White Rose Research Online

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk
Universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York

Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/95626/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:
Perez Diez, JA (2016) Editing on stage: Theatrical research for a critical edition of John Fletcher and Philip Massinger's Love's Cure, or The Martial Maid. Shakespeare Bulletin, 34 (1). pp. 69-88. ISSN: 0748-2558

https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2016.0011

© 2016 The John Hopkins University Press. This is an author produced version of a paper accepted for publication in Shakespeare Bulletin. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher' self-archiving policy.

Reuse
Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown
If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS
University of Sheffield
UNIVERSITY of York

Editing on stage: Theatrical research for a critical edition of John Fletcher and Philip Massinger's *Love's Cure, or The Martial Maid*

JOSÉ A. PÉREZ DÍEZ, *University of Leeds*

During the spring and summer of 2012, a team of theatre practitioners under my coordination conducted a practical theatrical project at the Shakespeare Institute of the University of Birmingham in Stratford-upon-Avon. The aim was to investigate the staging possibilities of *Love's Cure, or The Martial Maid*, the play by John Fletcher and Philip Massinger that I was editing.[1] The main aim was to field-test the preliminary text of my critical edition using original theatrical practices (OP). These included employing an all-male cast, period costume and music, universal lighting, a bare stage, and a *frons scænae* with two flanking doors, a wide central opening, and an upper playing space.[2] The project was kindly funded by the Centre for Learning and Academic Development at Birmingham, and was designed as a collaborative endeavor. My two collaborators in leading the project were Robert F. Ball, artistic director of FRED Theatre, and Red Smucker, our costume designer.

This essay presents an analysis of some of the results of that project, and of how I incorporated them to the text and annotation of my modern-spelling edition of the play. Although *Love's Cure* did not seem particularly difficult stage, in the process of rehearsing our production I was expecting to find plausible solutions to some key moments that I found difficult to visualize on my own. Some of the solutions to crucial staging problems that we came up with during the rehearsals

[1] The edition I was preparing for my PhD thesis adopted the form of a conventional critical edition in print; I was not attempting to produce a more flexible electronic edition.

[2] We are, of course, indebted to the practices and research processes employed at Shakespeare's Globe in London since it opened in 1997, as analyzed at length in Carson and Karim-Cooper.

openly contradicted my assumptions about the text. I use the pronoun "we" quite deliberately, since the felicity of some of these solutions was due to the process of working with a diverse team of practitioners who brought different creative energies to the rehearsal room. Not only did they actively discuss the staging of the scenes, but also the meaning and significance of a number of archaic terms, and the complexities of some of the characters. They creatively and collectively challenged my editorial stage directions (SDs) and my modernized punctuation and spelling, with the fundamental objective of being able to perform the text in front of an audience. After the process, my text emerged strengthened and corroborated by actual theatrical practice. This seemed even more important as we were dealing with a play that has never been performed professionally since the closing of the theatres in 1642, and has only received, so far, three semi-professional productions at institutions of higher education in England, including our own.[3]

In the absence of a substantial stage history, editors have only a few options available to support their editorial SDs and their annotation with appropriate reference to the theatrical realization of the text. The most usual approach has been to rely solely on the imagination to consider how the scenes may have been performed in their own time, or what staging possibilities they may allow in modern production. However, there have been a number of exceptions to this rule in the last ten years, the most salient being the *Richard Brome Online* project, which produced a multilayered

[3] The earliest production was directed by Martha Crossley at the Greenwood Theatre, King's College London, with a mixed-sex cast and a cut-down text, as part of the two-day conference *Early Modern Kinship: Sexualities, Materialities, Localities* that was convened by Lucy Munro on 23-24 March 2001. See Lucy Munro, "Report". In addition, Graham Watts directed an all-female ensemble of American students of the British American Drama Academy in a one-night-only performance at the Oval House Theatre in London on 12 December 2013.

hypertext for each play in the Brome canon, enriched with explanatory notes and parallel texts—early printed and edited—as well as a number of accompanying videos showing footage of the series of workshops undertaken to explore the staging practicalities of the plays. Richard Cave, Eleanor Lowe, and Brian Wolland have written about the methodology they developed, which is not dissimilar to the processes that derived from our own experience. We fundamentally coincided in our sense of surprise at the felicity of some unexpected results, as well as in appreciating the tentative, non-definitive nature of the process of running the workshops and obtaining usable results.

We also coincided in the pursuit of historical authenticity: "Editing in this manner could, we discovered, become an exercise in informing the editorial process with degrees of theatrical-historical insight." (Cave, Lowe, and Woolland 219) Unlike the approach proposed by Lynette Hunter and Peter Lichtenfels, for whom a piece of Renaissance drama should be treated as a new play, irrespective of the historical processes that shaped the extant text/s,[4] my intention in choosing to develop an OP production was to study this text as a historical document emerging in, and responding to, a particular theatrical context. We aimed at reconstructing its dramaturgy in terms of the original staging, as far as it can be inferred from the copy text and other relevant documents. This seemed especially important in the case of *Love's Cure*, as the earliest authoritative text, printed in the 1647 folio of the works of Beaumont and Fletcher (F),[5] seems to be derived from a promptbook in the

[4] See Hunter and Lichtenfels, "Reading in the Moment", as well as Hunter and Lichtenfels, "(Un)Editing with (Non-)Fictional Bodies".

