written of Shakespeare's tendency to use 'logic and rhetoric', similarly emphasising his capability to be 'less obvious and more artistic' than his contemporaries – where such a style is 'more thoroughly assimilated into his work and adapted to each character and circumstance.'[1410] Leah Scragg has highlighted that, from an early date, audiences were aware of euphuism's function of 'artifice or design', and its patterning of 'non-naturalistic, seesaw oppositions',[1411] but both Joseph and McDonald find that Shakespeare's euphuism represents a form that allows greater room for performed nuance and personality in a specific role. In the case of Beatrice and Benedick, for example, their shared dramatic rhetoric – conducted through their unique form of repartee – may be regarded as vital. For this couple, repartee exceeds the bounds of commonplace communication, being representative of their own intimate conversational rapport. The 'merry war' of dialogue (I.ii.40), the 'skirmish of wit' (I.ii.41-2)[1412] in which they are relentlessly engaged, indicates their deep

---

[1407] *Much Ado About Nothing*, in *the RSC Complete Works*, I.i.79-98 and IV.i.260-320.
[1408] McDonald, p. 110.
[1409] McDonald, p. 119.
[1410] Joseph, p. 208.
[1411] Scragg, *Metamorphosis*, p. 18.
[1412] Cf. Joseph, p. 210.

chemistry. And it is notable that such a rhetorical magnetism is substantially manifest in prose, which was thus so central to our workshop investigation.

In the extracts of this workshop we see how a pathway might be navigated between elaborate rhetoric and grounded contemporary characterisation, in serving the conversational dynamic of Beatrice and Benedick. I chose to apply a variation of actioning, in the style of Mike Alfreds' rehearsal work,[1413] as distinct from the 'strict actioning' practice of transitive verbs;[1414] accordingly, throughout this workshop, the words 'action' and 'actioning' refer to Alfreds' technique, and not the realm of strict actioning. [1415]

Firstly, it is important to note that Alfreds requires actors to annotate scripts with suggested actions prior to the first rehearsal.[1416] Such text preparation is common in other versions of contemporary actioning,[1417] and we might note that this isolated form of preparation might share a comparable dynamic with Palfrey and Stern's assessment of the Renaissance player trying to initially 'identify […] the "passions"' contained in their part.[1418] One of Alfreds' departures from stricter practice is that he prefers that actors 'flesh out their active verbs with complete sentences', as a 'verb alone' may seem 'a little starved of [the] nourishment' of fuller context.[1419] An example might be that, instead of using the action 'I reject you', the actor writes 'I reject your philosophising and complaints of poverty'.[1420] In this manner, 'Alfreds actioning' is immediately freer from the constraint of a singular transitive verb. Indeed, Alfreds is also not restrained by a precise linguistic definition of the transitive (as 'issued by the Action Police'),[1421] but he instead makes the stipulation that 'if the verb used is *not obviously transitive towards another person*

[1413] See Chapter 2, on Alfreds' actioning; cf. Alfreds, pp. 164-174.
[1414] See Chapter 2 and Chapter 5.
[1415] The actions that the actors attributed to the text are found in the annotated workshop script – see Appendix C, at the close of this chapter.
[1416] Alfreds, p. 133.
[1417] See Moseley, p. 22.
[1418] Palfrey and Stern, p. 311.
[1419] Alfreds, p. 136
[1420] Alfreds, p. 135.
[1421] Alfreds, p. 75.

[…] it must always be played transitively, for the benefit of and to the other actor-characters'.[1422]

Furthermore, Alfreds stresses that actors should aim for '*the least interpretive but accurate action*' in early rehearsal.[1423] He offers an example from *The Seagull*, where it might be seen as 'an indisputable fact' that Masha is '*rejecting*'[1424] Medvedenko. For an actor there would be 'many possible *hows*'[1425] of performing this; she could play 'rejection' by '*deriding, arguing* [with]*, enlightening,* [or] *discouraging*'[1426] her dialogue partner. However, if she were to decide too early on one of these given 'interpretations' it would 'lock' any 'budding characterisation' work that might develop.[1427] The early rehearsal practice is designed to offer both the '*discipline* (the security of the *what: reject*) and *freedom*', in enabling the actor to choose '*how* she *rejects*' her dialogue partner.[1428] Alfreds is notably distinct from other practitioners who stipulate stronger early rehearsal definition; Nick Moseley, for example, suggests that 'at this point' an actor should avoid '"neutral verbs"' that do not suggest a 'strong intention or strategy'.[1429] Whilst Alfreds does briefly assert, in the depths of his manual, that actions such as 'I say' or 'I tell you' are '*not* acceptable', as they are 'too unspecific' and could apply to any dialogue,[1430] in his extended mark-ups he consistently uses similar verb choices. To 'inform', 'point out', 'state' and 'announce' are repeatedly used,[1431] where he elsewhere uses verbs of stronger import, such as 'advises', 'orders' or 'insists'.[1432] For the most part however, Alfreds' disposition is that actors should have freedom of choice in this early selection.

[1422] Alfreds, p. 73.
[1423] Alfreds, p. 135.
[1424] Ibid.
[1425] Ibid.
[1426] Ibid.
[1427] Ibid.
[1428] Ibid.
[1429] Moseley, p. 6.
[1430] Alfreds, p. 166.
[1431] Alfreds, pp. 46, 134, 135 and 138.
[1432] Alfreds, p. 47.

During this workshop, I asked actors to apply actioning in the spirit of Alfreds, having familiarised themselves with examples from his manual. Consequently, they were asked to work 'on their feet'[1433] from the very start, which made an important distinction from the table-work convention of alternative forms of actioning[1434] – as Alfreds encourages actor engagement to be made 'holistically, not just with their intellects and their tongues, but also with their *bodies*'.[1435] The actors worked with scripts in hand, annotated with actions that they had attributed to small segments of the text.[1436] The first stage was for the actors to 'state-and-play' their actions '*using the words defining the action* [and] *not* […] *the actual dialogue*' of the text.[1437] For example, Beatrice begins the extract proclaiming, 'I wonder that you will still be talking, Signior Benedick: nobody marks you' (I.i.80). Instead of reading this line, Jo Herbert began the exercise by walking up to her 'Benedick' and speaking the words 'I point out that you're talking to no one'[1438] – her chosen equivalent action to correspond to Shakespeare's text.[1439]

Throughout the exercise, the actors were encouraged to 'play fully', acting out the words of their chosen action.[1440] Alfreds' intended aim is to pinpoint something that is 'utterly truthful' to the text, without promoting a delivery that is 'necessarily naturalistic' – actors are 'encouraged to heighten the physicality' to isolate the 'absolute epitome of each action' (166). Thus, the actor can identify a clear root '*action*' that has '*caused a* [character to voice a] *particular piece of dialogue*' (164). Simultaneously, the actor 'receiving' the action is similarly charged to 'react specifically to every action' of their partner, where '*reaction is as important as action*' (167). In this way, the Alfreds exercise illustrates a scene's lived-through sense of repartee in a manner that cannot be made manifest by any literary-critical

---

[1433] Alfreds, p. 165.
[1434] See Chapter 5.
[1435] Alfreds, pp. 164-5.
[1436] The actions were decided upon on the day, by the actors, prior to running the exercise.
[1437] Alfreds, p. 165.
[1438] Herbert, W4.
[1439] As influenced by the 'Alfreds' spirit of placing the verb within a complete sentence.
[1440] Alfreds, p. 165.

exercise (160); we really notice the effect of the scene's action on those who are *not* speaking at a given moment. Alfreds warns participants that they should not become too 'hung up on semantics', in making their action choices; 'disagreements about verbs' between actors and director should be avoided, where later rehearsal will allow for revision (168). This exercise simply represents the first stage of Alfreds' process of text work. In the second stage of text work, actors will read the direct dialogue of the playtext, building from this early, skeleton framework of a play that has already been actioned.[1441]

With our first attempt at 'Alfreds actioning', one problem was revealed: it could be hard to establish exactly how much detail to give to each action and to divide a text into clear boundaries; as previously stated, syntax divisions are a much better aid in the Shakespearean text than punctuation.[1442] At first, the number and placement of actions did not match the text in an entirely smooth manner. For example, in Shakespeare's text Benedick says to Beatrice:

> Then is courtesy a turncoat. But it is certain I am loved of all ladies, only you excepted: and I would I could find in my heart that I had not a hard heart, for truly I love none.
>
> (I.i.85-7)

Initially, David Sturzaker represented the passage by playing the following conjoined actions to his 'Beatrice':

> I inform you that all ladies love me, and I am sorry that I do not have the capacity to love anyone in return.[1443]

Prior to a second attempt, I encouraged both actors to review whether their chosen actions accounted for every moment of the text. In further consideration of Benedick's opening phrase – 'Then is courtesy a turncoat' – Sturzaker added an

---

[1441] N.b. Alfreds divides his rehearsal time evenly across three areas: text, character, and the 'world of the play'. Each day, he divides rehearsal equally between these areas. Alfreds, p. 174.
[1442] See Chapters 3 and 4.
[1443] Sturzaker, W4.

action, to now begin with the phrase, 'I question you about courtesies loyal to you.'[1444]

Similarly, Herbert had to consider Beatrice's response to Benedick, worded in the text as:

> A dear happiness to women: they would else have been troubled
> with a pernicious suitor. I thank God and my cold blood, I am of your humour for
> that. I had rather hear my dog bark at a crow than a man swear he loves me.
> (I.i.88-91)

Herbert first represented this entire reply with the succinct action, 'I thank you for women's sake',[1445] which did not perhaps fully express the nuance in the second and third sentences of the text. On second reading, Herbert added the action, 'I state to you that I am not interested in men',[1446] which included more of the pertinent detail. Of course, the real finesse in Beatrice's speech comes with the extraordinary, problematic image conjured up by her preference for hearing her 'dog bark at a crow' rather than being wooed by a suitor. This can be assimilated into the wider action of 'not being interested in men'. However, Alfreds is not adverse to using actions that lift quite directly from the text, where necessary – he recognises that naturally 'at times, some words from the text will inevitably be incorporated into the statement of the action.'[1447] In this spirit, Beatrice's witticism could alternatively be represented by closer assimilation of the text. An example action might read, 'I assert that I would prefer to hear my dog bark at a crow than be wooed.'

One significant revelation was that each of the actors derived actions that were expressed in different tonal styles. Sturzaker's actions – independent of the precise wording of the original – still used a Renaissance flavour of word choice. For example, for Benedick's line, 'Well, you are a rare parrot-teacher' (I.i.94), Sturzaker chose the action, 'I tell you that you are skilled in base repetition'[1448] – 'base' having

---

[1444] Ibid.
[1445] Herbert, W4.
[1446] Ibid.
[1447] Alfreds, p. 165.
[1448] Sturzaker, W4.

287

an archaic, period resonance. Beatrice's reply to this statement is, 'A bird of my tongue is better than a beast of yours' (I.i.95); and Herbert chose the action, 'I show that I am better than you'[1449] – a more timeless and concise phrase by comparison. However, it would be misleading to seek a preference between the approaches, as both actors were engaging in the text through their own filtered response, where the individual's ownership of the text is an important aspect of such early work. What was clear in performance was that the different actioning styles could work in a fluid dialogue, when fired against one another. The crucial delivery of the actions was performed in a complementary mode; it was not the case that one actor was engaging in a 'truer' representation of expressive 'Renaissance' or 'Shakespearean' acting, or that the other was being more 'natural'. Both took ownership of the actions of their lines and, as a result, a network of actions was created that closely responded to the demands of the text.

Importantly, both actors believed, in complete accord with Alfreds,[1450] that it would be possible to 'play different versions'[1451] of the actions that were derived during the exercise. Herbert noted how an actor would have to 'think quite carefully' about the exact wording of the action she writes on the script, where an action such as 'I point out that you're talking to no one'[1452] is 'just explaining' on a very generic level – compared to the specificity of an action such as, 'I mock your face.'[1453] Sturzaker spoke of a balance between an actor's commitment to 'tell the story' as 'arrived at with the director' – there being 'certain […] 'flags' that an actor has to display – and the desire for actors to create 'a framework in a production whereby [they] *can* keep it fresh and enable there to be changes and shifts and differences every night.'[1454] Sturzaker noted how the manifestation of a specific action in

---

[1449] Herbert, W4.
[1450] Alfreds, p. 68.
[1451] Here I quote the wording of the question that I posed to them in interview.
[1452] Cf. Alfreds use of the same action – Alfreds, pp. 46 and 134.
[1453] Herbert, W4.
[1454] Sturzaker, W4 – here he was also echoing the very spirit imbued by Alfreds' book title, *Different Every Night*.

performance might change 'on a nightly basis'[1455] – *how* this action is played will not 'on the whole' be the type of decision that disrupts and 'throws [other] actors' in a scene.[1456] Herbert agreed that, as long as the action being applied was 'still within […] the barriers […] agreed at the beginning' of rehearsals, then it would not create a problem for collaborators.[1457]

Sophie Dickson clarified this distinction, referring to her personal experience of using this actioning exercise during rehearsals for a Restoration play. She described the process as creating a 'slight shorthand'.[1458] She stated that whilst this exercise might initially seem superficially 'counter-productive in terms of keeping [the scene] fresh', in fact she discovered that the process allows actors the support of knowing 'the outlines of the basic argument'.[1459] If a dialogue partner decides one performance to represent a given action, for example, 'slightly more flirtatiously', one might be 'freed' to 'rise' to such a challenge, to 'respond […] in a slightly fresh way', knowing the security of 'the train track [running] underneath' the scene.[1460] As she stated, 'you know the basic [action might be] "he's rejecting me" – but tonight he does it *this* way […] It's still the same underlying action, but it's a slightly different tactic.'[1461] In this way actioning manifests a 'kind of psychic' connection between performers.[1462] The performance cannot be derailed as a result.

Having applied the spirit of 'Alfreds actioning', we then turned to a second exercise, Alfreds' 'Logic Text',[1463] which he uses in parallel with other text work, but later in the rehearsal period – to avoid imposing strict 'line-readings'.[1464] Helpfully, Alfreds' manual directly illustrates this exercise using this very moment of repartee between Beatrice and Benedick. The Logic Text exercise is an

---

[1455] Sturzaker, W4.
[1456] Ibid.
[1457] Herbert, W4.
[1458] Dickson, W4.
[1459] Ibid.
[1460] Ibid.
[1461] Ibid.
[1462] Ibid. The other participants strongly concurred.
[1463] Alfreds, pp. 196-202. See Appendix C, at the close of this chapter, for illustration.
[1464] Alfreds, p. 199.

encouragement from Alfreds for actors to 'make sense of the text at its simplest, logical, grammatically structured level.'[1465] The first step is for an actor, script in hand and seated this time, to deliver the line 'more or less free of emotion or interpretation beyond what is […] *common-sense logic*'.[1466] The aim is to address the risk of actors becoming 'absorbed by the psychology of their character',[1467] where Logic Text focuses upon the direct 'response' required of actors in dialogue, triggered by 'what has just been said to them'.[1468] Additionally, Alfreds finds that the exercise highlights two especially Shakespearean requirements. Firstly, as the main focus of an action is often found towards the end of a Shakespearean line, 'often on the last word', such an action should be continued 'well beyond the last word' of the line.[1469] Secondly, the texture of Shakespearean drama often consists of 'elaborate and sophisticated thoughts that sustain themselves through several clauses, often over many lines of verse.'[1470] Where this is the case, Logic Text encourages actors to action in a spirit of Renaissance 'fluency', with the aim of 'juggling' a series of ideas until the 'entire thought-sentence' has been completed.[1471]

In this specific extract, Alfreds finds that potency depends upon a sense of point-scoring between Beatrice and Benedick, each 'playing off the words the other has used […] based on the inference that in the past they've had some sort of relationship that's turned sour.'[1472] The stichomythia represents comments that are '*specific* and *personal*'.[1473] The dialogue is a sequence of conversational pivots.[1474] Beatrice begins by remarking of Benedick, 'I wonder that you will still be talking […]' (I.i.79). Benedick – in terms of Logic Text – is seen to employ a

---

[1465] Ibid.
[1466] Alfreds, p. 199.
[1467] Alfreds, p. 196.
[1468] Ibid.
[1469] Alfreds, p. 198.
[1470] Ibid. Cf. 'suspended syntax' – Alexander, 'Introduction', p. xlv.
[1471] Ibid.
[1472] Alfreds, p. 201.
[1473] Ibid.
[1474] See Appendix C for Alfreds' mark-up.

'synonymous'[1475] variant of 'still' in his reply: '[…] Are you yet living?' (I.i.81).
Alfreds notes how the examples 'may seem quite obvious',[1476] but the importance of
the exercise is underscored by the fact that he has witnessed 'many Benedicks'
playing the line 'without any reference to what Beatrice has said.'[1477]

Further shifts follow. Benedick characterises Beatrice as 'Lady Disdain'. Her
retort is that she is ordinarily the personification of 'Courtesy', but Benedick's
presence has forced her change in disposition. Benedick consciously mocks their
echoed dialogue; he regards Beatrice as being unoriginal, calling her a 'rare parrot-
teacher' (I.i.94). And Beatrice characterises Benedick as beastly in return. As Brian
Vickers remarks, '[…] as the bout becomes quicker […] there is the more difficult
trick of catching up metaphors and developing them as if by free association.'[1478]
Benedick's final response is to misread Beatrice's words deliberately as literal, in
agreeing that he wishes his 'beast' (his 'horse') had the rapid speed of her tongue
(I.i.96). However, it is *Benedick's* energy that is seen to finally dissipate in the
conversation. Beatrice remarks that he has ended too abruptly, like a tired old horse
(a 'jade' – I.i.98).[1479]

Our practical workshop findings supported Alfreds' instruction that the Logic
Text would best be applied in later rehearsal; we also found it would be difficult to
apply as an independent exercise. Herbert suggested that an actor would be 'just
picking out words' without knowing 'quite […] where from', unless they used
auxiliary text work first, which would give context to Logic Text and the mutual
trigger words.[1480] She felt Logic Text would pose a problem, if applied in too much
isolation: an actor could feel they have 'got to hit' specific words in the text, perhaps
reducing the mutual engagement with a dialogue partner.[1481] For Sturzaker, the
'particular focus' of Logic Text served as a 'more academic' approach to the text, an

---

[1475] Alfreds, p. 201.
[1476] Alfreds, p. 202.
[1477] Alfreds, p. 201.
[1478] Brian Vickers, *The Artistry of Shakespeare's Prose* (London: Methuen, 1979), p. 175.
[1479] This may also represent sexual innuendo. See the *RSC Complete Works*, p. 260.
[1480] Herbert, W4.
[1481] Ibid.

aid to a literary 'understanding'.[1482] Whilst he always favours an appreciation textual details, he found it was 'quite difficult to think of the line as a whole' in this manner and then integrate this within 'the scene as a whole';[1483] instinctively, Sturzaker preferred Alfreds' actioning exercise which, although it similarly divided the text into smaller segments, felt more clearly 'intended for performance'.[1484] With certain qualifications, both Herbert and Sturzaker suggested that Alfreds' two processes could work in successful rehearsal conjunction; it would certainly be possible to action in the spirit of Alfreds' 'framework',[1485] whilst still acknowledging the sense of the 'rhetorical' side, as highlighted by Logic Text[1486] – each exercise being 'helpful in different ways.'[1487] Indeed, it could surely be argued that the selection of a more appropriate action verb will result from close consideration of the dialogue's repartee patterning.

