Order Number 9431850

The two quartos of "Romeo and Juliet": A performance comparison

Basile, Michael, Ph.D.

City University of New York, 1994

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

The Two Quartos of *Romeo and Juliet*: A Performance Comparison

by

Michael Basile

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in English in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

1994

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in English in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

4/19/94
Date

Chair of Examining Committee

4/19/94
Date

Executive Officer

David Craft

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

The Two Quartos of Romeo and Juliet:
A Performance Comparison

by

Michael Basile

Adviser: Professor Steven Urkowitz

Performance Variations between the First Quarto (1597) and the Second Quarto (1599) of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet are considered with the intention of establishing both as viable theatrical versions of the play. Linguistic analyses of Shakespeare's texts are coupled with semiotic analyses of previously unrecognized performance texts--the intonational and gestural programs which direct actors' performance choices.

A discussion of stage conventions in operation in London during the 1590s--e.g., "rolling repertory" and the close physical and emotional proximity of actor and audience--suggests that these performance texts were the products of the direct artistic collaboration of Shakespeare and his fellow actors.

Will Kemp, the resident clown of the Chamberlain's Men, was the most renowned member of Shakespeare's acting company. The effect of Kemp's "celebrity text" on the two

quartos of Romeo and Juliet is traced, with particular attention given to those scenes during which his name appears in the texts: 4.4 and 4.5.

Past bibliographical discussions (1920-1980) concerning the relative authority of each quarto version are reviewed in the light of recent theories of polyvocal authorship and compositional recursion processes. Subsequently, a general reassessment of the traditionally accepted pattern of textual transmission between the two quartos--and between their supposed source texts--is proposed.

Finally, modern performances of Romeo and Juliet are semiotically explicated in order to expose interpretive patterns likely to have been originally fashioned by Shakespeare and the Chamberlain's Men.

Preface

Several years ago I took a course in Shakespeare's multiple text plays with Steven Urkowitz. As a former actor and director, I immediately understood the theatrical significance of my naive discovery: there were two (and sometimes three) significantly different, yet equally producible, playtext versions of many of Shakespeare's most renowned works. I knew then that my task would be to begin to develop for myself the means by which these versions might be appreciated in all their striking individuality.

Before I could develop a method, however, I felt I had to narrow my sights. As many as ten plays exist in multiple texts, and I knew I would not be able to perform the close theatrical explication each would require. Without much anxiety or hesitation, I decided to focus my energies upon the two quarto versions of Romeo and Juliet. I had always responded to the play with emotional fervor. As a child, I had been introduced to Shakespeare through it; as a doctoral candidate, I had more recently discovered its critical neglect. While King Lear, Hamlet, Henry 5 and other multiple text plays had been positively reevaluated during the 1970's and 1980's, little attention had been paid to Romeo and Juliet. Into a critical vacuum I walked armed with the deeply felt impressions of my youth.

My goal of cataloguing the delightful eccentricities of each quarto, however, faced some very practical obstacles.

It was difficult, for instance, to find either quarto in its original form: all modern editions borrow from both Q1 and Q2, and they often do it without informing the reader when or where. Michael J. B. Allen and Kenneth Muir's facsimile edition offered what the other editions did not, but in a volume so large and heavy as to make it impractical. During the preliminary fact-gathering stages of this project, I was conducting my own research, assisting a professor with his, teaching, studying, writing and raising a family. I needed to use my many hours on New York's subways and buses charting, if not evaluating, quarto variants. There wasn't room in a crowded subway car for me and Allen and Muir's facsimile edition.

Fortunately, I stumbled upon Frank G. Hubbard's portable, lightweight 1922 edition of the first quarto of Romeo and Juliet in the Queens College library. Upon first opening it, however, I realized this discovery would prove more than a mere convenience. In the margins of the pages a previous reader had inscribed his comments. One such inscription, when Juliet stabs herself and follows Romeo into death, read, "She really loved him!"

What is the significance of this pencilled inscription in Hubbard's edition of the First Quarto and of the many similar inscriptions I found? I believe the reader who made these comments assessed the play he read without critical prejudice, never considering it anything but Shakespearean.

He may have simply skimmed the title, taking little if any note of the words "First Quarto", or, if initially noting them, letting them soon pass from his mind as insignificant. His responses to this early version of the play, then, were fresh and unencumbered. Never aware that he was reading a "bad" quarto, he was free to be emotionally moved by Juliet's suicide.

How, I wondered, might others be given the same opportunity to assess this text on its own merits? And how might the second quarto be similarly reassessed?

During the months when I was plodding through Hubbard's edition, I was simultaneously reading an anthology, The Semiotics of Art, compiled from the work of the members of the Prague Linguistic Circle. Their work foregrounds the codes through which playtexts are developed and the signs by which those playtexts are translated into stage action. These signs include, among others, the playwright's script, the actor's gesture and intonation, costume and set. Hard semiotic analysis, I began to realize, would be the methodology through which I might highlight the distinctiveness of each version of Romeo and Juliet. This approach would allow me, at least initially, to leave the question of authorship aside so that I might allow each text to speak for itself.

And so, we begin.

Acknowledgements

I owe so much to so many.

I am most deeply indebted to Steven Urkowitz. His scrupulous readings helped me achieve whatever clarity is to be found within, and his enthusiasm reminded me--at every step along the way--to be happy in my work.

Much thanks, also, to David Greetham, whose provocative textual and methodological insights caused me to constantly reassess where I was and where I had yet to go.

For technical support, I owe thanks to William Salter, Bernard Codd, and, most of all, to Patrick Moroney. This book may have been finished without them, but not before I had become even more old and grey than I am.

I have grown old and grey with this book bolstered by the emotional support of two dear friends, William and Philip Salter, my mother-in-law, Evelyn Codd, my brother and father, Mark and Mario Basile, and my children, Theresa and Daniel.

I yearn for the day when Theresa eclipses me and shares her literary insights with the world. Thank you, Daniel, for showing me the miracle of learning.

I dedicate this book to my wife, Evelyn Codd. She teaches me that faith is unshakable, that patience is silent and sure, and that love goes "beyond beyond."

Table of Contents

I introduce four goals for this chapter, goals which will be further developed in subsequent chapters: (1) a theoretical reevaluation of professional actors' contributions to playtext revisions; (2) an introduction to the practical methodology by which those contributions may be ascertained; (3) an application of this theory and praxis to the historical context particular to Shakespeare and a leading actor of the Chamberlain's Men; and (4) the combined application of this theoretical argument, practical method, and historical context to the resolution of some long-standing textual cruces in the two critically neglected quarto versions of Romeo and Juliet

Redefining authorship as it applies to playtexts: a semiotic reappraisal

Although it is true that the redefinition of authorship has occupied theorists and textualists for the better part of two decades, seldom has the professional actor's collaboration with the playwright been recognized as the paradigmatic model for polyvocal textual generation. Reception theory has fostered the reappraisal of authorial intentions and fixed texts in the light of a transactional semiotic model in which acts of encoding and decoding interdependently create "the message," but most theorists apply this model almost exclusively to the writers and

readers of prose narrative. Fortunately, many textualists appropriately extend this reappraisal to include the authoring acts of editor, publisher, scribe--in short, all those who contribute toward the material text[1]--and then apply this reappraisal to a larger range of literary genres: prose, poetry, and drama. The actor's contribution to authorship, however, remains a largely unexplored area.

But while the Elizabethan actor's contribution to text and performance has long been overtly neglected by the academic community at large, the current theoretical vocabularies of several scholars attempt to yoke the actor's contributions to the more recognized contributions of other textual collaborators and thereby provide an indirect endorsement for my position. For instance, Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor remind us that Shakespeare wrote his plays for two groups of readers: the first was his fellow actors, the second the general public. The actor, in this analogy, becomes the primary reader. They continue this analogy (and develop a second one) when they say that this first group of readers necessarily received the written playtext before the second, for it was the actors (i.e., the primary readers) who would "edit [Shakespeare's] manuscript, at least mentally and perhaps physically" and thereby develop the "invisible life-support system of stage directions" left unwritten by him (Textual 2). The actor/reader has now become an editor. The reversal of terminologies--we also

hear of reading "performances"--could create an atmosphere of tolerance in which actors' contributions to textual authorship may receive their much overdo reappraisal. It is unfortunate, however, that this reappraisal must come by way of proxy, that acting must first be analogized to reading or editing. In fact, the actor is the paradigmatic co-author for crucial generic reasons.

Unlike any other literary genre, dramatic playtexts require engagement in actual performance for structural and artistic completion. Though this might appear obvious, the value of performance as a site for textual reformation has generally been underestimated; consequently, so has the semiotic potential by which that reformation ensues. The lack of a methodological precedent for the retrieval and analysis of performances partially validates the neglect they have received, for the theatrical scholar "finds himself in a rather paradoxical and unenviable position: he must study an object (the performance) which, as such, is missing" (Pavis, Languages 30). Indeed, the theatrical structures that are found within performances seem irretrievable, and the semiotic systems which compose theatrical structures appear beyond the scope of conventional analysis. Analogies to more familiar terms, however, may help clarify my proposal to retrieve and analyze the contributions of actors in performance.

Theatrical structure is analogous to literary structure

in so far as both are composed of devices, forms, or components which may be isolated and objectively analyzed. The devices, forms, or components of literary structure include, among others, metrical patterns, rhyme schemes, rhetorical figures, and diction--some of the traditional objects of linguistic analysis. Theatrical structure, however, subsumes literary structure, and requires analytical tools which are able not only to unlock the linguistic signs of the literary text, but are also able to explicate the various semiotic devices, forms, and components actors employ in performance to transfigure those linguistic signs into stage action. Without performance, a dramatic text remains only partially realized. But traditional linguistic analysis cannot account for the multiplying dimensions of actors' performances, each dimension of which may represent a sign-system discrete from linguistics.

Consider, for example, a linguistically indeterminate moment in Antony and Cleopatra when Antony says: "the nobleness of life/ Is to do thus" (1.1.36-37; my emphasis).[2] Although no one can say exactly what happens at this moment in the play, it seems clear that this apparently unimportant word "thus" offers exciting gestural and intonational opportunities for the actor. We may speculate, for instance, that Antony might seize Cleopatra in a full embrace on "thus," and that the audience might

react with the kind of swooning approbation likely to foster a second embrace--or even a gesturally resplendent kiss.[3] But whatever the signs produced and received, linguistics cannot account for them. Semiotics, however, can.

Semiotics subsumes linguistics. Linguistics is a sign-system composed exclusively of words; semiotics is a broader classification of sign-systems which offers the possibilities of analyzing (1) the verbal and dramatic signs of the playwright's text, (2) the variegated sign-creating capacities of the actor-in-performance--gesture, intonation, costume, make-up, music, and dance--and (3) the audience's reception of the text-performance collaboration. The value of this approach seems obvious: dramatic texts provide the blueprint for eventual theatricalization. They are not ends unto themselves. Q1 and Q2 Romeo and Juliet were written to be performed. I will demonstrate that, in practice, actors must generate a semiotic analysis of their play's theatrical structure and that a full semiotic analysis necessarily includes a linguistic analysis of the play's literary structure. The actors' analysis of the full theatrical structure offers precedent for my application of the semiotic method to Q1 and Q2 Romeo and Juliet.

The theatrical structures of Q1 and Q2 Romeo and Juliet may be broken down and analyzed, just as their literary structures have been previously. I offer a comparative semiotic analysis of these two versions as a method by which

the textual perspectives of modern readers and Elizabethan actors may be fruitfully combined. I believe that elements of the performances of Elizabethan actors, evaluated and adjusted before demonstrative, live audiences, may be reflected within these two literary texts, thereby offering modern readers the opportunity for the imaginative construction of them. As a modern reader, I show how parts of those theatrical structures are formed by various semiotic systems including, but not limited to, the linguistic semiotic system of the literary structure. I will enumerate and analyze several semiotic systems simultaneously at work in Shakespeare's theatre; however, since I introduce in this section the active collaboration of the actor and playwright, I will pay particular attention to the interactions between the playwright's written text and two of the most significant semiotic systems employed by actors throughout performance: kinesics--stage positioning, stage movement, and physical gesture--and paralinguistics--variations in the oral delivery produced by manipulations in pitch, volume, speed, and intonational nuance. With these two distinctly performance-generated sign systems, actors create at every occasion when the play is presented what I will call the performance text.

The performance text is the literary text applied. If the literary text is composed for the theatre, the performance text is produced in the theatre (Elam, Semiotics

3). Any performance text, then, because of its ephemeral existence, resists most forms of conventional analysis; however, a performance text may be imaginatively constructed from a literary text.

Unlike written, literary texts, semiotic performance texts might appear irrecoverable. But the authorship of actors in performance need not "remain unheard within the written text" (Foley, "Oral Tradition" 3) if we can propose a method by which the orthographic codes of the written texts will yield the performance codes within them. I believe Q1 and Q2 Romeo and Juliet provide fruitful objects for such an analysis. Analyzed in tandem, I believe they record two significantly different, yet independently successful, textual collaborations between Shakespeare and his fellow actors of the Chamberlain's Men. We will never know which textual changes the playwright demanded from the actors and which they demanded of him (Wells and Taylor, Textual Companion 19), but the quality of many of the variants between these two texts suggests the adaptations and reformations made by theatrical professionals when they inevitably shape the linguistic codes of the written text into the semiotic codes which form the performance text. Both are semiotic codes, but only the linguistic code appears to have survived in traditional textual form. The multiple text plays, however, help resolve one of the most intractable obstacles to unlocking the co-authorship of

actors: they exist as records of those semiotic performance codes retranslated into stable, orthographically tangible linguistic codes.

The literary texts offer a range of possible performance texts; although these performance texts will inevitably demonstrate a broad interpretive range, they nonetheless derive from the literary texts as their common source. I propose, therefore, to construct imaginatively the performance texts of Q1 and Q2 Romeo and Juliet working with the two extant literary texts as my sources. For practical, historical, and theoretical reasons, I will choose the written texts as the initial objects of my discussion, and I will choose a linguistic analysis as my initial methodological approach.

Pragmatically, the written texts are extant and the performances are not. No direct records exist of the original performances of these two scripts. Nor do we possess any first-hand reports of Q1 or Q2 Romeo and Juliet by audience members who might have seen the original performances, reports which might have lent us some insight into how Shakespeare's words were translated into stage action by members of the Chamberlain's Men. But while first-hand accounts of specific performances would provide invaluable insight into Shakespeare's theatre, my discussion does not depend on them. Instead, I will focus on a model performance of each script. The extant written texts

provide substantial information about a range of performance choices actors may have made in these two model performances.

A contrastive semiotic analysis of these two texts begins with a contrastive linguistic analysis for two excellent reasons. First, the words of a written text exist as words before they are subjected to theatrical collaboration. Secondly, the words of the written texts represent the playwright's contribution to that collaboration, a contribution which readily submits to conventional analysis.

But as I alluded to earlier, linguistic analysis is semiotic analysis, albeit an incomplete one for any theatrical text. Linguistics is one of the many semiotic systems found within theatrical structure. By focusing on the written texts of Q1 and Q2 Romeo and Juliet, I will first demonstrate how those texts represent significantly different linguistic values, and then demonstrate how those contrasting linguistic values embed kinesic and paralinguistic signs intended to program two distinct performance texts.

Historical conditions supporting co-authorship of playtexts

In addition to practical reasons for beginning my analysis with the written texts, there are historical

reasons as well. The historical conditions particular to the Chamberlain's Men make Shakespeare's written texts especially fruitful objects for a discussion of their performance texts. In the next chapter I discuss one of those conditions--Will Kemp's membership in Shakespeare's acting company. At this point, however, I would like to briefly introduce several other aspects of the historical conditions surrounding the Chamberlain's Men which encouraged them to embrace collaborative playtext development.

In The Repertory of Shakespeare's Company 1594-1613, Rosalyn Knutson describes a situation in which the Chamberlain's Men were locked in a highly competitive battle with rival theatre companies for the audience "dollar." In order to appeal to a public ever-hungry for new plays, the Chamberlain's Men and its competitors used a repertory system which rotated its offerings often (32). For instance, Shakespeare's company produced twenty new plays a year from 1594-1599. The pressure for novelty was heightened by the profit potential: for a new play, a company could charge double the normal admission price (35). Nevertheless, a new play could only be new once. Unlike modern theatrical runs which may last for months or even years, the Chamberlain's Men seldom if ever performed any play--new or old, successful or not--on consecutive days.

Moreover, a new play might receive only ten additional performances during the next six months after its premiere (33). And after these ten performances, it might be dropped from the repertory altogether. Besides new plays, the remainder of the repertory included continuations from one season to the next of plays that had been spectacularly successful, revivals of plays dropped from the company's repertoire several years earlier, and revivals of plays acquired from rival companies. In any given week, during which the Chamberlain's Men performed every day except Sunday, actors were offered multiple opportunities to collaborate with Shakespeare in the development of those properties in which they exercised joint ownership: their playtexts. Although we can never be certain which textual variants were influenced by performance and which were created by Shakespeare alone, we can be sure that the company worked under conditions which have no modern theatrical analogues. That knowledge must caution us against applying limited twentieth-century models of playwright-actor collaboration to the Chamberlain's Men: the actors were not merely interpretive stylists. Whether they had to prepare a premiere performance, or adapt a play bought from a rival company, or revive a play they had not seen for months, it seems clear that the actors not only had to learn their parts quickly, but also had to make them immediately "come alive" without the benefit of extensive

rehearsal.

As a consequence of these historical conditions, Shakespeare and other professional playwrights wrote plays which often could be quickly understood by professional actors and easily reformed by them into performance texts. Detailed examinations of his literary scripts reveal how Shakespeare attempts to program his plays in performance even while encouraging in his fellow actors great creative license. Further, the creative license expected of the Chamberlain's Men during the developmental rehearsals which produced those performance programs helped to assure the financial success of the final product.

Before I continue this discussion of the co-authorship of playtexts with a further review of the semiotic theory which sustains it, I would like to offer a contrastive analysis of the literary text-performance text dialectic found within the two versions of the opening lines of 5.3 in Q1 and Q2, Romeo and Juliet. I call this process a dialectic because--as I propose to make clear--the written dialogue between Paris and his Page not only contains information about the dramatic circumstances within the play, but also records the "voices" of the playwright and actors as they collaborate in playtext development and revision. I do not mean, of course, that these texts contain direct evidence of Shakespeare's negotiation with his fellow actors and shareholders, or that the respective

positions or voices of playwright and performer can be factually distinguished. What I do mean, however, is that the two texts demonstrate linguistic and semiotic contributions that interdependently create significantly different theatrical structures in the two versions of 5.3. I will discuss the possible scenarios for this interdependent revision below. At this juncture, however, it is most important to note that the physical documents which house Q1 and Q2 Romeo and Juliet evidence little of what I have called co-authorship: changed entrances, punctuation added for dramatic emphasis, etc.[4] Although it is true that they contain printing house infelicities--inconsistent speech prefixes, duplicated lines, misalignment of verse passages--they contain only a few examples of compositional revision that might be attributed to performance adaptations. Moreover, these texts contain few stage directions which would, were they present, at least offer some evidence of the playwright's firm hand as he attempted to guide the actors in performance.

In the case of stage directions, at least, less is more. While we might long for the lost promptbook copies or authorial foul papers that might have provided us with invaluable insight into collaborative revision, the voices of Shakespeare and the actors may still be heard if we will examine how, where, and to what extent the literary texts program the performance texts without the use of apparent

stage directions. First, however, stage directions must be redefined.

Intra-dialogic and extra-dialogic stage directions

Many critics have noted how Shakespeare's written texts consistently include information about their performance texts.[5] Following Medieval and Renaissance conventions--but unlike playwrights' practices from more recent historical periods--Shakespeare's intended program for his performance texts is in large part included within the dramatic dialogue itself. (Not all passages include as many intra-dialogic stage directions as others, but most of those which are included are included internally.) This should not be surprising if scripts were generated collaboratively with professional goals in mind. Extra-dialogic stage directions would be rare, as they are in Shakespeare's plays, because a good deal of the information about the performance options would have been integrated within the verbal interactions between the dramatic characters. I contend that Shakespeare and the actors shaped these texts together, rendering unnecessary most of imperative, extra-dialogic stage directions found in the plays of later periods. In this sense, then, Q1 and Q2 Romeo will be found to be very complete since the performance text of the actor--when to cross the stage, whom to address, whether or not to

add rhetorical embellishment with the voice or hands--derives, to a significant degree, from the dramatic exigencies presented to the actor by the written text. This distinction cannot be overemphasized. Shakespeare's keen desire--evident in the extant dialogue of his plays--to influence the performance of his plays, and his appreciation of the actors' professional needs and artistic license, may be best understood by observing the abundance of intra-dialogic stage directions in his written texts. Intra-dialogic stage directions are best explained, however, by first contrasting them with their more "readable" counterparts: extra-dialogic stage directions.

Extra-dialogic stage directions dictate where an actor is to move, a specific action he is to play, or what props he is to carry on-stage with him. Although actors need not always (indeed, do not always) follow these directions, they have the option of doing so. Critics and editors often cite the relative abundance and specificity of extra-dialogic stage directions in Q1 to champion its theatrical authority, directions such as "He walks by them and sings" (E3r),[6] "She turns to Peter her man" (E3r), and "Enter Nurse wringing her hands, with the ladder of cords in her lap" (F3v) etc. On the other hand, both Q1 and Q2 contain an abundance of intra-dialogic stage directions which suggest, rather than dictate, performance options for the actor. Each text, however, suggests different performance options.

The setting is the Capulet tomb, the characters Paris and his Page. Q1 reads:

> Paris Put out the torch, and lay thee all along
> Under this Yew-tree, keeping close to the
> hollow ground.
> And if thou hear one tread within this
> Churchyard, Straight give me notice.
> Page I will my Lord. (K1r)

The dialogue dictates certain facts about the performance of Q1 at this point in the text. First, the torch may be brought on stage by Paris or the Page, but only the Page can "put [it] out." Second, the demonstrative pronoun in "this Yew-tree" (my emphasis) demands that either something representing a Yew-tree be present on stage, or that the actors' glances and gestures define some specific off-stage or on-stage area as "Yew-tree." Finally, the demonstrative pronoun in "this Churchyard" (my emphasis) dictates that the scene be played in one localized stage area designated as the "Churchyard." These intra-dialogic directions dictate dramatic conditions. Where the dialogue fails to specifically dictate, however, it still exerts an influence upon the creative performance options for the actor. Consider how the dialogue suggests stage positioning and gestural qualities.

The evolving physical proximity between Paris and his Page is an extremely important semiotic component in this

scene. The text first announces that they enter together: "Enter County Paris and his Page with flowers and sweet water" (K1r). But they do not remain together for, as the dialogue suggests, the Page is soon posted at some distance removed from Paris so that he may "straight give [him] notice" of anyone who might approach. But how far does the Page physically distance himself from Paris? Not altogether off-stage certainly, for both he and Paris remain in "this" (and not "that") churchyard. While the text strongly suggests a sizable cross from one part of the stage to the other, the exact size of that cross is left to the actor to decide. Furthermore, the Page's forthright compliance with Paris' commands ("I will my Lord") suggests--but only suggests--the clean and businesslike kinesic quality of his cross away from Paris and, consequently, from that part of the stage localized as "the Capulet tomb."

In contrast to Q1, Q2 illustrates significantly different semiotic values at a similar moment in its performance text. Paris' first two lines on L2r serve to illustrate the differences:

> Paris Give me thy Torch boy, hence and stand aloof, Yet put it out, for I would not be seen.

First consider the stipulations within the intra-dialogic stage directions. In contrast to Q1, Shakespeare and his fellow actors carefully choreograph the physical business with the torch. First, the Page (and only the Page) must

bring the torch on-stage with him in order to motivate Paris' command to "Give me thy torch"; next, after giving the torch to Paris, the Page must begin to move away from Paris in response to the command, "hence and stand aloof." But he must be careful not to move too far away from Paris because he must quickly recover the torch so that he can "put it out."

But while the text here requires the actors to perform particular actions, it suggests many other semiotic options. One suggestion embedded within the text concerns the speed with which the torch business is played; if the actors aim to maintain a tragic tone in this final scene of the play, it must neither be too fast, nor too slow. If Paris switches the torch back-and-forth with the page too quickly, his vacillating emotional state--signified by this "business"--will seem capricious, not painful. The audience will focus on <u>the business itself</u> instead of on its underlying emotional motivation. The effect could be comedic. (In the next chapter I consider the possibility that this finale was meant to appear comedic.)

A comedic effect could also be created if the torch were to be switched back-and-forth too slowly. If the Page were allowed to move halfway across the stage in obedient response to "hence and stand aloof," he would then have to retrace that long move in order to retrieve the torch from Paris so that he might "put it out." If the props are

passed too quickly or too slowly, engendering kinesic moves and gestures which are too staccato or too languid, the result is essentially the same: the audience is encouraged to focus on the props and gestures instead of on the dramatic situation. The act of signing, which is a process meant to connect signs with their referents, instead becomes an end unto itself. Shakespeare's texts frequently direct audiences to such metatheatrical concerns, and this text may or may not be doing so at this time. While it provides few explicit extra-dialogic stage directions in shaping this scene toward his tragic denouement, its intra-dialogic stage directions perform the double duty of suggesting pace and movement and allowing actors creative license in the performance of those suggestions.

In the scenes between Paris and his Page I just analyzed, I made a distinction between how the literary text dictates, and how it suggests, performance values. This distinction, though important, is somewhat arbitrary. Actors may, for instance, choose to ignore the most carefully crafted stage directions, whether dictated extra-dialogically or suggested intra-dialogically. And some passages will offer fewer stage directions to ignore or follow than others. In performances of Romeo and Juliet over the years, actors must have negotiated with their texts in countless ways. I cannot account for these specific performances for, as I have said, I aim to explicate model

performances as contained within the two literary texts. While model performances necessarily limit the number of variables found in actual performances in order to present a pragmatically analyzable construct, the theoretical basis for the literary text-performance text dialectic sustains a limitless and on-going negotiation between the signs which--and sign makers who--compose each type of text.