[5] Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *Comedies and Tragedies* (London: Humphrey Robinson and Humphrey Moseley, 1647). The particular copy used for reference was the digitized facsimile on *Early*

possession of the King's Men at the time of the closing of the theatres.[6] The F text was a product of theatrical practice and was not written as purely literary drama. The text indicates when the action occurs *above* (4.2 and 5.3), or when characters enter *at several doors* (3.3), and it also includes cues to introduce sound effects (*Within clashing swords*, 1.3; *Drums within*, 5.3) and music (1.3). These are recognizable features of most commercial theatres of Renaissance London, with its *frons scænae* including an upper playing space, two side doors, and, in this case, as I will discuss, a central opening or discovery space situated at the top of an otherwise bare stage of rectangular or tapered shape. As the play seems to have received its premiere in the summer of 1615, it was most likely performed by the King's Men at the Globe, but probably later at the Blackfriars playhouse as well.[7] These were the venues that we had in mind when developing the project.

For reasons of availability of an indoor rehearsal and performance space, we decided to explore the dramaturgical geography of the text as it might have worked in indoor performance, recreating a version of the Blackfriars stage and *frons scænae* in the Hall of the Shakespeare Institute.[8] At 7.5 meters wide, or 24.6 feet, it is only

---

English Books Online, reproducing the Bridgewater exemplar at the Houghton Library, Harvard University, HEW 7.11.5.

[6] Modernized quotations from *Love's Cure* are presented in my version, except when discussing the particular features of F. Line numbers are keyed to George Walton Williams's edition. The origin of F in a promptbook is sufficiently explained in that volume (see 7-8).

[7] Based on hitherto untraced topical references and a study of its language in the context of the other plays in the Fletcher canon, Martin Wiggins and myself have reliably dated the play to that season.

[8] The Hall is a nineteenth-century mock-Elizabethan building, originally constructed as the dining room of the extinct Trinity College next door to Mason Croft. The novelist Marie Corelli, who lived in the house, bought the Hall and transformed it into a music room. It was used as a tearoom during

slightly narrower than the stage at the Blackfriars, whose maximum width Ralph Alan Cohen estimates at around 9 meters, or 30 feet, and Andrew Gurr brings down to 8.5 meters, or 28 feet. (Cohen 213; Gurr 32) We used the whole width of the Hall and a depth of around 4.5 meters, or 15 feet, which is what Cohen estimates.[9] At the top of that rectangular platform we placed the *frons scænae* that we built on site, with two curtained doorways and a central discovery space. The construction of an above gallery was impossible due to budget constraints, so we used a set of ladders for the few scenes requiring an upper playing space. The research rationale was that, by constraining the working space to a size, probable shape, and means of access similar to those present in one of the original venues where the play was performed, we could test the staging solutions proposed in my text in an actual physical space.[10]

The experiment was particularly focused on the traffic of actors and props on stage. As I will describe, certain necessary placements of groups of actors on stage, and some entrances and exits, seemed easier to perform in a certain way in that space; and problematic moments that have never worked on the page admitted plausible staging solutions. I therefore agree with the hypothesis eloquently proposed by Jim Fitzpatrick: "Complementing the verbal signification of the texts there may also be a

---

World War II, when the building belonged to the British Council; but since the foundation of the Shakespeare Institute in 1951 it is regularly used for lectures, concerts, and theatrical performances.

[9] The estimation of the size of the Blackfriars stage is also more reliable for this kind of experiment than attempting to approximate the dimensions of the stage platform at the Globe, for which we have virtually no information.

[10] This spatial approach is akin to that adopted by the *Richard Brome Online* team: as the director Brian Woolland describes, they arranged their performance space with the intention of creating "an approximation of the playing conditions when the plays were first staged." See Cave, Lowe and Woolland.

verbally inscribed spatial semiotic which provides an additional range of meanings—and that such possible semiotic functions ride upon pragmatic stage management patterns which governed entrances and exits and the rhythms of the original performance context." (Fitzpatrick "Stage Management" 1) My argument through this essay will be that these pragmatic patterns can and should have a direct impact on the way an editor formulates and inserts SDs, and on how annotations may and should shed light on performance issues. This process may help the present-day users of the edition to understand how the text worked as a piece of practical theatre conceptualized for a specific kind of space, offering solutions for modern performances of the text based on an understanding of its original dramaturgy.

The 2012 project: performance conditions.

The decision to use original performance practices had the secondary aim of facilitating an investigation of the remarkable gender issues of the play in performance by using an all male ensemble: the main plot of the play deals with the transformation of two siblings, Lucio and Clara, who have been brought up separately as members of the opposite sex, and who are reunited twenty years later and commanded to recover their expected gender behavior. This aim is, however, secondary for the purpose of this essay, which is to illustrate how our experiment helped to encode performance options in editorial SDs and the annotation.

Love's Cure admits virtually no doubling: the minimum number of actors needed to perform the play as it is written is 23, as the final scene calls for no fewer than nineteen speaking characters and a minimum of four supernumeraries.[11] Our

[11] Only the Herald (5.3) and the non-speaking servant Stephano (1.2) can be doubled with minimum difficulty using two of the actors playing the craftsmen in the subplot. We decided to double Stephano

heterogeneous cast of nineteen encompassed professional actors, postgraduate and undergraduate students from the Shakespeare Institute and Birmingham, and some experienced amateur actors. The format, however, imposed a salient limitation: actors would not memorize their parts and would hold the uncut script in performance, allowing for an exploration of the full text while eliminating the pressure on them by making memorization unnecessary. Holding scripts is always slightly alienating, as actors find it more difficult to keep eye contact with their scene partners and to direct asides and soliloquies to the audience. However, there seems to have been a shared enjoyment of the experience in the final performances, as if actors and audience were actively reading the play together.[12]

However, important as the final performances were, the main research took place during the five day-long sessions held in consecutive weeks in which we focused on one act at a time, working through the scenes in chronological order for about seven hours per session. This setup allowed us to get to know the text in detail, having ample time to work extensively on the most difficult sections. We agreed a sufficiently long timescale for the project, encompassing ten weeks of intermittent

---

with Metaldi, and the Herald with Mendoza. Although the 1647 text does not provide an exit for the Herald, understanding that he remains on stage for the remainder of the play, we made him exit after his long speech so that the actor could re-enter as Mendoza. The minimum number of supernumeraries, according to the SDs, is two, who can double as Eugenia's servants in 1.2 and 1.3, Vitelli's two pages carrying lights in 4.1 and 4.3, and the Asistente's watch and guard in 4.3 and 5.3. For practical reasons we had to dispose of the servants and pages—the lights were carried by Lamoral and Anastro instead—except one watchman and guard in the later scenes.