The workshop clarified two aspects of *Much Ado*'s repartee: (i) it serves as an integral constituent of character (rather than being a superficial veneer); and (ii) there is variety in the mechanics of this effect. Both of these points were illustrated where we searched for comparison dialogue, in the church scene (Act Four, Scene One). On the former point, Darrel Bailey spoke of the grave culmination of the repartee in 'the dramatic effect of Benedick being […] persuaded to challenge his friend in a fight to the death'.[1488] On the latter point, Giles Block has suggested how this later scene represents a dynamic that is 'markedly different' from earlier scenes.[1489] A mode of repartee is still crucial to the Beatrice and Benedick relationship, even if it becomes nuanced, in the solemn atmosphere following the cancellation of the wedding of Claudio and Hero. Block notes how, beneath surface stichomythia, Beatrice is 'not engaging with Benedick's lines as we might expect […] *her mind seems to be*

[1482] Sturzaker, W4.
[1483] Ibid.
[1484] Ibid.
[1485] Ibid.
[1486] Ibid.
[1487] Herbert, W4.
[1488] Darrel Bailey, W4.
[1489] Block, p. 164.

elsewhere.'[1490] As a result of Claudio's actions, there is a burgeoning response from Beatrice, 'something […] which is either being censored or has not yet come to light'.[1491] Benedick chooses this moment to finally declare that he does 'love nothing in the world so well' as Beatrice (IV.ii.270). Given the untimely context, Beatrice 'continues to parry' his sentiments; whilst there is a 'greater degree of engagement with *what* Benedick is saying, something still remains hidden […]'.[1492] Accordingly, Benedick shifts to address Beatrice more informally (and indeed, intimately) as 'thee' (rather than 'you'). Here we find concord between theorists of Renaissance interpretation and present-day practitioners. Tiffany Stern has discussed how such an exchange between the 'formal and informal modes of address' can serve as a device of direction in the actor's part, elucidating the 'nature of the relationship'.[1493] In this instance Block has interpreted Benedick's use of formal '"speech acts"' more specifically: he swears by his sword (IV.i.274), and then protests that he loves Beatrice (IV.i.278),[1494] representing 'indisputably the voice of the male wooer'[1495] in his use of the terms 'thy' (IV.i.282), 'thee' (IV.i.285; l. 313), and 'thine' (IV.i.295). However, Beatrice tellingly dismisses the mode of intimate 'swearing' (IV.i.314), following Benedick's offer of his hand in love. And Benedick thus chooses to return to the perceived sincerity of formal address, as he completes this section of repartee.

The scene pivots on the abrupt nature of Beatrice's request, that Benedick 'Kill Claudio' (IV.i.286). Block proposes that so great is 'the actuality of wanting Claudio dead' that perhaps it 'has even been hidden from Beatrice herself until [that] moment.'[1496] Certainly, where our workshop was inspired by Block's reading, the complexity of this scene's dramatic rhetoric became more evident. Beneath any superficial preoccupation with a love suit, the depth of subtext indicates grave

---

[1490] Ibid.
[1491] Ibid.
[1492] Block, p. 165-6
[1493] '*ehearsal*, p. 65.
[1494] Block, p. 169. He cites the influence of Penelope Freedman, *Power and Passion in Shakespeare's Pronouns* (Farnham, Ashgate, 2007; repr. Routledge, 2016).
[1495] Ibid.
[1496] Block, p. 164.

personal stakes for the characters – and so much is drawn from euphuistic craft. Sturzaker remarked that although the scene might seem to display binaries between the romantic and the subtextually brooding, in fact 'the one [state is] dependent on the other'.[1497] Benedick has equated 'love with fulfilling any desire of the other person'.[1498] Thus he must establish two things in the scene: (i) that he loves Beatrice and (ii) that Beatrice thinks Claudio has genuinely wronged her.[1499] Love and the provocation to challenge Claudio share one common root. In this manner, euphuism can indeed be a medium of profound gravitas.

In applying 'Alfreds actioning', it is clear that actors can dig beneath the surface semantics of euphuism, uncovering a subtext that is rich in dramatic character 'truths'. This is only possible given his total directorial commitment (which is by no means true of all theatre practitioners) to an 'immersion in the material' of the text, coupled with a clear anticipation of dramatic parameters – 'at the start of rehearsal you have the text; at the end of rehearsal you have the text *embodied*.'[1500] The workshop underscored that it does not matter that the dialogue seems to sparkle with artifice. As Alfreds asserts, the key criterion of success is 'not whether any acting is naturalistic, but whether it is truthful'; 'truth' in this sense being defined by a 'truthful impulse',[1501] as manifest in the discerning selection of an action. Indeed, we will recall that 'Alfreds actioning' is conducted in a heightened, melodramatic mode – far from subtle naturalism – to provide a clear representation of the characters' driving impulses. What is also key to Alfreds' specific technique is the shared dynamic between scene partners. Whilst the actors will have prepared provisional actions prior to rehearsal, the first application is a recitation of actions directly between actors. His approach ensures that 'actor-characters' in the first instance make this 'genuine contact with one another', in order to 'truly affect each

---

[1497] Sturzaker, W4.
[1498] Ibid.
[1499] Ibid.
[1500] Alfreds, p. 142.
[1501] Alfreds, p. 91.

other' and 'play [the] actions truthfully'.[1502] Little has been formally committed to print on the subject of actioning, but Mike Alfreds' approach – demonstrated by this particular workshop – offers a tantalising glimpse into a rehearsal process that may create something of a distributed cognitive framework. If the actors playing Beatrice and Benedick first encounter actioning in this embodied manner, reading their dialogue of actions together, from the very first stages of rehearsal the intimacy of their repartee is already becoming mutually memorised and encoded.

[1502] Alfreds, p. 67.

Appendix C:

Extract mark-up

Much Ado (I.i.79-98)

In the following mark-up the actions that were suggested by David Sturzaker and Jo Herbert have been printed in bold and placed in square brackets. They directly follow the phrase in the text to which they refer. The words in italics represent a second exercise, of Logic Text, being applied to the dialogue, following Mike Alfreds' own mark-up (pp. 200-202) [l. 79-98 – in the *RSC Complete Works* edition]. The footnotes relating to this extract are all derived from Alfreds' own.

Don Pedro *and* Leonato *talk aside.*

BEATRICE   I wonder that you will *still*[1503] be talking, Signior Benedick: nobody marks you.

[**I point out that you're talking to no one**.]

BENEDICK   What, my dear Lady *Disdain*![1504] Are you *yet* living?

[**I question whether Lady Disdain is still alive.**]

BEATRICE   Is it possible *disdain* should die while she hath such meet food to feed it as Signior Benedick? [**I question your use of disdain.**] *Courtesy* itself must convert to *disdain*, if you come in her presence. [**I explain your presence is the problem**.]

BENEDICK   Then is *courtesy* a *turncoat*. [**I question you about courtesies loyal to you.**] But it is certain I am loved of all ladies, only you excepted: and I would I could find in my heart that I had not a hard heart, for truly I love none. [**I inform you that all ladies love me, and I am sorry that I do not have the capacity to love anyone in return**.]

BEATRICE   A dear happiness to women: they would else have been troubled with a pernicious suitor. [**I thank you for women's sake**.] I thank God and my cold blood, I am of your humour for that. I had rather hear my dog bark at a crow than a man swear he loves me. [**I state to you that I am not interested in men**.]

[1503] 'Still' and 'yet' are synonymous (p. 201).
[1504] Benedick characterizes Beatrice as 'Disdain'. She reclaims her 'self-image', in characterising herself as the opposite, 'Courtesy' (p. 201-202).

BENEDICK   God keep your ladyship still in that mind, so some gentleman or other shall scape a predestinate scratched face. [**I appeal to you that you don't ever change your mind, in order to save potential suitors**.]

BEATRICE   Scratching could not make it worse an 'twere such a face as yours were. [**I mock your face**.]

BENEDICK   Well, you are a rare *parrot*-teacher. [**I tell you that you are skilled in base repetition**.]

BEATRICE   A *bird* of my tongue is better than a *beast* of *yours*.[1505] [**I show that I am better than you**.]

BENEDICK   I would my *horse* had the speed of your tongue, and so good a continuer. [**I declare to you that I wish my horse had the speed and stamina of your tongue**.] But keep your way, a God's name, I have done. [**I resign from you**.]

BEATRICE   You always end with a *jade's* trick. I know you of old. [**I undermine your finish.**]

Don Pedro *addresses them all.*

[1505] Benedick begins the chain in animal imagery. Beatrice's 'bird' is a response to his 'parrot', but she then progresses the argument – where 'beast' becomes a pun 'both as an animal in opposition to the bird he has mentioned *and* to identify Benedick with his "beastly" nature and tongue […]'. Benedick deliberately reads the words as literal, replying that he wishes his horse did have the speed of Beatrice's quick tongue. Beatrice sees his dismissal of the conversation as a loss of status and compares his actions to those of a 'jade' – a 'worn-out horse' (p. 202).

Repartee Two: Early Verse – *Richard III*

The second repartee workshop assessed an extended extract from *Richard III*,[1506] brimming with rhetorical devices that are common to early Shakespeare. Richard and Anne were played by Mark Quartley and Sarah Ovens.

In this workshop we turned to the wooing scene of *Richard III*, an extraordinary, extended example of verse-based repartee as initiated by devices of dramatic rhetoric, which allowed for comparison with the prose analysis of the first workshop. The stakes are raised in Richard's seemingly improbable suit to win the hand of Anne, the widow whose husband he is alleged to have killed.[1507] The workshop sought to isolate and assess a number of verse techniques in which both interlocutors are engaged. *Stichomythia*[1508] is prominent again but (unlike the prose-based example of *Much Ado*) this time the effect is augmented by the additional echoes in the repetition of verse form. We also encounter examples of split verse lines, shared between the two parties, something that could be seen as a development of the classical device of the *antilabe*.[1509] At the climax of the debate/proposal, we find shortened verse lines, and the unusual presence of iambic trimeters (which could alternatively be regarded as forming shared hexameters – paired lines forming longer units of 12 syllables). These effects combine to create a pattern that Bart van Es has described as being based on the 'elaborate symmetries and dissonances of language',[1510] all of which draw from the influence of the Roman playwright Seneca.

At the start of the workshop, I took the opportunity to review Alfreds' actioning process,[1511] this time assessing its application to verse dialogue.[1512] The

---

[1506] *Richard III*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, I.ii.68-210.

[1507] The corpse in this scene however is that of Henry VI, Anne's late father-in-law. Richard will admit to the murder of Henry VI during this scene – see I.ii.104.

[1508] Stichomythic dialogue is composed of lines that rapidly alternate between speakers, often with frequent repetition and antithesis.

[1509] R. B. Rutherford describes the *antilabe* as the 'division of a dialogue line between two or more speakers,' evidence of mimicry of 'the natural flow of speech' – a development of classical heritage that 'figures in almost all the plays of Sophocles and Euripides'. R. B. Rutherford, *Greek Tragic Style: Form, Language and Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), p. 42.

[1510] Bart van Es, *Shakespeare in Company* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 68.

[1511] See Repartee One.

initial actioning worked very smoothly in the same manner as the previous workshop, so I will not detail the actors' selection of the action verbs themselves.[1513] Nothing about the versification hindered the initial assignation of action to text. However, a few concerns were helpfully revealed in practice.

Sarah Ovens found the exercise attempted 'too many things at once, too quickly', where the 'many layers' are something that an actor might otherwise 'build up to'.[1514] It was difficult to 'properly listen' to the other speaker and offer a contextually considerate response; she found that she would 'concentrate too much' on her own designated action, which impinged her reaction to her dialogue partner.[1515] She felt that this form of actioning was too complex as a first-step process, where she had not yet been able to establish her character's 'journey through [the scene]'; she was required to be 'physically […] affected' by the chosen actions before really understanding the implications of her words.[1516] Yet she did suggest that, in the context of a full rehearsal period, the process of 'Alfreds actioning' may indeed prove to be 'liberating' and move the actor towards a 'clarity' of performance.[1517] Contrastingly, she had preferred the 'strict actioning' process of our previous workshop;[1518] it had been 'much easier' to focus on 'just a verb' rather than a larger 'chunk' of text.[1519] She also stressed, however, that the actor's own agency is integral to the success of any actioning process; her difficulty was based on the fact that she was 'not quite convinced' by her own choice of actions.[1520]

As established, 'Alfreds actioning' encourages a heightened physical delivery, to accentuate each action for clarity.[1521] However, Mark Quartley's initial response was that the performance of 'over-the-top gestures' may seem to be a

---

[1512] I.ii.68-80.
[1513] See Appendix D for a mark-up of the extract and the corresponding chosen actions.
[1514] Ovens, W7.
[1515] Ibid.
[1516] Ibid.
[1517] Ibid.
[1518] See Soliloquy Two.
[1519] Ovens, W7.
[1520] Ibid.
[1521] See Repartee One.

barrier from the 'emotional truth.'[1522] He described the conflict between the surface, semantic 'meaning of the line' and the subtextual, 'emotional truth' – where Quartley regards the two as 'quite […] separate'.[1523] This was ironic, given that Alfreds' own intention for the heightened playing of actions in the exercise is to make the subtextual drive clear, ensuring an actor is 'totally committed', can 'remember the structure of the scene' and has an 'increased muscular commitment' as a result, akin to muscle memory.[1524] Alfreds would contend that the essence of the exercise is to be 'utterly truthful', establishing the crux of a character's purpose at each small beat of a line, where the deliberate style of delivery is '*not necessarily naturalistic.*'[1525]

In the case of these obstacles, it seems that both actors were already envisaging the exercise outcome as a direct projection of a final staged performance itself. They were consequently dissatisfied with their 'performance', where this first-stage Alfreds exercise is perhaps best approached as a creative tool for rehearsal. Naturally, this was hard to replicate in its totality in a workshop setting, where actors felt an instinctive obligation to offer a workshop 'performance' of their reading of the text. If one were to have the opportunity to apply 'Alfreds actioning' in the context of a full production rehearsal period, one might then determine how far any such early concerns with the process might be allayed.[1526]

Clearly a choice between 'strict actioning' or 'Alfreds actioning' revealed individual actor preferences. Ovens found the Alfreds process had seemed too overwhelming, too 'much of an intellectual exercise' that appeared to force 'instincts completely […] out of the window';[1527] whereas for Quartley, the 'limiting' nature of the exercise could be beneficial for an actor, in reducing a line or a clause to the

---

[1522] Quartley, W7.
[1523] Ibid.
[1524] Alfreds, p. 166.
[1525] Ibid.
[1526] Alfreds typically allots four days to the actioning of a whole play, based on two hours' actioning per day (where text work represents 30% of his designated rehearsal focus). Alfreds, p. 165.
[1527] Ovens, W7.

simplicity of just 'one intention or action'.[1528] Quartley personally deemed that 'Alfreds actioning' allowed for a wider general foundation – it was 'not as closed' and 'not as prescriptive' as the alternative of strict actioning, based exclusively on transitive verbs.[1529]

Most importantly however, in spite of these performative concerns, the value of the central attempt to connect Shakespearean *elocutio* and post-Stanislavskian action was reaffirmed. Quartley noted how easy it was to divide the text into definitive 'units' which could then be actioned;[1530] the division based on syntax was fruitful[1531] – the units seemed 'quite simplistically split up'.[1532] It was the selection of a single, specific action that caused internal debate for the actor, given the richness and potential of the text. Quartley stressed 'that one line' alone could be interpreted as having a 'number of different intentions'.[1533] Giving the example of his single line, 'Lady, you know no rules of charity' (I.ii.68), he felt could 'write an essay' to discuss 'what Richard is trying do to Anne'; but, from a practical acting perspective, one would have to 'limit' the response.[1534]

Our focus turned to discrete aspects of verse repartee. We began by assessing the dynamic of stichomythia where, at the beginning of this duologue, each instance of stichomythia is sited within a cluster of wider rhythmical effects. Again, the actor's prerogative is to question how far the language can be regarded as indicative of a direct character 'voice' (rather than just being a manifestation of the playwright's own *elocutio*). Russ McDonald has written of the 'verbal flourishes' that Shakespeare uses to 'individuate his various speakers', with specific emphasis on his use of prose and the licence encouraged by the 'informality' of that medium.[1535] However, with patterned verse actors are still tasked with attempting

---

[1528] Quartley, W7.
[1529] Ibid.
[1530] On 'unitting', see Chapter Two. Cf. Alfreds, pp. 125-132, and Moseley, p. 5.
[1531] See Chapter Three. Cf. Tarlinskaja, on syntax division, p. 22.
[1532] Quartley, W7.
[1533] Ibid.
[1534] Ibid.
[1535] McDonald, p. 119.

similar connections. Quartley remarked that 'you have to buy that [Richard and Anne] are both very intelligent […], that they are able to pick up so quickly on what the other person's said.'[1536] He added that such a challenge is something that 'you wouldn't get […] in a naturalistic, twenty-first century play'; repartee today 'wouldn't be [so] quick', where contemporary characters 'wouldn't be [faced with the challenge of] picking up on the language as much.'[1537] Lois Potter has referred to the Renaissance context of boy players being especially noted for delivering their female characters' repartee 'at a cracking pace', citing this as a reason for specific reference in Renaissance plays to the 'speed of women's tongues.'[1538] However, there are two parties to contend with in Shakespeare's mixed-gendered duologues (as represented by both the boy apprentice and the adult player),[1539] where the prowess for quick-wittedness must be shared.

In terms of contemporary necessity, Quartley described the acceptance that the characters would 'speak in this way' even if a production were 'set it in the twenty-first century; 'they happen to be speaking in these verse lines', but 'otherwise [they would be] living truthfully within that.'[1540] Contrastingly, Ovens found adequate justification for Anne's quality of speech in the specific given circumstances of the play's plot; her 'grief sharpens her wit [and] makes her more determined to beat [Richard] in whatever way […] verbally'.[1541] Thus both actors found great potential for character in stichomythia, it having the integrity of scintillating dramatic rhetoric, rather than serving as a closeted, literary game. Indeed, this appears to be supported by the characters themselves; Richard metatheatrically recognises the mechanics of their 'keen encounter of […] wits' (I.ii.119-20).[1542]

[1536] Quartley, W7.
[1537] Ibid.
[1538] Potter, p. 91; cf. Beatrice, in Repartee One.
[1539] Gurr, p. 113.
[1540] Quartley, W7.
[1541] Ovens, W7.
[1542] Cf. Beatrice and Benedick, in Repartee One.

In workshop practice, stichomythia demanded quick reaction to the dialogue partner – intense concentration and close listening being necessitated by the proximity of the repetition of certain words. This priority of the live moment presented an overwhelmingly dramatic manifestation of the device. As an example of stichomythic and verse repetition, first Richard implores Anne:

> Vouchsafe, divine perfection of a woman,
> Of these supposèd crimes to give me leave,
> By circumstance but to acquit myself.
> (I.ii.75-77)

He wishes to have Anne's permission to present a detailed summation for his defence, to rebuff her allegations. Her response sardonically reflects his language:

> Vouchsafe, defused infection of man,
> Of these known evils, but to give me leave,
> By circumstance to curse thy cursèd self.
> (I.ii.78-80)

Each small turn proposes an exact point of opposition: Anne's echo of 'vouchsafe' (I.ii.78) ripples with sarcasm; Richard described Anne as 'divine perfection' (I.ii.75), where she refers to him as a 'defused infection' (I.ii.78); the allegations, the 'supposèd crimes' (I.ii.76) are referred to by Anne as concrete events, 'known evils' (I.ii.79); and where Richard has requested a legal acquittal (I.ii.77), Anne wishes to instigate a detailed 'curse' (I.ii.80), which itself arguably reverberates with a tone of judicial usage.[1543] The two tercets begin and end with syllable repetition (and resultant rhyme), Anne providing both *anaphora* and *epistrophe* to each of Richard's examples – such is the closeness of her parody. For Quartley, the mechanics of this repartee are 'not that different to […] Beatrice and Benedick […] or Kate and

---

[1543] Cf. John Jowett, in William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of King Richard the Third*, ed. by John Jowett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 163.