Semiotic theory and co-authorship

The building blocks of theatrical "meaning" are signs, signs created by the playwright's words, the actors gestures and intonations, setting, costume, music, props, and so on. Although leading semioticians distinguish types of signs in order to catalogue the variety of meanings each can create, presently I wish to highlight three qualities all theatrical signs have in common. The first, and most important, is that (1) they stand for other things. The second and third, which build upon the first, are: (2) they can be interchanged with one another, and (3) they stand for other signs, not for material things.

The laws governing theatrical semiosis have remained stable since the early Greek actor Thespis stepped away from the chorus of unidentified mankind and "invented the first actor, transforming narrative into imitation" (Barthes

Responsibility, 82) or presentation into re-presentation. From that moment on, everything placed (or found) on every stage gained the power (and responsibility) to represent something else.

Signifiers were obviously not invented with Thespis or with the theatrical mimesis Barthes credits to him. They exist in daily life as obviously as a man's blackened eye signifies that he has met with some form of violent trauma. But when the theatre evolved from what is happening (narration) to what happened (imitation of that narrative event), the signifier-signified relationship became intentionally referential and gained--as a result of that intentionality--greater connotative power. Barthes' distinction between narration and imitation implies a distinction between loosely scripted, orally transmitted folk texts, and more conventionally scripted dramatic literature.

Proposed reconstructions of Anglo-Saxon oral texts, and John Miles Foley's actual reconstruction of South Slavic oral texts, suggest that these texts include the formulas for the transmission of story, character, and setting, but that the scop or singer who delivers the recitation makes spontaneous decisions effecting the content of his performance. For instance, in an unpublished paper Foley identifies "I pocmili" as the opening four syllables of a song which might possibly inform the audience that the hero

was one "who is called away from his homeland and family to a battle he could not expect, who will suffer great hardships in his attempt to return home, who has a wife or fiancee who will be courted during his absence by unwanted suitors" etc. ("Oral Tradition" 3-4). While the formulas provide a wealth of possible contexts, the scop decides which context even while he recites the story. Further, the scop never sublimates his own identity to a dramatic character, but, according to another critic, would instead "not infrequently use his own personal real-life characteristics" to further the story's dramatic import (Bogatrev, "Semiotics in Folk Theatre" 46). While it is true that orally narrated stories refer to events and characters beyond the context of the situation in which that story is told--a singer and his attendant audience in a community hall for instance--efforts to obscure the distinction between on-stage and off-stage realities are minimal or non-existent.

Shakespeare's scripted dramas obscure and clarify this distinction all at once. Robert Weimann's study of the folk traditions which influenced Shakespeare's dramaturgy draws attention to this successful metadramatic oscillation between the actors' world and the audience's world (Popular Traditions), but it is an oscillation which may only proceed from the agreement between audience and performers that the fiction proffered on-stage is "real." Shakespeare

consciously exploits metadramatic values within a fictional construct built on obvious and important dramatic values. The mimetic nature of the theatre, which Barthes believes distinguishes it from more spontaneous forms of communal ritual, offers the playwright and actors opportunities for planned intentionalization of their collaborative artistic designs. It is no coincidence that "design" means "to indicate with a specific function or end"[7] or that "design" contains the prefix "de" and the word "sign." Planned imitation is built upon the ability of theatrical signs to refer to something--often many things--other than themselves. Planned intentionality distinguishes theatrical from non-theatrical signs. Acting as a spoor through which many possible meanings may be traced, a single stage sign will usually connote much more than that same unintentional sign found in daily life.[8] I return to the man with the blackened eye for clarification of this distinction.

While a blackened eye on a man may clearly signify his occupation, the circumstances surrounding the event at which he received it, and that someone inflicted it on him, it may offer no clear information at all. We might presume the answers to the implied questions are (1) a prize fighter, (2) in the prize ring, and (3) by his opponent; however, we might also invent many other conjectural scenarios for his blackened eye. For instance, unless we knew him to be a prize fighter before he appeared before us with the

blackened eye, we would not be able to reasonably deduce from the evidence that he had been in a professional fight. Further, even knowing his occupation, we could not be certain where, or by whom, he got it. Unless we had seen him receive the blow that blackened the eye (or had been told of it by a reliable source who had himself or herself seen it), we could not even be sure that his wife had not given it to him, or that he had not walked into a door. This hypothetical man with the hypothetical blackened eye might denote a great deal of meaning, but he, and it, might just as easily denote very little meaning of which we, his every-day "audience," could be certain.

Not so for stage signs and theatrical audiences. On stage, the blackened eye attains quotes around it: it becomes "the blackened eye." Because we, as an audience, assume intentionality on the part of the theatre professionals who design production, we not only decode meaning encoded by them, but we also impute meaning to signs which may have appeared on stage unintentionally or circumstantially. In the hypothetical example I offered just before, we would expect a play to offer us <u>some</u> context--if not the obvious context--for the man and his "blackened eye." When a play fails to clarify its context--and thus the intentions of its signs--audiences invent their own. "If he's not a boxer, then what is he?" "If he didn't get it in a fight in the ring, then why and where?" While

it is true that off-stage audiences impute false meanings to off-stage signs--not all bald men lack confidence, not all thin people live exciting lives--on-stage audiences impute many more meanings to on-stage signs. But there is an important distinction between those meanings imputed to, or overread in, off-stage and on-stage signs: on-stage imputations cannot be false. While overreading off-stage signs may cause serious confusion and distress in the everyday lives of people (a bruise on a small child's arm often elicits silent, and sometimes vocal, public condemnations of the parent who "must" have inflicted it), overreading on-stage signs is part of the audience's semiotic license. Audiences may, as all actors and playwrights know, impute meaning even to apparently meaning<u>less</u> phenomena. Most seasoned professionals, for instance, can relate painful stories of a fellow performer's "dead body" heaving and panting with apparent "life" just as the star begins his despairing eulogy on the death of a dear comrade. Indeed, when audiences impute meaning to such unintentional signs they are, like playwrights and actors, <u>en</u>coding signs, and thereby participating in the transactional communication process which defines an essential feature of theatrical discourse. To an audience searching for signification--and prepared to create it should its search prove fruitless--the apparently alive "dead body," for instance, might have serious impact upon a

production's emotional outcome.

Consider, briefly, the possible impact of two "dead bodies" in the final scene of Romeo and Juliet: the first intentionally encoded by actors and playwright, the second encoded by the audience from unintentional signs.

First, imagine Juliet's "dead body" immediately before she awakens from the "borrow'd likeness of shrunk death" (4.1.104) into which the Friar's dram has induced her. Position her upstage on a funeral bier, and Romeo downstage, facing the audience, just as he prepares to commit suicide by drinking the poison he purchased upon receiving the news that Juliet had died. As Romeo begins to deliver his final speech, imagine Juliet's "dead body" beginning to show signs of revival: gentle but discernible breathing, a silent twitching of the hand, etc.

Signs like these, any of which would greatly increase the audience's tension, could be easily contrived by the actors and the playwright. In fact, I saw a production of the play by a New York based company early in 1980 during which the actor[9] playing Juliet signed her imminent revival in just these ways. The twitching and heaving had the desired effect: I was torn as I watched Romeo commit suicide in ignorance of events which would have made his suicide unnecessary. Although no one can say for certain that the original production of the play, circa 1594, emphasized this discrepancy between on-stage character awareness and

audience awareness, it is likely that the professionals of the Chamberlain's Men were expert at milking dramatic tension by encoding such simple performance signs such as these. And the dramatic tension may have been significantly more exploitable if we consider that, unlike the audience in 1980, the original audience was likely to have been unaware of the eventual outcome of the play. They could not know that Romeo would not turn upstage in time to see Juliet alive and, consequently, avert his suicide. In 1980, we silently pleaded with our Romeo to see what we saw. A more exuberant Elizabethan audience may have expressed their emotional involvement in ways which produced a more direct effect upon the actors' subsequent performance choices.

Now consider the impact of a second "dead body"--Romeo's--on the original audience, and imagine how they may have encoded meaning into unintentional signs given off by the actor who played Romeo. We continue our visualization of the play moments after Juliet has revived, Romeo has died of the poison, and the Friar has left the tomb fearful of being implicated in the plot which has begun to sour. The Friar has tried to convince Juliet to depart with him, but her intention is to follow Romeo into death. As Juliet searches for a means by which to kill herself--poison, a dagger--the "dead body" of Romeo heaves in-and-out with breath. A modern audience, aware of the play's eventual outcome, reads through such signs: conventions allow an

actor to simulate his character's death even while he remains very much alive. Elizabethan conventions allowed for this as well. But if we remember that the on-stage reality of this scene had already contained one character's revival from a noxious potion, it is easy to imagine the original audience assuming a second character might similarly revive. The signs intentionally encoded by the actor playing Juliet in the earlier moment may have been exactly the same signs--twitching, breathing, etc.--unintentionally emitted by the actor playing Romeo in the subsequent moment as he attempted, but failed, to remain absolutely inert during Juliet's death scene.

As I have said, conventions--then and now--allow for discrepant realities between the actor and the dramatic character he plays. In many Shakespearean death scenes, this convention is extremely important because actors must first deliver highly rhetorical, athletically demanding speeches, then "die," and finally recover from their histrionic efforts without drawing the audience's attention <u>to their recovery</u>. In normal circumstances, the actor who plays Romeo's death scene would be easily overlooked by an audience that was newly focused on Juliet's subsequent revival; however, the matter at hand at the end of this play is revival from supposed death. Romeo could have inadvertently led the original audience into the false hope that the fate of the two lovers would be happily resolved.

The original audience's ability and license to misread stage signs, and thereby encode meaning into theatrical structures, might have even momentarily disturbed the contemporary generic conventions which helped the Elizabethans to form normative conclusions to many of those plays in which young lovers were the protagonists. In the next chapter, I draw upon evidence which suggests that Romeo and Juliet may have been originally conceived as a comedy. If so, the audience's understanding of the generic conventions of comedy--one of which presumes the survival, though not the necessarily the happiness, of the protagonists--may have supported such an encoding of Romeo's unintentional signs of life. It is reasonable to further propose that Shakespeare was fully aware of his audience's proclivity to intentionalize all the signs he and his fellow actors produced and that he exploited it to heighten dramatic tension.

Signs accrue meaning through the dramatic context, as demonstrated above. While audiences may frequently read meaning into unintentional signs, playwrights and actors impart signs so that they will be intentionalized. The hypothetical "blackened eye," mentioned earlier, will signify at least something, probably many things to an audience. If it does not signify violent trauma induced by one's professional occupation, perhaps it might signify

one's characterological pugnacity. (An actor playing Cloten in Cymbelline might exploit such a cosmetic addition in order to signify pugnacity.) Or perhaps it might signify time and place as much as character, especially if the play in which the man with the blackened eye appears were set in an historical situation an audience would easily associate with political repression: Nazi Germany, Stalinist Russia, or, to offer a Shakespearean analogy, Sicilia in The Winter's Tale.

The fact, then, is that most phenomena will be read as meaningful. Because of this, semiotic theory sustains the theatrical sign as an almost limitless repository of meaning. Semiotic theory also sustains the ability of any one theatrical sign to signify for several components of the on-stage fiction. Sometimes, for instance, signs employed by an actor with his body or voice may signify much more than characterological information.

Consider possibilities in The Winter's Tale. If, in a production of the play, Hermione should enter the trial scene in Act 3 with a blackened eye, a noticeable limp, and a "pained" vocal quality, the audience would probably deduce that Hermione had been physically beaten while in prison. If so, that deduction might reasonably inspire further deductions such as (1) Leontes is a tyrant and (2) Sicilia has become a repressive state under him. In this example, make-up, physical comportment (the limp), and vocal coloring

used by the actor playing Hermione would not only serve to shape his own characterization with qualities such as "strength," "nobility," and "honor," but might also help define Leontes, Antigonus, and many other characters as well. As mentioned, Leontes might be thought a tyrant, Antigonus a coward who was unable to thwart Leontes' aggression, etc. Further, from these signs employed by the actors playing Hermione, Antigonus, and Leontes in our hypothetical performance of the play, it may be seen how character choices may shape setting: Sicilia is oppressive; in this state, goodness must be combined with courage to meet oppression, etc.

When signs for character double as signs for setting--or vice versa--that is called semiotic interchangeability, the second maxim of theatrical semiosis I will discuss. If the first maxim states that all things placed on stage gain significance by virtue of the agreement between theatre professionals and audience that they may refer to something other than what they appear to be, the second states that this mutually imputed referentiality allows one sign to be easily associated with any other (even many others). Each theatrical sign is, therefore, a kind of tabula rasa that "passes from material to material with a freedom unknown to any other art" (Honzl, "Dynamics, 86). The sign's unfixed materiality, moreover, affords it potentially limitless referentiality. For instance, a diamond ring on the hand of

an actor may refer to her dramatic character's impending nuptial, social class, personal ostentation and many other things, and its ability to do so will not be diminished if it is, indeed, a glass ring instead. For practical purposes, glass might be the preferred material for the ring; however, that material choice does not effect its wide-ranging referentiality as a "diamond."

This is but one small example of how a single theatrical sign can connote several kinds of meaning. It also exposes the third, and perhaps most illusive, maxim of theatrical semiosis. Petr Bogatrev, a leading member of the Prague Linguistic Circle, states it most simply when he says that each theatrical sign "is a sign of a sign and not a sign of a material thing" ("Semiotics" 33). That is why the material value of the stage "diamond" is inconsequential; the stage prop "diamond" is the sign for a real diamond which, in turn, is a sign for wealth, ostentation, etc. In the hypothetical example I offered from The Winter's Tale, the actor's unsteady gait, blackened eye, and pained vocal quality would not be signs that directly announced "Hermione has been beaten," but rather several of a class of signs signifying "beaten" in that particular dramatic context. Further, they would be applied to the actor who represented not a "real man" (or woman), but rather to the actor who represented one of a class of objects signifying "man" (Elam, Semiotics 8). In other words, the physical bodies of

actors stand in for dramatis personae, each of which stands in for an individual character sign. But actors' bodies need not do so.

As we may know from our knowledge of various forms of twentieth century experimental theatre, the function of the dramatis personae may be just as easily represented by objects, puppets, even machines (Honzl, "Dynamics" 75).[10] In radio drama, for instance, voices alone represent character. But we need go no further than The Two Gentlemen of Verona to understand that signs have, even in what we may call "traditional" theatre, referred to other signs and not to material things at all.

Kier Elam calls 2.3.15 ff. one of Shakespeare's "metadramatic expositions" (Semiotics 14). In it, the clown Launce has "to decide which signified dramatis personae he must assign to his paltry set of sign-vehicles (of whom only two are animate and only one human)":

> Nay, I'll show you the manner of it. This shoe is my father; no, this left shoe is my father: no, no, this left shoe is my mother; nay, that cannot be so neither:--yes, it is so; it is so; it hath the worser sole. This shoe, with the hole in, is my mother, and this my father. A vengeance on't! there 'tis: now, sir, this staff is my sister; for, look you, she is as white as a lily and as small as a wand: this hat is Nan, our maid: I am

> the dog; no, the dog is himself, and I am the dog,--O! the dog is me and I am myself; ay, so, so.

Launce's plight, however, is our gain; it illustrates how the theatrical sign's limitless referentiality and easy interchangeability are further extended through the third maxim, which proposes that the sign's function is metasemiotic.

Having outlined these three maxims of theatrical semiosis, it is now time to further apply them to the objects of my study: Q1 and Q2 Romeo and Juliet. That application continues by asking: How does knowledge of the sign's referentiality/immateriality, its consequent interchangeability, and its ultimate metasemiotic function aid in the understanding of playtext co-authorship? If semiotic theory questions the stability of all sign-referent relationships, how can we proceed to analyze the signs by which Shakespeare and his fellow actors created "meaningful" playtexts? In order to answer this question affirmatively, I propose limits on theoretical relativism by assuming that not every sign on Shakespeare's stage demonstrated limitless referentiality, could be facilely interchanged with every other, or had the perceived ability to raise far-reaching metasemiotic considerations. While this proposal has the practical effect of allowing us to get on with our work, it

must also be recognized as a time-honored technique readers and audience members of other eras have employed before us in order that they could get on with theirs. In fact, if we are to analyze the co-authorship of Q1 and Q2 Romeo and Juliet, we must understand the particular rules by which the theatrical community of the Elizabethan era--Shakespeare, the actors, and their audiences--agreed to limit the potentialities of some theatrical signs, while extending the potentialities of others. We must, in other words, understand their stage conventions.

Theatre conventions: actor and script

Although many stage conventions are worthy of examination, I will focus primarily on how character and place were traditionally signaled in Shakespeare's theatre. Drawing upon the work of theatre historians and textual scholars, I offer the proposition that the playwright's words and the actors movements, gestures, and vocal deliveries signaled much of the dramatic information pertaining to character and place. Although these signs alone did not exclusively carry the semiotic burden for this important task, they carried much of it.

My proposition is both traditional and surprising. Traditionally, Shakespeare's written texts have been recognized by critics for their value in determining

dramatic information. It is my emphasis upon the actors' reformation of those written texts in performance, however, that has yet to be fully considered. The value of that emphasis will be clearer, however, after (1) a definition of stage conventions is followed by (2) its particular application to Shakespeare's theatre.

Citing Raymond Williams, Alan Dessen offers a concise definition of what stage conventions are:

> A stage convention, for Williams, "is simply the terms upon which author, performer and audience agree to meet, so that the performance may be carried on." Such agreement, he notes, "is by no means always a formal or definite process" but rather "is largely customary, and often indeed it is virtually unconscious"; this consent, moreover, "must usually precede the performance, so that what is to be done may be accepted without damaging the friction [sic].[11] (Stage Conventions 10).

Dessen continues by citing several examples offered by Williams of stage conventions which most would agree seem "customary" and which the author, performer, and audience apparently agree to unconsciously, such as "that the speech and action should as closely as possible appear to be those of everyday life" and that actors should "represent people behaving naturally, and usually privately while all the

maintaining the illusion that, as characters, these persons are unaware of the audience's presence."

While Williams' definitions offer a useful beginning to an understanding of stage conventions, his examples--employed to expose what he correctly calls agreements made "unconsciously" (e.g., that actors should "represent people behaving naturally")--suffer from his own unconscious agreement of the convention that, in this instance, actors "should represent people" (my emphasis). And that unconscious agreement masks another: that actors "should represent people." He does not question those customs. Neither does Dessen, whose project explores the stage conventions particular to the Elizabethan and Jacobean theatres. Nonetheless, Williams' essentialist perspective and Dessen's historical one, taken together, lead us to an understanding of what Dessen calls Shakespeare's "theatrical shorthand" (34). Before we can fully appreciate that, however, we must question all of customary agreements which that shorthand so inconspicuously condenses.

We must start with this most customary of agreements: that actors represent people. Many might challenge the assumption that this is a tradition at all, and thereby cite theatre traditions east and west, past and present, to justify their claim that actors can represent nothing but people, or--and this is just as significant--that nothing but actors have the ability to represent people. On both

counts, however, they would be wrong.

Past theatre traditions have employed other customary signs for people besides actors and have allowed that actors may represent something other than people. Although actors usually represent people, and people are usually represented by actors, exceptions to these conventions existed in all traditions and continue to exist today.

I offer, briefly, a single exception from two disparate traditions to illustrate my point: the theatre of ancient Greece and the expressionist theatre of twentieth-century America. The chorus employed by Sophocles, for instance, was composed of a small group of actors, but it represented societal-religious commentary rather than a collection of individual emotional statements. The chorus did not drive the plot as did the dramatis personae; instead, it often functioned as an on-stage audience. In contrast, the twentieth century American playwright Eugene O'Neill creates sets with "staring brutal eyes," thereby imparting anthropomorphic qualities to stage architecture. In this example from his play All God's Chillun Got Wings,[12] O'Neill employs the set as an actor whose judgements effect the on-stage lives of the two human protagonists.

Further exceptions to these two closely related conventions exist in the two theatre traditions I have mentioned and, indeed, in the theatre traditions of all eras. I will now recall the speech from The Two Gentlemen

of Verona that I mentioned earlier, however, to focus upon exceptions found in the Elizabethan theatre.

Although it frustrates him, Launce's plight illustrates for us how an actor may imaginatively signify, in this case, a dog--"I am the dog; no, the dog is himself, and I am the dog,--O! the dog is me and I am myself."--and how people may be easily represented by objects--"This shoe is my father...this staff is my sister...this hat is Nan." Shakespeare offers this speech as a comic interlude in the play, and it is reasonable to assume that it was received with laughter. If it was, the audience's response was likely to have been conditioned by an interesting, but not unusual, paradox: the semiotic interchange at the heart of Launce's "metadramatic exposition" (Elam, Semiotics 14) was exceptional in that it may have elicited what Erving Goffman calls the audience's realization that the actor was "creating a scene" (Presentation 210), but conventional enough that it was easily understood. Thus the paradox: they were defamiliarized enough to be made more fully aware of their familiar relationship to the performance. Or, in other words, they were made aware of this "play-within-a-play," and they recognized it for what it was. If we agree with Umberto Eco who believes that successful communication derives from the manipulation of well-understood codes (or what I have called conventions)--and not, instead, from the proffering of new or vaguely differentiated ones (Theory 135

ff., my emphasis)--Launce's functional manipulation of actors, props, and other signs may not be exceptional at all. It seems, therefore, that Launce's self-directed "play" must draw upon conventions which allow for the ability of the scripted performer to manage the functional requirements of on-stage reality: character and setting.

Dramatic character, to put it simply, could be imputed to anyone or anything so long as acting made it so. The same was true of locale. What is remarkable about Elizabethan stage conventions is that while actors almost always stood in for the class of signs signifying man, they could potentially also signify something other than "man" or could--and this is most significant--signify man in addition to signifying locale or place. Launce's speech illustrates somewhat exceptional examples of a "man" standing in for a non-human and of props standing in for "men"; however, it illustrates the traditional power of the scripted actor in Shakespeare's theatre to run, as it were, the whole show.

The term "scripted actor" sums up the single most important convention at work in Shakespeare's theatre. Both halves of this term deserve equally careful analysis, for it was the combination of the playwright's linguistic text with the physical performance text of the actors that supplied nearly all of the dramatic and theatrical communication necessary to successful production.

Costumes were what we may accurately call referentially

neutral; though costumes often supplied information on social roles and gender, the performers who owned them were relatively unconcerned with historical accuracy. It was, as Peter Thomson tells us, "more important to look good than look right" ("Playhouses" 82). In addition, sets were practically bare and therefore provided little in the way of locale. Further, there was no lighting, and the theatres had few mechanical aids for the creation of special effects. Except for hand-held props like lutes--which Dessen reminds us usually signified a character's "madness" (38)--or costume additions like boots--which he reminds us signified that a character was in "haste" (39)--nearly all other dramatic information was conveyed by the actor and the script.

Actor

First consider the actor. He usually signified "man," but often signified much more. Jindřich Honzl, a leading member of the Prague Linguistic Circle, endorses the actor as the most vital component of the theatre. The actor, he believes, may not only convey his own character but many other components of the dramatic context as well. Audiences, he believes, rely on the actor to the point that "we cannot tell what a contraption on stage is supposed to signify until is used by an actor. He has first to sit on

it or rock on it or climb out of it" ("Dynamics" 78). In this context, he is referring to the twentieth-century symbolist theatre of Meyerhold in which, for instance, an abstract cylindrical structure or "contraption" is defined as a "prison cell" only after an actor paces back and forth in it and clutches at it as if it had bars on its "doors." The question arises: does this apply to the conventions of other, less symbolic, theatre traditions? Is the actor's ability to interchange signs and thereby impart locale by the creative use of props specific to some theatre traditions and inapplicable to others? It may be argued, for instance, that on a more realist stage setting a painted stage door would be easily accepted by an audience as a member of the class of signs signifying "door" with or without the presence of the actor. If so, it is only because modern audiences have been reared on the conventions of the realist stage and have come, therefore, to "expect the signified class to be represented by a vehicle in some way recognizable as a member of it" (Elam, Semiotics 13). But the iconic similarity between sign and referent is not a requirement of the theatre. Indeed, playwrights and actors often disrupt the apparent similarity of sign and referent for comic or tragic effect. For instance, on the set of a realist play which contained what appeared to be a recognizable "door," it is possible that an actor's movements or gestures could control signification by using

the "door" as if it were not a door, just as Launce uses the "staff," "hat," and "shoes" as if they were not what they appear to be.

In Shakespeare's theatre--which thrives on the metaphysical border between realism and symbolism--the actor is licensed to clarify or confuse sign-referent similarities. Honzl's endorsement of the actor's value, therefore, should not be understood as historically specific, as Launce's controlled uses of the props as dramatis personae clearly testifies. In fact, Honzl reveals the essential importance of the actor when he says in the same article that "we find that the actor's function is always present even though it may change into, or appear in the guise of, another function" (86).

Honzl here exposes the obverse side of the stage convention that Raymond Williams tacitly agrees to: that actors, and only actors, can represent dramatis personae. If we turn again briefly to a scan of diverse theatre traditions, we will easily find the "actor function" in the cast of other functions such as (1) sets (e.g., O'Neill's windows with "staring brutal eyes), (2) puppets (e.g., Gordon Craig's theatre of the uber-marionette used no live performers), or (3) props (e.g., "trees", "ropes" and "boxes" which victimize the human figures in Beckett's Act Without Words I and II).[13] In respect to Shakespeare's theatre, the value of the actor function in the guise of

other functions resides predominantly in its potential interchangeability, and not often in its actual occurrence. The most regularly occurring interchange within Elizabethan theatre practices involved the casting of boy actors in the roles of mature women. Although there are significant similarities between the signified class--we cannot say "man" here but must say "human being"--and the individual sign--boy actor--feminist critics have often noted how important these gender disruptions were to the stage conventions of the era.