[12] Similar experiences in this particular repertory are regularly available in the *Read Not Dead* series organized by Globe Education in London, and the symposia held by the Malone Society. See Munro, "Read Not Dead", and Wallace.

work, starting on 27 April 2012 with a read through of the play and finishing on 7 July with two performances.[13]

I will now present some of the most significant results of our investigation, centered on a selection of problematic moments that are particularly relevant to discussing the encoding of implicit physical actions, the traffic of some meaningful props, and entrances and exits in the freshly edited version. I shall generally proceed by examining the SDs and dialogue in F, and then presenting my tentative modernization.[14]

1. The traffic of the stage: use of the stage doors and the central opening.

A particularly interesting exploration of the staging possibilities of this text was to orchestrate the use of the three openings on the *frons* for entrances and exits. Rob Conkie has summarized the available theories around the general principles that governed the traffic of characters on the Renaissance stage. Scholars who advocate

[13] We performed the play in Stratford in the morning and at the Cadbury Room in St Francis Hall, on the main Edgbaston campus of the University of Birmingham, in the evening. In addition, the morning session was followed by a two-hour symposium about the play and the project with Katherine Duncan-Jones, Martin Wiggins, and Jonathan Thacker.

[14] In the modernization of the text I have followed the principles established by Stanley Wells for the Oxford Shakespeare with respect to (British) spelling and punctuation; see Wells and Taylor. I have adopted the formatting conventions of the Arden Early Modern Drama series; see the General Editors' Preface in any Arden Early Modern Drama text, for example, Fletcher's *The Island Princess*.

that Shakespeare specifically composed plays for theatres with a three-opening *frons* generally indicate that the central door is "reserved for special and symbolic entries and that the majority of the stage traffic passes through the flanking doors." (Conkie 37) Be it in a two- or three-opening stage, as Conkie adds, the two doors may have been used under any of the following guiding principles: the "S rule" by which characters make exits using the same door they came from (Gurr and Ichikawa 122); the "O rule" that prescribes that characters come from one door and exit through the opposite one (Gurr and Ichikawa 97) (Beckerman 72-73); and, as Tim Fitzpatrick has suggested,[15] that one door "provides access to a place more inside than the stage and the other door to a place more outside." (Conkie 37)

The traffic of actors through the doors may have also been regulated by the general principle of observing the fluidity of the action, overlapping the end and beginning of contiguous scenes. This is the regular practice in OP productions at the Globe in London: characters exit at the end of one scene at the same time as those required for the following are already making their entrance. This obviously dictates that in those transitions, each door and the central opening can be used only in one direction.

In our rehearsal process we explored some of these options with our actors, who were not aware a priori of this theoretical framework. However, the discussions on the staging of each scene soon established an approach quite close to Fitzpatrick's rule: in most scenes one of the doors was associated with an indoor or private

[15] Conkie gives the following references to Fitzpatrick's work: Fitzpatrick, "Shakespeare's Exploitation of a Two-Door Stage: *Macbeth*", "Stage Management, Dramaturgy and Spatial Semiotics in Shakespeare's Dialogue", and "Playwrights with Foresight: Staging Resources in Tne Elizabethan Playhouses"; also Fitzpatrick and Millyard, "Hangings, Doors and Discoveries", and Fitzpatrick and Johnston, "Spaces, Doors and Places in Early Modern English Staging".

imaginary location, and the other one with access to an outdoor or public space within the fiction of the play. For example, in 1.3 the actors playing Clara and Álvarez chose to make an entrance through the central opening, entering a fictional space in the house immediately adjoining the street. We associated the stage-right doorway in 1.2 and 1.3 with the inner part of the house where Lucio and his mother live, and from where it made sense for them to come from and exit, following the "S rule." When the voices of Sayavedra and Vitelli were heard off stage, it was assumed that the brawl that had broken out in the street would suddenly invade the stage and disturb the reunion of Álvarez's family, using the same opening from where Clara and her father had made their entrance. Here the practicalities of the text seem to indicate that the fighters probably need to come on through the central opening, as no less than five characters make their entrance with drawn swords in the middle of a fight: the number seems excessive to stage the moment efficiently using one doorway.

The SD in F, however, is phrased sequentially: "*Enter Vitelli, pursued by Alvarez, & Sayavedra, Clara beating of Anastro.*" (sig. 5Q4^{v}; 1.3.88) If there is the possibility that some characters come on individually—first Vitelli, then Álvarez, then Sayavedra—the requirement that Clara appears in the middle of a fight with Anastro seems to reinforce the need for a large opening. In addition, there is also a character who may not enter the stage fully, but who is implied in the dialogue: Lamoral has accompanied his friends Vitelli and Anastro at the end of 1.1 to confront Álvarez, and it is reasonable to think that they appear together in the fight. In addition, Clara's line in the middle of the brawl—"Leave me to keep *these* off" (89, my emphasis)—implies that she is fighting against more than one opponent. It also makes dramatic sense to show visually the asymmetry of the situation: while Clara is capable of fighting against two young gallants and make them flee, Vitelli is easily

overpowered by the two experienced military men, Álvarez and Sayavedra. After rehearsing the available options—using the doorway for a sequential entrance, as well as trying to use the discovery space—we came to the conclusion that the fight would be more spectacular and easier to manage using the wider central opening, and making the two group of fighters occupy opposite corners of the stage to show the asymmetry of the fight. We also decided that the presence of Lamoral is required, even if he does not need to enter completely and may remain fighting in the threshold. I therefore decided to emend the SD as follows:

Enter VITELLI *pursued by* ÁLVAREZ *and* SAYAVEDRA*,* [*and*] CLARA *beating off* ANASTRO [*and* LAMORAL].