Petruchio', resulting in something akin to 'a lovers' scene, where they are picking up on each other's words.'[1544]

Frank Kermode regards the notion 'that stichomythia was a route towards more naturalistic dialogue' to be misleading, instead describing the device as being 'wholly faithful to an older rhetoric'.[1545] Using critical benefit to anticipate the output of Shakespeare's late drama – with its apparently more progressive devices (such as enjambment of 'sense units' and 'half-lines') – Kermode suggests that Shakespeare would never use stichomythia 'in quite this way again'.[1546] Yet, even if we can now recognise that such stichomythia was moribund in Shakespeare's later period of work, it is problematic to regard the device as incapable of dramatic resurrection. Even in the immediate aftermath of its 'death' there was evident delight in the revival of *Richard III* (and one might therefore assume in its dramatic style). As Kermode notes, '*Richard III* seems to have been a favourite with contemporary audiences, and was still called for in the next reign and the next', a performance being 'recorded in 1633'.[1547] Kermode surmises that 'a taste persisted for plays that were in obvious ways out-of-date […where] there was a hankering after old ranting rhetorical style'.[1548] One could alternatively regard regular revivals as evidence of stichomythia being in fact timeless – in terms of the dramatic rhetoric that it engenders. It is possible that Shakespeare understood stichomythia as having inherent dramatic potential and indeed borrowed it (from Seneca) for this reason. In turn, it might thus be said that the inherent dramatic power of stichomythia is one aspect that makes both the vibrant rapport of Beatrice and Benedick and this scene of frisson in *Richard III* still endure for audiences today.

Within this scene, there is a prominent degree of line sharing in the style of the classical device of the *antilabe*,[1549] which Frank Kermode clearly prefers over

---

[1544] Quartley, W7.
[1545] Frank Kermode, *Shakespeare's Language* (London: Penguin, 2000), p. 30.
[1546] Ibid.
[1547] Kermode, p. 31.
[1548] Ibid.
[1549] Cf. Line over-lapping as a 'passing on' of speaker agency, which is stylistically distinct. See Repartee Three.

stichomythia, describing it as 'a device of Seneca better worth imitating than some others'[1550] and arguing that it indicated a development in style towards 'something like a modern theatre' (31). Peter Hall gives specific attention to shared lines, but problematically includes them within his discussion of the *caesura*[1551] – as both devices often hinge on the common denominator of a mid-line full stop. I would argue that the caesura (which is more frequently encountered in late Shakespeare) functions quite differently, often as a variety of mid-line volta. An example is provided if we return to Othello's 'cause' speech.[1552] In his third line Othello proclaims, 'It is the cause. Yet I'll not shed her blood'[1553] – a dynamic about-face between the realms of charge and verdict. I propose the *antilabe* warrants an independent category, but I will approach Hall's discussion on its own terms (regardless of his wider taxonomy).

Hall's position on shared lines is that 'the second character must come in precisely on cue,'[1554] where the two halves together constitute 'a whole line which has the same pace, dynamic, rhythm and volume' (32). The two halves form 'one smooth whole', (33) *'although the dramatic motive of each half may be, and often is, entirely different'* (32). Having spoken of the need for consistent 'pace' and 'rhythm', Hall then states that 'the necessary change of pace required to earn the full stop occurs on the first half of the line' (32). In this manner, Hall seems to regard shared lines as an inherent indication of a tempo change, typical of the caesura that is 'the means by which Shakespeare varies the tempo and orchestrates his verse' (32). But such a change begins at the start of a line and is not precipitated by the full stop.[1555] John Barton sees a similar quality in the shared line, 'as surely as if

---

[1550] Kermode, p. 30.
[1551] They form the bulk of the brief chapter. Hall, pp. 32-34; cf. Puttenham on '*cesure*', in Alexander, p. 117.
[1552] See Chapter 5.
[1553] *Othello,* in the *RSC Complete Works*, V.ii.3.
[1554] Hall, p. 34.
[1555] Again, punctuation might seem problematically dominant, competing with a syntax-based division. I would argue the case for certain mid-line, metrical variations also to be considered as a variety of caesura.

Shakespeare had written in the stage-direction, "don't pause here."'[1556] Helpfully he turns to the same extract as a workshop scene, describing it as 'swift-flowing: a piece of ding-dong dialogue', warning that 'actors will get lost if they don't go with the rhythm and pick up the cues as Shakespeare wrote them' (43). The repartee dynamics are 'like a rally at tennis' – where the actors of his televised workshop 'served the text up to each other' (44).

　　We reviewed Hall's assertion that 'smoothness is the objective'[1557] in relation to two specific shared lines in our extract. Lady Anne reinforces the honour of her late husband, whilst Richard promotes his own cause:

ANNE	His better doth not breathe upon the earth.
RICHARD	He lives that loves thee better than he could.
ANNE	**Name him.**
RICHARD	**Plantagenet.**
ANNE	**Why, that was he.**
RICHARD	The selfsame name, but one of better nature.
ANNE	**Where is he?**
RICHARD	**Here.** (*She spits at him.*)
	Why dost thou spit at me?
	(I.ii.145-153)

In the case of the first shared line – 'Name him. Plantagenet. Why, that was he.' (I.ii.147-9)[1558] – Mark Quartley felt the 'general' proposal of the Hall approach was 'right', where if an actor is 'picking up the line' then they would be 'coming in quickly.'[1559] Shakespeare, in this instance does not seem to be encouraging hesitation.

　　The second shared line – 'Where is he? Here. Why dost thou spit at me?' (I.ii.151-3) – was more problematic for Hall's concept of 'smoothness'; where here it would seem an imposition, negating the intended interruption of Lady Anne's spitting. Renaissance hands were quite willing to place stage business in the midst of

---

[1556] Barton, p. 32.
[1557] Hall, p. 34.
[1558] Bate and Rasmussen have chosen to number 'shared lines' instead by their separate component lines – *Richard III*, in the *RSC Complete Works*. I have lineated the extract suggestively (and used bold type), to make the presence of line sharing clear.
[1559] Quartley, W7.

such a shared line: Q1 places Anne's spitting between her words, 'Where is he' and Richard's reply, 'Heere';[1560] F1 places the same stage direction between Richard's reply, 'Heere' and his follow up line, 'Why dost thou spit at me.'[1561] The spitting seems to work best in this latter format, as an immediate reaction to Richard's assertion that he is the very man of 'better nature' (I.ii.152). Either way, we witness how an imposed preoccupation with smoothness can disrupt the dynamic of line sharing.

The device can be more usefully regarded as a constructive tool in the dramatic representation of persuasive character. Ovens took a contrary position to Hall's 'caesura' assertion, stating that Shakespeare 'surely, by using those writing techniques' could also be aiming at an outcome that demonstrably '*isn't* smooth for effect'.[1562] An example might be the representation of a character 'whose breathing has changed' because of their emotional context.[1563] It was certainly clear in our workshop examples that shared lines could have at least an equal function for purposes of verbal antagonism, where any superficial harmony in the form of a shared line is creatively juxtaposed with discordant semantics or actions.

In the midst of this scene, we encounter a curious passage of trimeter, a device Bart van Es has described as the 'most direct instance of Seneca's verse in the play.'[1564] Yet, despite its classical heritage, Kermode finds such trimeter to be 'resourceful' (as a 'modern theatre' device, like the *antilabe*), showing evidence of a more progressive Shakespearean style.[1565] Using a similar tennis analogy to John Barton, Kermode views the trimeter in this extract as 'a volley of short lines, as if both players had advanced to the net'.[1566] Giles Block refers to the same effect as

---

[1560] William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of King Richard III* (London: printed by Valentine Sims for Andrew Wise, 1597), [Q1] B2 [p. 11] <http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/doc/R3_Q1/page/11/> [accessed: 3 June 2016].
[1561] William Shakespeare, *The Life and Death of Richard III*, in the *Bodleian F1*, p. 175.
[1562] Ovens, W7.
[1563] Ibid; cf. Puttenham, where the *cesure* is closely related to breath. Puttenham, in Alexander, p. 117.
[1564] Bart van Es, p. 71.
[1565] Kermode, p. 31.
[1566] Ibid.

'"mirroring"'.[1567] Where he regards shared lines as occasions 'where the speaker takes up and completes the other's pentameter' he finds, by contrast, that 'mirroring' is indicative of 'the second speaker's [attempt] to avoid a shared line, which would have sounded more conciliatory.'[1568] Block does not therefore put emphasis on the first speaker (who has only spoken a trimeter) but on the second speaker, who has the responsibility of deciding how a section of dialogue will proceed (that is, either by completing a shared pentameter or by 'mirroring' with trimeter). Anne and Richard are engaged thus:

ANNE	I would I knew thy heart.
RICHARD	'Tis figured in my tongue.
ANNE	I fear me both are false.
RICHARD	Then never man was true.
ANNE	Well, well, put up your sword.
RICHARD	Say, then, my peace is made.
ANNE	That shalt thou know hereafter.
RICHARD	But shall I live in hope?
ANNE	All men, I hope, live so.

(I.ii.202-210)

For Block, Anne resorts to a short line as a tentative appeal – 'probably inviting a real dialogue' – for Richard to continue 'an exchange in full pentameters' and complete a shared line.[1569] Instead, Richard deliberately retorts with his own short line – ''Tis figured in my tongue' (I.ii.203) – which Block interprets as Richard's attempt to reduce Anne's time to think, ensuring she will capitulate to 'the force of his seduction.'[1570] This reading accords with John Jowett's view of this dialogue, that Richard's style of 'flattery succeeds not simply in itself but through antagonistic engagement; hence the carefully patterned language.'[1571] Yet Block notes how Anne then shifts momentum, becoming the active agent of the 'mirroring' – she is the one responding to Richard with shortened lines, the rhythmic quality being possible

---

[1567] Block, p. 101.
[1568] Ibid.
[1569] Block, p. 102.
[1570] Ibid.
[1571] Jowett, p. 163.

evidence of her 'new-found attraction' towards Richard and a 'new-found confidence' that she has gained.[1572]

An alternative reading would attribute dominance to the *first* person speaking, as the instigating agent. Anne would thus be seen to initially take control, signalling the move to a trimeter pattern. But Richard's shift of the order of call-and-response allows him to seize the initiative; he breaks the pattern of the rally with his request, 'Say, then, my peace is made' (I.ii.207), and we recognise his proposal that swiftly follows. It is Anne who has to finish the thought.[1573] Previously Richard has been returning the ball in this conversational rally, but now it is he who plays the attacking shot (in spite of superficial subservience), asking, 'But shall I live in hope?' (I.ii.209). And indeed, if one were to follow the Q2 variation of the line, one finds the question reworded as the emphatic statement, 'But I *shall* live in hope.'[1574]

Regardless of character dominance, the shortened lines were clearly perceived in the workshop to increase tension to a climactic level, in the context of a scene where various rhetorical techniques had been building pressure over a significant period of time. Ovens saw the rhythmical climax as an indication that there is 'so much sexual tension […] that it takes quite a lot for [Richard and Anne] to keep a lid on it.'[1575] She found that this is especially the case for Anne, for whom 'there's been such a huge turnaround', which has 'completely shocked her.'[1576] Whilst the passion increases in the shortened lines, there could be seen to be a residual effect on the tempo, which for Ovens 'slows down' considerably in these moments; 'instinctively it [felt] like [each line needed] some air around it' – a moment of breathing space, or a moment for pause, as the 'intensity' for Anne has become so palpable.[1577]

[1572] Block, p. 102.
[1573] Quartley, W7.
[1574] Italics are my own emphasis. Cf. Jowett, p. 170.
[1575] Ovens, W7.
[1576] Ibid.
[1577] Ibid.

Additional texture is provided by Shakespeare's 'omission'[1578] of verse, in his fashioning of incomplete lines, irregularities that Peter Hall interprets as deliberate, 'written-in pauses' (38) that are 'mandatory' to observe (39).[1579] Indeed, Palfrey and Stern speak of the Renaissance playwright's 'part-based prosody' as 'scoring' the player's 'performance' in this manner.[1580] We encounter incomplete lines at a key moment in our extract,[1581] where Richard first makes his amorous advances explicit:

RICHARD	Let him thank me, that holp to send him thither,
	For he was fitter for that place than earth.
ANNE	And thou unfit for any place but hell.
RICHARD	Yes, one place else, if you will hear me name it.
ANNE	**Some dungeon.**
RICHARD	**Your bedchamber.**
ANNE	Ill rest betide the chamber where thou liest.
RICHARD	So will it, madam, till I lie with you.
ANNE	**I hope so.**
RICHARD	I know so. […]

<div align="right">(I.ii.110-119)</div>

Palfrey and Stern highlight Richard's 'twisted' response to his cue words: 'dungeon' becoming 'bedchamber'; 'liest' becoming 'lie'; and 'hope so' becoming 'know so'.[1582] In doing so, they emphasise how the part indicates Richard moving 'through the place, position, and commission of the sexual satisfaction he recommends.'[1583] But it was the first of these twists that for both Quartley and Ovens represented the great crux of the scene; from the moment that Richard suggests admittance to Anne's 'bedchamber', Anne starts to feel the effects of Richard's charismatic command of language, and 'she can't complete the verse' to form a shared line.[1584] As Ovens stated, this is the first indication that Anne is 'taken off centre' and disorientated.[1585]

[1578] Hall, p. 38.
[1579] Barton concurs. Cf. Barton, p. 31.
[1580] Palfrey and Stern, p. 360.
[1581] I have highlighted such lines in bold type.
[1582] Palfrey and Stern, p. 361.
[1583] Ibid.
[1584] Quartley, W7.
[1585] Ovens, W7.

Even in the Renaissance context of a part-script, both actors may have been aware of a mutual suggestion for a pause; a two-word cue might have represented for both of them a rare knowledge of their partner's entire line. We recall Stern's wider research in part scripts and the fact that a typical part contained cues of only 'one, two, three, or (occasionally) four words'.[1586] But in our contemporary context, full awareness of the text is naturally assumed. Consequently, Peter Hall notes the textual ambiguity over 'where a defined […] pause should be taken', believing that the actor 'should always consider if the pause plays better before the half-line or after it', as a matter of personal choice.[1587] In our workshop, both actors preferred a pause following Richard's revelation, which served as a moment for Anne to compose herself and deliver her retort. Hall would suggest the requirement here for the actor to 'always know what [the] emotional journey is during a pause.'[1588] Palfrey and Stern place the requirement for Anne's reaction slightly later, in response to Richard's 'unexpected backing away', indicated by the caesura at the close of this cluster of lines (following his words, 'I know so').[1589] However, my workshops actors considered her requirement to react earlier, in response to Richard's 'seductive jabs' of morphed meanings.[1590]

Anne's wish is that 'ill rest' (I.ii.116) will fall upon Richard's sleeping place, and he agrees that this will be the case, until he gets to 'lie with' her (I.ii.117). At this moment we encounter another conspicuously short line, creating potential conflict between surface semantics and loaded subtext. Anne replies, 'I hope so' (I.ii.118). Superficially, she appears to be restating her desire for Richard's discomfort. However, as John Jowett notes, this is complicated by: (i) the sense of 'dramatic irony' (that Anne will agree to marry Richard); and (ii) a sense of 'unintended ambiguity' – does Anne harbour, on some level, the desire to sleep with Richard?[1591]

[1586] Stern, *Rehearsal*, p. 61.
[1587] Hall, p. 38. As echoed by David Suchet, in discussion with John Barton – cf. Barton, p. 31.
[1588] Hall, p. 39.
[1589] Palfrey and Stern, p. 361.
[1590] Ibid.
[1591] Jowett, p. 165.

Many varieties of acquiescence or repulsion are available to the actor playing Anne, in close proximity with Richard's potential spectrum of strategies to seduce. Consequently Richard's response, 'I know so' (I.ii.119), could appear to an audience member as charismatic or as very sexually predatory, or as a troubling combination of 'rapacious but somehow irresistible menace'.[1592] Palfrey and Stern suggest a variety of plausible reactions for Anne who could be: (i) 'forced to remain merely petrified', or (ii) face the puzzlement of 'erotic capitulation', or (iii) implacably make a 'blank refusal of Richard's game'.[1593] But the importance is that textual 'scoring'[1594] offers, at the very least, distinct options and mutual dramatic agency.

Russ McDonald has discussed the dramatic potential for such passages of stichomythic patterning, where the lines of dialogue 'march together to create a dramatic whole vivified by their contention.'[1595] This metrical anticipation gives actors a responsibility as a partnership. But it could be damaging to regard such a cooperation as a suppression of individual agency. Bart van Es has suggested that Richard's 'highly developed "character" […] cannot always be distinguished', where at 'key points, the logic governing his expression is fundamentally intertwined with that of his interlocutor.'[1596] He cites one such seamless transition between Lady Anne's words, 'I would I knew thy heart' (I.ii.202) and Richard's reply, ''Tis figured in my tongue' (I.ii.203). Elsewhere however, where the metre of a scene may seem fluid and premeditated, we know that there is still the potential for sudden deviation. Anne falls into the pattern of a half-line, with her interrogation, 'Didst thou not kill this king?' (I.ii.103). The callous brevity of Richard's response, 'I grant ye' (I.ii.104), is emphasised by his rejection of the opportunity to complete the full metre of the line. In choosing to complement or compete, in choosing accord or denial, it must be emphasised that the actor-characters can still navigate a very nuanced and individual pathway through the play. Quartley and Ovens indicated throughout our

---

[1592] Palfrey and Stern, p. 361.
[1593] Ibid.
[1594] Palfrey and Stern, p. 360.
[1595] McDonald, p. 94.
[1596] van Es, p. 73.

workshop that a mutual engagement in repartee is neither exclusive to accord nor repressive of individual character voice.[1597] It may seem paradoxical, but characters were frequently observed to exploit a shared source of dramatic rhetoric, in order to establish distinct individuality – evident in the contrasting tactics behind their employment of similar forms of speech (be it in metre, trope or figure).

Finally, it is striking that such a tour de force of intimate rhetorical persuasion takes place in public. Again, this is an example of a scene's power becoming manifest in performance, as opposed to a literary reading of the text. The presence of eavesdroppers adds intense heat to the already-simmering vitality. One of the attendants has overheard Richard's claim to Anne that he will inter the body of her late father-in-law at Chertsey (I.ii.223). Following Anne's exit, he therefore enquires of Richard, 'Towards Chertsey, noble Lord?' (I.ii.235). Richard's terse response, 'No, to Whitefriars' (I.ii.236) possibly suggests duplicity in his intentions regarding Henry VI's final resting place. The dramatic rhetoric, for Richard, has served his moment of what might be called public intimacy.

[1597] As indicated by the discussion of trimeter.

Appendix D:

<u>Extract mark-up</u>

<u>*Richard III*</u> (I.ii.68-80): 'Alfreds Actions'[1598]

RICHARD   Lady, you know no rules of charity,

              [I challenge your unkindness]

              Which renders good for bad, blessings for curses.

              [I educate you about the laws of charity.]

ANNE   Villain, thou know'st nor law of God nor man: 70

              No beast so fierce but knows some touch of pity.

              [I point out to you that you don't live by any rules and that even

              beasts know how to pity.]

RICHARD   But I know none, and therefore am no beast.

              [I rebut you with the notion that I lack all forms of pity.]

ANNE   O, wonderful, when devils tell the truth!

              [I conclude that you must be a devil and agree with what you

              said.]

RICHARD   More wonderful, when angels are so angry.

              [I praise your anger.]

              Vouchsafe, divine perfection of a woman,

              Of these supposèd crimes to give me leave,

              By circumstance but to acquit myself.