Script

Now that I have considered the actors' abilities to shape dramatic and theatrical reality, I would like to turn once again to the actor working in alliance with a written script. In the passage quoted from Honzl earlier, he endorsed the semiotic power of the actor by identifying a symbolist stage setting which was transformed by an actor into a "prison" through the use of gesture and movement alone. Honzl's actor used no words to accomplish his task. While all actors of all theatre traditions exercise this power to impart signification--to "intentionalize" sets, props, etc.--some do it working with a written script, some without.

The actors of the commedia dell'arte, for instance, had

no written scripts from which to work; they exclusively employed improvised dialogue, gestures, costumes, make-up and other performance signs in order to shape on-stage reality. The actors who performed the closet dramas of Dryden and Addison, by contrast, were almost entirely dependent on the written texts, texts which the authors intended as "academic neoclassical exercise[s]" (Gamez, 3). The actors were therefore expected to function as the vocal mouthpieces of the author and to keep their gestural and intonational variances to a discreet minimum lest they intrude upon his literary intentions.

The Chamberlain's Men operated within a convention that allowed for a much more complex relationship between the actors and the written script than that of either the commedia dell'arte troupes or of the oratorical performers of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-century closet dramas. Shakespeare's scripts, like Dryden's and Addison's, are linguistically determinant. I believe Shakespeare is responsible for the scripts' linguistic programs in all but a few passages; those exceptions, I believe, may have been influenced by the actors' performances. (See the discussion in the next chapter on the two quarto versions of Romeo and Juliet at 2.4 and 4.4). Shakespeare's scripts, however, unlike Dryden's and Addison's, are also theatrically determinant. I believe the performance programs embedded within the linguistic texts reflect the co-authorial designs

of Shakespeare and his fellow actors, actors who employed gesture, movement, and intonation with a creative abandon akin to the actors of the commedia.

Agreeing provisionally that Shakespeare's scripts reflect his collaboration with the actors, how, we may ask, did they come to do so? Having outlined the basic maxims of theatrical semiosis, which sustain performance as a site for textual reformation, and having next applied these maxims to the conventions of Shakespeare's theatre, which placed the written script as a dominant influence upon eventual theatrical discourse, we must now consider how playwright and actors may have employed the dialectical tension between word signs and performance signs to shape Q1 and Q2 Romeo and Juliet. We may ask, for instance, how the two scenes between Paris and his Page mentioned earlier became so programmatically dense? More specifically, we may ask why do they so strongly suggest that the Page's crosses of the stage to and from Paris be "businesslike," or that the torch passing between the two characters be "neither too fast, nor too slow?"

Actor and script

How the actors contributed to these programmatically dense texts--texts which Mac D. P. Jackson says Shakespeare "would not have thought of... as in any sense a final draft

(166)--first requires an understanding of the rules of theatrical semiosis I have already outlined: semiotic interchangeability is the essential means by which actors reform word signs into stage action. My comparative analysis of these two quartos, however, also finds significant variances in the words themselves, variances which have been the focus of much of the textual debate over which quarto is "good" and which is "bad." Instead of accepting the "moral idiom of this textual narrative" (Levenson, "Editing" 5), we may speculate that the actors' functional translation of the scripts' words into gesture, movement and intonation may have also occasionally included what I have called direct linguistic reformation. "How" actors contributed to authorship, therefore, may have two answers. And those answers may be found if we consider another question: where actors co-authored.

In rehearsal, I believe actors collaborate with playwrights on direct linguistic development. In performance, actors create semiotic performance texts within the structure of the written dramatic text. These two means by which actors co-author, however, do not occur exclusively at one site or the other. Linguistic changes may indeed occur in rehearsal, for instance, when an actor discovers he needs an additional line "to cover" a move across the stage, or that a line already present in the script must be changed so that the fellow actor he must address enters the stage on

the appropriate cue. During performance, however, on-site conditions--whether political, meteorological, or financial--may also cause direct linguistic changes to the script. The shaping of words into stage action defines the essential means by which actors collaborate on playtext development, and this shaping, manifested at times in direct linguistic change, occurs both in rehearsal and performance.

Further, the application of gesture, movement, and intonation constitute the essential means by which actors "shape": they create semiotic performance texts from written linguistic texts. In the English tradition of scripted drama--and in contrast to the commedia dell'arte--working within the written text becomes the goal of actors in rehearsal or performance since the reformative powers inherent to the theatricalization of text provide ample opportunities for what I call "authorship" in either site. Nevertheless, aspects of performance meant to remain within text inevitably become text itself. (I demonstrate this in the next chapter in a discussion of Will Kemp in Romeo and Juliet, 2.4.). A further blurring of the distinction between linguistic and semiotic authorship occurs when we consider how semiotic performance texts, tested by textually faithful actors before audiences, may retrospectively influence the written text on which they were based. In this case we might hypothesize conversations between the actors and the playwright similar to the one I alluded to

previously. "I needed an extra line to get across stage" or "I needed Benvolio on-stage by my second line in the speech, not the third." If we further apply these definitions of co-authorship to the scenes between Paris and his Page mentioned earlier, we may evidence both semiotic and linguistic variations that may have been the result of playwright-actor collaboration.

I have said that the Q1 text suggests that the Page physically distance himself from Paris on or about the line "Lie thee all along under this Yew tree here" (K1r). In discussing the Q2 text, I subsequently said that Paris' lines--"Give me the torch boy, hence and stand aloof,/ Yet put it out" (K1r)--must be carefully aligned to the Page's movements lest the abrupt physical transfers of the torch, instead of the emotional motivations <u>behind</u> those transfers, become the primary focus of the audience. In both of these passages, I have previously explicated variant performance choices which are embedded within the two linguistic texts. But what of the variants in the linguistic texts themselves? If they embed different semiotic structures developed by Shakespeare and the actors--and, to a certain extent, program future semiotic structures to be made by subsequent performers--how did they come to do so? I believe the different linguistic structures are also the result of the co-authorship of actors and playwright. The interdependency of word and body signs in the formation of theatrical

structures suggests nothing less. A literary appraisal of the theatrical structures in these two scenes reveals this interdependency.

As I have previously alluded, the original audiences may have mistakenly overread the unintentional signs of the actor playing Romeo in 5.3 (breathing, twitching, etc.) as evidence of the character's imminent revival, thereby momentarily imputing their hopes for a happy resolution into the performance's theatrical structure. If they did so, they might have been induced to do so by accepted generic conventions: "legend...was the proper matter for serious drama; romance was the stuff of the comic stage" (Levin 108). They may have also been induced to do so, I speculate, by Shakespeare's original intentions to write Romeo and Juliet as a comedy, intentions which he may have subsequently revised.

David Wiles believes that performance information in 5.3 programs a comic ending for a romantic play originally conceived according to typical Elizabethan generic norms (92 ff.). He specifically highlights the role of "Peter" in the second quarto as one which was played by the Chamberlain Men's resident clown, Will Kemp, and persuasively argues that Kemp's on-stage presence, though appropriate for the original comic ending, may have been out-of-play in the revised tragedy. I will discuss Wiles' argument more fully in the next chapter. In this context, however, it is

important to first consider this: if Romeo and Juliet was first a comedy, (1) what changes were made to reconstruct it as a tragedy, and (2) who made those changes. The Paris-Page scenes offer evidence to begin to answer both questions.

They also demonstrate the particular value of extant multiple text plays. While the semiotic and linguistic co-authorship of playtexts applies to all of Shakespeare's plays, the multiple text plays evidence the negotiation between playwright and actors most poignantly. Agreeing provisionally with David Wiles argument that the final scene of Romeo and Juliet was written before the rest of the play (Shakespeare's Clown 92)--and that it was originally written to conclude a comedy--how do the two quarto versions of this scene demonstrate changes made by Shakespeare and the actors to refashion the ending to suit a tragedy? Once again, a comparison of the first moments between the two characters in Q1 and Q2 illustrate important variations.

On the one hand, we have Q2's "Give me the torch boy, hence and stand aloof,/ Yet put it out" (L2r); on the other hand, Q1's version reads, "Put out the torch, and lie thee here all along/ Under this Yew-tree" (K1r). Neither passage could be called remarkable verse. Nor could much of the verse between Paris and the Page which follows. Shakespeare may have been responsible for both of these passages, or neither. Yet Q2's words program certain semiotic options

which, as shown, could cause an audience to react with inappropriate laughter if tragic pathos had been the goal at this moment in the script. Q1's version, however, is not only different linguistically, but it also embeds less comedic semiotic choices for those performers who may wish to play a tragic denouement. It is quite conceivable that the original actors who played Paris and the Page offered Q1's version of these lines in response to a performance of Q2's version which had elicited laughter. It is also quite conceivable that Shakespeare hastily drafted Q1's version after the actors pleaded with him to save them from embarrassment.

If Q1 preceded Q2, however, we might envision a series of negotiations between playwright and actors significantly different from the ones proposed above. The actors playing Paris and the Page may have felt the Q1 ending to be colorless and flat, and may have collaborated with Shakespeare on Q2's more ambiguous, more tension-filled version during which an audience might be unsure whether to laugh or cry. Harry Levin hints that Shakespeare would have wished audiences to do both when he says that Shakespeare's "innovation [the play] might be described as transcending the usages of romantic comedy" (109). I would only add that it seems probable that both of these different versions of the final scene of Romeo and Juliet evidence innovation, and that both were developed through a collaboration of

Shakespeare and his fellow shareholders in the Chamberlain's Men--that rehearsals, trial performances, and linguistic revision were interdependent processes employed in the development of successful playtexts by playwright and actors alike.

Notes

1
See Peter L. Shillingsburg's article, "Text as Concept, Matter, and Sign" for a useful definition of "material text."

2
Unless otherwise noted, modern act, scene, and line numbers are taken from The Complete Works of Shakespeare, ed. Hardin Craig (Chicago, 1961).

3
Fifty years ago Harley Granville-Barker brought to our attention how Shakespeare carefully crafted his love scenes without the need for much physical contact between boy actors, disguised as women, and their "male" partners. That is why I speculate that the kiss between Antony and his boy Cleopatra may have been stylized. Granville-Barker was explicating performance text structures, although he did not call them that.

4
Dramatic emphasis is regularly reconstructed by modern editors by adding dashes and exclamation points. The goal, presumably, is to help the reader understand the emotional content of the dramatic characters' speeches. These emendations proceed from a misconception: that the original texts, largely devoid of exclamatory punctuation, therefore contain no dramatic emphases.

To me, these extant quarto texts appear full of dramatic emphases. The question is how those emphases got there. Were they developed by Shakespeare independently, or did the actors' performances become the stuff that scripts are made on? I incline to the second explanation. In chapter two I offer evidence of my position; however, a precedent has already been established for textual revision resulting from an actor's performance, though the text and the actor are from a different era.

I audited a paper entitled "The Clown and the Copy-text: Colley Cibber's Comic Timing and the 1713 Cato Duodecimo" by Luis R. Gamez at the Seventh Conference of The Society for Textual Scholarship (April, 1993) in which Gamez argued persuasively that Addison "destabilized his own claim to authority over the play-text, in a collaboration which wedded his words to Cibber's voice" (2).

5
Peter Thomson credits the "stage directions and the internal evidence of the texts themselves" with the success of Shakespeare's acting company ("Playhouses" 77). David Wiles cites evidence from Q1 and Q2 to show how Shakespeare

shaped the role of the clown for the actor Will Kemp. He identifies "two developmental layers of text" each of which provides "ample opportunities for the clown" (Clown 90). Describing a situation during which Shakespeare himself may have issued directions orally, Jill Levenson states that the actors "mastered their roles as theatrical craftsmen, articulating the words as the text/playwright directed" (In Performance 15). Proposing a somewhat more collaborative relationship between Shakespeare and his fellow actors, Wells and Taylor note that a written text "depended upon an unwritten para-text which always accompanied it: an invisible life-support system of stage directions which Shakespeare could either expect his first readers [i.e., actors] to supply, or which those readers would expect Shakespeare himself to provide orally" (Textual Companion 2).

6
Unless otherwise noted, quotations from the First and Second Quartos text will be given with original page signatures and modern spelling. Both Q1 and Q2 are most readily available in Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto, eds. Michael J. B. Allen and Kenneth Muir.

7
This definition is taken from Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary.

8
Peter Shillingsburg employs the image of the spoor to describe how the Material Text contains the traces of "a multitude of speakers working at various times and places ("Text" 73).

9
Throughout this disseration I use "actor" for both male and female performers and the pronoun "his" to refer to all individual performers. Since all of the original performers were male, these choices seemed reasonable.

10
Gordon Craig's theatre of puppets or uber-marionettes used no actors, Samuel Beckett's Act Without Words I and II employs props such as a rope as the active subject or protagonist, and Honzl mentions the theatre of "the Belgian cooperatives where a bolt of material, a spider's leg, a coffee grinder, and the like were dramatic characters" (75).

11
"Friction," which I assume to mean "fiction," is a misprint in Dessen's book.

[12] References to All God's Chillun Got Wings may be found in The Plays of Eugene O'Neill. New York: Random House, 1955. Vol. 2, 299-232.

[13] Kier Elam uses this Beckett reference on page 16 of The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama. For full details, see Works Consulted.

Past discussions concerning the theatricalization of literary playtexts--when words go from page to stage--appropriately define that translation in semiotic terms: dialectical tensions are created when the arbitrariness of the linguistic sign confronts the material iconicity of the actor's body (Pavis, Languages 18; Veltrusky, "Dramatic Text" 115). Implicit to such discussions are the evaluation of performance as the site for non-literary textual generation and the associative elevation of the actor as the on-site generator of those "performance texts." Such reappraisals have been long overdue. While many post-modern critics, textualists, and theorists have redefined authorship to include the silent contributions of readers and editors, the professional actor's reengagement of the playwright's text as seen and heard by the audience has seldom been recognized as a paradigmatic model for polyvocal textual generation.

Yet the generic structural requirements of playtexts make them a uniquely instructive choice for the practical analysis of collaborative authorship, and for consideration of a relevant theoretical and textual concern: textual instability. Playtexts must be performed if they are to reach their artistic and structural completion; the actor is indispensable to this completion.[1] I want to further suggest, however, that the actor's transformation of the

playwright's arbitrary linguistic signs into the iconic, material signs of the body constitutes nothing less than an act of textual authorship, the product of which often derives from, sometimes modifies, and occasionally destablizes the literary text from which it originated. The reverse is also true: literary texts destabilize performance texts. This mutual destabilization derives from those ways in which different kinds of signs create meaning.

A taxonomy of signs

While all signs on stage exert what I will call "semiotic pressure" on an audience, signs differ in how they exert this pressure. In order to clarify these distinctions, I employ Charles Pierce's tripartite division of signs: icon, index, and symbol. They represent the three basic kinds of signs used in theatrical discourse.

An icon, according to Pierce, is a "diagrammatic sign...which exhibits a similarity or analogy" to its referent (Pierce 181). In my explanation of the two dead bodies of Romeo and Juliet in the last chapter, Juliet's intentional and Romeo's unintentional breathing might be read by an audience as equally important to the reality of the play because actors' bodies--and most of the attendant movements of those bodies--are the theatre's "iconic signs

par excellence" (Elam, Semiotics 23). In other words, actors' bodies clearly signify for the class of sign, "man." Moreover, as we saw in Launce's speech from The Two Gentleman of Verona (2.3.), the iconic power of an actor's body may predominate theatrical discourse to such an extent that it may disengage other iconic signs (e.g., the dog, the shoe, the broom) from those apparently obvious referents to which they had previously referred, and subsequently recast them anew as "man." In contrast, an index refers to its object not by similarity, but by "forcing the attention to the particular object intended without describing it" (Pierce 181). Unlike the icon, the index does not fully aim to represent the object but rather points to its object and presupposes its presence. Indices form a large part of theatrical discourse since they include personal and demonstrative pronouns (I, you, this, that, etc.) and adverbs of time and place (now, then, here, there, etc.). When performed by accomplished actors, these verbal indices are often accompanied by gestural indices. Whether combined with gesture or not, however, indices are "the primary means whereby language gears itself to the speaker and receiver" (Elam, Semiotics 25). Or, to quote another theatre semiotician, indices allow "language an 'active' and dialogic function" (Honzl, "Hierarchy" 121-122) because they situate the speaker (I), the receiver (you), and the object(s) (he, she, it, they) in time and place (now/then

and here/there).[2]

Before I turn to the theatre's third type of sign--the symbol--I would like to analyze icons and indices in dramatic contexts. Because icons and indices create meanings in ways which are more alike than different, yet each significantly different from the ways in which symbols do so, I will examine several of these similarities in the two quarto versions of Romeo and Juliet at 5.3. These passages provide excellent sites for my task because the audience's shifting attention during these scenes is partially caused by the dynamic of iconic-indexical signing.

In Q2, the dramatic plot in this final scene proceeds from the Friar's discovery of the dead bodies of Romeo and Paris to Juliet's subsequent awakening. In an imagined performance of this script, our attention is first directed by the Friar to look at the iconic signs of death:

> Alack, alack, what blood is this which stains
> The stony entrance of this sepulchre?
> What mean these masterless and gory swords
> To lie discolour'd by this place of peace? (L4r)

As readers or observers, we of course know the answers to these questions and the significance of these iconic signs: the stage props (swords) signify the means of death, and the imagined stage set (sepulchre or tomb) signifies the place of death. Then the Friar's words redirect our attention to

Juliet's awakening: "The lady stirs" (L4r). And, within a matter of seconds, his subsequent words redirect our focus to the off-stage sounds which may be used to signal the coming watch:

> I hear some noise. Lady, come from that nest
> Of death, contagion, and unnatural sleep.
> A greater power than we can contradict
> Hath thwarted our intents. Come, come away.
> Thy husband in thy bosom there lies dead,
> And Paris too. Come, I'll dispose of thee
> Among a sisterhood of holy nuns.
> Stay not to question, for the watch is coming.
> Come, go, good Juliet. I dare no longer stay.
>
> (L4v)

The plot of this scene proceeds linearly forward, as it would were it narrated in a novel: discovery, awakening, arrival of the watch. The total theatrical structure, however, is much more complex due, in part, to the semiotic pressure exerted by different types of signs.

The Friar's lines attempt to lead the audience through a narrative sequence, and the audience <u>may</u> follow the exact narrative sustained through the Friar's lines. But the chances are that it will not follow it <u>completely</u> quite simply because there are too many other signs competing against the Friar's linearly progressive words and gestures. On stage, the signs of "death"--two bodies, stage blood and

swords--remain on stage even while the Friar turns his attention to Juliet. And the blood and swords--along with the vocal sighing, physical twitching, or whatever other signs the actor playing Juliet chooses to demonstrate her reawakening--together continue to intrude upon the audience even as the Friar has moved on to a recognition of whatever off-stage audible sign may have been chosen to demonstrate the imminent arrival of the watch.

But while the multiplicity of semiotic signs intrudes on the audience's ability to construct this scene's narrative sequence, the plot's predetermination is also strongly compelling. The arrival of the watch does "happen," for instance, and, when it happens, it verifies the plot's narrative "promise" as stated by the Friar: "the Watch is coming." But there are many other iconic signs which compose the units of this performance text that further compromise the narrative sequence by "overloading" the emotional import of the dramatic situation. For instance, Tybalt's corpse also occupies the stage along with the dead bodies of Romeo and Paris. The audience might associate Tybalt with the violent passions which have led to this final scene in the Capulet tomb. Moreover, if Juliet has been buried in her wedding gown as was the custom, the iconic "picture" provides a visual crystalization of the literary text's recurrent metaphor linking marriage to death: "I'll to my wedding bed,/ And death, not Romeo take

my maidenhead" (3.2.136-137). And if the Friar is costumed in the traditional cowl and habit, his visual presentation might suggest the figure of Death, a figure he seems to evoke in more ways than one. This catalogue of semiotic options might easily be extended, but the density of the iconic transactions can now be seen.

I offer Juliet's wedding gown and the Friar's traditional cowl as iconic signs which might possibly appear in a performance of Q2; I offer the bloodied swords, the dead bodies of Tybalt and Romeo, and Juliet's breathing as iconic signs which should appear if the indexical signs which accompany them are to have clear referents.

If iconic signs propose to factually resemble their referents, indexical signs propose what Roman Jakobson calls a "factual contiguity" with them ("Language" 700). Or, to once again quote Pierce, an index "forces the attention to the particular object intended" (Pierce 181). For instance, the off-stage sound which may be employed to motivate the Friar's line, "the watch is coming," would qualify as an acoustic index for the imminent appearance of the iconic signs of "the watch": guards or soldiers. Indices--the off-stage sound in this instance--force the audience's attention to the intended object--the watch--as iconically represented by members of the acting company. The interdependence of these two types of signs may now be seen: if verbal indices promise things, icons "are" those promised things. Semiotic

"promises," moreover, may also be made by gestural indices. For instance, the actor playing the Friar would likely move his hand to direct the audience's attention as he says: "Alack, alack, what blood is this which stains/ The stony entrance of this sepulchre?/ What mean these masterless and gory swords/ To lie discolour'd by this place of peace?" (my emphases). In the imaginary creation of the scene from Q2, the verbal and gestural indices--the italicized words and the inferred gestures which often accompany them--help to extend and clarify the meanings implied by the iconic signs--swords, blood, dead bodies, and tomb.

At times, however, verbal and/or gestural indices may not complement icons but rather subvert them instead; theatrical discourse relies so endemically upon the confrontation of signs that even these two very similar sign types may exert contradictory semiotic pressure. In this scene, the Friar's pronomial indices (i.e., this, these) may draw the audience's attention to the swords, blood, and bodies, but they may just as easily draw attention away from those iconic representations of "death," and, instead, toward his own pointing at them. When such a shift in focus occurs, the audience may at times be forcibly reminded that it is, indeed, "at a play." A similar metadramatical effect might be created if the Friar's earlier line--"the watch is coming"--was not induced by an off-stage sound, and was not followed on-stage by actors representing the Prince's guard.

Like Macbeth's imagined dagger which the audience cannot see, the Friar's words would serve to point at his act of pointing, no objective referent to that pointing being on-stage.

In Shakespeare's theatre, metadramatic and metatheatrical elements such as these rely upon the combined formative power of script and actor, and indices represent the semiotic amalgam of word and body signs from which much of that power derives. Because they appear as written symbols in the script (i.e., words such as "this" and "that" etc.), and often require gestural encoding by actors' bodies (i.e., pointing, directing a visual glance, cocking of the head in the direction of an off-stage sound), indices can be particularly useful in forcing audiences' attentions to the necessary questions of the play. Shakespeare's linguistic texts abound in obvious verbal indices which embed complementary gestural indices. The Friar's two short speeches (140-146; 151-159), abbreviated above, contain seventeen verbal indices, most of which, as I have said, beg the performer's physicalization: e.g., pointing, directing a visual glance, etc. An even clearer example of the preponderance of indexical markers in Shakespeare's plays may be found in Launce's speech from The Two Gentlemen of Verona discussed in the last chapter. In the section I discussed from that speech (2.3.15-23), there are thirty one verbal indices including "this shoe," "this staff," "this

hat," "I am myself" etc. (my emphases). Most would likely be reinforced by gestural signs as the performer constructs dialogue, characterization, and a complete mise en scene in solus.

However, the proportion of indexical markers in this speech is only slightly higher than that found in many other passages of Shakespeare's plays; indeed, a cursory perusal of almost any speech from any of his plays would bear this out. His theatre's reliance on deixis--that is, "showing," or what indices do--is predicated upon the ability of indexical signs to subsume and "unite the meaning borne by the images [icons], by the various genres of language (prose, poetry), by the various linguistic modes of the characters, by intonation, by rhythm, by proxemic relations [i.e., stage positioning], [and] by the kinesics of the movements, etc." (Serpieri, 20). Indices like those of the Friar's mentioned above, often overlooked in purely literary explications of Shakespeare's plays, provide important clues by which modern readers may begin to visualize Elizabethan performances.

Indices, either by inference or direct statement, can often situate the receiver, the object, time, and place for the audience's reception. Mercutio's questions to Benvolio, "Where the devil should this Romeo be? Came he not home tonight?" (2.4.2), imply the addressee (Benvolio) and explicitly state the conversational object (this Romeo).

And Mercutio's "where," though not itself an index, presumes Romeo's location cannot be indexically signified in the "here and now."

Most of all, however, indices situate the speaker--the implied or stated "I" in every spoken line. In this instance, Mercutio's voice rings out characteristically, for his first person positions, his "I's," can be easily distinguished from those of the other characters. It has been proposed, however, that every speaker's utterance has an equal ability to focus an audience's attention and that dramatic dialogue, as contrived by the playwright, while appearing refracted throughout the dramatis personae, is, in truth, the playwright's "homogeneous utterance" (Veltrusk , "Basic Features" 131). Allowing that most dialogue is written by playwrights, I must still challenge the implication that audiences receive that dialogue as a "homogeneous utterance." The preponderance of verbal and gestural indices in Shakespeare's plays, for instance, seem programmed for quite the opposite effect: that is, to continually wrench audiences' attentions hither and yon, thereby creating a cacophony of utterances or voices. I agree with Alessandro Serpieri that indices "unite the meaning borne by the images...[and] the various linguistic modes of the characters"--that, in other words, they are the semiotic glue for word and body signs--but I also believe that the first person implication behind every line of

dialogue insists so greatly upon the audience's recognition of the addresser that the content of the address may at times be subordinated: often it is the glue itself, and not the glued, that becomes the focus.