I then added a footnote about these performance options and the dramaturgical rationale behind including Lamoral in the SD. I had not anticipated the practical difficulties posed by this multiple entrance, and after discussing it with the actors and trying out the different solutions, we found this to be the most plausible.

*

The fact that the play was probably written with a three-opening *frons* in mind is also attested by the transition between scenes 3.2 and 3.3, which we workshopped extensively. At the end of 3.2 the swordsman Piorato and the courtesan Malroda leave the stage to go into her lodging (she says "I am thine, walk in"; 155). The SD in F that follows immediately prescribes "*Enter Vitelli and Alguazier at severall doors*." (sig. 5R4^{r}) Malroda and Piorato are probably meant to exit through the central discovery space, while Vitelli and the Alguazir appear at either door.[16]

[16] The spelling *Alguazier* in F may be modernized etymologically to *Alguazir*, as it derives from the Hispanic Arabic *al wazir*. Note that names of Spanish origin have been adapted to their correct modern forms: for example, *Alvarez* to *Álvarez*, *Assistente* to *Asistente*, and *Pachieco* to *Pacheco*.

The subsequent scene presents an additional difficulty in the way it is laid out in F. Vitelli and the Alguazir share a conversation just before Malroda and Piorato re-enter, presumably using the same central opening they had exited to just 17 lines before. The text in F renders the moment as follows:

> *Enter Malroda and Piorato.*
>
> *Mal.* Tis he, do as I told thee: 'Blesse thee Signior.
>
> Oh, my deare Lord.
>
> *Vit. Malroda*, what alone?
>
> *Mal.* She never is alone, that is accompanied
>
> With noble thoughts, my Lord; and mine are such,
>
> Being onely of your Lordship.
>
> *Vit.* Pretty Lasse.
>
> *Mal.* Oh my good Lord, my picture's done: but 'faith
>
> It is not like; nay this way sir, the light
>
> Strikes best upon it here.
>
> *Pio.* Excellent wench. *Exit.*
>
> *Alg.* I am glad the danger's over. *Exit.*
>
> *Vit.* Tis wondrous like,
>
> But that Art cannot counterfeit what Nature
>
> Could make but once.
>
> (sig. 5R4^{r}; 3.3.18-28)

The moment is relatively problematic, as Malroda directs three consecutive utterances to the other three characters on stage, one of which (Piorato) is invisible to another (Vitelli). The first ("Tis he, do as I told thee") presumably refers to Vitelli and is directed as an apart to Piorato, directing him to do something as instructed. The third ("Oh, my deare Lord") is clearly directed to Vitelli, as he is repeatedly addressed as such in the following speech. We have to assume that the second ("'Blesse thee Signior"), therefore, is spoken to the Alguazir as a greeting. Piorato is invisible to

Vitelli and perhaps to the Alguazir (though this is not relevant to the effect of the scene), so we have to infer that the implied instruction given to him by Malroda is to hide from the young gallant. Vitelli therefore sees her walking alone. Malroda instructs him to follow her "this way" to appreciate her picture under a better light, obviously taking him away from where Piorato is hiding: if he came on through the central opening, then the direction is towards the edges of the stage. The portrait is clearly meant to be portable, perhaps a miniature, and not a full-size painting.[17] Piorato and the Alguazir utter a line each before exiting without being overheard by the others. The Alguazir is visible to the other three, while Piorato's presence is only known to Malroda (and perhaps the Alguazir).

In this respect, the hiding Piorato is standing apart from the others, while the Alguazir, who may be visible to all three other characters, does not need to do so. George Walton Williams's edition, however, interprets that the Alguazir stands apart before Malroda and Piorato's entrance, and that the half-line "'Blesse thee Signior" is also directed at Piorato. The key to resolve this ambiguity is to decide whether the swordsman hides before or after this salutation. We rehearsed both options and several ways of blocking the scene. If, as the text seems to indicate, Piorato re-appears with Malroda using the central opening, and he is immediately instructed to retreat and hide, he could easily do this by partly hiding himself behind the curtain: a straightforward device if performed using a curtained discovery space. In this respect, we found that, if Piorato does so after the definite instruction "do as I told thee," Malroda can then advance, first greeting the Alguazir in passing, and then starting the conversation with Vitelli, eventually taking him apart. This option avoids Williams's

[17] In his edition, Alexander Dyce added the SD "*While she shews Vitelli the picture, Piorato steals to the door*". (152)

perhaps more awkward instruction for the Alguazir to stand apart as he notices Malroda and Piorato approaching (while Vitelli is oblivious of their presence). It also reinforces my initial assumption that the two come on through the central space by allowing the curtain to be immediately put to a specific use.

All in all, avoiding being too specific about Piorato's hiding place, and introducing the differentiation between the hidden swordsman's *apart* and the visible Alguazir's *aside*,[18] the edited passage would be as follows:

Enter MALRODA *and* PIORATO.