              [I ask you to allow me to prove my innocence.]

ANNE   Vouchsafe, defused infection of man,

              Of these known evils, but to give me leave,

              By circumstance to curse thy cursèd self.

              [I hear what you are saying but need you to understand that I

              don't believe you.]

[1598] The actions (indicated in square brackets) are those suggested by Mark Quartley and Sarah Ovens, in the spirit of Mike Alfreds' style of actioning – as derived from his aforementioned text, *Different Every Night*.

Repartee Three: Verse Developments – *Twelfth Night* and *The Tempest*

The third repartee workshop looked at: prose/verse transition, as illustrated in *Twelfth Night* (I.v.123-222); and the fluid, hypermetrical verse of late Shakespeare, as evidenced in *The Tempest* (III.i.26-109). The workshop featured Heather Long (playing Olivia and Ferdinand) and Molly Vevers (playing Viola and Miranda).

Twelfth Night

Viola's first meeting with Olivia represents the tonal range that Shakespeare can achieve in his repartee, in shifting dialogue between the modes of prose and verse. In our workshop, Molly Vevers described this duologue as being rich in 'clues'[1599] for actors, where there are 'very clear transitions'[1600] between the prose that begins the scene and the mutual use of verse that ends the scene. Here, the spirit of repartee is engendered by the characters drawing from the same pool of imagery and a shared lexis. Vevers felt that a verse/prose transition was a useful acting aid, as it reduced the risk of getting 'stuck in one rhythm' of delivery (as could be the case with extended prose or verse).[1601] 'The fact that Viola comes in and out of speaking' the 'poetic verse' made the scene much 'easier to follow',[1602] and something that consequently enabled 'units' to be attributed to the text with greater precision. Again, a contemporary actor was describing Shakespeare's text in a manner that parallels the period research of Palfrey and Stern, who regard 'shifts between prose [and] blank verse' as one of the many techniques that would have helped the player to 'pace and measure the "units" of his speech'.[1603]

As with the previous repartee scenes, again the sounds of courtship resonate in *Twelfth Night*. Roger Warren and Stanley Wells deem Viola and Olivia to be 'equals in poise and wit', where 'so often Shakespeare uses wit to suggest

---

[1599] Molly Vevers, W9.
[1600] Ibid. Heather Long concurred.
[1601] Ibid.
[1602] Ibid.
[1603] Palfrey and Stern, p. 328.

relationship or potential relationship.'[1604] Yet Shakespeare uses his characters' shared facility in eloquence to instigate comic chaos, with the additional means of disguise, metadramatic frivolity and dramatic irony. It is Viola's personal skill with a verse transition that beguiles Olivia. She has been tasked with wooing Olivia on behalf of her master (Duke Orsino) – delivering a prepared speech, whilst in disguise as the fictional male, 'Cesario'. However, in her struggle, Viola resorts to her own extempore description of love. If a rapport (occasioned by dramatic rhetoric) is seen to indicate a true romantic connection, then Olivia is more purely enamoured by Viola's speech than by Orsino's vicarious construct of Cesario's words. Peter Hall finds in this extract that 'Shakespeare uses each transition back into verse to lift the emotional stakes.'[1605] He regards the prose as asserting 'the rational' (against the 'emotional'), as verse 'defines the lyrical and the passionate.'[1606] Where the two become mixed within a scene, he finds that 'the prose takes on an almost iambic pulse as it hands on the sense to the verse.'[1607]

To comprehend the full effect of this prose/verse transition, one first has to consider the building momentum of the prose repartee, which culminates in Olivia's unveiling of her face. Olivia anticipates a compliment on her visage, asking, 'Is't not well done?' (I.v.169). Viola replies that the beauty is, 'Excellently done, if God did all' (I.v.170) – in an audacious transgression, that Hall proposes might either represent 'unthinking candour' or female jealousy, two possibilities the audience 'should not' be able to reconcile.[1608] Olivia's reply is an equally 'quick-witted'[1609] assertion that her beauty is 'in grain' and will 'endure wind and weather' (I.v.171). And it is this that serves Viola the ideal opportunity to transition into verse, to appraise Olivia's beauty:

[1604] Roger Warren and Stanley Wells, 'Introduction', in William Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night, or What You Will,* ed. by Roger Warren and Stanley Wells (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), p. 31.
[1605] Hall, p. 45.
[1606] Ibid.
[1607] Ibid.
[1608] Hall, p. 117.
[1609] Warren and Wells, 'Introduction', p. 31.

> 'Tis beauty truly blent, whose red and white
> Nature's own sweet and cunning hand laid on.
> Lady, you are the cruell'st she alive,
> If you will lead these graces to the grave
> And leave the world no copy.
>
> (I.v.172-176)

Viola may finally be quoting a portion of the very speech that Orsino asked her to deliver, and it may indeed be the ineffectual rhetoric of her master that is hampering her persuasive attempt. Miriam Joseph observes that a device of 'antecedent and consequent' is being employed, to express a 'hypothetical proposition'.[1610] The argument is one of cold, pragmatic *logos*, suggesting that Olivia should marry (presumably the ideal suitor, Orsino), solely for the purpose of procreation – the genetic imprint of her 'graces' (I.v.175) may be passed on to benefit future generations. The appeal is devoid of romantic or sexual charm. Olivia responds with her own wordplay, asserting that 'divers' (I.v.177) inventories of her supposedly 'indifferent' (I.v.179) physical qualities will be written for posterity. Most importantly, at this stage Olivia denies the transition into verse, taking the 'scene back into prose'.[1611]

For Vevers, Viola's attempt at a verse transition marked the first important shift in the scene, as it represented her use of 'a totally different tactic' to persuade Olivia – even if it included words from Orsino's 'prepared' text.[1612] However, when Viola's second shift to verse is provoked, it seems all the more crucial: she appears to speak in her own voice, responding to Olivia, 'I see you what you are, you are too proud' (I.v.181). As a result, Viola accentuates her description of Orsino's adoration:

> My lord and master loves you. O, such love
> Could be but recompensed, though you were crowned
> The nonpareil of beauty!
>
> (I.v.183-5)

[1610] Joseph, p. 159.
[1611] Warren and Wells, 'Introduction', p. 31-2.
[1612] Vevers, W9.

Olivia seems to be increasingly enticed by verse. One might regard her as completing a 'shared' verse-line in response (even where she oversteps the metrical count). She appears engaged, and yet retains an abrupt and supercilious tone:

> How does he love me?
>
> (I.v.186)

After such lengthy persuasion, Olivia tellingly resorts to verse to voice her dismissal of Orsino's advances (even if, in Hall's words, the style remains 'precise and practical').[1613] Olivia's words may be a rebuttal, but Hall suggests the echoed verse 'allows the heat of the scene to be maintained'.[1614] Indeed, Tiffany Stern sees even greater implication in Olivia's words at this point, regarding Olivia's rejection of Orsino – 'Your lord does know my mind: I cannot love him' (I.v.189) – as ironically 'the actual moment at which [her] love [for Viola/Cesario] is engendered'.[1615] This is signalled by the transition of Olivia's 'cued part' from prose to verse.[1616]

In our workshop, we judged this revelatory moment to come later. We found, in Olivia's possible half-line completion of verse (I.v.200) the true encouragement that Viola required to transition into a deeper, 'heartfelt and direct' use of verse herself:[1617]

> VIOLA   In your denial I would find no sense,
>   I would not understand it.
> OLIVIA   Why, what would you?[1618]
>
> (I.v.198-200)

At this point Viola takes ownership of the verse, indicating her facility with language by beginning her 'willow cabin' speech – a passage that Warren and Wells believe 'starts off from a basis of fashion and convention but goes far beyond the merely

---

[1613] Hall, p. 119.
[1614] Ibid.
[1615] Stern, *Rehearsal*, p. 65.
[1616] Ibid.
[1617] Hall, p. 121.
[1618] I have lineated the dialogue to emphasise the half-line.

extravagant.'[1619] In assuming the role of hypothetical wooer, Viola mistakenly captivates Olivia with both her imagery and the stylistic delivery of her dramatic rhetoric. Viola's verse is too successful, in unintentionally creating an 'atmosphere of erotic ambiguity';[1620] as Simon Gray (the playwright/director) noted, even if her speech is 'ironic in its exaggerations, it is also insidiously enticing in its rhythms.'[1621] Viola builds to the climax of her lover's declaration, which launches a series of complicated (shared) line exchanges:[1622]

VIOLA	[...] O, you should not rest
	Between the elements of air and earth,
	But you should pity me!
OLIVIA	**You might do much. What is your parentage**?
VIOLA	Above my fortunes, yet my state is well:
	I am a gentleman.
OLIVIA	**Get you to your lord.**
	I cannot love him.

<div align="center">(I.v.207-214)</div>

The nature of the first exchange is unclear.[1623] If Viola's phrase – 'But you should pity me!' (I.v.209) – forms an unfinished line, this might offer a moment for Olivia to pause, to emphasise (perhaps for comic effect) her reaction to Viola's romantic declaration. However, Olivia's reply – 'You might do much' (I.v.210) – could be regarded as the second half of a shared line, which she is completing on cue.[1624] In workshop, we preferred the latter formation. This results in Olivia's vital question – 'What is your parentage?' (I.v.210) – becoming the start of its own isolated half-line, with room for a pause either before or after. We favoured a pause prior to the question, and consequently we felt that this shift in the part represented the best

---

[1619] Warren and Wells, p. 32.
[1620] Ibid.
[1621] Simon Gray, article, *New Statesman*, 28 August 1969, as quoted in Warren and Wells, p. 32.
[1622] The key turns are highlighted in bold type.
[1623] Cf. Warren and Wells, pp. 116-7.
[1624] Cf. Hall – Olivia's cue 'must be directly taken', to allow the audience to 'realise that [she] has fallen in love.' Hall, p. 121.

moment to locate Olivia's love-struck epiphany, with full comic potential. Viola's straightforward answer then appears naïve by comparison.[1625]

In the second exchange, Olivia discovers that 'Cesario' is a 'gentleman' (I.v.212) – that is, of high enough status to make 'him' eligible for Olivia's own romantic consideration.[1626] But Olivia's dismissal – 'Get you to your Lord' (I.v.213) – is so abrupt as to not betray the weight of subtext. The scene ends with the paradox that the disguised Viola has bared her innermost thoughts on love, where the unveiled Olivia has concealed her burgeoning infatuation.

Olivia's shifting attitude revealed two specific actioning considerations. Firstly, I questioned Heather Long on the paradox of having to choose a verb to indicate *passive* action. Regarding Olivia's initial scene objective, I asked whether 'receiving' a guest could be considered too passive a dramatic task.[1627] She remarked that Olivia's engagement never felt 'passive'.[1628] 'Everything had an agenda', even if it was a case of Olivia 'affecting nonchalance.'[1629] Indeed, this supported Long's belief that actors should always make compelling action choices, and that no character should ever be in a purely passive state, being 'not in action'.[1630] Even if a character is 'just […] listening', the actor might play examples such as: the action 'to support' the speaker; or, to try and tacitly encourage the speaker to 'hurry up'.[1631] Silent characters could employ such strategies. Secondly, Long was also keen to highlight the differences between a character's superficial agenda and their underlying motive. By the close of the scene Olivia is enamoured of Viola. Contrary actions can sometimes be derived from the same moment of the text. Olivia's attempt to part on cordial terms is evidence of this precarious balance. She states:

[1625] Hall would suggest a pause here, but for a different purpose (and not comic potential) – to allow Olivia 'to collect herself'. Hall, p. 123.
[1626] Cf. Hall: '[As] this page is a gentleman […] Olivia may be able to pursue her passion.' Ibid.
[1627] Cf. Soliloquy Two.
[1628] Long, W9.
[1629] Ibid.
[1630] Ibid.
[1631] Ibid.

> Fare you well:
> I thank you for your pains. Spend this for me.
> (I.v.216-7)

In Olivia's phrasing, one might find a surface attempt '*to dismiss*'[1632] Viola. However, Long suggested that, in the subtext, Olivia's pure desire is for Viola's return. Olivia is deliberately playing coy (in spite of her surface semantics), and thus her sincere motive is '*[to] entice*' Viola,[1633] to ensure her return. There is conflict here as to whether an actor should therefore choose dismissal or enticement as their action. Both Alfreds and Moseley in fact suggest that an actor should always play the superficial action, the 'action you want the other characters to "see"',[1634] as opposed to 'what he or she might be *thinking* […] *under the surface*.'[1635] In this instance, the practioners' advice would thus be to play Olivia's attempt '*to dismiss*'.

As Warren and Wells recognise, whilst Olivia's behaviour at the scene's close 'may appear humorously incongruous to an onlooker', it is 'no joke [to her as] the person experiencing it.'[1636] Consequently, Olivia is 'aware both of the pain and the irony of her situation as an oncoming wooer.'[1637] One thing that Hall shares in common with various contemporary practitioners, each with their varieties of actioning techniques (in spite of differences in disposition and execution), is that they all acknowledge the dangers of superficial rhetoric. Hall rejects the notion that Viola's famous 'willow cabin' speech be spoken 'as a kind of show piece', which would force the words to serve 'the exact opposite of the dramatic truth.'[1638] Both Hall's tradition and an 'actioned' approach today reconcile the text with nuanced character creation. Again, the rhetorical signposts of a playwright's *elocutio* are thus not to be regarded as 'show piece' artifice, where they may otherwise function as the constituent parts of a dramatic rhetoric, and the process of a staged persuasion.

[1632] Ibid.
[1633] Ibid.
[1634] Alfreds, p. 73.
[1635] Moseley, p. 28.
[1636] Warren and Wells, p. 33.
[1637] Ibid.
[1638] Hall, p. 121.

The Tempest

In the chosen extract from *The Tempest* we encounter two features that are in many ways characteristic of late Shakespearean dramatic *elocutio*.[1639] Firstly, the verse has the more liberated quality of Shakespeare's late style, evidenced by lines overhanging the ten-syllable boundary of the iambic pentameter with 'greater frequency'.[1640] Secondly, the shared line no longer serves with the conspicuous artifice of Shakespeare's earlier career.[1641] Instead, a speaker will regularly leave their final line incomplete with their dialogue partner finishing the metre, almost as a passing on of a baton. The changeover is fluid and, along with the substantial use of hypermetrical lines, this forms evidence of a significant development in verse form, which had clearly taken place by this period of Shakespeare's career.

As the lines in this extract are so frequently hypermetrical, it is a curiously distinct moment in this scene when Ferdinand is struck by a sudden need for verse-constraint. He has just acknowledged Miranda to be 'perfect' and 'peerless' (III.i.56) – almost a composite woman, 'created | Of every creature's best' (III.i.56-7). Miranda has responded with a sudden and forward revelation, born of her (paradoxically) sexually precocious naivety.[1642] She has proclaimed that by the 'jewel in [her] dower' (III.i.64) – that is, her virginity – she would not wish for 'any companion in the world' (III.i.65) except Ferdinand. However, she immediately recognises this revelation as uncensored fervour – a momentary neglect of her 'father's precepts' (III.i.68) – Ferdinand is encouraged to enhance his suit. Thus, he engages in the scene's brief example of consistent, 'regular' (that is ten-syllable count) metre and a shift into a more sober mode of declaration. Typically for this scene, Ferdinand first fluently completes Miranda's metrical half-line. Then he reveals his social status with a measured metrical poise:

[1639] William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*, in the *RSC Complete Works*, III.i.26-109.
[1640] McDonald, p. 101.
[1641] See Repartee Two.
[1642] Frank Kermode instead refers to her as 'inexperienced but not naïve, educated but more candid than another young woman might be […]'. Kermode, p. 295.

> I am in my condition
> A prince, Miranda: I do think, a king –
> I would not so – and would no more endure
> This wooden slavery than to suffer
> The flesh-fly blow my mouth. Hear my soul speak:
> The very instant that I saw you, did
> My heart fly to your service, there resides
> To make me slave to it, and for your sake
> Am I this patient log-man.
>
> (III.i.70-8)

In shifting to stricter pentameter, Ferdinand appears to have succeeded in his rhetorical goal; Miranda immediately replies with, 'Do you love me?' (III.i.79).[1643] He continues in this mode, concluding that he loves, prizes and honours (III.i.85) Miranda, 'Beyond all limit of what else i'th'world' (III.i.84).

Vevers saw this phrase as evidence of a Ferdinand 'who […] isn't actually that poetic or […] romantic, *trying* to be romantic'; he is speaking the verse 'in the right rhythm' but is using imagery that is 'quite small' for its purpose.[1644] As he has apparently used a slightly outmoded, elevated metrical rhythm to achieve his rhetorical aim, perhaps a mastery of figures and tropes evades him. Ferdinand cannot conjure anything like the depth, resonance, or esoteric vision of Viola. Fortunately, he does not have to, as his prospective love is someone who has been rather less frequently wooed than the Countess Olivia.

The workshop applied two exercises in shared line delivery across this scene. The first was based on 'smoothness', as inspired by Peter Hall's approach.[1645] The second exercise, influenced by Declan Donnellan, contrastingly regarded a shared line as a moment of speaker 'interruption'. Donnellan does not mean interruption in the 'literal' sense of a speaker's words being prevented, but in a sense that their

---

[1643] This assumes the question is rhetorical. Alternatively, if Miranda's initial response is played as a genuine question, she will finally be persuaded by Ferdinand's continued use of regular pentameter (which follows) – the moment signalled by her words, 'I am a fool | To weep at what I am glad of' (III.i.86-7).
[1644] Vevers, W9.
[1645] See Repartee Two.

chosen 'target' has been halted.[1646] Donnellan uses the concept of target 'interruption' to explain the progress of any dramatic speech (including the soliloquy). He states: 'development is unavoidable. We cannot say the same word twice. We cannot have the same thought twice'.[1647] An actor can never repeat successive choices of target, irrespective of any literal textual repetition.[1648] He refers to Juliet's repetition of the word 'fain', by illustration:

> Fain would I dwell on form, fain, fain deny
> What I have spoke: but farewell, compliment![1649]

Each time Juliet repeats the word 'fain', her target 'must be different';[1650] 'each thought is not equal to its predecessor […it] thinks it is "better" than its predecessor', and thus 'acquires the quality of interruption' (185). For Donnellan, any dramatic speech should be progressive in this manner, and he applies this same spirit to his treatment of a duologue.

Any section of dialogue may be interpreted as a series of interrupted 'reactions to different targets' (185) – rather than a passage of smoothness, with characters working towards a common goal. Where one character ends their speech with a half line, the 'new target' of the next speaker might be regarded as causing an 'interruption' (185). Donnellan suggests that the rhythm of interruption is 'dependent on the target' (185), but with the caveat that 'interrupting has nothing to do with speed' (186). This contrasts with Peter Hall's position – that by 'observing the form' ingrained in the text, the actor will sound 'completely natural'.[1651] Donnellan does not feel lineation dictates delivery, stating that when 'we appear to interrupt, it is in fact a new target that has interrupted us'.[1652] Interruption is centred on 'the transition

---

[1646] Donnellan, p. 185. See Chapter Two and Soliloquy One, for discussion of the Donnellan 'target'.
[1647] Donnellan, p. 184.
[1648] Cf. Moseley, p. 14.
[1649] *Romeo and Juliet*, in *RSC Complete Works*, II.i.137-8.
[1650] Donnellan, p. 184.
[1651] Hall, p. 27.
[1652] Donnellan, p. 186.

from one thought to the next […].'[1653] Hall instead finds importance in rhythm, where the end of the line offers 'an energetic hesitation that summons up the strength to proceed and define the next line'.[1654]

The most crucial point for Donnellan is that 'interrupting does not mean that the actor has to stop listening'.[1655] He illustrates this with the following dialogue:

ROMEO	O, wilt thou leave me so unsatisfied?
JULIET	What satisfaction canst thou have tonight?
ROMEO	Th'exchange of thy love's faithful vow for mine.
JULIET	I gave thee mine before thou didst request it […]

(II.i.176-9)

Donnellan questions how the actor playing Juliet can both 'listen to Romeo' and 'manage to interrupt him at the same time', as she responds to his word 'unsatisfied.'[1656] His solution is that as Juliet 'modifies' Romeo's word 'into "satisfaction"', she must be hearing 'every syllable' of the ending of the preceding line.[1657] This is complementary to (and indicative of) the general notion that 'as the stakes increase we anticipate more exhaustively what the other will say', and thus our 'production of predictions and possibilities goes into overdrive'.[1658] Thus, it becomes plausible for today's actor-character's reaction time to increase in a scene such as this, where the exact pace of the new line's delivery can be as long as the actor wishes, as 'any silence will fill with thoughts' (189). Even if she 'chooses to leave a long, astonished gap before she enquires: "What satisfaction…" – she will still end up interrupting anyway' (188). And so, for Donnellan, it is the suggestion of a succession of new targets that becomes important – the chain of thoughts linking together – rather than what might seem an arbitrary sense of pacing.