Celebrity actors, for instance, may easily draw attention away from "the necessary questions of the play" and toward their own performances simply by carefully encoding gestural and intonational information which sustains and furthers the indexical pointers of their dialogue; moreover, audiences may be disposed to overreading actors' performances and underreading "the play," thereby creatively decoding dramatic content through a process which has the practical effect of re-encoding it as a "star performance." (See the discussion on Will Kemp which follows). In the passage from Q2 Romeo and Juliet mentioned above, the Friar's verbal/gestural indices may easily focus the audience's attention on his own performance, and away from the dismal scene which seems to be the matter at hand. Of course, iconic signs such as bodies, swords, and tombs are compelling too. During these crucial moments in the play's denouement, it is most likely that the audience's reception never finds stasis, but rather fluctuates between assessing the informational content of the situation (Paris and Romeo are dead), a need to judge the Friar's complicity in that situation ("Ah what an unkind hour/ Is guilty of this lamentable chance"), and a more generalized cathartic

release ("Alack, alack..."). This dynamic relationship between different kinds of signs and the audience's performance of interpreting these signs occurs at every moment of the performance text. It is the rule, not the exception, in theatrical discourse.

The potential for further ambiguity and complexity occurs during this moment in the performance text of Romeo and Juliet when a third type of sign is brought into the play: the symbol. As I have suggested, indices and icons often, but not always, signify in complementary ways: the former points to and verifies the existence of the latter. Symbols, however, signify in ways which greatly distinguish them from both icons and indices; it is those distinctions which create the most significant dialectical tensions during the process of translating literary playtexts into live performances.

A symbol, as defined by Pierce, "is the general name or description which signifies its object by means of an association of ideas or habitual connection between the name and the character signified" (Pierce 181). Unlike the icon's similarities and the index's physical contiguity, the symbol represents its object by artificial law. We all agree, for instance, that the marks on this page--S W O R D--signify a pointed, metal object used in combat; we must tacitly agree to this because in our working code those marks have no inherent correspondence to the object. Those

marks (S W O R D) neither iconically replicate the real object, nor do they refer to it by indexical contiguity. In a sense, a symbol must traverse a more perilous consensual distance than an icon or an index in order to signify.

The difference between symbols and indices/icons lies in the imputed relationship symbols have with their referents. Because linguistic texts are composed mainly of symbols (i.e., all non-indexical words), the playwrights who compose them, the performers who deliver them, and the audiences which receive them engage in numberless acts of mutual imputation throughout the translation of those texts into performances. And because physical performance signs rely to a much smaller extent on imputation--and instead much more on graphic representation in the "here and now"--the combination of symbolic words and icons/indices sparks the dialectical tension endemic to the theatre.

In a sense it may be useful to think of symbols or words as the most carefully constructed set of conventions used in communication, whether on or off-stage. Conventions, as defined by Alan Dessen and Raymond Williams, are agreements between audiences, playwrights and performers which precede a performance (Elizabethan Stage 10). Any play, therefore, being composed of thousands of words, is anchored in a sea of previous agreements. These agreements, however, are often tenuous, and may be subject to frequent renegotiation.

"The written signifier...," one modern theoretician believes, "has no constitutive meaning" (Derrida 11). Perhaps this applies to the words of a novel or those words used in non-dramatic verse. But I do not agree that this is so for those written signifiers used in dramatic performance which indices help to situate in the "here and now" and to which icons often lend graphic "reality." I believe just the opposite is true. Conventions attempt to corral the many possible constitutive meanings which written signifiers proliferate during performance due to their sometimes clear, sometimes opaque, and sometimes contradictory on-stage referents.

When written signifiers are most clear, they often have iconic and/or indexical approbation within the dramatic context. Consider, for instance, this exchange between the Nurse and Romeo at 3.3.162-164. The Nurse says, "Here sir, a ring she did bid me give you, sir," to which Romeo replies one line later with, "How well my comfort is revived by this." The ring (icon) and its indexical marker (this ring; my emphasis) both serve to affirm the reason for Romeo's "comfort": although he has killed her cousin Tybalt, Juliet still loves him.

When written signifiers are more opaque, however, the ambiguity of their signification may be caused by one of two situations: little or no support from physical stage signs, or physical stage signs which apparently emanate messages

contradictory to them. In 3.3, Romeo's exit lines are: "But that a joy past joy calls out to me,/ It were a grief so brief to part with thee./ Farewell." Questions arise: knowing the inevitable outcome of the play, do we not read this line to mean that his joy is past, or, if not completely past, that it will be very short-lived indeed? I believe we do. Yet the ring provokes Romeo's "comfort" even as we sense his despair.

The intra-sign dynamic, as I have mentioned, sometimes clarifies the audience's focus and sometimes clouds it. Conventions attempt, but ultimately fail to succeed entirely, at promoting clarification and containing ambiguity. This failure, moreover, applies not only to those conventions which surround written signifiers (i.e., what a word "means") but also to those surrounding physical body signs. In fact, the possible failure of a particular convention to clarify the significations of body signs in 5.3 Romeo and Juliet helps me to make my point about the multiplicity of meanings proliferated in performance by all types of signs, even those which seem to bear a striking mimetic resemblance to their apparent referents. If iconic signs may be misunderstood, any signs may.

Before looking at some of the possibly misunderstood linguistic signs in 5.3, therefore, recall the possible misunderstandings generated by the iconic stage convention discussed in the last chapter (p. 25 ff.): all agree that

"dead" characters may be represented by live actors so long as those actors do nothing "out of play" to annul that agreement (e.g., standing up, scratching heads, etc.). This convention is built upon the strength of iconic representation, a strength which derives from a kind of mimetic closure between sign and referent: actors as dramatis personae. This particular iconic stage convention, therefore, does not seem to rely on the tenuous imputation by which symbolic or linguistic symbols signify. Yet it is quite possible that, given the dramatic context in this scene, the original audience auditing the premiere performance of Romeo and Juliet may have imputed false value to a "breathing Romeo" who had unintentionally signified to them that he was "alive."

If such a basic iconic convention such as this may be confused, consider how tenuously words or symbols may signify meaning when they possess no apparent, physical relationship with their referents. During any performance, therefore, imputed linguistic meanings may be manifold, with each audience bringing somewhat different imputations to words used by the Friar such as "gory", and "masterless" in his line, "What mean these masterless and gory swords" (142). Consider the possible imputations that might attend the word "death" in "Come from that nest of death." While the icons and indices may help focus the audience's attention on what "death" means to this play at this moment

by indexically showing it ("that nest of death", my emphases), and by iconically "being it" (dead bodies, bloodied swords, etc), no one can account for the possibility that audiences will impute different meanings than those which the playwright and actors had intended to encode. Such is the dialectic between performance signs and word signs, and such is the confrontation between actors' bodies and playwright's texts.

Consider how the performance text of Q1 at the moment of Juliet's awakening in the Capulet tomb further demonstrates the dynamic tension between these three types of theatrical signs. After the Friar speaks the line, "The lady stirs," Juliet responds:

> Ah, comfortable friar!
> I do remember well where I should be,
> And what we talked of, but yet I cannot see
> Him for whose sake I undertook this hazard. (K2r)

The iconic signs remain as they were before; on stage the audience should be able to easily see the "dead" bodies, swords, and blood and to understand their significations. In addition, the Friar, who has delivered his flurry of impassioned lines, may have assumed the dynamic facial expressions and bodily postures representing fear, worry, or remorse. Also operating simultaneously with these iconic signs are Juliet's verbal/gestural indices: " I do remember well where I should be,/ and what we talked of, but yet I

cannot see/ Him for whose sake I undertook this hazard" (my emphases). The first person singular pronouns draw attention to Juliet. The first person plural pronoun, however, reminds the audience that it was the Friar who engineered "what we talked of." And the Friar admits just three lines later that "if we here be ta'en,/ We shall be thought to be an accessary." The indexical signs in this scene seem to hint at the Friar's complicity. The symbolic signs provide further emotional ambiguity. This "hazard," referred to by Juliet, resonates more fully than she can guess, for although she cannot yet see the iconic signs of death and dread, we and the Friar can. While she indexically implicates him with the we in "what we talkt of," her symbolic signs reveal to us that she does not yet guess the full extent of that implication. The ambiguity (and pain) seem almost palpable to us when she misreads the iconic signs of the Friar's emotional state and calls him "comfortable."

This scene illustrates how the semiotic transactions between different types of signs provide the tools by which theatrical tension may be created, tension not only between the dramatic characters, but also between the dramatic characters and the audience. For instance, long before Juliet awakens in the Capulet tomb, we have been apprised of the full extent of the Friar's complicity in the events leading to this tragic denouement. We, then, blessed with a

broader perspective, have the ability to appropriately "read" those signs which Juliet misreads, underreads, or overreads. When she calls the Friar "comfortable," she may be misreading his facial expressions; however, her inaccurate decoding of his gestural signs not only illustrates her error, it also suggests that the cause for that decoding error is the quantitative imbalance between those semiotic meanings to which the audience is privy but to which the dramatic character is deprived. To call the Friar "comfortable," Juliet must, for example, underread at least one sign that impinges upon us: Romeo's dead body. (I am assuming, in this instance, that the actor playing the role did not unintentionally signify he was "alive.") Juliet, deprived of a full semiotic appraisal, may also inaccurately overread the "comfort-evoking" value of the Friar's religious costume: habit, crucifix, and rosary. In contrast, we, the audience and readers, have the perspective that allows us to read-through those signs which delay Juliet's full understanding of the impending disaster even as we simultaneously participate with her in her pain as she eventually discovers it.

The performance texts created through the collaboration of Shakespeare and his actors illustrate the sometimes purposeful, sometimes unintentional, manipulation of discrepancies between audience/readers and dramatic characters. As I have demonstrated, those discrepancies may

be most fully exposed by performing a semiotic analysis of the encoded literary texts. But while all of Shakespeare's literary texts encode performance texts, his multiple text plays reveal how authorial revision and the contributions of actors generate different versions of the same "Work."[3] Q1-Q2 Romeo and Juliet offer especially fertile ground for my methodological approach for two mutually related reasons: (1) a comparative semiotic analysis reveals both texts to be linguistically and theatrically rich; and (2) that analysis may contribute new terminologies and perspectives toward the hopeful resolution of long-standing textual debates.

The intra-sign dynamic and playtext co-authorship

I would now like to consider the dialectical tensions between word and body signs in light of my proposition that Shakespeare and his fellow actors co-authored and co-revised their playtexts. I will first discuss the two quarto versions of 2.4, a scene which has inspired relatively little textual debate, and then turn to comparative passages from 4.4 and 4.5, scenes which have inspired somewhat more.

2.4.150-158

Semiotic theory suggests support for my contention that the actors of the Chamberlain's men contributed to revisions

of both performance and literary texts. The literary text variations, however, are more obvious. But the reformation of word signs into body signs in performance implies textual change even when none is obvious, as the possible renegotiation of previous agreements between performers and audiences ensues: "Is Romeo really dead?" "He may yet survive." "Look! Isn't he breathing?" "Maybe he, as she before, will live." Further, this mutual encoding--decoding relationship between performers and audiences bestows upon the performer the power--or onus--to reform text even when he has no intention of doing so. That may be the case in one or both of the two versions of 2.4 which follow.

In this scene, Peter, a Capulet servant, accompanies the Nurse as she seeks to confirm Romeo's nuptial intentions. Peter and the Nurse confront a group of men which includes Romeo, Benvolio, and Mercutio. Due to the internecine struggle between the two Veronese families, it is possible that the Nurse--also a Capulet servant--fears being seen talking to any member of the house of Montague. This may be the reason why, on a hot summer's day, she apparently disguises her body behind an outrageously large, ill-fitting garment and her face behind a large fan. The fan, however, signals "prostitute" to a group of the Montagues (Wiles 86), and it provides an entree into their subsequent derisory commentary.

I provide this brief exposition because sexual derision

is at the heart of the variant readings in the two quarto versions of the play. Or perhaps it would be more appropriate to say that sexual derision is suggested at one moment in the scene by Q1 and that sexual innuendo is inferred in that same moment by Q2. In the Q2 version, the scene reads as follows:

> Nurse and thou must stand by too and suffer every knave to use me at his pleasure.
>
> Peter I saw no man use you at his pleasure: if I had, my weapon should quickly have been out.

(E4r-E4v)

The Q1 text reads somewhat differently. Immediately prior to the corresponding dialogue, the Q1 text contains the stage direction, "She turns to Peter her man." Then the Nurse, after having had her fill of the Montagues' jests, says:

> Nurse And thou like a knave must stand by, and see every Jack use me at his pleasure.
>
> Peter I see nobody use you at his pleasure, If I had, I would soon have drawn: you know my tool is as soon as anothers if I see time and place.

(E3v)

Peter's reply in Q2--"I saw no man use you at his pleasure--infers by sexual innuendo: "use could mean 'copulate with'" (Gibbons 151). But consider the variant reading in Q1: "I see nobody use you at his pleasure." Although the

difference between Q2's "no man" and Q1's "nobody" seems minor, we may speculate that the actor who played Peter in the the Q1 script may have punctuated his line with a somewhat more overtly demonstrative gesture than the actor who delivered the corresponding line in the Q2 script.

Compare next a more striking difference between the two texts in the line immediately following. In Q2, Peter says, "if I had, my weapon should quickly have been out"; in contrast, Peter in Q1 says, "if I had I would soon have drawn: you know my tool is as good as another's" (my emphases). The American Heritage College Dictionary lists "penis" as one of its definitions for "tool"; in contrast, no such connotation is listed for "weapon." Still, while both "weapon" and "tool" may refer to Peter's "peter," the "tool" association seems the more obvious, the more overtly physical.

Who or what effected these textual variants? While no one can offer definitive answers to these questions, historical information may be combined with an understanding of playtext theatricalization to imagine several possible explanations.

It is possible, for instance, that the variants in these two scenes were made by the Shakespeare in solus or that he made them after he had participated in an early performance. If these variants derive from performance testing, then the Q1 text may represent Shakespeare's

version of Romeo and Juliet which he later revised in Q2. There are, moreover, several other possible explanations. One is that the performers intentionally changed word and performance signs and that Shakespeare acquiesced to those changes. If this happened, Q1 and Q2 might represent first and second versions of Romeo and Juliet by Shakespeare and his fellow actors, although the contributions of those actors would be impossible to accurately identify. Finally, there may be one further possible explanation for variants such as "no man"/"nobody" and "weapon"/"tool." And this explanation neither focuses on playwrights nor actors but on the decoding processes of audiences instead. It suggests that both texts may have recorded identical dialogue for the character, Peter, in the actor's playscripts (a.k.a. the actor's "part"), but that an audience member or promptbook manager recorded something quite different during or after his attendance of live performances based on those playscripts. Unlike traditional editors who use imagined reporter error to discredit variants in "bad" texts, I offer audience decoding as another possible influence on playtext reformation to which Shakespeare may not only have been aware, but to which he may have also easily acquiesced.

I reserve my discussion of authorial revision for the next chapter. At this juncture, I would like to first consider possible revisions by performers and, next, possible revisions by auditors.

In the original production of Q1 and Q2 Romeo and Juliet, it is probable that the actor playing the character Peter was the most recognizable player of the Chamberlain's Men: Will Kemp. Kemp, the resident "clown" of the Chamberlain's Men, was a nationally known comedian with "a broadly plebeian appeal" (Wiles 35). We can be reasonably certain that he played Peter in the original performances of Q1 and Q2 Romeo and Juliet because the "servingman" in 4.4--who David Wiles, Giorgio Melchiori and others have convincingly proven to have been played by the same actor as "Peter" in 2.4--is announced in the Q2 text as "Enter Will Kemp" (K3v).

I would like to propose that both Q1 and Q2 "vest their authority in theatrical performances" (Goldberg, "What" 17). Both texts, then, may record two different performances (or set of performances) of the play during which Kemp played the jests at 2.4 (i.e., "I see no man," and "my weapon" in Q2; "I see nobody," and "my tool" in Q1) in several different ways. I suggest that Kemp may have introduced the variants in the two quarto versions of this speech improvisationally. With clear visual signs overscoring the innuendos on prostitution, rape, and copulation, Kemp's "no body" and "tool" could have been his way of giving the audience exactly what it had paid to see: the physical hilarities of the most famous celebrity of the day. David Wiles, however, does not agree that Kemp could have

introduced these variants himself, proposing, instead, another kind of "authorship."

In his otherwise excellent study of the artistic contributions of Will Kemp to the Chamberlain's Men, Wiles rejects the reading from Q1 Romeo and Juliet on the grounds that "the reporter understood the jest in performance...[but that] it would be rash to take this as evidence of Kemp changing his lines" (Clown 87). Unfortunately, he offers only one possible explanation for the Q1 reading: a reporter saw a production of the play, "understood the jest in performance," but apparently could not memorially reconstruct it word-for-word. Wiles reasserts a traditional explanation for these textual variants in Q1: memorial error. Yet Peter's lines in Q1 demonstrate the kind of workable theatricalization of text that might easily result in direct linguistic change.

Still, as Wiles suggests, Kemp may have played this scene faithfully maintaining Q2's text[4]; if so, the transcription of his performance possibly preserved in Q1 seems to include gestural information superimposed upon linguistic text. In other words, if Kemp said "no man use you" and "weapon," but accompanied those lines with flamboyant gestures, the reporter may have nevertheless received those same lines as "nobody" and "tool." Wiles asserts the reporter "understood the jest" (Clown 87). If so, the jest may have produced in his mind words integral

and appropriate to the jest: Kemp may have mimed copulation and/or masturbation and the reporter may have encoded these as "no body" and "tool." Physical performance signs can predominate over word signs in just this way. The receiver's imputed meanings must not be considered corrupt, however, simply because they may cause irrevocable textual reformation.

The semiotic and linguistic values in these two texts demonstrate difference, not preference. And that difference may be traced to the semiotic interchangeability of the text's arbitrary linguistic signs for the physically manifest, iconic signs made by the actor's body. Although reportorial transcription is one possible explanation, authorial and performance revisions must be considered as well.

There is one final point I would like to make about the two quarto versions of this scene before moving on to 4.5, 4.4, and 5.3: no modern editions use the Q1 readings of Peter's dialogue while nearly all employ Q1's extra-dialogic stage direction preceding it which reads: "She turns to Peter her man." Ann Pasternak Slater says that this stage direction "tellingly underlines the implications of the text" (Shakespeare 11; my emphasis). What implications, I wonder, could Slater mean? If she means that Peter is implied as the Nurse's addressee, that seems much more than

an implication to me. The Nurse's line immediately following this stage direction--"And thou like a knave must stand by, and see every Jack use me at his pleasure"(Q1), and "And thou must stand by too and suffer every knave/ to use me at his pleasure!" (Q2)--could only be addressed to Peter if the actor follows the internal cues in the script. Romeo, several times referred to by the Nurse as "sir," has been cordial to her, and certainly no "knave" or "Jack"; Mercutio, and to a lesser extent Benvolio, are those knaves and Jacks to which she sues exclusively to Peter for redress. If the actor is committed to following the intra-dialogic cues in the dialogue, then he can deliver his lines to no one else; there is no "implication" behind this stage direction.

The important implications about the early performances of Romeo and Juliet reside in the dialogue variations found in these two versions of the Nurse's lines to Peter and in the two versions of his replies to her discussed earlier. Important implications also reside, of course, in the semiotic variations found embedded within the dialogues. It is here where modern readers will find the opportunities to imaginatively visualize the performances of the Chamberlain's Men. Here is also where modern readers may look to consider those many influences, several of which already discussed, which may have helped to create these two distinct quarto versions: (1) Shakespeare's linguistic

revisions, (2) intentional performance adaptations engendered by the actors and agreed to by Shakespeare, and (3) the unintentional variations caused by audiences' reformative acts of reception.

Celebrity texts

Although it has been traditional to cite Q1's relative abundance of stage directions as evidence of its exclusive dependence on performance, the great majority of those stage directions merely describe actions which the dialogue makes obvious: for instance, "She kneels down," or "Enter Nurse hastily," or "She turns to Peter her man."[5] Any or all of these could have been easily included within the scripts given to the actors, though it is hard to agree with Brian Gibbons when he calls Q1 "a version adapted *for* acting" (2; my emphasis). Actors adept at transforming dialogue into stage action would not need to be directed how to move nor to whom they should address their speeches. Nor would they necessarily submit to these directions even if they were included in their scripts. At least in relation to these stage directions, Q1 does not seem to have been adapted *for* acting or *for* actors.

Q1 is, however, a version of the play I believe to be adapted *through acting* and *by actors*. The playtext Shakespeare may have handed his fellow actors in the first

rehearsal of the play likely underwent both subtle and substantive reformations as physical actions were added to the dialogue. I also believe the actors of the Chamberlain's Men collaborated with Shakespeare in the development of the Q2 version of Romeo and Juliet, that it is no less performance-tested than Q1. Having already cited the semiotic theory which sustains the interdependence of these Shakespearean playtexts and their public performances, I now offer orthographically recorded textual evidence which supports it.

In both quartos that evidence is the name of the company's most famous comedian: Will Kemp. Each text combines several small roles into one composite character, and each text identifies Will Kemp as the actor who played its composite character. Characteristics associated with Kemp--word-play, slap-stick physicality, and dance--may be found in the composite character of each text.

Recalling my previous discussion of the two scenes at 2.4, Q1's stage directions designate the Kemp role in that scene as "her man" and "Peter." Earlier in Q1, he is called "clown," and later in 4.5. he is called "servingman." But the evidence which most strongly suggests Kemp's participation in performances of Q1 may be found in 4.4. In that scene, Capulet advises an anonymous servingman who has delivered logs which are too wet for burning that "Will will tell thee where thou shalt fetch [drier ones]" (I1v).

The composite character played by Kemp in Q2 has just as many designations as its counterpart in Q1. Q2 uses "Clown," "Servant," and "Peter." Textual evidence from Q2 suggests that Will Kemp played one of the musicians in 4.5.; the stage direction preceding his entrance announces: "Enter Will Kemp" (K4r).

The subtle yet significant linguistic and semiotic variations previously explored in the two versions of 2.4 demonstrate a pattern of textual physicalization found in other parts of the composite characters he likely played--in the illiterate servant who erroneously delivers Capulet's banquet invitation to Romeo (1.2), in the Clown who calls Juliet into supper (1.3), and in the servant who accompanies Romeo when he breaks into the Capulet vault (5.3). The only two incontrovertible citings of Kemp's performances, however, are recorded in the stage direction in Q2 and within the dialogue of Q1. Establishing the possible significance of those "citings" will not only serve to underscore the importance of the comparative linguistic/semiotic explications I have previously undertaken in 2.4, it will also further prepare for those explications of 5.3 which will be offered at the end of this chapter.

Q2: Enter Will Kemp

The auditor or auditors who may have been responsible for recording Kemp's performance in this instance are anonymous; they may have been promptbook managers, pirate actors, or audience members. Their identities hardly matter. Kemp's, however, does, for it is his name, and not the dramatic character's, which has found its way into the printed quarto.

What significance does this hold? A great deal, it seems to me, if we attempt to maintain our belief in the primary authority of the written text, for here we have a written text influenced by a star performer. While a rather heated debate has surrounded the importance of inconsistent speech prefixes to the establishment of the textual pedigrees of Q1 and Q2,[6] little or no mention is made of this instance where the text neither identifies the character, nor the character function, but the performer's name instead.[7] While I do not choose to review that debate at this time, I nevertheless wish to note that Enter Will Kemp suggests a performer's influence on what has often been thought to be Shakespeare's orthographically stable text. Several interesting possibilities may account for this influence.

First, Shakespeare may have written 4.5.--the scene which follows this stage direction--as a vehicle for Kemp. Several editors, including Gibbons in his New Arden edition (214) and Wells and Taylor in their Textual Companion (300),

suggest this.[8] Second, the scene may have been played by Kemp with the intentions of sublimating his celebrity within his dramatic role. And the third possibility I would like to explore relates directly to the second: Kemp's intentions notwithstanding, the familiar signs audiences must have associated with him--intonational nuances, costume, physical comportment etc.--might have easily predominated their reception of those scenes, such as 4.5, in which he appeared. When arbitrary word signs confront familiar body signs, body signs usually come out on top. This is particularly true when those body signs belong to a celebrity actor.

Celebrity enters per-formance, pre-formed. While performance completes text, celebrity comes to performance as already completed text. Audiences expect, and to a large degree receive, a reaffirmation of a celebrity's personally idiosyncratic behaviors, intonational nuances, and physical presentations during each performance in which that celebrity appears; moreover, audiences strongly resist substantive variations in the celebrity texts which their encoding procedures have previously helped to create. Kier Elam, analyzing the "actor-text rapport" in a performance of The Little Foxes starring Elizabeth Taylor, concludes that "the real semiotic force of the performance becomes not so much to represent as to present the actress herself in a

suitable and convenient role" ("Much Ado" 46). Indeed, audiences often attend such a performance exclusively to see a celebrity such as Taylor. If we consider that Kemp had been a national celebrity before he began acting with the Chamberlain's Men, a celebrity who wrote his own song-and-dance "jigs,"[9] then we may reasonably compare his effect on past performances to what we know of Taylor's (or Chaplin's, or Keaton's) on modern performances. David Wiles identifies Kemp's idiosyncratic "language" as primarily physical rather than verbal, a language which "triggers the speech act" creating the illusion "that the actor has taken over from the writer as creator of the play" (101). Celebrity status also may create the illusion that the actor <u>is</u> the play.

If celebrity texts appear concluded almost before they begin, they are not so very different from other types of re-read and over-read texts. If "Enter Will Kemp" begins a scene which Shakespeare added as a star vehicle for Kemp, as Gibbons and Wells and Taylor believe, the question arises: "Why did Shakespeare do it?" The scene immediately preceding 4.5 contains the discovery of Juliet's supposed death and the choral lament which follows it; the scene following 4.5 contains Romeo's discovery of Juliet's death and his immediate plans for suicide. The apparent interpolation of 4.5. between two scenes of pain and death may reflect an appeasement of Kemp, but it may also reflect Shakespeare's artistic decision to provide different

emotional colors as he wrenches the audience from tragedy to comedy to tragedy once again. But while we cannot know for sure if Shakespeare was induced to include this scene to appease Kemp, or whether he included it to vary the dramatic coloring of this part of the play, the stage direction suggests that it was the celebrity Kemp that carried the greatest signification for those audiences in attendance at the play's performances. In the confrontation between Kemp and this section of Romeo and Juliet, therefore, two different texts seem to want to rush toward closure on very different terms. Kemp's comic celebrity text, which may have disrupted--intentionally or not--the literary text's tragic inevitability, had, nonetheless, an inevitability all its own. And one fashioned long before he joined the Chamberlain's Men and had a chance to play the "musician" in 4.5.