MALRODA [*apart to Piorato*]

'Tis he. Do as I told thee. [*Piorato stands apart.*]

[*to the Alguazir*] 'Bless thee, señor.

[*to Vitelli*] O my dear lord.

VITELLI Malroda, what, alone?

MALRODA

She never is alone that is accompanied
With noble thoughts, my lord; and mine are such,
Being only of your lordship.

VITELLI Pretty lass.

MALRODA

O my good lord, my picture's done, but 'faith [*She shows him a*
It is not like. Nay, this way, sir, the light *portrait, and takes*
Strikes best upon it here. *him apart.*]

[18] For the distinction between these two closely related terms, see George Walton Williams, "To Edit? To Direct? Ay, There's the Rub": "The 'apart' can be an indicator of a longer condition or separated dialogue. It may involve several characters, and it can suggest a line of stage action parallel to the main line of action continuing on stage. It represents, like the 'aside', a divergent, not necessarily antagonistic, stream of action." However, as Eoin Price pointed out in private communication, this is a useful modern distinction, but not a consistent textual practice in early printed playbooks.

PIORATO [*apart*] Excellent wench. *Exit.*

ALGUAZIR [*aside*]

I am glad the danger's over. *Exit.*

VITELLI 'Tis wondrous like,

But that art cannot counterfeit what nature

Could make but once.

This seemed to our performing team to be the most plausible way to stage this scene, though I then added a note on Williams's choice as an alternative. In any case, though most editions of the play have not included it, the SD added to specify that Malroda takes Vitelli apart by using her portrait seems essential to make sense of the stage business.

2. The case of 2.2: a traditional staging crux.

Perhaps the most problematic moment in the play as printed in F occurs in scene 2.2. The steward Bobadilla has been commissioned to instruct Lucio on how to behave like a man; after a brief role-playing scene in which the steward assumes the persona of Vitelli to try to excite Lucio to a fight, Clara makes her entrance. This is how the passage appears in F:

Enter Clara.

Cla. Where art thou Brother *Lucio?* ran tan tan ta ran tan ran tan tan, ta ran tan tan tan. Oh, I shall no more see those golden dayes, these clothes will never fadge with me : a —— O' this filthie vardingale, this hip hape : brother why are womens hanches onely limited , confin'd, hoop'd in, as it were with these same scurvy vardingales?

Bob. Because womens hanches onely are most subject to display and fly out.

Cla. Bobadilla , rogue, ten Duckets, I hit the propose of thy Cod-peice.

Luc. Hold, if you love my life, Sister *:* I am not *Zancho Bobadilla* , I am your brother *Lucio* : what a fright you have put me in?

Cla. Brother ? and wherefore thus?

(sig. 5R2^{r}; 2.2.66-78)

No edition of the play has presented a convincing solution to the staging of this scene. As Williams annotated, "This is a difficult passage to visualise. In both of her speeches, Clara addresses one man and the other answers." (94) The comic effect is based on the fact that Clara mistakes Lucio for Bobadilla. But how can this be possible, even if, in the fiction of the play, Clara has only known Bobadilla and Lucio quite briefly, and it is the first time that she is seeing her brother in masculine clothes? The actors playing Bobadilla and Lucio would have been dressed quite differently to indicate Lucio's higher social rank. In addition, Bobadilla would be wearing a chain of office that is implicit in the text, as Clara uses it a little later to attempt to strangle him for his insolence. So, if both men do not look alike, why does she get it wrong? And not once, but twice?

The clue to start to disentangle this staging crux may be in the traffic of props in the scene. When Clara gets annoyed with Bobadilla's sexist remarks, she attempts to hit the steward with his staff of office, and then proceeds to try to strangle him with his chain, both times using the symbols of his newly-acquired status. In F it appears as follows:

> *Cla.* Hold these a little.
>
> *Luc.* Ile not touch 'em, I.
>
> *Cla.* First doe I breake your Office o're your pate

(sig. 5R2^{r}; 2.2.104-5)

Clara is holding two or more objects ("these") that she tries to leave aside before attacking Bobadilla. Lucio refuses to take them, and presumably she puts them down. But what are they? A little later, just after Bobadilla runs away, she addresses her brother (my emphasis):

> *Cla.* *Lucio* , who bought **this**?

'Tis a reasonable good one; but **there hangs one**
Spaines Champion ne're us'd truer: **with this Staffe**
Old *Alvarez* has led up men so close,
They could almost spit in the Canons mouth,
Whil'st I with **that**, and **this** well mounted, scurr'd
A Horse-troope through, and through, like swift desire;
And seen poor rogues retire, all gore, and gash'd
Like bleeding Shads.

(sig. 5R2^{r}; 2.2.121-29)

Apart from, explicitly, Álvarez's staff of command, there is a weapon hanging somewhere that is of the same kind as one that Lucio carries. The complication arises from the relative distances implied by the demonstratives ("this" and "that") and the adverb of place "there." The most likely possibility is to infer that, in the first two lines of the speech, Clara is talking of two swords, the one Lucio is presumably carrying and the one that belongs to her; the latter could be hanging from her belt, or, as the adverb suggests, from somewhere on the *frons scænae*. Lucio needs a sword in subsequent scenes—the fencing lesson in 3.4, his father's defense in 4.3, and his duel with Lamoral in 5.1—and Clara needs hers a little later, when she surrenders it to the man she loves, Vitelli, adding that she values it "next [her] Virginity." (2.2.240) This line, "*Spaines* Champion ne're us'd truer," would then foreground Clara's affection for the sword and her admiration for the deeds that it has accomplished in battle.[19]