[1653] Ibid.
[1654] Hall, p. 28.
[1655] Donnellan, p. 187.
[1656] Ibid.
[1657] Ibid; cf. a Renaissance player responding to the short cue in their part – Stern, p. 61.
[1658] Ibid.

In our extract from *The Tempest*, Vevers noted the problematic nature of both Miranda and Ferdinand wanting 'the same thing'.[1659] We might expect difficulty in sustaining an interest in the repartee, if both characters aim for the same outcome. Vevers drew from Donnellan's instruction that the same target cannot be repeated. She believed both characters could share the same general wish to further a romantic relationship, whilst each could approach this goal via smaller targets in 'different ways and […] have [discretely] different tactics'.[1660] Heather Long agreed and warned that the playing of 'one objective' and 'one action', regardless of eloquence, could result in a 'dull' performance.[1661] Indeed, the risk in 'those big long speeches, especially as [Ferdinand and Miranda] are matching each other', is that the acting of a single objective might mean the audience will 'just hear a wash' of a fixed emotion, rather than a dialogue rich in exchanges.[1662] They close the scene thus:

> MIRANDA   […]
> You may deny me, but I'll be your servant
> Whether you will or no.
> FERDINAND   My mistress, dearest,
> And I thus humble ever.
> MIRANDA   My husband, then?
> FERDINAND   Ay, with a heart as willing
> As bondage e'er of freedom: here's my hand.
> MIRANDA   And mine, with my heart in't: and now farewell
> Till half an hour hence. […]
> (III.i.100-8)

First, it is apparent how they each employ different tactics to navigate the conversation towards marriage. Miranda speaks of service towards Ferdinand; he counters by describing her as *his* 'mistress'. Yet both their positions meet in a conclusion of shared rhetorical chiasmus: Ferdinand's heart wishes for marriage (like slavery yearns for freedom), and he offers his hand; Miranda offers her hand, placing her heart within it.

[1659] Vevers, W9.
[1660] Ibid.
[1661] Long, W9; cf. Ovens, in Soliloquy Two.
[1662] Ibid.

Secondly, where half-line transitions have previously functioned in this scene almost as baton exchanges, at this moment they more closely resemble the device of classical repartee.[1663] The scene's conclusion contains an odd number of half-lines. In the spirit of Hall, the actors would be obliged to choose where to place a pause – either before or after Miranda says the line, 'My husband, then?' (III.i.104). The first option offers Miranda a brief moment of composure before framing her intimate question. The second option gifts Ferdinand time to assess Miranda's proposal. We found the first version (and therefore a swift response from Ferdinand) best served the spirit of the scene. Miranda has been proactive in her wording leading up to this moment; in stating 'I am your wife' – placing the corollary *before* the conditional, 'if you will marry me' (III.i.98) – she has become the wooer. Above all, for Donnellan, the nature of the target takes precedence (over rhythm of delivery), and Miranda has set her sight upon Ferdinand's hand in marriage.

Both actors preferred the dynamic that was offered by Donnellan's more 'charged'[1664] process, based on interruptions. Long felt that the imposition of a set rhythm would be 'like waiting to catch a ball', turning the scene into 'a dance […] something very safe' with a 'routine to it', more concerned with 'accurate steps' than with compelling drama.[1665] Vevers similarly described a rhythmic exchange as akin to 'juggling with each other', but she also suggested that a long enough rehearsal period could successfully combine 'both' approaches: a reading based on Hall's rhythm merged with a reading based on Donnellan's targets.[1666] Actors 'could technically be picking up the cues and trying to […] work on each other's energies and rhythms' whilst retaining their 'own intentions'.[1667]

Overwhelmingly, the workshop indicated the variety that we can find in Shakespeare's verse, dependent on the stage of his career. In relation to this, we saw further variation in post-Stanislavskian motivations, where target 'interruptions' can

---

[1663] Cf. Repartee Two.
[1664] Vevers, W9.
[1665] Long, W9.
[1666] Vevers, W9.
[1667] Ibid.

be a resourceful tool to solve the riddle of late Shakespeare dynamics. The 'range of metrical devices' that he finessed allowed, towards the end, a 'greater flexibility' to the players.[1668] But where previous rhythmical variation (such as trochaic inversions and feminine endings) had composed the substance of a character's 'emotional volatility',[1669] by the era of *The Tempest* 'virtually any extended speech exhibits the sophisticated sound of the late style.'[1670] The rhythmic effect transcends character, creating a shared dynamic of fluid dialogue that is free from perceived iambic artifice. To the very last therefore, we see evidence that warns us against interpretations (such as iambic fundamentalism) that regard Shakespearean drama as universally conforming to a consistent form of metrical orthodoxy.[1671]

Concluding remarks

The repartee workshops revealed the dramatic-rhetorical range of Shakespeare's quick-witted dialogue, across both genre and career chronology. In the prose repartee of *Much Ado About Nothing* we see evidence of Shakespeare working at the 'high point' of his early-career experimentation,[1672] having developed a 'lyrical'[1673] efficacy that traversed genre boundaries. Beneath the 'verbal figure-skating'[1674] of the surface semantics however, we find the substance of human sincerity; G. K. Hunter has described the two-way process of such prose euphuism, with 'sentiment being sharpened by wit, and wit being humanized by sentiment'.[1675] Whilst a similar stichomythic dynamic is witnessed in *Richard III*, in this early incarnation of his verse repartee, Shakespeare establishes conversation via the dense mechanics of classical rhetoric. Similarly to the versification of Shakespeare's soliloquies we see that, as Harold F. Brooks has noted, variations and 'strongly

---

[1668] McDonald, p. 106.
[1669] McDonald, p. 101. See Soliloquy Two and Enargeia Three in particular.
[1670] McDonald, p. 102.
[1671] Cf. iambic fundamentalism – see Enargeia One.
[1672] Doran, p. 11.
[1673] Brooks, p. xlv.
[1674] Humphreys, p. 222.
[1675] G. K. Hunter, *John Lyly: The Humanist as Courtier* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962), p. 298.

patterned language' indicate specific 'emotional contexts' which are finding their 'pointed schematic expression.'[1676] But such a 'schematic expression' in the text can be the rich resource for present-day actors, who are seeking to establish a network of actions from their role. The schematic expression of an emotion need not suggest the direct acting of a passion itself but, as frequently illustrated through the 'Alfreds actioning' exercise, it can suggest a series of actions which collectively suggest a character's response and thus an implied emotion. By the time of *The Tempest* however, Shakespeare's versification has evolved, becoming so fluid and metrically irregular that much of the early career schematic no longer exists. In this late period, as Russ McDonald observes, 'Shakespeare seems utterly insouciant about the force of the metrical foundation. He observes its norms, but only just.'[1677] Given this, one hopes that actors will increasingly be made aware of the importance of a fluidity that inundates the previous verse confines.

Shakespeare's fashioning of stichomythic wit is, regardless of its medium of construction (whether it be euphuistic prose or verse), always much more substantial than a device of mere artifice. Leah Scragg has discussed the undoubted encouragement of 'an awareness on the part of the audience' that such 'artifice' is being employed.[1678] However, in the extracts from *Much Ado About Nothing* and *Richard III* we see clear evidence of such ornament serving deeper character epiphany. The dramatic-rhetorical mechanics are resolved with revelations of profound human sentiment. Furthermore, beneath the surface of the patterned embellishments, there are in fact a variety of textual routes to performance and there is great 'freedom and flexibility', the dramatic rhetoric serving as a 'ground bass on which an infinite number of variations may be played.'[1679] Where the patterns of the text provide a hidden capacity for variation, it is appropriate that actioning techniques can be seen as developing from a supposedly fixed network to an

---

[1676] Brooks, p. lii.
[1677] McDonald, p. 103.
[1678] Scragg, *Metamorphosis*, p. 18.
[1679] Jonas Barish, *Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy* (New York: Norton, 1970), p. 31; cf. McDonald, p. 119.

expression of multiple nuanced readings. Alfreds asserts that the actor must be 'disciplined' in relation to the 'absolute specificity' of the text, whilst also allowing for the actioning process to be 'open-ended' and imaginative in the selection of chosen actions.[1680] It is thus quite possible to reconcile euphuistic dramatic rhetoric with present-day performance.

On the whole, as with previous workshops in the series, the actors found that Shakespearean repartee responded very well to actioning. Shakespeare's considered syntax offers discrete units of text for the assignation of post-Stanislavskian action. As Mark Quartley reflected, in relation to the *Richard III* extract, the logical progression through the scene was 'comprehensible from a first reading'.[1681] The phrasing of rhetoric offers pragmatic appeal to an actor, particularly if one channels the sentiment of Humphreys, that it is 'equally apt for the mind which follows it, the memory which learns it, and the voice which speaks it […]'.[1682] However, euphuism also especially allows for 'onward-moving attention', which is 'enticing not only to the ear but the mind by expectation of new stages of ingeniously provoked idea'.[1683] We encounter a chain reaction that is notably suggestive of the 'dramatic action' of contemporary theatrical parlance, seeing rhetoric as the ideal conduit for a scene's dramatic progression. The actor can be helpfully influenced by Humphreys' belief that a prose style conveys 'the rhythms of dramatically activated meaning', where the voice can then be used to carry 'meaning' with an ultimate expression in onstage 'action'.[1684] Humphreys' use of the term 'action', as a literary-based anticipation of a theatrical event, comfortably overlaps with the realm of present-day actioning techniques. What is more however, the complementary relationship between *elocutio* and actioning suggests a two-way impact; the workshops emphasised just how far actioning techniques uniquely respond to the nuances of the Shakespearean text. This was a significant revelation throughout the workshop series. Where other acting

---

[1680] Alfreds, p. 163.
[1681] Quartley, W7.
[1682] Humphreys, 'Appendix II', p. 226.
[1683] Ibid.
[1684] Humphreys, 'Introduction', p. 29-30.

approaches may become side-tracked by a tangential investigation of the autobiographical or techniques pertaining strictly to emotion, accurate actioning relies upon an intense textual focus. Actioning seeks out the subtle variations in syntax that are inherent to the technique. Consequently, the process is ready-made to respond to the minute shifts in the cognitive implications that appear as encoded in the Shakespearean text.

Mike Alfreds' approach to actioning then places an additional emphasis on three specific elements: (i) an actor's reaction to their dialogue partner, in their choice *and reception* of actions; (ii) the consequent unique contingencies of live performance; (iii) the greater specificity of actioning, compared to choices of general 'motivation'. 'Alfreds actioning' requires significant preparatory text work of an actor, its first application in a rehearsal context is through actors working 'on their feet'[1685] and playing reactions to their dialogue partners, where 'reaction is as important as action';[1686] and at its core, Alfreds' method focuses on 'interdependence'.[1687] The result is that actors respond to the essence of their partner's chosen action, rather than simply a lexical 'cue'. And, as there may be subtle shifts in the manner in which an action is played, the entire technique fundamentally embraces 'live' contingencies, being permanently spontaneous and 'in some state of improvisation'.[1688] This approach thus lends itself particularly well to repartee, as we may recognise in Brian Vickers's companion spirit; he describes the euphuism of *Much Ado About Nothing* as offering language that is 'always so fresh as to seem spontaneous' and he recognises in the characters' language a 'minting of minds commanding their resources', where Beatrice's effect of repartee allows for replies that are 'made to seem like improvisation'.[1689]

We cannot know precisely how the repartee would have been presented on the Renaissance stage. Euphuism, in its Lylian usage, began life in the context of the

---

[1685] Alfreds, p. 165.
[1686] Alfreds, p. 166.
[1687] Alfreds, p. 169.
[1688] Ibid.
[1689] Vickers, *Artistry*, p. 174.

Paul's Boys company. It was enacted by what Andrew Gurr has described as 'academically tutored schoolchildren', expressing rhetoric with 'careful speech and studied gesture.'[1690] However, for all their literary prowess and noted 'speed of repartee',[1691] Leah Scragg has highlighted how Lyly's drama was designed to place 'minimal strain on the [boy] actors' histrionic skills';[1692] much of the drama and details of characterisation were achieved by 'non-verbal means'[1693] and the capabilities of the 'juvenile troupe' for 'dancing […] and song.'[1694] Shakespearean euphuistic repartee occurs in a quite different context of apprenticed boy players (in female roles) applying their quick-witted skill whilst sharing the stage with adult males. Clearly there is a much richer psychological framework to the style as penned by Shakespeare. But the repartee would still have been designed with the anticipation of a cue-based delivery. In the present-day rehearsal room by contrast, using Alfreds' methods, one can begin to root a character's reaction in the full context of their partner's line, where one might presume that a Renaissance player would be more reliant upon the spontaneity of the staged performance for such a reaction.

On the one hand, we witness Shakespeare's commitment to specific fixtures of prosody, such as prose-to-verse transitions. Our *Much Ado About Nothing* extract provides an excellent example, with a prose transition that Russ McDonald has described as the '"coda" of the love confession'[1695] between Beatrice and Benedick. As the 'two wits have resisted and sparred with each other', prose is the appropriate mode for such sincere revelation, and 'their attraction and self-revelations […] seem "natural" […]' as a result.[1696] However, we also see Shakespeare freeing himself from formal shackles as his career progresses. He inherited an iambic beat that had been established and prevalent across Renaissance drama for a thirty-year period. For much of his career metrical variations (such as trochaic inversions and feminine

---

[1690] Gurr, p. 116.
[1691] Potter, p. 91.
[1692] Scragg, *Metamorphosis*, p. 39.
[1693] Ibid.
[1694] Scragg, *Metamorphosis*, p. 5.
[1695] McDonald, p. 129.
[1696] Ibid.

endings) provide suitable formal signals to an actor, indicating the expression of a certain passion in the role or the structuring of a character's thought process. Yet we see that his late career work is a notable exception, where variations are used so frequently and audaciously to become the commonplace pattern, threatening 'to efface the pentameter altogether'.[1697] Underneath this irregular beat however is the inescapable memory of the model iambic line, the 'fundamental pattern' is never forgotten, causing a 'tension between line and phrase.'[1698] With the backdrop of more conspicuous 'theatrical invention', Shakespeare was increasingly engaged in such 'aural experiments' throughout his late work.[1699] For this very reason, a promotion of Shakespearean metrical orthodoxy (so called 'iambic fundamentalism'), where present-day actor training is concerned, cannot adequately respond to the depths of his metrical nuance.

It is a curious juxtaposition that just as Shakespeare's drama moves towards increasingly '"unrealistic"' stagecraft, his metrical irregularity is suggesting speech rhythms that are increasingly '"natural" or conversational'.[1700] If one compares the chronological gap between *Gorboduc* and Shakespeare's earliest work with the gap across Shakespeare's own career, the relative scope and pace of Shakespeare's development is extraordinary. At the start of his career Shakespeare was using, albeit with considerable skill, a then-established form of stage versification. Twenty years later, when he comes to write his final solo-authored play, Shakespeare has playfully innovated across genre boundaries and in forms of both verse and prose (elaborating in each case on the foundation of his dramatic antecedents). One constant throughout is his commitment to linguistic figures and tropes by which he cultivates the flesh and bones of engaging human characters. Where he has moved away from 'iambic consistency', he retains a 'poetic coherence' that 'ameliorates' its loss, as indicated

---

[1697] McDonald, p. 101.
[1698] Ibid.
[1699] Ibid.
[1700] McDonald, p. 106.

by a continued use of features such as 'extravagant alliteration, […] consonance and assonance, [and] various forms of lexical and phrasal repetition'.[1701]

Our workshops revealed that even where the repartee was at its most heightened – what Sarah Ovens referred to as a 'weird dance'[1702] between the characters – each role retained a discrete sense of identity. In the *Richard III* extract, various shifts in character dominance were indicated by the stichomythia, and the dynamic of which party is undertaking what might be called the 'returning' in the rally of wits. Yet even though both parties were employing the same general rhetorical devices (down to the level of rhythmical italics and individual syllabic feet), the two characters were seen to be resolutely individual in the strategies that they employed, beneath the superficial accord of the language.

In 'Alfreds actioning', one could find a similar distinction between the general pattern of a conversation and the capacity for a character's individual voice to be heard. The great importance for Alfreds is that 'however heightened or poetic the language of a play may be, *the characters are always engaged in conversation and the dialogue must be heard as conversation.*'[1703] Where he encourages in actors a mutually reactive approach, which enlivens such dialogue, he also uses actioning to offer great specificity and individuality. Thus, where the rhetoric of the role is at its most complex, in the case of a character seeking 'to lie, deceive […] or confuse', the focus is on the actor-character playing the action that they want the other character '*to "see" and accept*'.[1704] Characters of individual nuance emerge, whilst the methodology ensures that repartee consistently serves a live theatrical embodiment, where actors' mutual tactics are always 'in direct response to the reactions they are eliciting from their partners in the scene.'[1705]

[1701] Ibid.
[1702] Ovens, W7.
[1703] Alfreds, p. 196.
[1704] Alfreds, p. 73.
[1705] Alfreds, p. 68.

Conclusion

This thesis chiefly represents the simultaneous presence, in our present-day rehearsal room, of an intensely dramatic-rhetorical conception of an 'origin text' and a company practice that is influenced by post-Stanislavskian sensibilities. In addition however, to clarify what it means to function as dramatic rhetoric and on post-Stanisvlaskian terms, I have presented extended detail in four key areas. Firstly, I have proposed a revisionist view of what it really means to be a post-Stanislavskian practitioner, on Stanislavski's own terms. Secondly, I have provided an account of British developments in post-Stanislavskian practice, including an investigation of the text-orientated techniques that are favoured by leading theatre directors. This has included an account of the history and development of actioning (and other related techniques), where there is not currently a comprehensive one in published existence. Thirdly, the thesis has explored how Shakespeare's playwriting functioned, in terms of its dramatic-rhetorical style, and its staged mechanics, drawing from the very latest academic investigations in a range of fields (from detailed metrical analysis to research in Renaissance theatre production). Most importantly, as a programme of research that was distinct to this thesis, I turned to practical workshops to provide a series of case studies. Each of these has reinforced the importance of wider textual context, when analysing a given Shakespearean extract. Research has found that whilst the most challenging and distinct areas of Renaissance style (such as soliloquies, *enargeia* and repartee) developed considerably throughout Shakespeare's career, post-Stanislavskian techniques can respond to nuance and variation.