When Kemp came before Elizabethan audiences in Romeo and Juliet, he was as a comfortably familiar--and therefore, nearly completed--celebrity text. Michael Quinn observes that

> The aesthetics of celebrity are not only psychological but structural: the apparent stability of the star provides a landmark against which the unfolding scenes of the drama can be judged. Celebrities come equipped with an intertext that includes several levels, not only

> the most obvious of which is the conjunction of art and life in a particular role. The intertext is an accretion, based on similar art/life connections in earlier roles, and also on the connections the celebrity provides between the roles themselves. (158)

Considering Kemp's effect on Romeo and Juliet, we may raise a fascinating question: who corrupted whom? Or, more precisely, what text corrupted what text? If we apply the same rule of Lachmannian genealogy so cherished by those traditional editors who call Q1 a corrupt derivation of Q2, then Shakespeare's written play corrupted Kemp's celebrity text. The "author's intentions"--fashioned by highly specific costume, oft repeated comic banter, and individually defining gestural and intonational information--may have been abrogated by the Romeo and Juliet text so many modern editors have subsequently tried to cleanse from the corrupting influences of Elizabethan actors.

Q1: "Will will tell thee where thou shalt fetch them."

Q2's descriptive stage direction, "Enter Will Kemp," not only suggests Q2's indebtedness to performance but also an instance where a particular actor may have dominated an audience's reception of the text. Capulet's line from Q1, however,--"Will will tell thee/ where thou shalt fetch

them"--reveals possibilities of textual reformation even more fascinating. The distinction I have previously made between intra and extra-dialogic stage directions illustrates why. Extra-dialogic stage directions may usefully describe what happened in a performance; intra-dialogic stage directions, however, hold the very key to discovering the interdependence of the playwright's word signs and the actor's performance-generated signs.

Extra-dialogic stage directions are what semiotician Gerard Gennette calls paratext, and what Keir Elam defines as "a marginal or peripheral aspect of textual structure, usually preceding or following the text proper" (Shakespeare's 314). Using J. L. Austin's terminology, we may say that as words they do not "perform." As theatrical words, they are also mute. Intra-dialogic stage directions, in contrast, are wedded to dialogue and, consequently, should seem to move and speak. In the line of dialogue we are examining from Q1 which announces that "Will (i.e., Will Kemp)[10] will tell thee...," we must ask, consequently, how Kemp's name became mixed within the spoken dialogue of the play, how his name became voiced during performance. Q2's paratextual announcement of his entrance in 4.5. is indeed significant; Q1's incorporation of his name within the spoken text is even more so.

Two possible explanations present themselves. The first compares with the explanation offered for Q2's "Enter

Will Kemp": the hypothesized auditor or auditors who recorded the performance were overwhelmed by Kemp's presence; consequently, they mis-heard Capulet's lines which read in Q2 as, "Make haste, make haste sirra, fetch drier logs./ Call Peter,[11] he will show thee where they are" (K2r). In this possible recreation of the events surrounding the reception of the play, Q1's "Will" may stand as a record of Kemp's overwhelming effect upon the audience's reception of a performance(s) of Q1. Taken together with Q2's extra-dialogic stage direction, evidence suggests that Kemp performed in the two distinct versions of Romeo and Juliet as recorded in Q1 and Q2. This suggests that both quartos have been informed by performances.

5.3

As I briefly discussed in chapter one, Wiles contends that Q2 Romeo and Juliet embeds "two developmental layers of text": the first conceived by Shakespeare to provide a fittingly comic ending to a typically melodramatic, "early Elizabethan tragedy," the second a revised ending suitable to Shakespeare's "first essay in new genre, romantic tragedy" (89 ff.). His proposed chronology of events may be summarized like this: (1) Shakespeare writes the finale for a burlesque tragedy before he has written the body of the play; (2) he next changes his generic intentions and writes

a romantic tragedy from "the beginning," only to find he has an unsuitable ending; this prompts him to (3) scrap the original comic ending and write an appropriately tragic one. Wiles may be correct. Composition often follows its own chronology with finales being constructed first, last, or sometime in between. He supports this not entirely unlikely proposition, however, on a single piece of textual evidence: the Q2 finale, which he believes was written before the rest of the play, has Peter accompany Romeo to the Capulet tomb. In contrast, the Q1 finale, "recording what happened in a performed version of the play," illustrates that Shakespeare had reconstructed the tragedy "from the beginning," recasting Peter as Balthasar.

I agree with David Wiles that at least part of the final scene of Q2's text suggests it is derivative, although we disagree slightly on the source or sources from which it may have been derived. He contends that the text from which it was derived is not extant, while I contend that of the several texts from which it was possibly derived, Q1 is the only one which is extant.

The issue here, once again, concerns celebrity texts. The character who accompanies Romeo to the Capulet tomb in the Q2 version is named Peter. Peter was only one of the many small roles Kemp played in both versions of Romeo and Juliet. Linguistic and performance evidence from 2.4, 4.4, and 4.5 discussed earlier strongly suggests this: (1) His

ribald language in 2.4 ("You know my tool is as soon out as another's"), (2) the stage direction "Enter Will Kemp," and (3) Capulet's line at 4.4 "Will will tell thee where thou shalt fetch them." On the other hand, the wordplay and slapstick typical of Kemp's roles are noticeably absent from the character who accompanies Romeo to the tomb in the Q1 version: Balthasar. This suggests that some other actor in the company was subsequently imagined by Shakespeare in the role of Romeo's accomplice in 5.3 when he was composing the Q1 text. I agree with Wiles that the on-stage presence of Kemp, as Peter, might make it difficult for "Romeo to dominate the stage...preclud[ing] any even short-lived idealizing of Romeo's emotions," and I wholeheartedly accept the possibility that two (and maybe more) "developmental layers of texts" may lie behind Q2's printed form. Kemp's celebrity text seems to be one of those. A careful analysis of the Q2 version which follows shortly seems to confirm this.

Implicit to Wiles contention that Q2's ending was first contrived as comedic is his belief that it may derive, in part, from early drafts which are no longer extant, or which Shakespeare may have decided were too underdeveloped to offer to the actors in rehearsal. Q1, however, is an extant document. It may be an authorial first draft and the only text through which Q2's development may be inferred. If Q2 embeds "developmental layers of text" internally, Q1's text-

-whether derived from Q2 or vice versa--must offer a comparative treasure of information relating to the developmental performance practices employed by the Chamberlain's Men.

Q1's "Balthasar" may have been, according to Wiles, an appropriate recasting of Peter in order "to signal that this was a straight character, distanced from the immediate world of the London audience." He may be correct. However, when he suggests that "there was no need to rewrite Peter's lines [and that] a few cuts and appropriate casting were enough," he thereby disregards the exciting variations in the linguistic and performance programs of the Q1 version which provide the only sure evidence for his contention that Romeo and Juliet was, indeed, revised.

Wiles appropriates Q1's speech prefix revision of Balthasar as a replacement for Q2's Peter while denying revisions within the Q1 scene in which Balthasar appears, although those revisions further support his speculation that Shakespeare may have first conceived of the play as a comedy. Most modern editors of the play (e.g., Gibbons, Evans, Wells and Taylor) also appropriate Q1's speech prefix of Balthasar, presumably to insure against a disconcerting modulation in the play's tragic tone in the important, final scene.

By culling select theatrical information from Q1 and ignoring Q1's significantly different linguistic and

performance programs, however, both Wiles and the editors I have just mentioned deny themselves the full value of a Renaissance text which may have already successfully completed the generic "purification" for them. But if Q1 preceded Q2, a compositional revision toward generic purification cannot be assumed. We may speculate, instead, that Q2 represents Shakespeare's evolution away from Q1's more generically homogeneous tone at 5.3. In Jill Levenson's opinion, Romeo and Juliet is a "kaleidoscopic text: tragedy side by side with comedy" (Shakespeare 16). Comparisons to moments in other Shakespearean tragedies support her assessment. Comedy is often employed dissonantly in exactly those moments when tragic pathos is greatest: the Porter follows Duncan's murder in Macbeth, the Clown's scene with Cleopatra immediately precedes the female protagonist's suicide in Antony and Cleopatra, and, in Romeo and Juliet, Will Kemp's star-turn in 4.5 immediately follows Juliet's apparent death. Taking this into account, we must be careful when weighing the literary qualities of the two quarto texts at 5.3 with an eye for establishing textual genealogy. Nevertheless, the relatively anonymous Balthasar in Q1 Romeo and Juliet at 5.3 may have been placed there in order not to distract the audience's attention away from Romeo.

But in whichever chronological direction the two texts developed (i.e., Q1 > Q2 or Q2 > Q1)[12], modern editors

create an eclectic character to represent Romeo's servant by combining Q1's character, "Balthasar," with Q2's dialogue for "Peter." The implicit assumption can only be that it is structurally possible to segregate a character's name not only from the words he uses and from those that are used "on" him, but also from the myriad performance choices embedded within those words. In fact, it is impossible to create this kind of textual Frankenstein if the structural integrity of either Renaissance text is to be preserved. The Q1 text which calls its version of Romeo's personal servant "Balthasar" comes complete with a character who performs different actions, speaks different words, and effects the dramatic structure of its play in profoundly different ways than his clownish counterpart, Peter, affects the dramatic structure of Q2. My earlier point about the two different versions of 2.4 applies directly to 5.3: whether the playwright, the actors, or the reception by the audience is the source of obvious theatrical revisions (e.g., changed speech prefixes, additional extra-dialogic stage directions, etc.), accompanying linguistic and embedded performance revisions must be analyzed in tandem if the marvelously tangled story of the chronological relationship between the two quartos of Romeo and Juliet can be appreciated. I have contended that Kemp's overtly sexual jest in the Q1 version of 2.4 and the stage direction "She turns to Peter her man" cannot be easily segregated. In

5.3, Q1's and Q2's full linguistic and semiotic programs must be assessed in relationship to their respective assignments of "Balthasar" and "Peter" as the names for Romeo's servant.

Let us first consider the Q2 version of the opening dialogue[13] between Romeo and Peter:

> Enter Romeo and Peter
>
> Romeo Give me that mattock and the wrenching iron
> Hold take this Letter, early in the morning,
> See thou deliver it to my Lord and Father,
> Give me the light upon thy life I charge thee.
>
> (L2v)

In the following comparative analysis, I highlight several important variations between the two quarto texts, most of which can be put into one of two categories: actions and words offering comedic opportunities for an actor like Kemp, and actions and words pared of their most overt comedic qualities. I draw upon my earlier discussion on sign types--icon, index, and symbol--to clarify these categories.

Notice first the physical qualities of the performance text of Q2, and consider what an experienced comedian like Kemp might have made of them. The character, Peter, enters with three large props: a mattock (or pick-ax), a wrenching iron (or crow-bar), and a torch. Romeo commands, "Give me

that mattock and the wrenching iron" and, immediately after, "Hold take this letter." Assuming Romeo's "Hold" is a command to Peter to temporarily halt the earlier action now already in progress--the transferring of the mattock and wrenching iron--so that he, Romeo, can give Peter the letter, how, we must wonder, does Peter physically reaccommodate the wrenching iron and mattock without bringing undo attention unto that accommodating process? That is, how does he refrain from drawing the audience's attention to his fumbling when it seems as if the necessary question of the play should be Romeo's emotional desperation? Assuming the actor does not wish to draw the audience's focus to himself, the embedded performance information in this scene makes that humble inclination terribly difficult to achieve.

It seems reasonable to speculate that these actions are made intentionally difficult for Romeo's servant, whatever name he is given. Perhaps difficulty and fumbling--physical, low-brow humor--<u>was</u> the necessary question of the play in this version of this finale. If not, the performance text seems stacked against any performer--then or now--who would hope to remain shadowed by Romeo's emotional torment. Consider further comedic implications for Peter.

Let us assume that Peter succeeds in working against the performance program embedded within the text and that he

manages somehow to inconspicuously prepare himself to accept Romeo's letter. How, we must ask, can he possibly summon the further reserves of gestural aplomb he will need to quietly transfer the torch? Without reviewing the dialogue, readers may easily forget (and may have already forgotten) that Peter enters not with two, but with three large props. Audience and actors, however, never would: unlike the ephemeral word signs which name them, material signs do not fade from memory. They are physically manifest when on stage and remain so until they are taken off-stage by actors. Physical manifestation distinguishes iconic signs from all others: they signify by physically approximating what they represent. Sometimes, moreover, iconic stage signs are nothing more (or less) than the real objects they represent; this is exactly why human actors usually stand-in for dramatic characters. During Peter's predicament in 5.3 of Q2 Romeo and Juliet, it is probable that a "real" mattock and a "real" wrenching iron were used when this scene was staged. Sign value for an object, tacitly agreed upon by playwrights, actors and audiences through shared conventions and experience, must be signaled in one way or another. The mattock in this scene, for instance, if it were "real," would inherently contain values for weight, sharpness, and size. These inherent values would become obvious whenever Peter or Romeo was required to lift, transport, or discard it. If it were a prop, however, an ersatz representation

without the heaviness or sharpness of a real mattock, the actors handling this prop would be required to impart these values by miming the effect of weight or sharpness on their bodies and voices. In this instance, actors might choose to signify the "mattock's" sign values in a variety of ways including, but certainly not limited to, (1) generally laconic and labored movement, (2) a wipe of the brow, (3) or a vocal grimace of pain as the "mattock" is lifted (ugh!).

An ersatz "mattock" would require sustained mental concentration, however, for once weight and sharpness are imputed through movement and/or vocal signs, the actors must be careful not to annul the mimetic realism of the playworld by tossing that same mattock around as if it were, for instance, fake. (Even though, "in reality", it is fake.) For this reason, actors usually prefer "real" props. Considering the extreme demands placed upon actors in performance, real props allow mental short-cuts: a real mattock is heavy and cannot be tossed about as if it were not. Still, occasions do arise when ersatz props may be used for comedic purposes.

If Shakespeare wrote the final scene in Q2 in order to startle his audiences by placing comedy side-by-side with tragedy, the actors playing Peter and Romeo might accommodate the exchange of the mattock and wrenching iron too easily. This might signal a semiotic interference between the two spheres of reality working within and

without the performance: the playworld and the real world (Mukařovský, "Structural Analysis" 172). An exchange of props which appeared to be too facile could signal that the props were ersatz, causing as much laughter as the possibly unintended, yet undeniably conspicuous, fumbling with the real props.

I offer these as possibilities. Obviously we can neither be sure which choices were made by Kemp and the other actor, nor if they played comedy with real or ersatz props. The multiple physical exchanges of the mattock and wrenching iron--the stage "business"--could have elicited laughter in either case. What seems reasonably clear, however, is that Peter's physical predicament is compounded within the space of two lines, and that he has no time to complete any of the actions required of him by Romeo. Can we not easily imagine a twentieth century comedian such as Charlie Chaplin or Red Skelton in this role, playing the poor servant's steadfast obedience to his master against his increasing exasperation with his master's unreasonable commands as his struggle with these props intensifies? In the Q2 version of this scene, Kemp may have mugged his way to center stage in a very similar manner.

An alternative design for this scene is evidenced by the change of speech prefix for Romeo's servant: from Q2's "Peter" to Q1's "Balthasar." Further, the stage direction announces Balthasar's entrance: "Enter Romeo and Balthasar,

with a torch, a mattock, and a crow of iron" (K1r). This alterative design suggests that Shakespeare may have imagined some actor in the role besides Kemp as part of a more consistently tragic shape for the scene. We do not know who this other actor was, but his exact identity is hardly important. It is only important that the actor was not Kemp. The celebrity could not be made faceless, and facelessness is what Shakespeare seems to require in this version of the scene. Any actor in the Chamberlain's Men would have been more faceless than Kemp.

After the stage direction I just quoted from Q1, Romeo says to Balthasar:

> Give me this mattock, and wrenching iron
> And take these letters early in the morning
> See thou deliver them to my Lord and Father.
>
> (K1v)

Sensing Q1's more generically homogenous rendering of this scene and its characterizations, most modern editors collate Q1's speech prefixes and stage direction with Q2's dialogue creating eclectic texts which obscure the two distinct Renaissance versions. Strangely, however, they leave Q2's dialogue untouched. But as I have suggested, the dialogue of Q2 programs comic performance signs no matter what name--Peter or Balthasar--one assigns to the character who speaks it. Q1, which I believe may have been developed subsequent to Q2 in this final scene of the play, deserves careful

evaluation because it evidences character and dialogue variants which modify the original comedic ending. I return to Q2, however, in order to demonstrate Q1's modifications.

After Romeo's staccato-like commands have apparently tied Peter up in knots, he continues in Q2 to command: "Give me the light upon my life I charge thee" (L2v). Before Peter has been able to gesturally adjust to the original command, which has now been aborted, and to the subsequent command to accommodate a fourth prop in addition to the three large ones to which he had been already entrusted, he must now hand the torch--the last of the original props to be accounted for in the text's linguistic program--to Romeo. The difficulty of carrying out these actions is further compounded by the desperate speed at which Romeo demands their execution and by the penalty for failure: death. Romeo's threat, "Upon thy life I charge thee," may refer to his subsequent command to Balthasar not to "interrupt me in my course," or it may refer to his commands immediately before which I have already mentioned. But to whichever line or lines the death threat refers, it seems ridiculous, and therefore entirely appropriate for a comedy. Yet if it also seems oddly inappropriate for a tragedy, we may be discovering once again intentional generic modulation by Shakespeare. But whether Q2 represents authorial revision of a tragedy--i.e., Q2's scene followed Q1's--or an earlier version once planned as the finale of a subsequently

abandoned comedy--i.e., Q2's 5.3 predated Q1's--the dialogue and implied action in this scene shifts the audience's focus toward and away from Romeo's plight and the comedic stage business of Peter.

In chapter one, my discussion of the linguistic and performance programs in the Q2 version of the scene between Paris and his Page--a scene which immediately precedes this one--also exposed latent comic business. Although Wiles does not use the Paris/Page scene in Q2 to help support his contention that Shakespeare had originally planned to construct Romeo and Juliet as comedy composing backwards from the finale, he might have noticed how similar it is to the subsequent Romeo/Peter scene that he does discuss.

Both contain a nearly mute servant who must quickly perform a series of difficult physical maneuvers with props and stage-movements and a major character who delivers an impassioned eulogy at the tomb of whom he believes to be his dead lover. Moreover, both the nearly mute servants--the Page and Peter-- likely remain on-stage after they have performed their "business" and during those impassioned eulogies by Paris and Romeo. The Page says, "I am almost afraid to stand alone,/ Here in the Church-yard, yet I will adventure" (L2r), while Peter says, "For all this same, I'll hide me here about,/ His looks I fear, and his intents I doubt" (L2v). Wiles recognizes the significance of Peter's on-stage presence when he says that Kemp would be "ideally

placed to engage in some visual by-play with the audience" (91); however, he apparently overlooks the comic potential equally implied by the Page's on-stage presence. Both minor characters could have been placed downstage to offer a visual bridge between the audience and the more fully integrated characters of the upstage drama; if they were, both likely signaled an alternative comic perspective to the tragic perspective of Romeo and Paris. From this highly similar evidence, it is therefore reasonable to propose that these sections of 5.3 in Q2, and so not only the sections in which Kemp appeared, may have been slated to conclude a comedy, or, like the Porter in Macbeth or the Clown in Antony and Cleopatra, slated to include comedy.

What we cannot know is how much of Q2's version was composed by Shakespeare and how far the actors' performances affected that composition. Neither can we know the answers to these questions in relation to the development of Q1. Although one critic labels the apparently corrupt and derivative Q1 version as an "impoverished reminiscence" in an effort to highlight the finer poetry in Q2--the "Shakespearean original" (Slater 11)--I can find little difference in the quality of the verse between the quartos in these sections. Either version may or may not have been written by Shakespeare; either may have been written long before the rest of the play, perhaps in 1590 or 1591, when Shakespeare's verse was relatively unpolished.

As I suggested in the first chapter, the Paris/Page scene in Q1 seems carefully designed to limit the comic potentials explicit in the Q2 version (see p.45 ff.). Analyzed in tandem with its version of the Romeo/Balthasar scene which immediately follows, we may be able to confirm Q1 as the "neat and performable" script Jill Levenson calls it ("Editing" 10).

By offering fewer comedic possibilities in this opening dialogue, Q1 demonstrates how the play's last scene may be directed towards a more homogeneous tragic ending. It reads:

> Enter Romeo and Balthasar, with a torch, a mattock, and a crow of iron
>
> Paris The boy gives warning, something doth approach. What cursed foot wanders this way to night, To stay my obsequies and true loves rites? What with a torch, muffle me night a while.
>
> Romeo Give me this mattock, and this wrenching iron. And take these letters early in the morning, See thou deliver them to the Lord and Father.

Two of the significant differences between this version and the Q2 version are: (1) Paris remains on-stage while Romeo and his servant enter and (2) the indexical signs used by Romeo to indicate the mattock and the iron. First consider how Paris' on-stage presence during the entrance of Romeo

Romeo and Balthasar may strengthen the tragic import of the scene.

By placing Paris on-stage during the subsequent entrance of Romeo and Balthasar, Shakespeare exploits the disjunct between audience "seeing" and dramatic character "not-seeing" (Dessen, 140-155), thereby heightening the dramatic tension. We see that it is Romeo who enters, but Paris does not. And we easily predict that Paris' fervent wish to perform his "true loves rite" will soon be interrupted by Juliet's true love in the person of Romeo. While Paris' words in Q1 are quite similar to those in Q2, the difference in the Q1 staging imparts its total theatrical structure with different tragic ambiguities. In this instance, the simultaneous iconic presence of both actor-signs extends the possible meanings of the linguistic word signs.

Semiotic analysis also exposes the second major difference between the two scripts that I wish to emphasize, although in the following instance the intra-sign dynamic involves icons, word symbols, and two subclasses of indices: distal and proximal.

When Romeo commands Peter in Q2 to "give me that mattock" (my emphasis), the actor employs a distal indexical sign that indicates "a movement away" from the stage space assumed by his immediate context. According to Kier Elam, it is through deixis (such as "this" and "that") that "an

important 'bridge' is set up between gesture and speech" (Semiotics 73). A truer sense of that bridge may be seen in Q1, however, when Romeo includes the mattock within the context of the actor's first-person utterance by the use of a proximal index: "this mattock. It appears that Romeo, rather than his "man," performs the prop-juggling in this version of the scene preserved in Q1. This is further suggested by his second command: "[give me] this wrenching iron." Again, he includes the prop within the context of his first-person utterance. Q2's gesturally vague--"the wrenching iron"--(my emphases) has been replaced by a second proximal index. What these subtle variants suggest about the performance revisions embedded within Q1 is this: the actor playing Romeo likely takes the props from Balthasar on this line, therefore eliminating the possibility of disruptive comedic business when they are transferred as noticed in the Q2 script.

A second modification in Q1 is the inclusion of the connector "and" between Romeo's first and second commands, a little noticed but potentially important addition. Gone is Q2's preemptory "Hold"; in its place we have a linguistic sign which signifies continuation of purpose rather than abrupt cessation and change: Romeo has taken the mattock and iron himself, and he gives the letter to an open-handed Balthasar. Finally, the disrupting threat to Balthasar's life does not appear, nor does the business with the torch.

I believe the alternative versions of these passages suggest, in microcosm, Shakespeare's evolving generic intentions throughout the play. As those intentions evolved, a significant number of extravagant theatrical adjustments had to be made. Getting the celebrity Kemp off the stage may have been only one of them.

It may not have been as easy as we presume, however, and certainly was not as easy as erasing the word "Peter" and substituting the word "Balthasar." Words, we must remember, may be easily forgotten; the physical presence of actors who have made those words into action on stage are not as disposable.

The contrastive linguistic and performance programs within the two quarto versions of 2.4, 4.4, and 4.5 I analyzed earlier support my belief that actors' performances, intentionally or not, may profoundly and positively influence the received texts of audiences and that, in turn, those received texts may find their way back into the physical documents from which they were spawned. I have used the performances of one celebrity actor, Will Kemp, to sustain my position although the ability of actors to collaborate on textual development should not be thought exclusive to celebrities. They are the useful trace elements by which the fuller process may be followed.

Finally, in comparing the two quarto versions of 5.3 Romeo and Juliet, I have once again traced textual revision

through the performances of that same celebrity actor: Will Kemp. What appears to be Shakespeare's evolving tragic form has also been discussed in relation to Kemp's apparent presence in the Q2 version and his apparent absence from the Q1 version. In this final discussion, I have drawn a connection between theatrical structure and the intra-sign dynamic which forms it: I have attempted to describe the parts that make the whole. While the parts I highlight may be different from the parts previously highlighted by other readers of this play, they are quite as useful, quite as appropriate.

I do not propose, necessarily, that Shakespeare consciously distinguished a distal index ("that") from a proximal one ("this"), that the parts I pull apart to analyze can be proven to be the parts he knew of or cared about. Neither do I insist he made the minute revisions in those parts of the Q1 and Q2 scripts which nonetheless subtly alter the two finales. But I do not necessarily discount either possibility. What I do strongly propose, however, is that Shakespeare's generic adjustments elsewhere may have influenced--and may have been influenced by--the actors' performances in his two versions of 5.3; that, in fact, the Romeo and Balthasar who aimed to focus the audience's attention on the impending tragedy in Q1 could have intentionally, or unintentionally, minimized the scene's comic potentials with the stage props by altering

simple, apparently insignificant words. While a rose by any name may still be called a rose, a "this" can never be a "that."