[19] The other option may be that Clara is enquiring after Bobadilla's staff, and then goes on to talk about Álvarez's, which could be hanging somewhere on the stage. In this case an extra movement is implied by the text, as Clara would need to move from where she is to reach the staff ("there") so that she can immediately refer to it as "this Staffe." In this case, the modernized punctuation would have to retain the colon to establish the logical connection between "one" and "this Staffe." However, this move

Most importantly, the other prop encoded in this passage as "this" (126) can only be the pistol that she is carrying, and that Lucio asks about in lines 130-31: "what do'ye call / This Gun, a dag?" Clara is carrying an unusual prop, a French petronel, "a large pistol or carbine used in the 16th and early 17th centuries, especially by cavalry," (*Oxford English Dictionary* 1) which she used while fighting on horseback ("well mounted") in Flanders, as Lamoral related in 1.1.56-80. [20]

Now that we know what weapons are present on stage, we need to determine who brings them on. Henry Weber's 1812 edition attempted to solve this puzzle by adding, at the beginning of the scene, that the action takes place in "*A Room in* Alvarez' *House. Arms hanging on the Wall.*" In this case, the weapons would be preset on stage, which is an imaginable practice on a Victorian stage, but a problematic notion in a Jacobean playhouse, as it seems unlikely that there would have been enough time between 2.1 and 2.2 to set up these weapons somewhere on the *frons scænae*.[21] Discarding this, we have to assume that the actors playing Bobadilla, Lucio, and Clara are responsible for carrying them on.

Bobadilla brings on his staff of office and maybe his own sword. Lucio may be carrying his. This means that Clara, who appears in female clothes for the first time, would be carrying her large petronel, her own sword, and Álvarez's staff of command. This possibility is supported by the peculiar noise that she makes when entering the stage, "ran tan tan ta ran tan ran tan tan, ta ran tan tan tan:" she is reproducing the beating of a drum in battle, before she goes on to remember the

---

seems excessively cumbersome, and is probably safer to assume that Clara is referring to Lucio's sword and hers, which she again points at in line 126 as "that."

[20] A petronel would be larger than a dag, and therefore unmistakable to Clara's military-trained eyes.

[21] This possibility would be perhaps less unlikely if the scene were at the beginning of an act, after a musical interlude, and not immediately following another scene.

"golden dayes" when she was a soldier. She may be wearing a dress, but she is reluctant to give up her weapons, which, meaningfully, she only surrenders later in the scene to her brother (the petronel, line 131) and her lover (the sword, line 240). In rehearsal, this proved to be a challenge for the actor playing Clara. We decided that at some point in the scene Clara needs to leave her sword hanging somewhere on the *frons scænae*, perhaps as she enters, when she is complaining about her farthingale and maybe trying to adjust her skirt. Then she keeps carrying her father's staff and the petronel, both of which ("these," in the plural) she tries to give Lucio in line 104.

Now that we know which props are required for the scene and who has got them, we shall analyze the problematic moment of Clara's appearance. We initially rehearsed a few options, all of which proved to be unconvincing. After Clara's threat, my editorial SD read "*She strikes Lucio, mistaking him for Bobadilla,*" which described the confusion but did not attempt to make sense of the stage business. Peter Malin, our textual advisor and the actor playing Álvarez, suggested a solution based on the implied action in Clara's threat (in my modernization):

CLARA Bobadilla, rogue, ten ducats I hit the prepuce of thy cod-piece.

If the line can be paraphrased as "I bet you ten ducats that I can hit the tip of thy cod-piece," the implied SD could be "*Aims her petronel at Lucio*." This means that she is far away enough from Lucio and Bobadilla to be able to use her pistol (maybe at the other end of the stage), and from the dialogue it is clear that she aims at his cod-piece and not his face. The implied distance, in terms of the blocking of the scene, seems to determine that she enters using the door at the opposite end of the stage area where Lucio and Bobadilla are standing. Her first line ("Where art thou Brother *Lucio?*") and the sound of the drum could be heard off stage, or as she is coming on wielding her weapons. She enters looking for her brother, but she may not notice his presence

immediately, as she instantly starts complaining to herself about her "filthy farthingale," maybe thinking that she is on her own.

The second time she refers to her brother ("brother why are womens hanches onely limited") she may be just thinking aloud, as if she were addressing him in his mind, assuming that he is not present. Or she may have seen a man at the other end of the stage, and assumed it is her brother, but not turned to face him yet. In any case, when Bobadilla finally speaks, she immediately turns around and, following her military instincts, aims her petronel at the man who is standing there and speaks with Bobadilla's voice: may it be that Bobadilla and Lucio are standing in a line, and she can only see her brother, but hear the steward? If they are standing in a line, and Clara immediately aims her pistol at the cod-piece, without even looking at the face of the man, only reacting to Bobadilla's voice, we can explain the momentary confusion, and make sense of the text as it is written. The confusion is also justified by the fact that this happens in the short space of approximately ten lines, some of which may actually be spoken off stage or at the door while Clara is entering.[22]

This is not the only staging option, as I will say, but it is the one that, after much debate, our team came up with as the only plausible solution we could think of to justify Clara's mistake in theatrical terms. What we found in the workshop provided me with an actual performance choice that makes sense of the script, and that resolves a serious issue of apparent incongruity with a very simple blocking device. A longer note was added to explain this issue, but it seemed safe to encode

[22] Almost by chance, in our performances we had Lucio and Bobadilla wearing green doublets and black breeches, which enhanced this visual effect. Lucio's doublet, trimmed with pink ribbons, seemed richer than Bobadilla's, but the effect of using the same colour strengthened the sense of confusion.

these findings partially in the editorial SDs. Tentatively, the edited passage would be as follows:

Enter CLARA [*in women's clothes, carrying her weapons.* LUCIO *and* BOBADILLA *stand apart.*]

CLARA Where art thou, brother Lucio? Ran tan tan, ta ran tan ran tan tan, ta ran tan tan tan. O, I shall no more see those golden days! These clothes will never fadge with me. A pox o' this filthy farthingale; this hip hap! Brother, why are women's haunches only limited, confined, hooped in, as it were, with these same scurvy farthingales?