This thesis has implications for how literary scholars today might read a text as a basis for present-day performance, and for how historians of theatre practice should consider how a range of twentieth century and twenty-first century performance approaches interact with Shakespeare's text. However, the strongest proposal of the research is aimed at present-day rehearsal practice. I propose the development of a practice that encourages significant features of Shakespearean

elocutio to form the basis of inspiration for the application of post-Stanislavskian techniques. I draw from the significant contribution of strongly text-orientated practitioners (such as Hall and Barton) as well as the modernising influences of significant post-Stanislavskian figures (such Alfreds and Donnellan), where current manuals do not bring together strands of practice in this manner. The result is that an actor today can feel confident that they are mining a source text for key aspects of authorial *elocutio*, whilst knowing that they will still have the freedom to embody such nuances in their role with techniques that serve a contemporary presentation of a staged 'character'.

One of the discoveries of this thesis is that actioning directly mirrors the complexity of the units of thought in a text (be they erratic or fluid, rapid or elongated), which the playwright would 'encode' in the text.[1706] Actioning stands out as a technique owing to its relentless textual orientation and its sensitivity to specific textual nuance. In Shakespeare, it can respond to the 'suspended syntax' and construct cumulative chains – each action responding to each syntactic clause, as we build to periodic 'conclusion'.[1707] A playwright's stylistic nuance forms a mutually responsive dialogue with the attribution of any action. In the meeting place between actioning and Shakespeare, the text provides very distinct patterns of 'character' cognition. Where Renaissance players may be considered as performance rhetoricians, today's actors attempt to reverse-engineer the text, at least in terms of their own character's purpose at any given moment. Actioning is in constant dialogue with the text and will intimately respond to issues relating to character progression, tempo, and genre. In this way it has a far greater versatility than more generic, emotive techniques (such as those promoted by the American Method),[1708] and its application to larger rhetorical set-pieces reveals their hidden moments of

---

[1706] Palfrey and Stern, p. 329. Cf. McDonald, p. 101.
[1707] Cf. Alexander, 'Introduction', p. xlv; cf. Puttenham, in Alexander, p. 109.
[1708] See Chapter One.

intricacy (where other techniques may only offer a superficial emotive 'wash').[1709] Post-Stanislavskians draw us away from dated Stanislavskian misconceptions.

Post-Stanislavskian practice also has the utility to be telescopic with a text, and with relentless focus. It is very common for directors today to 'unit' a text, responding to the larger arrangement of scenes (in a dramatic-rhetorical sense the playwright's *dispositio*), whilst techniques such as actioning can take the actor through various levels, down to the microscopic consideration of syllables (in the playwright's *elocutio*). Consequently, actioning might be considered more as an adaptable framework rather than a singular technique (in the manner of emotion recall). In return, Shakespeare provides the semblance of a cognitive network; in the text of an actor's role we find copious evidence for the actor-character's live decision making. Just as such evidence vivified the personation of Early Modern players, exactly the same network can be adopted by present-day practitioners, who are increasingly developing techniques that encourage the creation of a discrete character (where the actor-character can 'own' their words).

Actioning can overcome the overwise 'intransigent materiality of performance', the sense of two parallel texts of a 'dramatic theatre'.[1710] The actor is no longer a 'ministerial'[1711] conduit for the interpretive proclamation of a text, where the practice instead relates to theatre as the productive 'event'[1712] and the presence of an actor-character with embodied, real-time agency. Given their own unique corporeality, actors can be confident that their response will be a unique treatment of the character, and that the actioned result will be capable of responding in-the-moment 'on different occasions.'[1713]

In many instances, actioning reveals how Shakespeare's text has responded so well across shifting eras of theatre history. We do not necessarily see a universalist sense of character as written, but more the timeless dramatic capacity of

---

[1709] See Ovens, W2.
[1710] Worthen, p. 6.
[1711] Worthen, p. 12; cf. Weimann, p. 185.
[1712] Worthen, p. 7; cf. Weimann, p. 182.
[1713] Cf. Lieblein, p. 128.

the text to suggest a network of 'thought', which can then find application in a variety of transhistorical acting techniques. In the soliloquy, we find that a transitive action enables an actor to externalise the brimming deliberation of the speech. In performance, the audience responds as a body. We witness the corporate event, a soliloquy-in-dialogue rather than a moment of self-absorption.[1714] In moments of *enargeia*, actors are aided by the depth of Shakespeare's circumstantial dramaturgy, actor-characters trying to persuade the audience or dialogue partners about the veracity of their claim and revealing focused purpose and desire.[1715] And where we encounter stylised repartee, Alfreds' specific variety of actioning allows for the actors to be mutually responsive to each other and immediately responsive to the text, in a manner that creates a collaborative actor-character construct.[1716] In this manner, by applying post-Stanislavskian techniques in today's Shakespearean rehearsal room, we can unlock Renaissance features in a more representative and accurate fashion, whilst anticipating a more engaging dramatic output (in terms of the present-day, performed outcome).

The process can only be one of anticipation, as dramatic character can only be fulfilled, phenomenologically speaking, with the additional agency of a live audience. Yet actions are best assessed in the rehearsal context, where they can be discussed with greatest specificity. Caldarone and Lloyd-Williams remind us that it is by no means anticipated that the audience members will be able to identify each 'individual action'. We do not expect them to report back a list of transitive verbs, as played by the actor and then accurately recognised in reception. The purpose of the technique is that it will result in a performance which is 'interesting and absolutely watchable because of its precision'[1717] – as the 'tonal variety and textural depth provided by […] actions conveys acting which is truthful and specific, rather than phoney and generalised' (xxi). The audience will witness an actor in the midst of intense deliberation and recognise signs of a live, embodied thinking process.

[1714] See Chapter 5.
[1715] See Chapter 6.
[1716] See Chapter 7.
[1717] Caldarone and Lloyd-Williams, p. xi.

The professional actors in my workshops represented a cross-section of practitioners with considerable Shakespeare experience. From their comments and their interaction in the workshops, it is clear that actioning is a technique that can work across different production contexts. It could be used equally for naturalistic modern dialogue or an Early Modern Speech production of Shakespeare. In expansion of this thesis, one continuation would be to take the text of a Shakespearean extract and to perform 'table-work' actioning with a choreographer and a dancer. Once actions had been discussed, the direct linguistic network in the text could be directly transformed into gesture/dance. In such a manner one could judge how far inherent performance dynamics might be transmitted, in the total absence of the spoken word.

Shakespeare offers the actor an uncommon range of useful provocations. Where he may be judged to have transcended rhetoric during his career, we might in fact find, in his stylistic development, the 'absorption of its principles'.[1718] The actor searches for a network of intention and Shakespeare's dramatic rhetoric responds in a far richer manner than typical present-day texts. We see how, in its very fabric, 'the verse is animated by a constant tension between the regularity of the beat and the syntactical or semantic pressures of the sentence'.[1719] From this, the actor is given greater inspiration for the selection of an action. The rehearsal room process represents 'preparatory thinking', but in the culmination of Shakespearean *elocutio* and post-Stanislavskian action it could be said that we witness the construction of a network. The eventual performance, whilst seeming apparently 'mindless', will actually have the solid foundations for a living and breathing form of 'in-performance thinking'.[1720]

Palfrey and Stern have questioned the 'apparent completeness' of a given character in Shakespearean text, given the 'lacunae in actors' parts'.[1721] They ask two

---

[1718] McDonald, p. 48.
[1719] George T. Wright, in McDonald, p. 8.
[1720] Robert Cohen, in Evelyn B. Tribble, 'Distributed Cognition, Mindful Bodies and the Arts of Acting', in Blair and Cook, p. 138.
[1721] Palfrey and Stern, p. 493.

things: (i) if 'any speech-action' can 'carry all of a mind with it' and (ii) whether 'any decision can make sense, or even take effect, without the co-operation or coercion of another'.[1722] In varieties of actioning we see that firstly, the actor-character responds on a moment-by-moment basis. A post-Stanislavskian Hamlet does not perform all actions in the general manner of a universalised 'Hamlet', where instead his actions cumulatively throughout the play suggest a glimpse into his character, within a very specific context. In their second question, Palfrey and Stern in fact describe the very purpose of actioning's dynamic, where the only thrust of any action is to exact a response from the recipient of the action verb, whether that be another onstage actor or the audience.

I found little evidence of 'iambic fundamentalist' practice amongst my workshop actors. For them, it was seen as problematic to regard verse features primarily as the instruction to deliver a 'beat' for audience recognition; here my research makes a departure from the suggestions of Rokison, Palfrey and Stern, and various theatre practitioners (most notably Peter Hall).[1723] The workshops still promoted the crucial role of versification, but not in the manner of signposting to an audience that a specific line is in iambic pentameter, with a metronomic vocalisation of the beat. Instead, for many contemporary actors the versification (which is still regarded with the same degree of importance), with all its useful variations, informs small choices in the action that is performed by an actor-character. From this network a character is then formed, which may influence the audience's reception in a variety of ways. Naturally, many features of Shakespeare's dramatic rhetoric are common to other Renaissance playwrights; broader similarities abound in terms of his use of tropes, figures and even metrical nuances.[1724] However, the workshops of this thesis helped to indicate the unique way in which he managed to command and develop these features, in creating a dramatic rhetoric that was distinctly his own.

[1722] Ibid.
[1723] Rokison, p. 26; Palfrey and Stern, pp. 320-321; Hall, p. 25.
[1724] See Chapter 3.

The suggestion of this thesis, in response to Shakespearean workshop examples, is that techniques in the field of actioning can in fact be fruitfully composed of the most microscopic aspects of Renaissance rhetoric. Rather than fearing rhetorical elements as fixed and prescriptive, the vestige of a long-lost performance style outcome, practitioners today can use the rhetorical prompts in rehearsal to construct a performance that responds to the text, whilst serving a compelling, present-day embodiment.

Appendix E

This is a sample that represents some of the questions that I asked actors during the start of each workshop. Questions were selected depending on the type of workshop, the actor present and the small amount of time available to this introduction stage of the workshop. The list of questions developed across the period that workshops were being conducted.

Actors' Survey

Do you always take the same approach to character in plays you have performed?

Do you tend to establish an overall character arc?

Are there routine activities you carry out, e.g. writing character lists, etc?

Have you ever been asked to perform in a way that doesn't represent the idea of a well-rounded character, e.g. figuratively or performing language rhythms?

What is your understanding of actioning? When have you used it? Do you use the thesaurus book?

Who decides the action: the director or the actor?

Have you worked with directors using actions?

What is your understanding of 'verse' in Shakespeare? Are there certain rules that have to be followed?

What sort of advice have you encountered from directors, relating to the Shakespeare text?

Have you encountered any specific text editions that are favoured?

What about the punctuation of a Shakespeare text?

Is the 'subconscious' of the character important? Is there such a thing?

Is it possible to action the play and then perform the same network of actions in a number of different performance styles (e.g. farce, melodrama, tragedy, naturalism)?

Photograph: Dickon Tyrrell (playing Sir Toby Belch), with Natasha Magigi (as Maria). *Twelfth Night* (Shakespeare's Globe, 2016).

Photo credit: Cesare de Giglio.

Sarah Ovens (as Juliet). *Measure for Measure*, dir. by Roxana Silbert (RSC, 2011).

David Sturzaker (as Bolingbroke). *Richard II*, dir. by Simon Godwin (Shakespeare's Globe, 2015). Photo credit: Johan Persson.

PLEASE CONSULT THE PRINT COPY IN THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Brian Ferguson (as Buckingham), in *Richard III*, dir. by Roxana Silbert (RSC, 2012).

Jo Herbert (playing Rosalind, *right*), with Beth Park (as Celia, *left*). *As You Like It*, dir. by James Dacre (Shakespeare's Globe, 2011). Photo credit: Abbey Walmsley.

PLEASE CONSULT THE PRINT COPY IN THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

David Sturzaker (as Bracciano). *The White Devil*, dir. by Maria Aberg (RSC, 2014).

Mark Quartley (as Ariel). *The Tempest*, dir. Greg Doran (RSC, 2017).

PLEASE CONSULT THE PRINT COPY IN THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Bibliography

Reference Works

Oxford English Dictionary Online (Oxford University Press)
     <https://www.oed.com>

Primary Sources

Ad C. Herennium de ratione dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium), trans. by Harry
     Caplan (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1954)

Ad C. Herennium de ratione dicendi (Rhetorica ad Herennium), trans. by
     Harry Caplan (London: William Heineman Ltd., 1954; repr. 1964)

Alexander, Gavin, ed., *Sidney's 'The Defence of Poesy' and Selected Renaissance
     Literary Criticism* (London: Penguin, 2004)

Arden of Faversham, ed. by Polly Findlay and Zoë Svendsen (London: Nick Hern
     Books, 2014)

Aristotle, *Poetics*, in *Classical Literary Criticism*, ed. by D. A. Russell and Michael
     Winterbottom (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Brooke, Arthur, *The Tragicall Historye of Romeus and Juliet* (London: Richard
     Tottill, 1562)

Bulwer, John, *Chironomia*, in John Bulwer, *Chirologia*: or the Naturall Language of
     the Hand (London: Thomas Harper, 1644) B5462

Cicero, *Cicero on Oratory and Orators*, trans. by J. S. Watson (Carbondale and
     Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1986)

– –, *De Inventione*, trans. by C.D. Yonge (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853)

– –, *De Oratore,* trans. by E.W. Sutton (London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1962)

Dryden, John, *The rival ladies: a tragi-comedy* (London: William Wilson, 1664)
     D2346

Fitz-Geffry, Charles, 'Compassion Towards Captives' (Oxford: Printed by Leonard Lichfield, for Edward Forrest, 1637)

Ford, John, *The Broken Heart*, ed. by T. J. B. Spencer (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1980)

– –, *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, ed. by Derek Roper (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1975)

Fraunce, Abraham, *Arcadian Rhetorike* (London: Thomas Orwin, 1588) STC 11338

[Gainsford, Thomas, as T. G.?] *The Rich Cabinet* (London: Printed by I. B. for Roger Jackson, 1616)

Gascoigne, George, 'Certain Notes of Instruction', in *Sidney's 'The Defence of Poesy' and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. by Gavin Alexander (London: Penguin, 2004)

– –, *Jocasta,* in *A Hundred Sundrie Flowres*, ed. by G. W. Pigman III (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000; repr. 2008)

Heywood, Thomas, *An Apology for Actors* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1612; repr. New York: Garland, 1973)

Howard, Henry, *The Second Book of Virgil's 'Aeneid'*, in *Poetical Works of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey: Minor Contemporaneous Poets and Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst*, ed. by Robert Bell (London: John W. Parker and Son, 1854)

Hughes, Thomas, *The Misfortunes of Arthur* (London: Robert Robinson, 1587; repr. by John S. Farmer for Tudor Facsimile Texts, 1911)

Kyd, Thomas, *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. by J. R. Mulryne and Andrew Gurr (London: Bloomsbury, 2009)

The Lamentable and True Tragedie of M. Arden of Faversham in Kent (London: Edward White, 1592)

Lyly, John, *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit* and *Euphues and His England*, ed. by Leah Scragg (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003)

– –, *Love's Metamorphosis,* ed. by Leah Scragg (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008)

– –, *Sapho and Phao* (London: Thomas Cadman, 1584) STC 17086

Marlowe, Christopher, *The Jew of Malta*, in *The Complete Works of Christopher Marlowe, Vol. 4*, ed. by Roma Gill (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)

– –, *Tamburlaine, Parts One and Two*, ed. by Anthony B. Dawson (London: Bloomsbury, 2003)

North, Thomas, 'The Life of Marcus Antonius', *Plutarch's Lives, Englished by Sir Thomas North*, Vol.9 (1579) in *The Temple Plutarch*, ed. by W.H.D. Rouse (London: J M Dent, 1899; repr. 1910), pp. 1-118

Norton, Thomas, and Thomas Sackville, *The Tragedie of Gorboduc* (London: William Griffith, 1565)

Peacham, Henry, *The Garden of Eloquence* (London: printed by R.F. for H. Jackson, 1593) STC 19498

Puttenham, George, *The Art of English Poesy*, in *Sidney's 'The Defence of Poesy' and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism*, ed. by Gavin Alexander (London: Penguin, 2004)

Quintilian, *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, trans. by H.E. Butler, vol. 2 (London: Heinemann, 1921; repr.1977)

Seneca, Lucius Annaeus, and E. F. Watling, *Four Tragedies and Octavia* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1966)

Shakespeare, William, et. al, *William Shakespeare and Others: Collaborative Plays*, ed. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013)

Talon, Omer, *Rhetorica* (Paris: Steph. Prevosteau, 1599)

Theophrastus, *Characters*, ed. and trans. by Jeffrey Rusten and I. C. Cunningham (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2002)

The Tragedy of Master Arden of Faversham, ed. by M. L. Wine (The Revels Plays, Methuen: London, 1973)

Webster, John, *The Duchess of Malfi and Other Plays*, ed. René Weis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)

Wilson, Thomas, *The Art of Rhetorique* (London: George Robinson, 1553; repr. 1585) STC 25806

– –, *Arte of Rhetorique*, ed. by Thomas J. Derrick (London: Garland, 1982)

Wright, Thomas, *The Passions of the Minde in Generall*, (London: Miles Flesher, 1630; facsimile repr. London: University of Illinois Press, 1971)

Referenced Editions of Shakespeare

a) Complete Works:

The Bodleian First Folio: Digital Facsimile of the First Folio of Shakespeare's Plays (London: Printed by Isaac Jaggard and Ed. Blount, 1623), Bodleian Library, Arch. G c.7. <http://firstfolio.bodleian.ox.ac.uk>

The Oxford Shakespeare: The Complete Works, ed. by Stanley Wells, Gary Taylor, and Others, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005; repr. 2006)

The RSC Shakespeare: The Complete Works, ed. by Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007)

Individual plays cited within the RSC Complete Works:
    Antony and Cleopatra; *Cymbeline*; *The First Part of Henry the Sixth*; *Hamlet*; *Henry the Fifth*; *King Lear*; *Macbeth*; *The Merchant of Venice*; *A Midsummer Night's Dream*; *Much Ado About Nothing*; *Othello*; *Pericles*; *Richard the Second*; *Richard the Third*; *Romeo and Juliet*; *The Taming of the Shrew*; *The Tempest*; *Titus Andronicus*; *Twelfth Night*; and *The Winter's Tale*.

b) Individual editions:

Antony and Cleopatra

Shakespeare, William, *Antony and Cleopatra*, ed. by John Wilders (London: Arden, 1995)

– –, *The Tragedy of Anthony and Cleopatra*, ed. by Michael Neill (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994)

Hamlet

Shakespeare, William, *Hamlet*, ed. by G.R. Hibbard (Oxford: Oxford University Press: 1987; repr. 1991)

– –, *Hamlet*, ed. by Harold Jenkins (London: Methuen, 1982; repr. London: Thomson, 2002) [Arden Second Series]

– –, *Hamlet*, ed. by Ann Thompson and Neil Taylor (London: Arden Shakespeare, 2006)
[Arden Third Series]

– –, *Hamlet: Prince of Denmark*, ed. by Philip Edwards (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1985; repr. 2001)

– –, *The Tragedie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke*, in *The Bodleian First Folio: Digital Facsimile of the First Folio of Shakespeare's Plays*
(London: Printed by Isaac Jaggard and Ed. Blount, 1623), Bodleian Library, Arch. G c.7. <http://firstfolio.bodleian.ox.ac.uk> [accessed 17 April 2016]

– –, *The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet*, *Prince of Denmarke* (1603) [Q1]. London, British Library, C.34.k.1, STC 22275 [accessed 17 April 2016]
<http://www.quartos.org/main.php>

– –, *The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet, Prince of Denmarke* (London: Printed by I.R. for N.L., 1604) [Q2]. Washington, D.C., Folger Library, STC 22276 [accessed 17 April 2016]
<http://www.quartos.org/main.php>