Notes

1
Completion is this instance means the fulfillment of a literary playtext's mission: performance. No two performances, however, fulfill that mission in exactly the same way.

2
See the last chapter's discussion of the differences between the oral recitations of Anglo-Saxon poetry and scripted drama. It is largely the dramatic context of the "here and now," defined in large part by indices, that distinguish theatrical imitation from poetic or prosodic narration.

3
See Peter L. Shillingsburg's "Text as Matter, Concept, and Action" for a useful definition of the "Work" as a conceptual entity (and not a physical one) which "exists in two (or more) Versions each represented more or less well by one of the physical copies" (49). As may be seen, he also defines "Version" conceptually. I believe that the "physical copies" Q1 and Q2 represent "more or less well" the "Work": Romeo and Juliet.

4
For the moment I postpone a discussion on the genealogy of Q1 and Q2 in order to discuss how actors and audiences may cause textual variations. "Faithfully," then, I use provisionally, since the original text to which Kemp may have (or may have not) adhered has not been previously established in this discussion.

5
Most modern editions include these stage directions at 3.5.158, 3.5.37, and 2.4.151 to describe, respectively, Juliet's gesture of physical supplication to her father, the speed with which the Nurse enters Juliet's bedchamber to warn her (and Romeo) of the impending entrance of Lady Capulet, and the character to whom the Nurse addresses her line, "And thou must like a knave stand by, and see every Jack use me at his pleasure."

6
In brief, McKerrow and Greg propose inconsistent speech prefixes indicate a foul paper source behind Q2 since Shakespeare himself would have been indifferent to these inconsistencies in preparing his manuscript. In contrast, they believe the more consistent speech prefixes in Q1 indicate a working theatrical copy since exits and entrances would be very important to a prompt-book, the apparent

source of Q1. Wells and Taylor agree, in the main, with these distinctions, though they grant Q1 added authority as a more "socialized" text because its inconsistent speech prefixes indicate it was an acted version of the play. Paul Werstine contends inconsistency or consistency of speech prefixes offers no hard proof of source material behind either quarto and is, it seems to me, correct.

7
Paul Werstine discusses the relationship between character/ character function and textual sources in "McKerrow's Suggestion" listed in my works consulted. A discussion of the textual significance of the performer's recorded name has not yet been undertaken. I propose to do so in a future discussion of my own.

8
Examining the improvisatory quality of the dialogue, David Wiles lends his voice to those who believe Shakespeare wrote this scene specifically for Kemp (88).

9
Robert Weimann describes a jig as "a dramatic balladlike dance containing some measure of satire and burlesque parody" (24).

10
"Will" might also refer to Will Shakespeare, in which case new questions arise as to why the playwright's name is included within the dialogue. I will pose these questions in a later discussion.

11
"Peter" is italicized in the Q2 text and may represent a later correction of the earlier performed Q1 reading I now discuss.

12
The published documents of Q1 and Q2 can only be shown like this: Q1 (1597) > Q2 (1599). However, much textual debate centers around the states of the text or texts behind the published quartos: promptbooks, foul papers, emended exemplars, individual actors' parts, etc. Since none of these sources survive, it has been speculated that Shakespeare's completed, but yet to be published Q2 version--and the sources behind that version--may have supplied copy for the 1597 quarto publication. In this case, Q2's unpublished sources may be shown to be textual forbears of Q1: Q2 > Q1. Further discussion on this debate is provided in the next chapter.

[13] I call this dialogue even though Peter/Balthasar have no lines in this early part of the scene. They do, however, perform actions which have an effect on Romeo's subsequent words and actions. In that way these scenes may be said to be dialogic.

I begin my discussion on the textual genealogy of the two quartos of Romeo and Juliet by citing John Bowers' cautionary conclusion to "Hoccleve's Two Copies of Lerne to Dye: Implications for Textual Critics": "the use of an author's final intentions as an editorial principle is rendered problematic by the inherent difficulty of establishing the linear succession of versions" (469; my emphasis). Not unlike the varied approach I have previously employed to discuss the two versions of Romeo and Juliet, he supports his conception of fluid and polygenous, not static and monogenous, texts with bibliographical, historical, and what I call semiotic analyzes. I will summarize them briefly.

Bowers' bibliographic analysis suggests that Hoccleve's revision of Lerne to Dye may inscribe the author's own memorial reconstructions thus rendering the editorial decontamination of such "blunders" a wasteful procedure in the ill-conceived quest for a product which may have never existed: the one authorially sanctioned text. Bowers' historical analyzes confirm, moreover, that the two versions of Lerne to Dye were planned for different social contexts, contexts which presumed the collaborative engagement of two distinct audiences. Finally, though he never uses the word "semiotic," it is apparent that his description of Hoccleve's texts as "medieval social transaction[s]" (463)

tacitly draws upon the concepts of communication and code so endemic to semiotic discourse.

Bowers accompanies his editorial exposition with useful diagrams (semiotic explorations in their own right), and, by so doing, he further questions the model of textual transmission based solely on the author's perceived final intentions. Labeling Hoccleve's autograph of Lerne to Dye as "A," and his two fair copy versions as "B" and "C," he believes their textual transmission should not be represented as A > B > C since "versions are not created in clear stages of composition...without backtracking or intermediate tampering," but rather as A > B and A > C "with the distinct possibility of authorial contamination by memorial retention of an earlier version or actual consultation of the other manuscript (A > B and AB > C)" (469; my emphasis). I would like to suggest that the two printed quartos of Romeo and Juliet may also evidence what can be usefully summarized from Bowers' descriptions and diagrams as a recursive compositional process. Assuming what composition theorist Joseph F. Trimmer calls "the presence of an evolving manuscript" behind every document (95; my emphasis), I believe the two quartos of Romeo and Juliet may demonstrate "backtrackings," "intermediate tamperings," "authorial memorial retentions" of earlier versions, and "actual consultations" with other manuscripts. Before I explore these possibilities, however, I would like

to offer one further word about Bowers' diagram.

Theories offered by Nancy Sommers and Peter L. Shillingsburg support and extend Bowers' diagrammatic exposition for the transmission of Hoccleve's Lerne to Dye. Sommers is concerned with univocal authorship. She believes that composition is a recursive process during which "'writing develops like a seed, not a line' and like a seed it confuses beginning and end" (334). By her account, either or both of Hoccleve's versions represented by Bowers as B and C may be the seed of a earlier, provisionally complete, A; and/or A may be the seed text from which B and C were nurtured and grown. But Sommers' theory has further implications if we agree with Robert Scholes that because "a text always echoes other texts...the analyst is entitled to speculate what went on before the decision to stop [writing] was made, and what might have gone on afterward" (16). We may, then, speculate that any "final text" (Hoccleve's C?) may theoretically provide the beginning for future compositional efforts and that any "original text" (Hoccleve's A?) may have been the fruition of compostional efforts which preceded it.

Peter L. Shillingsburg offers a linear image to describe textual transmission that encompasses these very possibilities--extinct, extant, and future texts. His focus, in contrast to Sommers', is on polyvocal authorship. He states that a written text "is not one unproblematic

transparent 'voice' but the 'spoor' so to speak of a multitude of speakers working at various times and places" (73). Shillingsburg's speakers include anyone who writes (the author), transmits (scribes, editors, publishers), or receives (readers, audiences) a text, for each of these contributors engage in acts of textual reformation. By his account, any future edition of Lerne to Dye will, for instance, represent a new text.

Combining Sommer's theory of compositional recursion with Shillingsburg's theory of polyvocal textual generation, we may see how Bower's A-B-C diagram for Hoccleve's texts makes sense. Indeed, Bowers' description of the textual relationships between the holograph and the two versions as a "radiating," not a linear pattern, evidence his speculative license about Hoccleve's unrecorded textualizing activities. That description presumes a multitude of textual speakers and a multitude of possible texts: that extant A, B, and C may have derived from now extinct textual predecessors A3, A2, and A1 etc. It also presumes that these extinct textual forbears may evidence radiation something like this: A3 > A2, A2 > A1, and A1 > A but also A3A2 > A1, A3A2A1 > B (perhaps skipping A), A3A > C (skipping A2, A1, and B) etc.

If this radiating diagram seems a confusing maze, that is because the theory upon which it is based assumes, in Hans Zeller's words, that "a version is constituted by a

single variant" (236). The implication behind Zeller's premise is especially applicable to theatrical texts--i.e., that every extant text may have had numerous unknown, unknowable, or lost predecessors, and may engender an infinite number of unrecorded and therefore lost offspring. My analysis of the textual transmission surrounding Romeo and Juliet will be limited to (a) the two extant texts, (b) the extant literary and hypothetical theatrical texts which most probably influenced them, and (c) to representative texts engendered by them. What I judge a probable textual forbear--an Ur-Romeo and Juliet for instance--I acknowledge, others might challenge: my rose is sure to be someone else's weed. Moreover, the representative textual offspring engendered by the two extant quartos require that I select one or two from many possible candidates since any performance of the play since 1599 would qualify. Those choices, too, I freely admit, entail a strong element of subjectivity. I will attempt, however, as Bowers does, to offer convincing bibliographic, historical, and semiotic analyses which strongly suggest though can not prove the existence and nature of texts prior to the two extant documents, and which validate my choice of representative texts engendered by and through them. Unlike Bowers, who only considers written authorial versions, some of the extinct forbears and performance text offspring I offer have been orally transmitted and, therefore, never submitted to

paper. Of those possibilities I have spoken in previous chapters.

Starting at this point, however, with what is sensible to our feeling as well as to our sight--what Peter L. Shillingsburg calls the "document" or "physical 'container' of the Linguistic Text" (54)--I will first summarize prevailing editorial opinions about the relationship of the two extant quartos of Romeo and Juliet. After that, I will speculate on those texts--Q* (perhaps a manuscript behind Q1), Q^{*2} (perhaps a promptbook derived from Q*), etc.--which I believe may have acted as forbears to Q1 and Q2. Finally, I will discuss how the eclectic text Q1Q2 Romeo and Juliet--for, we shall soon see, all modern editions are eclectic--has influenced modern performances.[1]

Major critical positions: A review

Two substantive, printed versions of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet exist: the first quarto published in 1597, and the second quarto published in 1599. Quartos published subsequent to 1599--Q3 in 1609, Q4 in 1622, and Q5 in 1637--are considered derivative by most critics and textual scholars because they demonstrate neither evidence of continuing revision by Shakespeare nor evidence of professional performance by actors but rather "errors accumulating through the process of the printing house, and

attempted corrections, some cogent, some mistaken, but all apparently without authenticity, none beyond the capacity of a compositor or editor" (Gibbons 2).[2] Debate therefore centers on the relationship between the two substantive versions--Q1 and Q2. Editors and textual scholars seek to establish the relative authority of each; they seek to discover how these texts reflect the supposed intentions of Shakespeare or of his acting company. "Authority", then, is variously defined by different schools of critics, and their debate appears to be fought between three major critical positions.

Most editors believe that Q2 Romeo and Juliet possesses a primary literary authority and that Q1 Romeo and Juliet has significant theatrical authority.[3] Q2 is believed by these editors to have been published with tacit--perhaps explicit--approval by Shakespeare. This text, therefore, is believed to reflect his literary intentions, literary intentions demonstrated in Q2's overall length, its apparently consistent character development, and its authentically "Shakespearean" verse. Q1, on the other hand, is considered a "corrupt" text. According to the conventionally accepted narrative, Shakespeare writes--but does not publish--"his" Romeo and Juliet, and it receives its theatrical premiere no later than 1596. In 1597, the story goes, several actors from his company who had performed the still unpublished play collude with a

publisher in the unauthorized publication of Q1 Romeo and Juliet. Then, in 1599, Shakespeare and the Chamberlain's Men respond to Q1 by publishing the authorized and correct Q2 Romeo and Juliet. The many textual variants between Q1 and Q2 are attributed to the hypothetical method of Q1's transmission from playhouse to publisher: "memorial reconstruction." The dishonest actors who had colluded in the publication of Q1 recited their recollection of the play to the publisher or his agent, who, in turn, reconstructed or pieced together a playscript as well as the actors' memories would allow. For adherents to this narrative formula, Q1 represents an imperfect effort at replicating a playtext better produced in Q2. Nonetheless, critics value Q1 because they believe it somehow records a performance (or performances) of the play prior to 1597. As a recollection of performance, the Q1 text represents significant theatrical authority for these critics. In addition to the "memorial reconstruction" narrative, internal evidence is cited for Q1's theatrical authority. Specifically, stage directions in Q1 not found in Q2 seem to give indications of the actors' gestures, of the costumes they wore, and of the props they carried on-stage. According to several of these critics, many of these indications from Q1 could not be easily deduced from Q2's dialogue alone (Wilson, Romeo 123; Gibbons 12).

While most critics accept Q2's literary superiority and

Q1's theatrical authority, two distinctly different value systems have been invoked when assessing the two texts' relative authority. One group of editors and critics claims that Shakespeare would have had only a single authorial intention in Romeo and Juliet, which, John Bowers reminds us, has been the case with editors of Thomas Hoccleve's poem, Lerne to Dye (448).[4] For many Shakespearean editors, Q2's "fixed text" possesses greater author-ity than the spuriously conceived Q1 text. Yet most modern eclectic editions of the play adopt Q1 readings over Q2 readings in those scenes where Q1 records a longer, more fully developed literary text--or where Q2 apparently offers no independently derived text at all. The best example of this is the ninety-five lines from 1.2.46-1.3.36.[5] This includes a long section of the Nurse's part printed in italics where the two quartos are "not only identical in substance but linked together by similarities of spelling, misprint, and type" (Wilson, Romeo 113). On the other hand, some of those same editors who testify to Q1's theatrical authority adopt Q2's text even though Q1 offers what seems to be authentic information about how the play was first performed. And a clear example of this is Brian Gibbons' refusal to include the Q1 direction at 3.3.106--"He offers to stab himself, and Nurse snatches the dagger away"--on the grounds that "this piece of business looks like a gratuitous and distracting bid on the part of the actor in the

unauthorized version to claim extra attention to himself when the audience should be concentrating on Romeo and the Friar" (180). Adherents of this position make their comparative judgments of Q1 and Q2 with the goal of establishing Shakespeare's "authorial intentions" and of publishing those intentions in their editions. The obvious eclecticism of these editions, however, contrasts with the philosophical purity on which they are purportedly based. As physical documents, however, these editions bear witness to the influence of the amalgam text I label Q1Q2 and thereby corroborate Bowers' radiating diagram: Q1Q2 > Arden edition or Q1Q2 > Cambridge edition, etc.

G. Blakemore Evans' New Cambridge and Brian Gibbons' Arden aim to uncover Shakespeare's authorial intentions in Q2 since they believe that the chronology of transmission is Q2 > Q1. By this, they do not mean that the published document Q2 (1599) predates the published document Q1 (1597). Instead, they believe the sources behind Q2, developed by Shakespeare but, as of 1597 yet unpublished, provided the illicit copy for the publication of Q1. This theory consequently leads to believe that Shakespeare had no hand in Q1.[6] Starting with Evans, I offer brief excepts from each of their editions.

Evans says that

> Since the establishment of Q1 as a "bad" quarto editors have sought to reduce their dependence on

> Q1. Even so, the present text, conservative in its adherence to Q2 as copy-text ... , accepts three-and-a-half additional lines and eighteen substantive readings on the authority of Q1... These figures do not include further debts to Q1 in punctuation and stage directions... (211-212)

Evans endorses the traditional narrative of Q1 as a 'bad' quarto or memorial reconstruction, so his reliance on Q1 for stage directions is neither surprising nor exceptional since Q1's "bad" literary values have been considered by many editors and critics to mean, curiously, that it must therefore have "good" theatrical ones. Evans' New Cambridge, owing "debts to Q1" in stage directions, corroborates this wildly uneven assessment of Q1. His additional indebtedness to Q1 for "substantive readings", "additional lines" and "punctuation", however, should be surprising since adherents of authorially fixed texts believe that only the playwright's hand is capable of creating substantive readings and textual addenda. But Shakespeare, according to Evans, had nothing to do with Q1.

Consider now Brian Gibbons' Arden. His moral imprecations against Q1 make Evans' seem tepid. He calls Q1 "imperfectly remembered...pieced together in a mosaic supplemented by pedestrian paraphrasings." He further calls Q1 "Bad," "piratical," and "unreliable," apparently repudiating its worth altogether (4-6). His edition,

however, is no less beholden to Q1, no less eclectic than Evans'. Stanley Wells reminds us, for instance, that Gibbons adopts Q1 readings over those in Q2 more than one hundred times ("Bettering" 710).

Evans and Gibbons represent the group of critics who seek to establish Shakespeare's authorial intentions. I will return to a more careful analysis of these two editions later when I discuss the enduring influence of Q1 and Q2 for other editors. First, however, I wish to examine an opposing critical view of Q1 and Q2.

A second group of critics challenges the notion that recovering a final "authorial intention" should be the only goal of textual scholarship and, instead, applies theories of "collaborative authorship" and "mutable text" to claim textual importance for Q1 as an independent document. Reflecting a "new sociology of the theatre" (Patterson 37), advocates of this position grant Q1 value perhaps exceeding that of Q2 <u>because</u> it is believed to be a product of "memorial reconstruction." In this light, final textual "authority" for the Q1 text resides in the actor or actors "who helped reconstruct the text." For if a Shakespearean quarto does indeed derive from a memorial reconstruction, it "may indeed represent a more finished, dramatic, socialized phase of the text than that preserved in an edition printed from Shakespeare's foul papers" (Wells and Taylor, <u>Textual</u> 28). Previously considered only a corrupting influence on

the playwright's text, here the actor has been recast as second (and, in some ways, preeminent) author. Q1--valued even by the first group of critics as a record of an early performance--has been afforded new authority by this second group because for them it demonstrates (1) the inevitable appropriation of Shakespeare's playtext by actors and (2) the subjection of that playtext to the destabilizing effects of professional production. According to this second group, the conventional search by editors for the "authorial intention" behind a playtext presupposes an idealized "fixed text"--a practical impossibility in the theatre. These critics seem to champion the actors' liberty to generate memorially reconstructed texts because those texts have come to reveal important historical insights into the relationships among Elizabethan theatre professionals. These critics, Wells and Taylor foremost among them, make a pedigree from a former mongrel.

I, too, believe theatricalization inevitably unfixes the words of the playtext. And I am reassured by the theatrical sensitivity of the Wells and Taylor Oxford. Why, however, must Shakespeare be left out of the socializing process which apparently developed the two versions of this play? The factors influencing textual versioning surely must include the playwright. Why must Q1 represent a more finished, more dramatic, more socialized phase of the text? Why, indeed, must it be more anything? By maintaining "the

moral idiom of this textual narrative" ("Editing" Levenson 5) first proposed by more traditional editors, and then modulating it only slightly--Evans' and Gibbons' "good" and "bad" have been replaced with the inferred labels of "better" and "worse"--the Oxford editors have tacitly "insisted upon the stability and the integrity of these [former] categories" (Werstine, "McKerrow's" 155). Moreover, they corroborate the model of textual transmission upon which Evans, Gibbons, and others situate their more traditional editions: for Wells and Taylor, it is still Q2 > Q1. Through the narrow perspective of this vision, Shakespeare has had nothing to do with Q1 once again.

In contrast to the editorial traditionalism and the new radicalism, a third group of critics argues that Q1 and Q2 Romeo and Juliet preserve substantively different versions of Shakespeare's work. In the introduction to his edition of the First Quarto, Frank G. Hubbard contends that Q1 is "the correct text of an earlier edition of the play" (7). Including Q1 Romeo and Juliet with other "bad" quartos, Steven Urkowitz urges a general reassessment of these "authorial or theatrical documents [which show] the development of Shakespeare's plays as working drafts of performing scripts" ("Good News" 190). For these critics, as for many editors and critics of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth centuries,[7] the textual

transmission of the two quartos should be represented as Q1 > Q2. As may be clear by now, my position is most closely aligned with Hubbard, Urkowitz, et al, but with two important distinctions. First, I have suggested in chapter one that both Q1 and Q2 may embody the contributions and suggestions of actors who had rehearsed or performed them, that, in essence, both Shakespeare's authorial intentions and the theatrical collaboration which processes those intentions for public performance are revealed within these texts. Second, as I suggested in chapter two, I subscribe to the image of a recurring pattern of composition inferred by Jill Levenson when she states that "the two substantive quartos witness the multiplicity of what Shakespeare wrote; the playwright may have created Romeo and Juliet over time and through different phases" ("Editing" 6). Or, to once again employ Bowers' radiating diagram, I believe that Q1 > Q2 and, in select passages perhaps, Q2 > Q1.

I have previously offered one such passage where Q1 may have developed from Q2. In the last chapter I examined David Wiles' theory that 5.3--the last scene of the play--contains "two layers of developmental text" (90). He believes Will Kemp was scripted as "Peter" in the earliest version and was subsequently replaced by some other actor as "Balthasar" in the later version. My semiotic analysis of the lines suggested, however, that no matter what name we give to the character of Romeo's "man," the Q2 dialogue

seems programmed for comedy. I then offered the possibility that Kemp's celebrity text may have obtruded so forcibly upon early performances that a version of 5.3 perhaps subsequent to Q2's (i.e., Q1's) was written which retained the character "Balthasar," but which assigned him lines and actions which were considerably less comedic. This is one instance where I believe the textual sources behind Q2 may have predated those behind Q1. Unlike traditional editors, however, I do not believe the possibility of this "backward" transmission (i.e., Q2 > Q1) relegates Q1 as "corrupt" or non-authorial.

Therefore, in order to demonstrate the authorial merits of both texts as the third group of critics do, and the theatrical collaboration that generated them so championed by group two, I have, in previous chapters, undertaken a contrastive semiotic analysis of the 1597 and 1599 Romeo and Juliet texts. That analysis, moreover, expanded previous notions of who may have authored these texts and of who may have collaborated upon them theatrically: in both cases, playwright and actors. I have also offered the fruits of these combined labors--tightly wrought, often highly complementary, linguistic/performance text structures. Finally, I have offered Will Kemp's celebrity text as a trace element through which the encoding and decoding acts of playwrights, actors, and audiences may be considered. These previously diagrammed texts should be kept in mind

during the discussion which now ensues on the textual forbears of Q1 and Q2 Romeo and Juliet.

Q1 and Q2: A pattern of recurrent textual transmission

I wish at this juncture to consider the chronology of textual transmission surrounding Q1 and Q2 by posing two questions: what texts may have influenced Q1 and Q2 before they were published, and what texts have been generated through them since 1599? I begin by reviewing the major points of agreement and dissent in past discussions. Dissent, as we shall see, predominates.

First, all agree--traditionalists and revisionists alike-- on the respective dates of publication: 1597 (Q1) and 1599 (Q2). Second, all agree that each document's influence may be illustrated in the other. Consensus stops here. Argument ensues on who provided the copy for each quarto, and on the forms of the text or texts--written, memorial, or performance, etc.--behind those quartos. Different conclusions are then drawn about the chronology of their textual transmission and their respective provenance (or lack thereof).

Although Q1 obviously influenced Q2, only one group of critics is happy about that fact. On the one hand, traditional editors find it difficult admitting to Q1's

new traditionalists alike, they cite bibliographical similarities in spelling and misprintings to admit that Q1 supplied the only copy for Q2 at various sections of the play, most particularly for a long section from 1.2-46 to 1.3.36 (Wilson, "New Way" 83; Evans 208). On the other hand, for those revisionists who believe Q1 represents Shakespeare's first draft later revised and expanded in Q2, the chronology of textual transmission signified by the diagram Q1 > Q2 may be evidenced throughout the two texts.

What of Q2's influence on Q1? As a Shakespearean revisionist myself, I have no problem supporting Q2 > Q1 and Q1 > Q2 since revision is "a process with significant recurring activities--with different levels of attention and different agenda for each" part of the cycle (Sommers 336). In light of this accurate description of the composition process, what is often considered Q2's more polished literary style may be seen as one of the agenda specifically highlighted by Shakespeare in the revised Q2 text, and his attention to descriptive stage directions as more important in the earlier version. Indeed, Jill Levenson seems to concur with this qualitative comparison when she deems "Q1 a neat and performable script" and Q2 "a more elaborate play...[of] cornucopian state" ("Editing" 10). Other revisionists, I believe, will not then deny the possibility that the later version may have exerted its influence on the earlier version retrospectively (Q2 > Q1), both perhaps

earlier version retrospectively (Q2 > Q1), both perhaps being in Shakespeare's possession simultaneously.

For traditional editors and critics who subscribe to the "memorial reconstruction" narrative[8], support for Q2 > Q1 has proven to be no problem at all, although to understand their position it is necessary once again to make a distinction between the published physical documents and the stages of the creative "work" they imagine to be behind those documents. Their imagined narratives presume that the work essentially preserved in Q2 Romeo and Juliet had been previously completed by Shakespeare, though not yet published, when pirate actors colluded with an unscrupulous publisher to produce the Q1 document from memory. To them, the illicit transmission of Shakespeare's work may be represented as Q2 > Q1.

But what of the sources behind each quarto? Disagreements about who provided the copy or copies behind each quarto have already been implied. For revisionists, it was Shakespeare himself who produced the copy for Q1 which he later revised to produce Q2; for the New Bibliographers, it was disgruntled or greedy actors who had illicitly sold the Q1 text which they had pieced together from memory from earlier performances of the authentic Q2. (The actor who played Capulet was the original suspect, but Romeo and Peter are the current ones[9].) While neither theory can be proven, the revisionist theory requires only that we assume

that (a) Shakespeare revised his work much as many authors have been proven to do,[10] and that (b) playtexts, submitted to minute and substantive revision through rehearsal and performance, are "the least stable of literary forms" (Jackson 166). In order to understand the "memorial reconstruction" theory, however, we need an active imagination.