BOBADILLA Because women's haunches only are most subject to display and fly out.

CLARA [*Aims her petronel at Lucio.*]

Bobadilla, rogue, ten ducats I hit the prepuce of thy cod-piece.

LUCIO Hold if you love my life, sister! I am not Sancho Bobadilla, I am your brother Lucio. What a fright you put me in!

This wording is cautious enough to avoid being too specific about which weapons are carried on stage, and as we cannot be entirely certain of where Clara's sword could be hanging. Since Lamoral referred to Clara's petronel in 1.1, it seems safe to use that precise term in the SD. The expression "*Aims her petronel at Lucio*" and the instruction to Lucio and Bobadilla to "*stand apart*," seem to encode the physical actions required quite economically, without adding a lengthier explanation. The reason for the confusion is also left sufficiently open for the performers to explore, though different performance options are suggested in the annotation. Most importantly, even if these editorial additions emerged in rehearsals for a given production, they do not reflect its particular circumstances, as they are open enough to allow the user of the edition to explore other ways of managing the traffic of props and most individual actions, while giving a solution for the basic difficulty of the scene.

In the production that Graham Watts directed in December 2013 at the Oval House Theatre in London, he opted for an alternative solution to this particular crux. Since the problem emerges from Clara's inability to recognize the person she aims her pistol at, it could simply be that her vision is temporarily impaired. As it is the first time she appears in feminine clothes, Watts decided that this could be easily and meaningfully done with an item of clothing: a veil. In private communication, he justified his decision as follows:

> Having Clara in a veil at the start of 2.2 was something that occurred to me on first reading, before rehearsals began. It seemed the simplest and most practical solution. The text is a little confused at that point so it's difficult to understand what exactly is happening, staging-wise. However, the whole scene is about Lucio and Clara trying to come to terms with the imposed clothing of their "new" gender. It seemed to me that a veil would be another encumbrance for Clara and make it difficult for her to distinguish between Lucio and Bobadilla. (Watts)

This staging solution was independently proposed by Martin Wiggins in a seminar I gave at the Shakespeare Institute on 31 February 2013. In that seminar John Curtis, the actor who had played Bobadilla in our production, also suggested that it would make sense for the cowardly steward to push Lucio in front of him and hide behind his back at that point: he would be standing in the line that we had adopted in our rehearsals, but following a specific reason of characterization. In any of these cases, it was reassuring to see that all the proposed solutions—standing in a line, the use of a veil, or Bobadilla's cowardly impulse—were compatible with the editorial additions to my modernized text, and they have found their way into the annotation of that moment as alternative performance options.

Conclusions.

Naturally, this kind of study of the practicalities of the staging of a play is not the solution to every problem an editor has to face when investigating the dramaturgy of an infrequently performed text. As I have shown, some findings are circumstantial in that they only apply to our particular production and to the space that was available to us, and cannot be immediately extrapolated to the original performances, or adopted straightaway in the modernized text as the only way to manage the stage business. Some other, however, illuminate the dramaturgy of the text and clarify the action to the point that useful, arguably essential, SDs can be added to complete what this particular copy text attempted to present: a codification of the original theatrical reality of *Love's Cure*. It would be impossible to generalize the processes we employed in this project—prior consideration of the text, extensive discussion with the actors, exploration of the multiple ways in which each scene can be played—as an infallible methodology to be applied to all the plays of the period, as the variation in the origins and textual conditions of most texts is, of course, enormous. But in this case, the SDs in the F text are clearly theatrical and specific, and the editor's work seems more straightforward. Dealing with other dramatic texts may inevitably pose different challenges when trying to disentangle their staging cruxes and encode possible solutions in the editorial matter.

In any case, the collaborative nature of these processes is possibly the most important lesson that we learnt. As Christie Carson has pointed out, "The single author/scholar/editor/king model is evolving into a collaborative practitioner involved in developing projects that span continents and decades. [. . .] I see the shift towards a greater general understanding of collaborative creation and the material conditions of the period as the key issues facing editors attempting to bring these historically rooted texts to a public audience." (Carson 215) Our project seems to be a good example of

this tendency. If anything, we demonstrated that editorial work on a dramatic text is greatly simplified when editors can experiment with the scenes with a group of actors, complementing the work of their imagination with those of their cast in a collective, collaborative enterprise.

Acknowledgements.

The work presented in this essay would have been impossible to undertake without the efforts and generous commitment of our production team and cast; my debt of gratitude to them is immense. I would like to thank in particular my two close collaborators, Robert F. Ball and Red Smucker, for their unfailing support and research input; the Centre for Learning and Academic Development at the University of Birmingham for funding the project; the Shakespeare Institute Players for kindly lending props and costumes; the staff, fellows, and students of the Shakespeare Institute for their help and encouragement; C K Ash for many fruitful conversations about editing and performance, and for demonstrating Clara's difficulties in carrying heavy weaponry while wearing a farthingale; Eoin Price for his insightful comments and suggested improvements to this essay; Martin Wiggins for his support throughout the project, and beyond; and Peter Malin, the best imaginable Álvarez, for lending his experienced textual eye and for his many valuable suggestions.