Julius Caesar

Shakespeare, William, *The Tragedie of Julius Caesar*, in *The Bodleian First Folio: Digital Facsimile of the First Folio of Shakespeare's Plays*
(London: Printed by Isaac Jaggard and Ed. Blount, 1623), Bodleian Library, Arch. G c.7. [accessed 9 May 2016] <http://firstfolio.bodleian.ox.ac.uk>

A Midsummer Night's Dream

Shakespeare, William, *A Midsommer nights dreame* (London: Thomas Fisher, 1600)[Q1] STC 22302 [accessed 9 May 2016]
<http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/doc/MND_Q1/scene/Titlepage/>

– –, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. by Harold F. Brooks (London: Arden Methuen, 1979; repr. Thomson Learning, 2006)

– –, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. by Peter Holland (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)

Much Ado About Nothing

Shakespeare, William, *Much adoe about Nothing* (London: printed by V.S. for Andrew Wise and William Aspley, 1600) [Q1] STC 22304 [accessed 9 June 2016] <http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/doc/Ado_Q1/scene/Titlepage/>

– –, *Much adoe about Nothing,* in *The Bodleian First Folio: Digital Facsimile of the First Folio of Shakespeare's Plays* (London: Printed by Isaac Jaggard and Ed. Blount, 1623), Bodleian Library, Arch. G c.7. [accessed 9 June 2016] <http://firstfolio.bodleian.ox.ac.uk>

– –, *Much Ado About Nothing*, ed. by A. R. Humphreys (Methuen: London, 1981 – for Arden 2nd Series; repr. Thomson: London, 2003)

Othello

Shakespeare, William, *Othello*, ed. by E.A.J. Honigmann (London: Arden, 1997; repr. Thomson Learning, 2006)

Richard III

Shakespeare, William, *The Life and Death of Richard III*, in *The Bodleian First Folio: Digital Facsimile of the First Folio of Shakespeare's Plays* (London: Printed by Isaac Jaggard and Ed. Blount, 1623), Bodleian Library, Arch. G c.7. [accessed 3 June 2016] <http://firstfolio.bodleian.ox.ac.uk>

– –, *The Tragedy of King Richard the third* (London: printed by Valentine Sims for Andrew Wise, 1597) [Q1] STC 22314 [accessed 3 June 2016]

– –, *The Tragedy of King Richard the Third*, ed. by John Jowett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)

Romeo and Juliet

Shakepeare, William, *An Excellent conceited Tragedie of Romeo and Juliet* (London: printed by John Danter, 1597) [Q1] STC 22322 [accessed 11 May 2016] <http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/doc/Rom_Q1/scene/Titlepage/>

– –, *The Most Excellent and lamentable Tragedie, of Romeo and Juliet* (London: printed by Thomas Creede for Cuthbert Burby, 1599) [Q2] STC 22323 [accessed 11 May 2016] < http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/doc/Rom_Q2/scene/Titlepage/>

– –, *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. by Jill Levenson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)

– –, *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. by T. J. B. Spencer (London: Penguin, 1967; repr. 2005)

– –, *The Tragedie of Romeo and Juliet,* in *The Bodleian First Folio: Digital Facsimile of the First Folio of Shakespeare's Plays* (London: Printed by Isaac Jaggard and Ed. Blount, 1623), Bodleian Library, Arch. G c.7. [accessed 11 May 2016] <http://firstfolio.bodleian.ox.ac.uk>

Twelfth Night

Shakespeare, William, *Twelfth Night*, *or What You Will*, ed. by Roger Warren and Stanley Wells (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994)

Secondary Sources

Texts

Adamson, Sylvia, Gavin Alexander and Katrin Ettenhuber, eds, *Renaissance Figures of Speech* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Alexander, Gavin, ed., *Sidney's 'The Defence of Poesy' and Selected Renaissance Literary Criticism* (London: Penguin, 2004)

Alfreds, Mike, *Different Every Night: Freeing the Actor* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2007; repr. 2013)

– –, *Then What Happens? Storytelling and Adapting for the Theatre* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2013)

Altman, Joel B., *The Improbability of Othello: Rhetorical Anthropology and Shakespearean Selfhood* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010)

Arciniegas, Diego, "Retracing Antonio: In Search of the Merchant of Venice", in *Shakespeare's Sense of Character: On the Page and From the Stage*, ed. by Yu Jin Ko and Michael W. Shurgot (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012)

Armstrong, W. A., 'The Influence of Seneca and Machiavelli on the Elizabethan Tyrant', *The Review of English Studies*, 24 (1948), 19–35

Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things With Words* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975)

Bailey, James, *Toward a Statistical Analysis of English Verse: the Iambic Tetrameter of Ten Poets* (Lisse, Netherlands: The Peter de Ridder Press, 1975)

Baker, Howard, *Induction to Tragedy: a Study in a Development of Form in Gorboduc, The Spanish Tragedy and Titus Andronicus* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1965)

Barish, Jonas, *Ben Jonson and the Language of Prose Comedy* (New York: Norton, 1970)

Barthes, Roland, 'L'Effet de Réel', *Communications*, 11 (1968), 84-89.

– –, 'To Write: An Intransitive Verb?', in *The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man: The Structuralist Controversy*, ed. by Richard Macksey and Eugenio Donato John Hopkins Press (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, London: 1970)

Barton, John, *Playing Shakespeare* (London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, 1984; reissued with DVD 2009; repr. 2014)

Bate, Jonathan, *The Genius of Shakespeare* (London: Picador, 1997)

– –, *Soul of the Age: The Life, Mind and World of William Shakespeare* (London: Viking Penguin, 2008)

Benedetti, Jean, *Stanislavski: An Introduction* (London: Methuen, 1982)

– –, "Translator's Foreword", in Konstantin Stanislavski, *An Actor's Work: A Student's Diary*, trans. and ed. by Jean Benedetti (London: Routledge, 2010)

Bentley, Eric, *The Theory of the Modern Stage: An Introduction to Modern Theatre and Drama* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968)

Bentley, Gerald Eades, *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time 1590-1642* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971)

Belsey, Catherine, *The Subject of Tragedy: Identity and difference in Renaissance Drama* (London: Methuen, 1985)

Berry, Cicely, *The Actor and the Text* (London: Harrap Ltd, 1987; rev. Virgin Books, 1993; repr. 2006)

Billington, Michael, *State of the Nation* (London: Faber and Faber, 2007)

[Birkett, Michael, as M. B.?], 'A Draft Artistic Policy', in *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, ed. by Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Blair, Rhonda, 'Image and action: Cognitive neuroscience and actor-training', in *Performance and Cognition: Theatre studies and the cognitive turn*, ed. by Bruce McConachie and F. Elizabeth Hart (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006),167-185

Blair, Rhonda, and Amy Cook, eds, *Theatre, Performance and Cognition: Languages, Bodies and Ecologies* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016)

Blamires, Harry, *A Short History of English Literature*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge, 1994)

Blanc, Pauline, ed., *Selfhood on the Early Modern Stage* (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2008)

Block, Giles, *Speaking the Speech: An Actor's Guide to Shakespeare* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2013; repr. 2014)

Bloom, Michael, *Thinking Like a Director: A Practical Handbook* (London: Faber, 2002)

Booker, Christopher, *The Seven Basic Plots: Why We Tell Stories* (London: Continuum, 2004)

Bond, R. Warwick, 'Lyly as a Playwright', in *The Complete Works of John Lyly, Volume II*, ed. by R. Warwick Bond (Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1902)

Borchmeyer, Dieter, *Richard Wagner: Theory and Theatre* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991)

Bowers, Fredson, *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy, 1587-1642* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940)

Bowsher, Julian, *Shakespeare's London Theatreland: Archaeology, history and drama* (London: Museum of London Archaeology, 2012)

Boyer, Clarence Valentine, *The Villain as Hero in Elizabethan Tragedy* (London: G. Routledge and Sons, 1914)

Boyle, A. J., *Tragic Seneca: An Essay in the Theatrical Tradition* (London: Routledge, 1997)

Bradley, A. C., *Shakespearean Tragedy: Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth* (Basingstoke: Palgrave McMillan, 2007)

Brenton, Howard, *Plays:1* (London: Methuen, 1986)

Bridges, Robert, 'A Letter to a Musician on English Prosody', in *The Structure of Verse: Modern Essays on Prosody*, ed. by Harvey Gross (New York: Echo Press, 1979)

– –, *Milton's Prosody* (Oxford: Henry Frowde, publisher to Oxford University, 1901)

Brook, Peter, *The Empty Space* (London: Penguin Modern Classics, 2008)

Brooks, Harold F., 'Introduction' in, William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. by Harold F. Brooks (London: Arden Methuen, 1979; repr. Thomson Learning, 2006)

Brown, A D J, Unpublished PhD thesis, 'Alexander Pope's Edition of Shakespeare: An Introduction', University of Bristol, 1995

Caldarone, Marina, and Maggie Lloyd-Williams, *Actions: The Actors' Thesaurus* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2004; repr. 2014)

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

Chambers, Colin, 'Developments in the profession of theatre, 1946-2000', in *The Cambridge History of British Theatre, Vol 3, Since 1895* ed. by Baz Kershaw (Cambridge University Press, 2004)

Clemen, Wolfgang, *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art: Collected Essays* (London: Methuen, 1972)

Clements, Paul, *The Improvised Play* – The Work of Mike Leigh: An Account, (Methuen: London, 1983)

Cordner, Michael, '(Mis)Advising Shakespeare's Players' in *Shakespeare Survey Volume 66: Working with Shakespeare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), (p.110-128)

Crystal, David, 'The Language of Shakespeare', in *Oxford Shakespeare*, 2nd edn, ed. by Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

– –, 'Saying It Like It Was: An OP *Troilus and Cressida*', in Globe Theatre Programme, 'The Persephone Projects' (London: Shakespeare's Globe, 2005)

– –, *Think On My Words: Exploring Shakespeare's Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Cunliffe, John William, *The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy.* (London: Macmillan, 1893)

Curran, Kevin, *Shakespeare's Legal Ecologies: Law and Distributed Selfhood* (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2017)

Delgado, Maria M., and Paul Heritage, eds, *In Contact with the Gods? Directors Talk Theatre* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996)

Dessen, Alan C., 'Ten Commandments for the New Globe', in Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper, eds, *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Donato, Eugenio, *The Languages of Criticism and the Sciences of Man: the Structuralist Controversy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1970)

Donnellan, Declan, *The Actor and the Target* (London: Nick Hern, 2002; rev. and repr. 2005)

Doran, Madeleine, *Shakespeare's Dramatic Language* (London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1976)

Dymkowski, Christine, *Harley Granville Barker: A Preface to Modern Shakespeare* (London: Associated University Press, 1986)

Eliot, T. S., *Elizabethan Dramatists* (London: Faber and Faber, 1963)

Eliot, T. S., and Fritz Joachim Raddatz, *Selected Essays* (London: Faber, 1951)

Elliot, Ward, review of Marina Tarlinskaja, *Shakespeare and the Versification of English Drama, 1561-1642* (2014), *Modern Philology*, 113, no.3 (February 2016), E152-E156

Erne, Lukas, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Evans, Robert O., *The Osier Cage: Rhetorical Devices in 'Romeo and Juliet'* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1966)

Eyre, Richard, *National Service: Diary of a Decade at the National Theatre* (London: Bloomsbury, 2003)

– –, *Talking Theatre: Interviews with Theatre People* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2009)

Fenton, James, *An Introduction to English Poetry* (London: Viking, 2002)

Foxon, Chris, and George Turvey's *Being a Playwright: A Career Guide for Writers* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2018)

Freedman, Penelope, *Power and Passion in Shakespeare's Pronouns* (Farnham, Ashgate, 2007; repr. Routledge, 2016)

Frazer, James George, *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion* (London: Papermac,1987)

Garfein, Jack, *Life and Acting: Techniques for the Actor* (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2010)

Granville-Barker, Harley, 'Antony and Cleopatra', in *Prefaces to Shakespeare*, Vol. I (London: Batsford, 1958; repr. 1961)

– –, 'Hamlet', in *Prefaces to Shakespeare*, Vol. I (London: Batsford, 1958; repr. 1961)

– –, 'Romeo and Juliet', in *Prefaces to Shakespeare*, Vol. II (London: B.T. Batsford Ltd, 1958)

Gray, Simon, article, *New Statesman*, 28 August 1969, in Roger Warren and Stanley Wells, 'Introduction', in William Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night*, ed. by Roger Warren and Stanley Wells (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994)

Grotowski, Jerzy, and Eugenio Barba, *Towards a Poor Theatre* (London: Methuen, 1969)

Groves, Peter, review of Marina Tarlinskaja, *Shakespeare and the Versification of English Drama, 1561-1642* (2014), *The Review of English Studies*, vol. 66, issue 276 (Sept 2015), 775-777

Gurr, Andrew, *The Shakespearean Stage 1574-1642* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Hagen, Uta, *A Challenge for the Actor* (Simon & Schuster, 1991)

Hagen, Uta, and Haskel Frankel, *Respect for Acting* (New York: Macmillan, 1973)

Halio, J. L., review of Marina Tarlinskaja, *Shakespeare and the Versification of English Drama, 1561-1642* (2014), *Shakespeare Quarterly*, vol. 67 no. 2 (2016), 266-269

Hall, Peter, *Exposed by the Mask: Form and Language in Drama* (London: Oberon, 2000)

– –, *Shakespeare's Advice to the Players* (London: Oberon, 2004)

Halle, Morris, and Samuel Jay Keyser, *English Stress: Its Form, Its Growth, and Its Role in Verse* (New York: Harper & Row, 1971)

Hapgood, Elizabeth Reynolds, 'Explanatory Note', in Constantin Stanislavski, *Building a Character*, trans. by Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood (London: M. Reinhardt, 1950)

Hauser, Frank, and Russell Reich, *Notes on Directing* (London: Atlantic Books, 2003)

Hecht, Paul, review of Marina Tarlinskaja, *Shakespeare and the Versification of English Drama, 1561-1642* (2014), *Spenser Review* 46.1 (2016) <https://www.english.cam.ac.uk/spenseronline/review/item/46.1.13/> [accessed 10 December 2019]

Heilman, Robert B. *Magic in the Web: Action and Language in* Othello (Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1956)

Hildy, Franklin J., 'Globe Theatre and "Essence of Globeness" Projects Since 1970', in *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, ed. by Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Hilton, Julian, *Performance* (London: Macmillan, 1987)

Hirsh, James E., *Shakespeare and the History of Soliloquies* (Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2003)

Holland, Peter, *English Shakespeares: Shakespeare on the English stage in the 1990s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

– –, 'Introduction', in William Shakespeare, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. by Peter Holland (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995; published online, September 2012)

Humphreys, A.R., 'Introduction' in William Shakespeare, *Much Ado About Nothing*, ed. by Humphreys (Methuen: London, 1981 – for Arden 2nd Series; repr. Thomson: London, 2003)

– –, 'Appendix II: The Evolution of Wit Style' in William Shakespeare, *Much Ado*, ed. by Humphreys (Methuen: London, 1981 – for Arden 2nd Series; repr. Thomson: London, 2003)

Hunter, G.K., *John Lyly: The Humanist as Courtier* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962)

Hunter, George K., 'Rhetoric and Renaissance Drama' in *Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. by Peter Mack (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994)

Hutson, Lorna, *Circumstantial Shakespeare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015)

– –, 'Forensic Aspects of Renaissance Mimesis', *Representations*, 94 (2006), 80-109

– –, 'Kantorowicz and Shakespeare', *Representations*, 106 (2009), 118-142

Jeffreys, Stephen, *Playwriting: Structure, Character, How and What to Write*, ed. by Maeve McKeown (London: Nick Hern Books, 2019)

Joseph, Miriam, *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language* (London: Hafner Publishing Company, 1st ed. 1947; repr. 1966)

Karim-Cooper, Farah, *The Hand on the Shakespearean Stage: Gesture, Touch and the Spectacle of Dismemberment* (London: Bloomsbury, Arden Shakespeare, 2016)

Kermode, Frank, *Shakespeare's Language* (London: Penguin, 2000)

Kesson, Andy, *John Lyly and Early Modern Authorship* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014)

Kinney, Arthur F., 'Rhetoric and Fiction in Elizabethan England' in *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. by James J. Murphy (London: University of California Press, 1983)

Ko, Yu Jin and Michael W. Shurgot, eds, *Shakespeare's Sense of Character: On the Page and From the Stage* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012)

Knight, G. Wilson, *The Wheel of Fire* (Abingdon: Routledge Classics, 2001)

Kristeller, Paul Oskar, 'Rhetoric in Medieval and Renaissance Culture' in *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. by James J. Murphy (London: University of California Press, 1983)

Lehmann, Hans-Thies, *Postdramatic Theatre*, trans. by Karen Jürs-Munby (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006)

Lieblein, Leanore, 'Embodied Intersubjectivity and the Creation of Early Modern Character' in *Shakespeare and Character: Theory, History, Performance, and Theatrical Persons*, ed. by Paul Edward Yachnin and Jessica Slights (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 117-35

Levenson, Jill, 'Introduction', in William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. by Jill Levenson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) <http://libsta28.lib.cam.ac.uk:2299/view/10.1093/actrade/9780198129370.book.1/actrade-9780198129370-miscMatter-8>

Lucas, F. L., *Seneca and Elizabethan Tragedy* (Cambridge: University Press, 1922)

– –, *Tragedy: Serious Drama in Relation to Aristotle's Poetics* (London: Hogarth Press, 1957)

Lyne, Raphael, *Shakespeare, Rhetoric and Cognition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)

MacGregor, Neil, *Shakespeare's Restless World* (London: Penguin, 2013)

Mack, Peter, *Elizabethan Rhetoric: Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

– –, *A History of Renaissance Rhetoric 1380-1620* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)

Maguire, Laurie and Emma Smith, *30 Great Myths About Shakespeare* (London: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 2013)

Mamet, David, *Three Uses of the Knife: On the Nature and Purpose of Drama* (London: Methuen, 2002)

– –, *True and False: Heresy and Common Sense for the Actor* (London: Faber, 1998)

– –, *A Whore's Profession: Notes and Essays* (London: Faber, 1994)

Mazer, Cary M., 'Historicizing Spontaneity: The Illusion of the First Time of "The Illusion of the First Time"', in *Shakespeare's Sense of Character: On the Page and From the Stage*, ed. by Yu Jin Ko and Michael W. Shurgot (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012)

McConachie, Bruce, *Theatre and Mind* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013)

McDonald, Russ, *Shakespeare and the Arts of Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001)

Merlin, Bella, *Beyond Stanislavsky: The Psycho-Physical Approach to Actor Training* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2002)

Milling, Jane, and Graham Ley, *Modern Theories of Performance: from Stanislavski to Boal* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000)

Miola, Robert S., *Shakespeare and Classical Tragedy: The Influence of Seneca* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992)

Mitchell, Katie, *The Director's Craft: A Handbook for the Theatre* (London: Routledge, 2009)

Moore, Sonia, *The Stanislavski System: The Professional Training of an Actor* (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1966)

Morgan, Joyce Vining, *Stanislavski's Encounter with Shakespeare: The Evolution of a Method* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1984)

Moseley, Nick, *Actioning and How to Do It* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2016)

Murphy, James J. 'One Thousand Neglected Authors: The Scope and Importance of Renaissance Rhetoric', in *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. by James J. Murphy (London: University of California Press, 1983)

Neill, Michael, 'Introduction', in William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Anthony and Cleopatra*, ed. by Michael Neill (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994; published online, 2012)

Noble, Adrian, *How to do Shakespeare* (New York: Routledge, 2010)

Nunn, Trevor, 'Foreword', in John Barton, *Playing Shakespeare* (London: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, 1984; reissued with DVD 2009; repr. 2014)