This narrative presumes, first, that we can distinguish which texts do and which texts do not derive "without intermediary from the dramatist's own hand" (Werstine, "Foul Papers" 67), and, second, that we are licensed to assign values based upon this distinction. But since we cannot accomplish the first, we dare not risk the second. Many, however, have. When, in the 1920's, the New Bibliography revealed new analytic methods for determining the history of books as "manufactured objects" (Urkowitz, "Good News" 191), it unfortunately misapplied those methods in an effort to determine the history of <u>texts</u>. Texts, however, involve not only physical book production, but conceptual creative and semiotic decoding processes as well. T. H. Howard Hill calls the combination of these production, creative, and encoding processes the <u>work</u> when he cautions that interpreting "authorial intention primarily on the level of the document rather than on the level of the work is unacceptable for drama" ("Modern" 90).

But the New Bibliography's insistence on documentary

proof of direct, authorial sanction was an historically specific obsession. Before the 1920's, Werstine reminds us, no one believed any printed playtext could have emanated directly from any playwright's hand. In the seventy years since then, and until fairly recently, however, in the eyes of many textual scholars "good" texts were those which did derive directly from the playwright and "bad" texts were those with "intermediaries."

But since we have discovered nothing in Shakespeare's own hand except three leaves from his collaboration in Sir Thomas More, "an unmediated text of Shakespeare is therefore unattainable" (Wells and Taylor, Textual 3). That fact was often overlooked when the New Bibliography constructed its moral taxonomy of published quartos. Already delegitimized, "bad" quartos like Q1 Romeo and Juliet were culled for useful theatrical information and labeled, thereafter, as corrupting influences. For example, Brian Gibbons employs Q1's stage direction at 4.5--"Exeunt all but the Nurse and Musicians, casting rosemary on Juliet and shutting the curtains" because it "may record a detail of an original and authentic production." He employs none of Q1's literary variants, however, because he believes that "the Q1 version of this scene is very garbled" (213). On behalf of Q2, in contrast, Gibbons and other editors make Herculean efforts to identify the nature of the text or texts which provided the copy for what they deem to be the only authorial

document. Possessed with no hard documentary evidence that could support this taxonomy, these editors nevertheless invent imaginary narratives to determine the nature of the copies behind Q2 and those who were responsible for them.

As will be seen, each personal narrative required an equally distinct dramatis personae: once editors had somehow gleaned Shakespeare's intentions, it was then incumbent upon them to accuse some person or persons with obstructing the fluid transmission of those intentions into the printed quartos and, thereafter, to posterity. Each narrative "type-casts" its leading and supporting players from among rogue actors, senile audience reporters, witless compositors, and daring Elizabethan editors. I will provide only a summary of other narratives and casts because my main task is to propose a more reasonable narrative, more recognizable cast of my own. Yet the ensuing retrospective of editorial opinion provides more than a point of departure for my own contrastive proposals; it introduces many of the very points I eventually develop. My reappraisal of the textual genealogy of the two quartos of Romeo and Juliet revives several original proposals offered by leading editors of the New Bibliography in the last seventy-odd years, proposals which have since been neglected: the possibilities of an Ur-Romeo and Juliet and of Shakespeare's collaboration with an unknown playwright. Further, I

reintroduce formerly traditional bibliographical analyses of the copy or copies behind the quartos in order to question the possibility of ever finding "Shakespeare's" intentions. Once used by the traditional editors who invented them to repress inquiries into the two quartos' pre-publication history, these analyses may now be used, paradoxically, to promulgate those inquiries instead. As I conduct the following retrospective, I will therefore highlight those proposals which I will discuss when the retrospective is over.

Robert Gericke, in 1879, first advanced the idea that Q2 was set from (a) Shakespeare's manuscript (an apparently non-mediated text) and, when that manuscript was illegible or incomplete, (b) the Q1 printed version ("Romeo" 270-72). This hypothesis, we shall soon see, was eventually developed to define Q2 as "good" and Q1 as "bad," but not without some interesting critical diversions along the way.

For instance, in an article printed in the Times Literary Supplement in 1919, A. W. Pollard and J. Dover Wilson proposed a common manuscript source for both quartos to explain certain printing and typesetting similarities. In their view, Q2 derived from a revised version of that manuscript, and Q1 derived "from that same manuscript at an earlier stage of its development." Moreover, they propose Q1 to be a highly eclectic text comprising "Shakespeare's

first revisions of an older play" by an unknown playwright "abridged...by what a pirate could remember of the later version" ("Stolne" 434).

This Pollard and Wilson position is significant for several reasons. First, it grants Q1 authority as Shakespeare's own work. Second, it offers the possibility that Q1 may have been the product of playwright collaboration as it is currently believed many of Shakespeare's other plays were, including Henry 8, Pericles, Timon of Athens, and Macbeth. And finally, Pollard and Wilson corroborate my position that both quartos may contain evidence of several different kinds of text produced by several different individuals: if Q1 included the contributions of playwright X, Shakespeare, and a pirate (or two), Q2, derived at least in part through Q1, contains no fewer texts, no fewer individual contributions. Indeed, logically it may include even more of each. The Pollard and Wilson proposals have not been fully considered since they were first enunciated; later in this discussion I shall attempt to do just that. Before that, however, I continue with my editorial retrospective.

After Pollard and Wilson had suggested a common manuscript source for both Q1 and Q1 Romeo and Juliet, in 1926 Greta Hjort offered the first major challenge to that theory while simultaneously developing the one advanced by Gericke in 1879. Instead of a common manuscript source, she

asserts that Q2 was set throughout with consultation to a copy of the Q1 text which had been "collated with an authentic manuscript" and which contained "corrections and additions written in the margins, between the lines, or inserted on loose slips of paper" (141-142). She focuses, as did Pollard and Wilson before her, on the same passages of particular bibliographical interest: 1.3.13-32 and 1.3.100-103. This scene between Juliet, Lady Capulet, and the Nurse includes the Nurse's speech from 13-32 and the servant's speech from 100-103 printed in italics; the remainder of the scene is printed in roman type. Both quartos demonstrate this typographical peculiarity. For Pollard and Wilson, this evidenced a common manuscript source which included, they speculate, parts of a text written in italic rather than secretary script. In contrast, Hjort uses the same bibliographical evidence to support her position that Q2 was based on an exemplar--or an amended version of such an exemplar--of Q1. She believes that one of the Nurse's speeches beginning at line ninety-five which was not printed in italics and which is not included in the Q1 version proves that the compositor of Q2 may have slavishly followed the augmented Q1 text until it stopped. At that point, apparently, he must have turned to one of the many addenda or revisions she imagines were written in the margins or on "slips of paper" in order to complete the type-setting of this scene. As to why the

compositor did not retrace his steps and print the whole of the Nurse's speech in italics, Hjort can only suggest that though he must have "discovered his mistake," he did not break up the "already set type...easygoing as he was" (141). She fails to address, however, why that "easygoing" compositor reverted back to italics while printing the servant's speech which concludes the scene.

Before continuing with my retrospective, I want to emphasize the importance of Hjort's article to a reassessment of the chronology of textual transmission of the two quartos of Romeo and Juliet as I have previously done with Pollard and Wilson's. First, Hjort's narrative assumes a corrected, augmented Q1 as the source for Q2 throughout its preparation and printing thereby lending obvious support for the textual interdependence of the two quartos as I have proposed. Further, the picture she paints of the Q1 exemplar seems highly similar to the one composition theorists have painted of the physical appearance of other texts which have undergone the revision process. To Lisa Ede, for instance, revised texts often include "many scribbles, inserts, and crumpled papers" (153), a description very close indeed to Hjort's of the "messy" physical appearance of the Q1 exemplar. Finally, Hjort's compositor, imputed by her to be at once slavish and easygoing, represents the lengths to which editorial imagination may travel in support of an essentially

unprovable theory. The leading character of her narrative is an amiable, yet sorely encumbered compositor. For others, it is pirate actor or audience reporter. Still others, with narratives even more tangled than Hjort's, create even more complicated protagonists.

Walter Greg creates an imaginary editor to refute Hjort's contention that Q2 was printed with consultation to Q1 throughout. Instead, Greg believed that Q1 served as copy only for the first two leaves and that that copy was an exemplar corrected by an editor who referred to a playhouse manuscript. Thereafter, he believes the copy for Q2 was a transcript of Shakespeare's manuscript prepared by the same editor who, nonetheless, occasionally consulted Q1 when the manuscript was deficient, illegible, or obscure. Greg's early position--which, as we shall soon see, he later revised--further adumbrates Q1's influence on Q2; however, it also illustrates once again the highly subjective editorial policy which was to dominate discussions on Romeo and Juliet for five decades. It is somehow appropriate, therefore, that he uses an imaginary Elizabethan editor to advance his own positions which are that (1) the copy for the early section of the play was Q1, amended and corrected by the manuscript used by the actors in performance, and (2) the editor of the manuscript behind Q2 had to decide which unauthorized and infelicitous Q1 readings to adopt in his transcript during the middle and later sections of play when

he felt the Q2 readings were "worse." If Greg's goal was to establish authorial intentions, this methodology hardly seems likely to succeed since it is his anonymous, perhaps imaginary, Elizabethan editor who has been entrusted with the theatrical and literary decisions more appropriately attributed to Shakespeare. In his self-appointed task of eliminating intermediaries between himself and the authorial source, Greg, and the other New Bibliographical editors I have mentioned, paradoxically create them instead.

In a subsequent effort to eliminate a few of this earlier obstructions, Greg later revised his position. In 1942 he questioned whether "[1] a rather ill-defined section of the 'good' Q2 was in fact printed from the 'bad' Q1 owing to a defect in the manuscript generally followed, or [2] whether the printer began by using the copy of Q1 that had been corrected by comparison with the manuscript" (Editorial Problem xvi). He first questions whether variants found in Q2 derive directly from Q1, and next whether they derive from a copy of Q1 previously amended by consultation with Shakespeare's manuscript. Greg's own inquiries imply, in fact, that Shakespeare's own manuscript is guilty by association with the "ill-defined section" of the Q2 text, and he manipulates this implication to promulgate his editorial position. If Q2 could be reenvisioned as Shakespeare's own handwritten holograph, a holograph subsequently labelled his "foul papers," then two

objectives might be established. First, Q1's influence on Q2 might be greatly minimized, and, second, the printing irregularities in Q2 might be easily explained: the copy for Q2 was Shakespeare's roughest, "foulest" draft. Nevertheless, it could be said to emanate directly from the bard himself.

But of course we have discovered nothing from the bard himself save three sheets from his collaboration in Sir Thomas More. Apparently, this absence of empirical evidence invites critics to create ornate narrative developments such as this one to explain what cannot be proven. Still, Greg's revised position suggests intriguing possibilities for the two quartos of Romeo and Juliet. Never disavowing Q1's profound influence on Q2 in the early section of the play, Greg, as others before him, attempts to explain away any value for it as an editorial resource. In doing so, however, he throws into doubt his own hope of retrieving Shakespeare's intentions.

Consider the conclusions he draws about the Nurse's speech in 1.3--the same speech which fascinated Hjort. When discussing the italic print set amid the rest of the text that is printed in more standard roman, Greg offers the intriguing possibility that the copy for this speech derived from a fragment of the actor's part--i.e., the Nurse's lines and short cues from those speeches preceding her lines. He further suggests that this part was obtained by the actor-

reporters when fashioning their memorially reconstructed text: i.e., Q1 (62). Brian Gibbons, the New Arden editor who subscribes to Greg's position, describes actor's parts as "consisting of strips pasted end to end" which the reporters could have "cut" and "pasted" into their copy (13). If this speculation about the Nurse's part is correct[11], then it helps create a picture of the copy behind Q2 as a revised text. Once again, the task of preparing those manuscripts used in type-setting the two quartos for publication must have been a very messy, disordered affair. Under these hardships, Shakespeare's pure text (if there ever was such a thing) could hardly have escaped unscathed or uncorrupted.

These, then, represent the major New Bibliographical positions on Q1 and Q2 Romeo and Juliet from the last seventy-odd years. I have excluded several contributors only because their positions are, in the main, derivative from the ones I have just outlined. Still, Richard Hosley and G. I. Duthie established positions within one year from each other that deserve mention because they exhibit the surprisingly wide range of editorial license contained within the rigid parameters established by the New Bibliography. Those parameters--the "good" and authorially sanctioned Q2 was the parent of the "memorially reconstructed" bastard Q1--could still encompass widely

diverse opinions.

Hosley, writing in 1953, assumes the most radical stance against Q1's authenticity. That radicalism is summarized in this advice: "the editor should attempt to solve cruces in Q2 without reference to Q1 and that only after he has thus exhausted the possibilities of emending Q2 in vacuo should he have recourse to Q1" ("Corrupting" 21). This policy leads him into some very strange editorial decisions.

He decides, for instance, that the Q2 reading at 2.2.186 is the only authentic one. Following Q2, Hosley's edition of the play splits the famous couplet between the two young lovers. Juliet's "Parting is such sweet sorrow" is followed by Romeo's "That I say good night till it be morrow." While Hosley's reading might play well enough in the theatre, all previous editors before and after him follow the Q1 reading by giving the entire couplet to Juliet on the not unreasonable assumption that "the speaker who wishes to say goodnight till it be morrow is surely the speaker who has already said it many times in this scene...and not the speaker who has never said it and has no desire to say it or to leave the scene" (Williams 119).

Hosley's principle to emend Q2 in vacuo has even stranger consequences for the four lines which follow hard upon the disputed couplet I just discussed. Hosley assigns the lines to Romeo although neither extant quarto does so

exclusively. Those first four lines of 2.3 read:

> The grey eyed morn smiles on the frowning night
> Checkring the Eastern Clouds with streaks of night
> And darkness fleckled like a drunkard reels,
> From forth day's pathway, made by Titan's wheels.

The Q2 text duplicates the speech, assigning it first to Romeo at the end of the scene most editors designate 2.2, and once again to the Friar at the beginning of 2.3. Q1 offers the speech to Romeo only, and all modern editions save Hosley's Yale and Gibbon's Arden follow this assignment. Hosley's justifications for assigning the lines to the Friar and only the Friar raise several unanswerable literary questions while simultaneously avoiding intriguing theatrical ones.

On literary grounds, Hosley believes the "ornate and sensuous imagery resembles Romeo's rather than the Friar's" (31). His poetic appraisal of the passage may be correct, but, even so, Shakespeare distributes his "sensuous and ornate" imagery throughout the play, assigning it to several characters. Capulet's speeches at 1.2 and early in 3.5 are certainly as sensuous as the ones disputed above from 2.2 (or 2.3), as are Benvolio's and Montague's in 1.1, as will be shortly seen.

Hosley also defends assigning the lines to Romeo on thematic grounds saying "the 'grey-ey'd morn' passage is appropriate to the iterated imagery of day and night which

Shakespeare associates with the lovers throughout the play" (31). But the lovers need not--indeed they do not--always deliver the imagery associated with themselves. From the beginning of the action until the end, the imagery patterns of several characters associate the lovers with day and night. Benvolio's description of the brooding Romeo at 1.1.115 begins--"Madam, an hour before the worshipp'd sun/ Peer'd forth the golden window of the east"--and is soon followed by Montague's--"Many a morning hath he there been seen/ With tears augmenting the fresh morning's dew (137-138)." And the final speech of the play delivered by the Prince--"A glooming peace this morning with it brings/ The sun for sorrow will not show its head" (5.3.305-306)--contains, if not night and day, the idea of night-in-day so appropriate after the lovers have died. Images such as these are spoken by several of the characters about the lovers and can not be used to sustain Hosley's argument that the speech at the beginning of 2.3 should be assigned exclusively to Romeo. This assignment, I repeat, appears in neither of the Renaissance quartos.

A side-by-side theatrical analysis of these two original quarto assignments, however, reveals rehearsal and performance possibilities which can then by easily extended to encompass Hosley's own reading. In early rehearsals of the play, it is possible that the actors who played Romeo and the Friar both tried these lines "out for size" before

they, the other members of the company, and Shakespeare finally agreed to whom the lines ultimately should be assigned. And this explanation may apply to the couplet shared by Romeo and Juliet mentioned earlier. In the case of the "grey-ey'd morn" passage, it is also possible that Shakespeare and his collaborators had agreed to give the lines to the actor playing the Friar from the start (as it appears in the earlier Q1 script) but that the same lines were then copied in, pasted on, or inadvertently inserted on a slip of paper within the scroll-like part of the actor playing Romeo. This imaginary scenario suggests that in the initial rehearsal of the Q2 script, first Romeo read the lines, and then those same lines were read by the astonished actor who was playing the Friar. One other possibility exists, moreover, and it concerns the power of celebrity. Evidence suggests that Richard Burbage premiered the role of Romeo. He may have called upon his combined financial, lineal, and artistic influence to ask (or demand) that those four lines be included in his role. Richard Burbage was a major shareholder in the Chamberlain's Men, the son of James who built one of the company's theatres, and, along with Edward Alleyn, one of London's two great tragedians in the 1590's. Wells and Taylor believe that "it seems reasonable to propose that Shakespeare personally suggested many or most of the alterations made in rehearsal, and that he acquiesced in others" (Textual 19). This may be an instance

Theatre practices are flexible enough to allow for Hosley's exclusive assignment of the lines to Romeo; ironically, Hosley cites theatrical values himself to rigidly argue against the Q1 assignment of the lines to the Friar. He believes Romeo should be assigned these lines because they provide "a calculated time-clue suggesting the simultaneity of the end of II ii and the beginning of II iii" (31). This may be true since the passage of time on stage may be signified by several different means--not only by verbal discourse, but also by an exit, a change of costume, even a long pause. In Hosley's reading, the actors could easily signify a time-clue, but I also know they would have no difficulty signifying the same with the lines as they appear in Q1. In the Q2 text, moreover, "the double performance" of the speech by Romeo and the Friar may expose theatrical and dramatic values: "the contrast between the dramatic here and now and [Romeo and the Friar's] conflicting 'narrative' pasts" (Elam, Shakespeare's 185). There is, in short, no theatrical justification for condemning Q1's assignment of the lines to the Friar. Nor, I believe, are there literary or thematic ones. Appearing neither in Q1 nor Q2, Hosley's personal construction of this scene demonstrates the extent to which textual evidence may be distorted in the service of a highly speculative editorial philosophy. Q2's duplication of the "grey-ey'd morn" speech is curious, though hardly definitive. If it

morn" speech is curious, though hardly definitive. If it confirms anything, it may be that irregularities in transmission, copy, and printing shroud the textual genealogy of these two quartos in a deeper mystery than we have erstwhile suspected.

In contrast to Hosley, G. I. Duthie went further in privileging Q1 than any other editor schooled in the New Bibliography. In a somewhat equivocal statement he cautions that "we must be very careful before we say that a given passage in Q1 represents a Shakespearean first draft, and the corresponding Q2 passage a Shakespearean revision" ("The Text" 19). Nonetheless, he continues by saying "I confess that there are just one or two cases (no more than that) where Q1 contains a word (different from the Q2 reading) which seems to me rather unlikely as a reportorial substitution." He cites variants such as "Burgomaster" (Q1) and "Alderman" (Q2) in Mercutio's "Queen Mab" speech. While he cautions that "some people might suggest...that Shakespeare originally wrote 'Burgomaster' and then, in a revision, changed it to 'Alderman,'" he tiptoes around his implication by finally saying that it is not "necessary to suppose that there was any Shakespearean revision between the texts represented by Q1 and Q2."

If the apparent revision is not *Shakespeare's*, however, we may reasonably ask, "whose is it?" We may go to great lengths to imagine someone other than Shakespeare producing

Duthie, reasonably attribute it to Shakespeare himself. And possible Shakespearean revision in even one instance suggests the further possibility of revisions throughout the texts.

Despite Duthie's careful circumambulation around the question of Shakespearean revision between Q1 and Q2, he nevertheless unequivocally legitimizes Q1 as a substantive text. Further commenting on the copy behind Q2, he says it consists of "(i) Q1 unaltered, (ii) Q1 edited by comparison with a Shakespearean manuscript, and (iii) direct transcription of that Shakespearean manuscript" (18). In regards to that section of Q2 emanating from "Q1 unaltered," he cites the passage I have previously mentioned: 1.2.57-1.3.36. Duthie's suggestion of Shakespearean revision between Q1 and Q2, and his legitimizing of Q1 as a substantive text, bring my editorial retrospective to the point at which it first begun: Pollard and Wilson's position as stated in the Times Literary Supplement, August 14, 1919.

Duthie's proposal also usefully transports us back to the diagram from which this discussion began. As borrowed from John Bowers, I proposed a radiating pattern of textual transmission surrounding the two quartos. Allowing the symbol Q* to represent a lost manuscript I speculate to have been behind Q1, the textual transmission of the two quartos might be represented by a diagram looking something like

might be represented by a diagram looking something like this: Q* > Q1, Q* > Q2, Q1Q* > Q2, Q2Q* > Q1, etc. Many of the possibilities represented concur with Duthie's proposal for the copy behind Q2: "Q1 unaltered" (i.e., Q1 > Q2), "Q1 edited by comparison with a Shakespearean manuscript" (i.e., Q1Q* > Q2), and "direct transcription of that Shakespearean manuscript (i.e., Q* > Q2). I suggest, moreover, that there may have existed more than one state of the manuscript behind Q1 (i.e., Q*), and that the influence of these now extinct drafts on the printed document Q1 may be represented something like this: Q^{*2} > Q1, Q^{*3} > Q1, Q^{*4} > Q1. Allowing for the further possibility of a <u>recursive</u> compositional pattern, we may add these possible formulations: $Q^*Q1 > Q^{*2}$, $Q1 > Q^*Q^{*2}$, etc.

But what of Q2? To include Q2's influence on Q1--to make this a radiating and not a linear model--much rests upon the nature of the extinct Shakespearean manuscript I represented above as Q*. According to Duthie, it was an authentic manuscript "badly written" (16)--or what Greg called "foul papers." Duthie further believes that it had not "been used as a prompt-book" (17). If he is correct, a radiating pattern of great variety and intensity emerges. This manuscript I have dubbed Q* may have (a) existed in tandem with the prompt-book the acting company used to perform the play at its likely premiere in 1594, (b) preceded Q1's publication in 1597 (whether piratical or

prepared Q2 prior its publication in 1599. It seems, therefore, that even accepting the memorial reconstruction argument (as Duthie does), bibliographical analysis suggests a possible cross fertilization of these two quartos and the further possibility that both texts were created through multiple processes of composition, revision, copying, publication and performance.

My editorial retrospective complete, I would now like to enter into a fuller discussion of those texts and individuals which may have served to influence the two quartos of Romeo and Juliet and to consider how the quartos' polygenous descent complicates the question of which is "good" and which is "bad." Most of the ideas I discuss were initially proposed by the editors and critics I have previously reviewed. In all cases, however, these ideas survive, if all at, only in moribund states. They include Shakespeare's possible collaboration with another playwright and an Ur-Romeo and Juliet. They also include the possibility that there was a plethora of texts behind each quarto, each, as Wells and Taylor tell us, in varying degrees of completion: "rough notes, draft fragments, a sustained first draft, [and] subsequent copies containing a greater or lesser degree of authorial reshaping" (Textual 3). To this list I might add performance texts, celebrity texts, and written actors' parts.

texts, and written actors' parts.

Since I will be examining both texts and those processes which generate texts, I recall a quote by Robert Scholes used earlier:

> A text always echoes other texts, and it is the result of choices that have displaced still other possibilities. The records of this textualizing activity may or may not be available as manuscript drafts, but the process must be assumed anyway. A text is always the result of an arbitrary decision to stop writing at a particular point. The analyst is entitled to speculate about what went on before the decision to stop was made, and what might have gone on afterward; about what is excluded as well as what was included. (16)

Q1 and Q2 represent our only evidence of Shakespeare's "textualizing activity." Yet all have speculated--traditional editors and revisionists alike--about "what went on before the decision" to print the quartos was made. I have outlined the different, pre-publication speculations of both critical camps. Now I will suggest some of my own. After that, I will suggest how that textualizing activity has continued beyond the publication of the two quartos.

Ur-Romeo and Juliet

History of Romeus and Juliet provided Shakespeare with the main source for his play. But there have been other, earlier sources as well. Brooke's poem, first published in 1562, establishes the existence of a play which predated his poem. In his preface, "To the reader," Brooke announces that "I sawe the same argument lately set forth on stage with more commendation than I can look for" (Evans 214).[12] Unfortunately, this play has not survived in physical form though, we may presume, its influence may be locked within Brooke's poem. His prolegomena, however, substantiates its existence more surely than bibliographical inquiries have substantiated the existence of Shakespearean promptbooks, manuscripts, and "foul papers."

Could this pre-1562 play have influenced Shakespeare when he was likely drafting Romeo and Juliet in the late 1580's and early 1590's? We cannot say for certain, though popular plays often survive as long. But whether the exact play alluded to by Brooke survived is hardly important. Historical evidence, pieced together from a number of sources, suggests that a play or plays on the same theme as Romeo and Juliet remained current on London stages well into the 1580s and perhaps as late as the early 1590s.

Citing Rene Pruvost's Matteo Bandello and Elizabethan Drama and Leo Salingar's Shakespeare and the Traditions of Comedy, Brian Gibbons first tells us that there were twelve allusions to treatments of "Romeo and Juliet" between 1562

allusions to treatments of "Romeo and Juliet" between 1562 and 1583 (32). Some of these were no doubt in reference to Brooke's poem, but Gibbons next tells us of at least one allusion which cites a play based on William Painter's Palace of Pleasure. Stephen Gosson, an Elizabethan playwright, poet, and critic, wrote Plays Confuted in which he attacked Painter's book as one which had been "ransack to furnish the Play houses of London" (32).[13] The date of Gosson's book is 1582. This establishes the endurance of a play for two decades after Brooke's poem. Finally, Geoffrey Bullough informs us that there was a dramatic treatment on a theme similar to "Romeo and Juliet" published as late as 1587. George Gascoigne's Posies contains a mask written for the marriage between "the son of Viscount Montacute and the daughter of Sir William Dormer" (275; my emphasis). Gibbons' reasonable conclusion is that Shakespeare may have known the story of the two Veronese lovers "for a number of years before 1591, in more than one version, before he decided to dramatize it" (32).