Credits. Cast (in order of appearance): Charlie Morton (Lamoral), Jason Burg (Anastro), José A. Pérez Díez (Vitelli), John Curtis (Bobadilla), Hadley Brown (Lucio), James Parsons (Eugenia), Richard Ball (Stephano, Metaldi), Peter Malin (Álvarez), Hefin Robinson (Clara), David Southeard (Sayavedra), Adrian McCarthy (Pacheco), Ryan Moir (Lazarillo), Robert Mrozek (Mendoza, Herald), Mark Spriggs (Alguazir), Callum Ashton (Malroda), Richard Nunn (Piorato), Liam Edwards (Genevora), Philip Hickson (Asistente), and Will Cotterill (Guard). Music arranged and performed by Jennifer Waghorn and Cecilia Kendall White, with Zoe Hawken. Directed by Robert F. Ball. Text and dramaturgy: José A. Pérez Díez. Costume design: Red Smucker. Costumes supplied by the Royal Shakespeare Company. Stage

manager: Helen Osborne. Set design: Colin Judges. Set artwork: Giulia I. Sandelewski. Props and armor: Richard Nunn. Catering: Irma Prieto Menéndez. Textual advisors: Peter Malin and Martin Wiggins. Project advisors: Erin Sullivan and Alison Davies.

Works Cited.

Beaumont, Francis, and John Fletcher. *Comedies and Tragedies*. London: Humphrey Robinson and Humphrey Moseley, 1647. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 1 May 2012. <http://eebo.chadwyck.com>

---. *Love's Cure; or, The Martial Maid* in *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher, in Fourteen Volumes: with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes*. Ed. Henry Weber. Vol. 8. Edinburgh: James Ballantyne, 1812. Print.

---. *Love's Cure*, in *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher: The Text Formed from a New Collation of the Early Editions*. Ed. Alexander Dyce. Vol. 9. London: Edward Moxon, 1845. Print.

---. *Love's Cure, or the Martial Maid* in *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon*. Ed. George Walton Williams. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976. Print.

Beckerman, Bernard. *Shakespeare at the Globe, 1599-1609*. London: Macmillan, 1962. Print.

Carson, Christie. "Influencing Editors, Influencing Performers: The Page to Stage Relationship." *Editing, Performance, Texts: New Practices in Medieval and Early Modern English Drama*. Eds. Jacqueline Jenkins and Julie Sanders. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. 198-217. Print.

Carson, Christie, and Farah Karim-Cooper, eds. *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. Print.

Cave, Richard, Eleanor Lowe, and Brian Woolland. "Actors and Editors: A Feature of the Edition *Richard Brome Online*." *Editing, Performance, Texts: New Practices in Medieval and Early Modern English Drama*. Eds. Jacqueline

Jenkins and Julie Sanders. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. 218-37. Print.

Cohen, Ralph Alan. "The Most Convenient Place: The Second Blackfriars Theater and Its Appeal." *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre*. Ed. Richard Dutton. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, 2011. Print.

Conkie, Rob. "Entrances and Exits." *Shakespeare and the Making of Theatre*. Eds. Stuart Hampton-Reeves and Bridget Escolme. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. Print.

Fitzpatrick, Tim. "Playwrights with Foresight: Staging Resources in Tne Elizabethan Playhouses." *Theatre Notebook* 56.2 (2002): 85-116. Print.

---. "Shakespeare's Exploitation of a Two-Door Stage: *Macbeth*." *Theatre Research International* 20.3 (1995): 207-30. Print.

---. "Stage Management, Dramaturgy and Spatial Semiotics in Shakespeare's Dialogue." *Theatre Research International* 24.1 (1999): 1-22. Print.

Fitzpatrick, Tim, and Daniel Johnston. "Spaces, Doors and Places in Early Modern English Staging." *Theatre Notebook* 63.1 (2009): 2-19. Print.

Fitzpatrick, Tim, and Wendy Millyard. "Hangings, Doors and Discoveries: Conflicting Evidence or Problematic Assumptions?" *Theatre Notebook* 54.1 (2000): 2-23. Print.

Fletcher, John. *The Island Princess*. Arden Early Modern Drama. Ed. Clare McManus. London: Methuen, 2013. Print.

Gurr, Andrew. *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Print.

Gurr, Andrew, and Mariko Ichikawa. *Staging in Shakespeare's Theatres*. Oxford Shakespeare Topics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.

Hunter, Lynette, and Peter Lichtenfels. “Reading in the Moment: Theatre Practice as a Guide to Textual Editing.” *In Arden: Editing Shakespeare*. Eds. Ann Thompson and Gordon McMullan. London: Thomson, 2003. 111-24. Print.

---. “(Un)Editing with (Non-)Fictional Bodies: Pope's Daggers.” *Editing, Performance, Texts: New Practices in Medieval and Early Modern English Drama*. Eds. Jacqueline Jenkins and Julie Sanders. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. 171-97. Print.

Munro, Lucy. “Read Not Dead: A Review Article.” *Shakespeare Bulletin* 5 (2004): 23-40. Print.

---. “Report of Francis Beaumont, John Fletcher and Philip Massinger's *Love's Cure* with the King's Players.” *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 41 (2002): 75-76. Print.

Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. Web. 16 June 2014. <http://www.oed.com>

Price, Eoin. Private communication. 14 August 2014. E-mail.

Wallace, James. “Staging Shakespeare's Contemporaries.” *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. 147-54. Print.

Watts, Graham. Private communication. 11 May 2014. E-mail.

Wells, Stanley, and Gary Taylor. *Modernizing Shakespeare's Spelling, with Three Studies in the Text of Henry V*. Oxford Shakespeare Studies. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979. Print.

Williams, George Walton. "To Edit? To Direct? Ay, There's the Rub." *In Arden: Editing Shakespeare*. Eds. Ann Thompson and Gordon McMullan. London: Thomson, 2003. 111-24. Print.