Nuttall, A.D., *A New Mimesis: Shakespeare and the Representation of Reality* (London: Methuen, 1983)

Ostrovsky, Arkady Mikhailovich, 'Stanislavsky meets England: Shakespeare, Dickens and Byron at the Moscow Art Theatre and its First Studio, 1898-1920' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 1998)

Palfrey, Simon, and Tiffany Stern, *Shakespeare in Parts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)

Pearlman, E., 'Shakespeare at Work: *Romeo and Juliet'* in *English Literary Renaissance*, Vol. 23, Issue 2 (March 1994), 314-342 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.14756757.1994.tb01084.x/full>

Plett, Heinrich F., *Enargeia in Classical Antiquity and the Early Modern Age* (Leiden: Brill, 2012)

– –, 'The Place and Function of Style in Renaissance Poetics', in *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. by James J. Murphy (London: University of California Press, 1983)

Poole, Adrian, 'Introduction', in William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, ed. by T.J.B. Spencer (London: Penguin, 2005)

– –, *Tragedy: Shakespeare and the Greek Example*, Adrian Poole (Basil Blackwell: Oxford, 1987)

Potter, Lois, '"Nobody's Perfect": Actors' Memories and Shakespeare's Plays of the 1590s', Shakespeare Survey, 42 (1990), 85-97

Preston, Claire, 'Ekphrasis: painting in words', in *Renaissance Figures of Speech*, ed. by Sylvia Adamson, Gavin Alexander and Katrin Ettenhuber (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Purcell, Stephen, *Shakespeare and Audience in Practice* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013)

Ritchie, Rob, *The Joint Stock Book: The Making of a Theatre Collective* (London: Methuen, 1987)

Rokison, Abigail, *Shakespearean Verse Speaking: Text and Theatre Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Russell Brown, John, 'Introduction', in *The Routledge Companion to Directors' Shakespeare*, ed. by John Russell Brown (London: Routledge, 2008)

Russell, D. A., and Michael Winterbottom, *Classical Literary Criticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008)

Rutherford, R. B., *Greek Tragic Style: Form, Language and Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

Rylance, Mark, 'Research, Materials, Craft: Principles of Performance at Shakespeare's Globe', in Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper, ed. *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)

Šaikevič, A. Ja., 'Opyt statističeskogo vydelenija funkcionalnyx stilej' ['An Experiment in Differentiating Functional Styles Statistically'], *Voprosy Jazykoznanija*, Issue 1 [a journal of the Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow] (1968), 64-76. Accessed online: <http://www.ruslang.ru/doc/voprosy/voprosy1968-1.pdf.>

Scragg, Leah, 'Introduction', in John Lyly, *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit* and *Euphues and His England*, ed. by Scragg (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003)

– –, 'Introduction', in John Lyly, *Love's Metamorphosis*, ed. by Scragg (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008)

Shevtsova, Maria, "Review of *My Life in Art* and *An Actor's Work* – by Konstantin Stanislavski, translated by Jean Benedetti", *TDR*, Vol. 54, No. 1, Spring 2010, pp. 172-4

Shevtsova, Maria and Christopher Innes, *Directors/Directing: Conversations on Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Skinner, Quentin, *Forensic Shakespeare* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2014)

Smith, Emma, *Shakespeare's First Folio: Four Centuries of an Iconic Book* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016)

Stafford-Clark, Max, *Letters to George* (London: Nick Hern Books, 1989; repr. 2012)

Stafford-Clark, Max and Maeve McKeown, *Our Country's Good: Page to Stage* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2010)

Stafford-Clark, Max and P. Roberts, *Taking Stock: The Theatre of Max Stafford-Clark* (London: Nick Hern Books, 2007)

Stanislavski, Constantin, *Building a Character*, trans. by Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood (London: Reinhardt & Evans, 1950)

Stanislavski, Konstantin, *An Actor's Work: A Student's Diary*, trans. and ed. by Jean Benedetti (London: Routledge, 2010)

Stanislavsky, Constantin, *Stanislavsky repetiruet: zapisi i stenogrammy repetitsii*, ed. by I.N. Vinogradskaia (Moscow: STD, 1987)

Stanislavsky, Konstantin, 'Actor's plan of *Hamlet*' (1910), Moscow, Moscow Art Theatre Museum (MXAT), Stanislavsky Archive, MS K.S. 18871, fols 39v-41v, trans. Arkady Mikhailovich Ostrovsky, in Arkady Mikhailovich Ostrovsky, 'Stanislavsky meets England: Shakespeare, Dickens and Byron at the Moscow Art Theatre and its First Studio, 1898-1920' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 1998)

– –, 'Director's plan of *Much Ado*', (1896), Moscow, Moscow Art Theatre Museum (MXAT), Stanislavsky Archive, MS K.S. 18906, fol.71v, trans. Arkady Mikhailovich Ostrovsky, in Arkady Mikhailovich Ostrovsky, 'Stanislavsky meets England: Shakespeare, Dickens and Byron at the Moscow Art Theatre and its First Studio, 1898-1920' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 1998)

Stern, Tiffany, *Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000)

– –, '(Re:)Historicizing Spontaneity: Original Practices, Stanislavski, and Characterisation', in *Shakespeare's Sense of Character: On the Page and From the Stage*, ed. by Yu Jin Ko and Michael W. Shurgot (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012)

– –, 'Sermons, Plays and Note-Takers: *Hamlet* Q1 as a "Noted" Text', in *Shakespeare Survey Vol. 66*, ed. by Peter Holland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 1-23 (p. 23)

Strasberg, Lee, *A Dream of Passion* (London: Bloomsbury, 1988)

Sumillera, R. G., review of Marina Tarlinskaja, *Shakespeare and the Versification of English Drama, 1561-1642* (2014), *Language and Literature*, 25 (2016), 399-402

Tarlinskaja, Marina, *English Verse: Theory and History* (The Hague: Mouton, 1976)

– –, 'Evolution of Shakespeare's Metrical Style', *Poetics,* Vol. 12, Issue 6 (December, 1983), 567-587

– –, *Shakespeare and the Versification of English Drama, 1561-1642* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014)

Tribble, Evelyn B., *Cognition in the Globe: Attention and Memory in Shakespeare's Theatre* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011)

– –, 'Distributed Cognition, Mindful Bodies and the Arts of Acting', in *Theatre, Performance and Cognition: Languages, Bodies and Ecologies*, ed. by Rhonda Blair and Amy Cook (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), pp. 133-40

Tucker, Patrick, *Secrets of Acting Shakespeare: The Original Approach* (London: Routledge, 2002)

van Es, Bart, *Shakespeare in Company* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013)

Vickers, Brian, *The Artistry of Shakespeare's Prose* (London: Methuen, 1979)

– –, *In Defence of Rhetoric* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988)

– –, "The Power of Persuasion": Images of the Orator, Elyot to Shakespeare' in *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. by James J. Murphy (London: University of California Press, 1983)

von Schlegel, August Wilhelm, *A course of lectures on dramatic art and literature*, trans. by John Black (London: Baldwin, Cradock and Joy, 1815)

Ward, John O., 'Renaissance Commentators on Ciceronian Rhetoric', in *Renaissance Eloquence: Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, ed. by James J. Murphy (London: University of California Press, 1983)

Warren, Roger and Stanley Wells, 'Introduction', in William Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night, or What You Will*, ed. by Roger Warren and Stanley Wells (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994)

Weimann, Robert, 'The Actor-Character in "Secretly Open" Action: Doubly Encoded Personation on Shakespeare's Stage', in Paul Edward Yachnin, and Jessica Slights, eds, *Shakespeare and Character: Theory, History, Performance, and Theatrical Persons* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009)

Whigham, Frank, *Seizures of the Will in Early Modern English Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996)

Wilders, John, 'Introduction', in William Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*, ed. by Wilders (London: Arden, Routledge, 1995)

Wiles, David, 'Aristotle's *Poetics* and ancient dramatic theory', in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre*, ed. by Marianne McDonald and J. Michael Walton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

Wolfson, John, *William Shakespeare and the Short Story Collections* (London: Globe Education, 2011)

Worthen, W. B., *Shakespeare and the Authority of Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)

– –, *Shakespeare Performance Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014)

Wright, George T., *Shakespeare's Metrical Art* (London: University of California Press, 1988)

Yachnin, Paul and Myrna Wyatt Selkirk, 'Metatheater and the Performance of Character in *The Winter's Tale*', in *Shakespeare and Character: Theory, History, Performance, and Theatrical Persons*, ed. by Paul Yachnin and Jessica Slights (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009)

Yachnin, Paul Edward, and Jessica Slights, eds, *Shakespeare and Character: Theory, History, Performance, and Theatrical Persons* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009)

Yorke, John, *Into the Woods* (London: Penguin, 2013)

Shakespeare Workshop Transcripts

Each of my workshops was recorded on digital audio, using a smartphone, with clear audio quality. From these recordings I made typed transcripts. These transcripts are frequently referenced throughout the thesis.

Soliloquy Workshops:
W1: *Macbeth* (II.i.40-71).
28 May 2015, at the Central Ballet School, London.
Participants: Dickon Tyrrell, Darrel Bailey and Sophie Dickson.

W2: *Romeo and Juliet* (III.ii.1-34).
7 August 2015, at the Jerwood Space, London.
Participant: Sarah Ovens.

W3: *Othello* (I.iii.372-393); (II.i.270-296); and, (V.ii.1-22).
8 October 2015, at Lost Theatre, London.
Participant: David Sturzaker.

Enargeia Workshops:
W5: *Antony and Cleopatra* (II.ii.222-276); and, *Romeo and Juliet* (I.iv.55-97).
4 November 2015, at the Jerwood Space, London.
Participant: Brian Ferguson.

W6: *Hamlet* (IV.vi.149-68); and (II.i.81-105).
23 February 2016, at Lost Theatre, London.
Participant: Debra Penny.

W8: *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (II.i.82-118); and (II.i.158-273).
22 March 2016, at the Jerwood Space.
Participants: Brian Martin and Ruth Sillers.

Repartee Workshops:
W4: *Much Ado About Nothing* (I.i.80-98) and (IV.ii.260-320).
15 October 2015, at Lost Theatre, London.
Participants: Jo Herbert, David Sturzaker, Darrel Bailey and Sophie Dickson.

W7: *Richard III* (I.ii.68-210).
8 March 2016, at the Jerwood Space, London.
Participants: Sarah Ovens and Mark Quartley.

W9: *Twelfth Night* (I.v.123-222); and, *The Tempest* (III.i.26-109).
1 April 2016, at the Jerwood Space, London.
Participants: Heather Long and Molly Vevers.

Referenced Theatre Productions

(play titles are arranged first alphabetically and then by date, for disambiguation between productions)

Anatomy of a Suicide, dir. by Katie Mitchell (Royal Court Theatre, 2017)

Antony and Cleopatra, dir. by Trevor Nunn (RSC, 1972)

Antony and Cleopatra, dir. by Peter Brook (RSC, 1978)

Antony and Cleopatra, dir. by Gregory Doran (RSC, 2006)

Arden of Faversham, dir. by Polly Findlay (RSC, 2014)[1]

Cleansed, dir. by Katie Mitchell (National Theatre, 2016)

Cymbeline, dir. by Mike Alfreds (Shakespeare's Globe, 2001)

Hamlet, dir. by Konstantin Stanislavski (Moscow Art Theatre, 1912 [O.S. 1911])

Hamlet, dir. by Dominic Hill (Glasgow Citizens Theatre, 2014)

Henry VI Part 3, dir. by Katie Mitchell (RSC, 1994)

King Lear, dir. by Harley Granville-Barker (Old Vic, London, 1940)

King Lear, dir. by Adrian Noble (RSC, 1982)

---

[1] Indicates specific productions that I personally reference (having seen). The other productions are referenced by practitioners as productions in which they performed.

Look Back in Anger, dir. by Tony Richardson (English Stage Company, Royal Court Theatre, 1956)

Measure for Measure, dir. by Roxana Silbert (RSC, 2011)

Measure for Measure, dir. by Declan Donnellan (Pushkin Drama Theatre, Moscow, 2013, prior to Cheek by Jowl international tour)

Measure for Measure, dir. by Dominic Dromgoole (Shakespeare's Globe, 2015)

A Midsummer Night's Dream, dir. by Harley Granville-Barker (Savoy Theatre, 1914)

A Midsummer Night's Dream, dir. by Mike Alfreds (Shakespeare's Globe, 2002)

A Midsummer Night's Dream, dir. by Emma Rice (Shakespeare's Globe, 2016)

Much Ado About Nothing, dir. Konstantin Stanislavski (Society of Art and Literature, Moscow, 1897)

Ophelias Zimmer, dir. by Katie Mitchell (Royal Court Theatre, 2016)

Our Country's Good, dir. by Max Stafford-Clark (Royal Court Theatre, 1988)

Our Country's Good, dir. by Nadia Fall (National Theatre, 2015)[*]

Othello, co-dir. by Peter Stein and Sam Mendes (co-production: Salzburg Festival and National Theatre, 1997-8)

The Recruiting Officer, dir. by Max Stafford-Clark (Royal Court Theatre, 1988)

The Revenger's Tragedy, dir. by Declan Donnellan (Italian language production, Piccolo Teatro, Milan, 2018, prior to Cheek by Jowl international tour)

Richard II, dir. by Simon Godwin (Shakespeare's Globe, 2016)[*]

Serious Money, dir. by Max Stafford-Clark (Royal Court Theatre, 1987)

Sleep No More, dir. by Felix Barrett (Punchdrunk International, 2011 –)

A Streetcar Named Desire, dir. by Harold Clurman (American Tour, 1947)

Top Girls, dir. by Max Stafford-Clark (Royal Court Theatre, 1982)

Twelfth Night, dir. by Harley Granville-Barker (Savoy Theatre, London, 1912)

Twelfth Night, dir. by Konstantin Stanislavski (Moscow Art Theatre, 1917)

Twelfth Night, dir. by Declan Donnellan (Pushkin Drama Theatre, Moscow, 2003, prior to Cheek by Jowl international tour)

Waiting for Godot, dir. by Peter Hall (Arts Theatre, London, 1955)

The White Devil, dir. by Maria Aberg (RSC, 2014)

The Winter's Tale, dir. by Harley Granville-Barker (Savoy Theatre, London, 1912)

The Winter's Tale, dir. by Joanna Read (Salisbury Playhouse, 2000)

Referenced Shakespeare Films

Romeo and Juliet, dir. by Franco Zeffirelli (Paramount, 1968)

Romeo + Juliet, dir. by Baz Luhrman (20th Century Fox, 1996)

Audio Interviews

Sierz, Aleks, *Jean Benedetti on Stanislavski*, interview with Jean Benedetti, online audio recording, TheatreVoice, 14 May 2007, <http://www.theatrevoice.com/2189/jean-benedetti-on-stanislavski/#.Um8JLxZbylk> [accessed 21 July 2016]

– –, *Mike Alfreds of Shared Experience on Acting*, interview with Mike Alfreds, TheatreVoice, 27 June 2008, <http://www.theatrevoice.com/2269/mike-alfreds-of-shared-experience-on-acting/#.UvzVHP3HfwI> [accessed 21 July 2016]

Televised Sources

Michael Parkinson: Masterclass, Season 2, Episode 5, featuring Simon Russell Beale, Sky Arts, 2014

Playing Shakespeare, nine episode series, London Weekend Television, 29 July – 23
	September 1982

'Royal Shakespeare Company Masterclass', in two parts, *The South Bank Show,*
	London Weekend Television, 9 December and 16 December 1979

Online videos, articles, educational talks, other transcripts and websites

The Actors Studio <http://theactorsstudio.org/studio-history/> [accessed 28
	February 2013]

Bahl, Ankur, 'Can Emma Rice give one of Shakespeare's best female parts to a
	man?', online blog, What's On Stage website
	<http://www.whatsonstage.com/london-theatre/news/ankur-bahl-on-helena-a-
	midsummer-nights-dream_40167.html> [accessed 9 May 2016]

Carroll, Tim, 'Confessions of an Iambic Fundamentalist', keynote speech at the
	American Shakespeare Centre, live blog transcript by Molly Beth Seremet,
	31 October 2015
	<https://asc-blogs.com/2015/10/31/blackfriars-conference-2015-tim-carroll-
	keynote-address-confessions-of-an-iambic-fundamentalist/>

Evans, Tim and Alex Hassell, 'A Manifesto' (Factory Theatre website, 2006)
	<http://www.factorytheatre.co.uk/the-factorys-manifesto.html> [accessed 9
	May 2016]

Herbert Berghof Studio <http://www.hbstudio.org/about.htm> [accessed 28
	February 2013]

Higgins, Charlotte, 'Katie Mitchell: British theatre's queen in exile', *Guardian*,
	14 January 2016
	<https://www.theguardian.com/stage/2016/jan/14/british-theatre-queen-exile-
	katie-mitchell> [accessed 14 May 2016]

Poole, Dan, and Giles Terera, 'Ben Kingsley Interview, *Muse of Fire: the Resource*,
	online video recording,
	Shakespeare's Globe website,
	<https://globeplayer.tv/museoffire?utf8=✓&per=99999> [accessed 6 October
	2016]

– –, 'Mark Rylance Interview', *Muse of Fire: the Resource*, online video recording, Shakespeare's Globe website <https://globeplayer.tv/museoffire?utf8=✓&per=99999> [accessed 6 October 2016]

– –, 'Michael Gambon Interview', *Muse of Fire: the Resource*, online video recording, Shakespeare's Globe website <https://globeplayer.tv/museoffire?utf8=✓&per=99999> [accessed 6 October 2016]

– –, 'Simon Russell Beale Interview', *Muse of Fire: the Resource*, online video recording, Shakespeare's Globe website <https://globeplayer.tv/museoffire?utf8=✓&per=99999> [accessed 6 October 2016]

'Simon Russell Beale on Shakespearean Soliloquies', taken from Series 40, Episode 4, *South Bank Show,* Sky Arts, published on YouTube, 3 July 2014 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cDPyINqK6Lo>

'Transcript: Daniel Day-Lewis on The Andrew Marr Show', transcript of broadcast interview, BBC, 27 January 2013 <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/entertainment-arts-21139066> [accessed 28 February 2013]

McKeown, Maeve, 'Max Stafford-Clark: Education Resource Pack' (Out of Joint, 2008) <http://www.outofjoint.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/Max-Stafford-Clark-Workpack.pdf> [accessed 14 May 2016]

Pritchard, Stephen, 'The reader's editor on…Actor or actress?', *The Guardian*, 25 September 2011.

Shakespeare's Globe <http://www.shakespearesglobe.com/discovery-space/previous-productions> [accessed 25 July 2016]

Shakespeare's Words <http://shakespeareswords.com> [accessed 5 November 2016]

Swain, Rob, 'A Director Prepares', Directing Studio at Shakespeare's Globe, 6 May 2017.

Taylor, Paul, 'An Eye for the Small Print', *Independent*, 9 August 1994 <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/theatre--an-eye-for-the-small-print-katie-mitchell-has-chosen-to-cut-her-shakespearian-teeth-on-henry-vi-part-3-paul-taylor-analyses-a-young-directors-decisionmaking-process-1382536.html> [accessed 11 May 2016]

– –, 'Harley Granville-Barker: How he radicalised the British stage', *Independent*, 20
        April, 2006

Trueman, Matt, 'Katie Mitchell: I was uncomfortable coming back to work in the
        UK', *Stage*, 26 February 2016
        <https://www.thestage.co.uk/features/interviews/2016/katie-mitchell-i-was-
        uncomfortable-coming-back-to-work-in-the-uk/> [accessed 14 May 2016]

Wiegand, Chris, 'Simon Russell Beale webchat – full Q + A', *Guardian*, published
        online, 24 April 2014