While no one can prove Shakespeare read the theatrical versions I just mentioned, or saw them performed in the theatre, he certainly had the opportunity to do both continuously throughout the late 1580's and early 1590's when, in my imagined sense of his "textualizing activity," it is likely that he was preparing his earliest drafts of Romeo and Juliet. Again, whether the play mentioned by

begun to draft his own earliest version is unimportant. It is also unlikely. The Ur-Romeo and Juliet likely descending to Shakespeare must have descended in a radiating pattern as do many theatrical texts; it must have undergone revision by playwrights, actors, and audiences as do all playtexts. We cannot, indeed we must not, presume a fixed and stable ur source if the principles upon which this investigation is based are to remain consistent. Semiotic theory may assist us in further clarifying what ur texts are and how they, too, "radiate."

Jan Mukařovský, a member of the Prague Linguistic Circle, identifies three phenomena through which "art" may be objectively studied: "(1) a perceivable signifier, created by the artist, (2) a 'signification'/=aesthetic object/registered in the collective consciousness and (3) a relationship with that signified, a relationship which refers to the total context of social phenomena" (6). Mukařovský's "perceivable signifier" is what Peter L. Shillingsburg identifies as the "Material Text": the physical document which contains the artist's informational, linguistic program (54). But since I here explore texts whose physical containers are no longer extant, I will dispense with Mukařovsky's first phenomenon. Mukařovský's third--what we might call a text's social, political, and cultural contexts--is also not entirely within the purview of the present discussion. Instead, my theoretical

examination of an extant ur source to Romeo and Juliet only considers how the play as an "aesthetic object registered in the social consciousness" may have descended to Shakespeare.

Elements of Mukařovský's definition may mislead. For instance, he calls his aesthetic object, "immaterial," while what he means by material object he calls "the perceivable artifact" (8). But his most important point is clear: apparently, the full "meaning" of a work neither derives from what an artist programs into its perceivable artifact, nor from what any single perceiver decodes from it, but rather from the accretion of the common responses a community has to that work. The inference is that these common responses encode meaning, that they form and reform works. I find this concept useful in coming to terms with non-existent ur texts, texts which may be understood to be, paradoxically, both static and fluid. An Ur-Romeo and Juliet descending to Shakespeare may have, for instance, "completely alter[ed] its appearance and inner structure" in the hands of various poetic and theatrical innovators during the thirty odd years prior to the first performance of Shakespeare's play in 1594[14], yet, as an "autonomous sign," its signification may have remained for Shakespeare essentially recognizable. (Mukařovský 4-5).

Semiotics gives a theoretical basis for any ur text just as the aforementioned historical evidence suggests the identities of the textual forbears of Shakespeare's Romeo

and Juliet. Further, several critics have lent their support to the possible existence of a now-extinct Ur-Romeo and Juliet.

Pollard and Wilson, as mentioned earlier, first subscribed to the theory that Shakespeare's first draft, as represented in Q1, was developed from the script of an anonymous playwright. Richard Hosley provided support for an earlier text written by another playwright when he advised editors against using Q1 variants because "it would be impossible to ascertain that the 'early draft' was Shakespeare's and not some other playwright's" ("Corrupting" 17). And Frank G. Hubbard stakes out the position for an Ur-Romeo and Juliet more thoroughly than anyone else.

In his edition of The First Quarto of Romeo and Juliet, Hubbard identifies verse styles and plot line in the 1597 quarto to suggest that it had been derived from an earlier, now extinct ur text. In particular, he cites "antique material" (23) in several passages of Q1 which are reminiscent of verse written in plays of the 1580's; further, he cites confusion about the time of the wedding of the two lovers in Q1 (morning or afternoon?) to assert that it may have been based on one or more of the now extinct dramatic treatments, all of which may have derived morning weddings from Brooke's poem. (By the time Shakespeare had written Q2, according to Hubbard, he had decided on an afternoon wedding.)

afternoon wedding.)

The "antique material" Hubbard cites runs throughout the Q1 text, much of it revised in Q2. This suggests that as one of Shakespeare's earliest plays (the Furness Variorum puts the date of the first performance at 1591), his own creative experimentation in language combined with adaptation of material written by others to produce, at times, some roughly hewn verse. There is one passage in Q1 cited by Hubbard, however, which seems "antique" and derivative but which is carried over in expanded form into Q2.

I will not quote the whole passage from 4.5.42-65 immediately after the Capulets and the Nurse discover the "dead" Juliet since much of it echoes itself, a quality which makes it different from much of Shakespeare's verse elsewhere in the canon. But a short selection from this passage in Q2 serves to question Hubbard's "antique material" argument for an ur text upon which it is based.

The Q1 text presents a choral lament that, in Q2, is dispersed among the several characters in greatly expanded form. Q1's stage direction, "All at once cry out and wring their hands," is followed by the chorally recited line, "And all our joy, and all our hope is dead,/ Dead, lost, undone, absented, wholy fled" (I2v). In Q2, however, Shakespeare gives each major character highly rhythmic, repetitious verse on the same idea. The result is a keening effect.

poor and loving child,/ But one thing to rejoice and solace in." And that is followed soon after by the Nurse's "O woe! O woeful, woeful, woeful day./ Most lamentable day. Most woeful day/ That ever, ever I did yet behold./ O day, O day, O day, O hateful day" (K3r). These selections may seem much like the more stilted, formal verse forms used by playwrights prior to Shakespeare, but they also seem appropriate to this moment in the play. More important, if they are examples of "antique material" from an earlier text, why have they not been revised and modernized in Q2 when, we may speculate, Shakespeare had more fully developed his individual styles? Verse style comparisons such as this one by Hubbard, long used by editors of the New Bibliography to delegitimize Q1 as corrupt, are at best uncertain delineators of adaptation or direct authorship.

Considered semiotically, however, the quality of this "antique" verse creates intriguing metatheatrical and metadramatic effects. Spoken dialogue usually serves as a vehicle for interpersonal communication, but, at this moment in 4.5, Shakespeare foregrounds language merely as a succession of auditory and tactile signals. Roman Jakobson says that "the two particularly elaborate systems of purely auditory and temporal signs, spoken language and music, present a strictly discontinuous, as physicists would say, granular structure" ("Language" 701). Shakespeare, foregrounding language as music in this scene, attempts to

foregrounding language as music in this scene, attempts to momentarily make "discontinuous" the dramatic plot. The sensuousness of lines such as "But one, poor one, one poor and loving child," created by musical repetitions of rhythm and sound, produce, paradoxically, only dramatic "noise." Each and every one of the characters lamenting Juliet's death seems to speak as one, for each in his way has attempted throughout the play to control and possess her. Now that "Death," according to Capulet, "hath ta'en her hence," the dramatic characters are revealed in their shared culpability.

Still, Hubbard may be correct: Shakespeare may have adapted this scene in Q1 from an earlier play and intentionally developed and expanded its verse style into the version of the scene we have preserved in Q2. Perhaps "antique material" was exactly what he meant for both versions of this scene if we consider, once again, the possibility that he was not foregrounding the semantic qualities of the verse but rather some other component entirely. In this instance, he may have been focusing upon "the archaic order of the words [as] a sign of a remote historical time or of an anachronical character living on the edge of the linguistic habits of his contemporaries" (Kowzan 62). This unusually stilted verse, then--in the same scene Paris laments "O love! O life! Not life, but love in death!"--may have been lifted from an earlier play and

adapted by Shakespeare in order to demonstrate several of the play's most important contrasts: between youth and age, vision and myopia, promise and failure. Juliet's death in 4.5 presents an excellent opportunity for these contrasts, for it is she who represents the object of the anachronical characters' misplaced, transferred hopes. When she dies, the very fibers of their identities seem to lose their structure as they lapse into repetitious, nearly anonymous wailings.

But Shakespeare uses verse styles to establish characters both in and out "of the times" elsewhere in the play, thereby carefully coordinating poetic form with dramatic content. The Romeo in act 1 who delivers staid Petrarchan oxymorons such as "O brawling love, O loving hate,/ O anything of nothing first created" (1.1.179-180) is wholly different from the Romeo in act 5 who confronts Paris with "I beseech thee, youth,/ Put not another sin upon my head/ Urging me to fury" (62-63). By act 5 he has grown, and the verse given to him is Shakespeare's best blank verse. In stark contrast, Paris has remained characterologically static, and his on-stage presence provides a gauge by which the audience may acknowledge Romeo's maturity. Appropriately, Paris' verse in this last scene of the play is formal, stilted, self-conscious, and "antique":

Sweet flower, with flowers thy bridal bed I strew

> O woe, thy canopy is dust and stones
> Which with sweet water nightly I will dew
> Or wanting that, with tears distilled by moans.
> (12-15)

So, while we must use verse styles with caution when attempting to suggest the identity of the text or texts prior to Shakespeare's first drafts of Romeo and Juliet, Hubbard's position nevertheless deserves consideration because Shakespeare may have borrowed earlier verse styles and then further developed them for his own characteristic metatheatrical and metadramatic expositions.

Hubbard's second point--that confusion about the time of the marriage in Q1 indicates that it was based on a ur text--may also yield new insights. The wedding happens on Saturday morning in Brooke's poem (Evans 223), and dramatic treatments descending to Shakespeare may have taken their plots from Brooke. Q1, however, offers confusion on this point. When the Nurse meets Romeo in 2.4 in order to deduce if he intends to marry Juliet, Romeo assures her saying, "Bid her get leave tomorrow morning/ To come to shrift to Friar Laurence cell" (E3v). This information is repeated several lines later when the Nurse reciprocates by assuring Romeo that "Well, tomorrow morning she shall not fail" (E4r). Later in the Q1 version, however, the wedding seems scheduled for the afternoon of the same day during which the Nurse and Romeo had previously exchanged their assurances

about Juliet. The Nurse, in the scene immediately following the one with Romeo, tells Juliet to "Go, hie you straight to Friar Laurence cell" (E4v; my emphasis).

In contrast to Q1, Q2 shows no apparent confusion about the time of the wedding. Romeo's advises the Nurse to have Juliet "devise some means to come to shrift this afternoon," advice to which the Nurse happily replies, "This afternoon, sir? well, she shall be there" (E4r). And an afternoon wedding is corroborated by the Nurse's line nearly identical to the line as it appears in Q1: "Then hie you hence to Friar Laurence's cell" (F2r).

What are we to make of this plot discrepancy in the two quartos as it applies to the possible influence of an ur text? As Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor tell us, texts are "more likely to evolve away from a source than towards it" (Textual 295). If we apply this theory to the extinct and extant texts--i.e., the manuscript or manuscripts I speculate to have been behind Q1 (i.e., Q*, Q*^{2}, etc.), and Q1 and Q2 themselves--the plot confusion in Q1, sometimes echoing Brooke's plot and sometimes demonstrating evolution away from it, may have been "resolved" by Shakespeare by the time he wrote Q2. Looking at the variants theatrically, moreover, may reveal other interesting inconsistencies between Q1 and Q2.

Consider the Nurse's seemingly unimportant use of the word "well" in both versions of her response to Romeo.

Among other definitions, The American Heritage College Dictionary says that "well" may be used (1) "to introduce a remark, resume a narrative, or fill a pause during conversation," (2) "to express surprise," or (3) to simply to signal assent as in "indeed." In both quarto texts, we may speculate about how the linguistic indeterminacy of this single word, once theatrically contextualized, creates numerous performance possibilities.

In Q2, the Nurse responds two lines later to Romeo's request to "Bid her [Juliet] devise some means to come to shrift this afternoon" with "This afternoon, sir? Well, she shall be there" (E4r). Because she repeats "This afternoon" from Romeo's line, the actor who played the part in early performances based on this script may have focused on something or someone other than Romeo during the gap between her line and his: e.g. the money Romeo has just given her, her useless servant Peter, etc. If she had focused elsewhere, her "well" may have acted as what Erving Goffman calls a "rerun signal" (Frame), whereby a speaker, having lost the thread of the previous speaker's thought, asks to have the information repeated. That the Nurse continues her dialogue without giving Romeo an opportunity to "rerun" his proposal--"Well" is followed by "she shall be there"--may indicate that she has succeeded in reconstructing from memory the conversation her shifting focus may have caused her to so quickly forget. Whether the actor playing the

to say. Yet the simple word "well," however linguistically vague, contains numerous semiotic options.

To offer other possibilities, the actor playing the Nurse in Q2 may use "well" to signal her surprise at Romeo's haste to marry Juliet "this afternoon," or her joyous assent to the marriage more fully expressed a few lines later when she says, "Now God in heaven bless thee." Indeed, a clever actor might be able to suggest all of these meanings and more.

The Nurse's line in Q1 suggests a significantly different set of possible meanings. In this version of the exchange, the Nurse responds to Romeo's "Bid her get leave tomorrow morning,/ To come to Friar Laurence cell" (E3v) with "Well, tomorrow morning she shall not fail" (E4r). The time of the wedding is different, of course, but it is the order of the Nurse's response upon which I would like to focus.

By first responding with "Well," she may be expressing what Kier Elam calls a "propositional attitude" toward her subsequent line, signaling her "doubt" or uncertainty" about holding the wedding "tomorrow morning" (Shakespeare's 315). Considering how intimately she knows the Capulets' hatred of the Montagues, she may anticipate that Juliet's wedding to Romeo had better be consummated as quickly as possible before their plans become known to Juliet's mother and father. Her directive to Juliet on the same day to "Hie you

father. Her directive to Juliet on the same day to "Hie you hence to Friar Laurence cell" (E4v) may then indicate a characterological variant in the portrait of the Nurse in the Q1 text. Taking matter into her own hands, she effects a change in the order of the plot.

Of course, the actor playing the part in Q1 may use "well" to signify surprise, to resume the conversation, or to take a pause--possibilities I suggested for the Q2 script. An actor could semiotically fill-out the different Q1 and Q2 lines in a highly similar manner although performance variations between the two texts seem strongly suggested. If there were performance variations by the actors during the time when Shakespeare was continuing to develop his scripts, he may have been subsequently induced to respond with his own linguistic variations. I agree with Marvin Rosenberg when he says that "no other playwright obtained so much creative collaboration from the artists of the theatre--his actors, his sign-makers" (33). As I suggested earlier when discussing the "grey-ey'd morn" speech, the variants in the Nurse's reply to Romeo as recorded in the two quartos may represent instances when Shakespeare and his fellow actors directly collaborated on textual reformation. And the possibility of this collaboration sheds new light on Hubbard's theory of an Ur-Romeo and Juliet.

The comparative semiotic and performance analyses of

While Shakespeare's use of "antique" verse forms in Q1 and his consistency about the time of the wedding in Q2 may suggest his use of an earlier play, variants between the two quarto texts may also suggest his independent exploitation of structural anachronisms in the service of character, and his highly wrought sense of theatrical possibilities.

Playwright Collaboration

The possible influence of an ur source on Shakespeare's play cannot be considered without also speculating about the possibility of his collaboration with other playwrights during the writing of Romeo and Juliet. If, as evidence suggests, plays on the same theme once existed, then the authors of those plays may have shared their material with Shakespeare as he drafted early versions of Q1. As analysts, we may speculate on what pre-publication textualizing activities may have gone on before Q1 and Q2, especially if evidence from a variety of sources and discussions may be pieced together to suggest that playwright collaboration cannot be ruled out.

Precedent for collaborative authorship may be found throughout Shakespeare's career. Many critics deem no fewer than five plays as the combined products of Shakespeare and another playwright or playwrights[15]--Henry 8 (with Fletcher), 1 Henry 6 (with Greene, Nashe, and/or Marlowe),

Fletcher), 1 Henry 6 (with Greene, Nashe, and/or Marlowe), Pericles (with Wilkins and Day), Timon of Athens (with Middleton), and Macbeth (with Middleton again). Further, he is credited with collaboration in at least three other plays which do not bear his name--Edward 3, Arden of Faversham, and the now extinct Cardenio--and one which bears his name in the title page along with John Fletcher's--The Two Noble Kinsman (Jackson 164-165). It appears, therefore, that early plays such as 1 Henry 6 (circa 1590) and late plays such as Henry 8 (circa 1613) bear witness to Shakespeare's readiness to collaborate with others in the authorship of plays throughout his career. Evidence from other sources supports this position.

The one and only surviving manuscript fragment we know to have been written by Shakespeare may be found in a one hundred and forty seven line segment of a play called Sir Thomas More (Jackson 166).[16] Shakespeare has been identified as Hand D in that manuscript; the remainder of the play has been attributed to several contemporaries of his. While the weight of my argument for Shakespeare's collaboration with other playwrights cannot be borne by this sole textual witness, neither can this witness be easily dismissed. It is, after all, the only empirical evidence we have of an unmediated Shakespearian text. And taken in conjunction with his presumed collaboration in the plays I have mentioned a moment ago, a case may be made for his

collaboration in the other plays scholars have assigned to him.

Scholars from one era have not always assigned the same plays to him, however, as scholars from another. And even when scholars agree that Shakespeare did write one play or did not write another, arguments often ensue as to how much of a play Shakespeare must have written before it may be called "his." In the nineteenth-century, Algenon Swinburne believed Shakespeare wrote Arden of Faversham (1592). Retreating further into time, neither Samuel Johnson nor Edmund Malone believed Shakespeare had much to do with Titus Andronicus though Malone conceded he may have written "a few lines in it" (Maxwell xx). And today, it is still debated whether Timon of Athens is wholly his or a product of, once again, collaborative authorship.[17] Yet even when critics agree on a play's authorship, they have difficulty applying a consistent value system based on that judgment.

Why, for instance, do we not include The Two Noble Kinsmen in survey courses on Shakespeare?[18] Since his name appears on the title page along with John Fletcher's, we can fairly assume that he wrote a good part of it. But did he write enough of it? Apparently he did not. In contrast, Pericles is attributed to him although, according to a prominent editor, "it is doubtful whether Shakespeare contributed anything to Acts I and II" (Hoeniger liv).[19] Yet acts 1 and 2 comprise nearly half of the play. It

appears, therefore, that in many of Shakespeare's plays (and perhaps several attributed to others) the question of authorship is one of degree, not of essence.

Employing this same inconsistent measure to Romeo and Juliet, one borrowed phrase from Brooke's poem or one performance insertion by Will Kemp might be grounds for asserting that Shakespeare did not author the play. That, of course, is patently absurd and quite beside my point. While playwright collaboration in Romeo and Juliet can neither be confirmed nor dismissed, both quarto versions evidence the literary and theatrical virtues we have come to associate with Shakespeare. Even if proven, the possible contributions of his fellow writers and actors would not change this correct assessment.

In order to open the doors of inquiry about the textual transmission of Q1 and Q2 long ago shut tight, I have suggested that Romeo and Juliet may be a product of Shakespeare's collaboration with another playwright or his reworking of an earlier ur play. Compellingly, semiotic theory demands that those doors remain open since it casts textual transmission as a radiating rather than a linear model; empirically, theatrical history of the 1580's and 1590's offers precedent for polygenous textual generation. The one final inquiry I would like to make concerns, once again, non-existent documents. What states of the texts did

the compositor, editor or collator have in front of him when he assembled his copy for publication of Q1 and Q2?

His task must have been monumental. He might have had a theatrical promptbook for each version and a set of Shakespeare's foul papers behind each of them. Further, as suggested by Hjort, there may have been intermediary texts: exemplars prepared from the foul papers in preparation for publication which may have excluded many of the stage directions normally found in promptbooks. Finally, the Elizabethan compositor may have consulted actors' parts when preparing his copy for publication, as the Nurse's speech printed in italics at 1.3 suggests. And since Romeo and Juliet requires a minimum of twelve actors, he would have had a minimum of twelve of these parts which had been copied, more or less well, from lines within the promptbook.

Or were those parts copied from the foul papers? Or from the exemplar? Or perhaps from a combination of these and the promptbook? Of course, no one can say. No one can say very much at all about how clear or illegible these texts were, or even if the compositor had access to all of them at once. Nor can anyone be sure that the actors who performed Q1 were not consulted by the compositor, or Shakespeare, or both in order that Q2 might be theatrically "fine-tuned." Further, no one can be sure if Shakespeare did not work on his plays right up until the moment before they were set in print, as his first and second attempts in

Q2 at 2.2. 185-189, 3.5.176, and 5.3.102 seem to suggest. Finally, even if Shakespeare continued to work on his scripts terminus ad quem, it is likely that the earlier versions of these scripts would have already been reformed or "fine-tuned" by the actors in previous performances. In such cases as these, authors who "come back" into their texts may do so only as "guests" (Barthes "Work" 161), making it uncertain whether Shakespeare's proposed last-minute revisions would have been necessarily accepted by the actors.

Several scholars have speculated, therefore, that the task of pulling together copy for the two quartos may have been untidy, even "messy." In my reading for this discussion, I encountered descriptions of an actor's part as "a long paper roll consisting of strips pasted end to end" (Gibbons 13), of the Q1 exemplar as having "corrections and additions written in the margins, between the lines, or inserted on loose slips of paper" (Hjort 141-142), and of the copy for Q2 as having been "corrected by hand in accordance with an authoritative manuscript, and then torn out of the particular first quarto used, and placed in the bundle of papers" (Duthie 13). If these are accurate descriptions of the states of the text behind the quartos, then we are obliged to assume an even more careful critical stance toward the textual transmission of Romeo and Juliet than I have previously suggested through my discussions of

ur texts and playwright collaboration. This is especially true because textual transmission may leave "a record...only so far as committed to paper"; in the case of Romeo and Juliet however, "not all such pieces of paper have survived" (Tanselle 113).[20] As far as its textual forbears are concerned, I might add that none have survived.

Romeo and Juliet's offspring: Eclectic all

I would like to conclude this discussion by briefly sampling texts which have been spawned after and through the two extant quartos. In marked contrast to my previous search for the textual forbears of Romeo and Juliet, locating textual offspring will be extremely easy. But it will be easy only if we know what to look for. If we seek either quarto text in pure form, we shall not find it except, perhaps, in a photographic facsimile; however, considering the possible influences upon those printed quartos I have previously enumerated, even that may be impossible. But if we seek to find the amalgam text Q1Q2, our efforts shall be quickly rewarded: any modern edition and/or any modern performance using as its script any modern edition constitutes such a derivative, eclectic text.

All modern editors have produced eclectic editions which make use of Q2 and Q1. Indeed, Q2 and Q1, perhaps cross-fertilized and eclectic in and of themselves, can

produce nothing else. Modern performances, then, whether based on the original quarto texts or any modern edition, will also be eclectic.

The radiating pattern of textual transmission I borrowed from John Bowers, now employed to understand texts proceeding from Q1Q2 as it was earlier employed to understand those texts preceding Q1 and Q2, would require hundreds and thousands of vectors going in several directions all at once. The editions based on Q1Q2 might number only a hundred or so (e.g., Q1Q2 > Arden, Yale, Oxford etc.), but it would be impossible to account for the thousands of performance texts based on those editions--texts developed in scores of countries for four hundred years since the first performance in 1594. Each, however, constitutes a separate, derivative structure.

That task happily beyond the limits of this dissertation, I will instead trace one set of interdependent vectors emanating from the earliest texts. I would like to briefly examine how the portrayal of one character--Lady Capulet--may have radiated through four texts: Q1, Q2, Franco Zeffirelli's 1967 film version of the play, and a performance text wrought during in a 1993 production of Romeo and Juliet in Morris County College, New Jersey. I offer what I believe to be the interdependence of these texts as examples of on-going textual transmission. I do not aim to judge the value of the variants produced through

occurs in exactly this way.

To provide a model for this textual transmission, consider a game of "telephone" during which a message begun by one individual is passed one-by-one throughout a group of individuals. By the time the last person of the group receives the message, it has become significantly different from the first person's original creation. That game should be kept in mind during the following discussion. Although Lady Capulet is recognizable in each stage of the transmission I will now examine, she undergoes substantial change from first to last "reading."

Generally speaking, the Lady Capulet in the Q2 version is more aggressive, more impatient, and more preemptory than her counterpart in Q1. For instance, in the scene immediately preceding the Capulet banquet, her intention is to intimidate Juliet into accepting Paris' proposal for marriage. But when Juliet hesitates--"It [the marriage] is an honour that I dream not of"--Lady Capulet responds with characteristic impatience--"Well, think of marriage now." And she continues to drive her position with "What say you? can you love the gentleman" and "Speak briefly, can you like of Paris' love?" (C1r-C1v). In contrast, Q1 presents a more empathetic mother who "delicately introduces the topic of marriage to her daughter" with the line, "Tell me Juliet, how stand you affected/ to be married" (Urkowitz, "Five Women" 298). To Juliet's subsequent hesitation she

Women" 298). To Juliet's subsequent hesitation she responds, "Well girl, the Noble County Paris seeks thee for his wife." And this is followed in this version of the scene by a similarly mild question--"Well Juliet, how like you of Paris' love?" (C1r).

The two quarto versions of the scene at 3.5 further demonstrate differences in Lady Capulet's character. She enters Juliet's bedchamber in order to inform her that Capulet has arranged for her (Juliet) to be married to Paris three days hence. These "joyful tidings" are meant to draw Juliet out from under the despair into which, the Capulets presume, Tybalt's murder has plunged her. Both quarto versions of the mother misinterpret Juliet's crying--Juliet's tears are for the banished Romeo--and both are given lines which show that Lady Capulet plans retribution for the loss of her nephew.

The Q2 version, however, is significantly more aggressive. Q2's Lady Capulet says, "We will have vengeance for it [Tybalt's murder], fear thou not" (H4v). This line does not appear in Q1. Further, the Q2 version of the character displays the same impatience with Juliet seen in 1.3. Upon entering the room and allowing Juliet to cry for what she deems a reasonable amount of time, she harps to her thirteen year old daughter--"Therefore have done: some grief shows much of love,/ But much of grief shows still some want of wit" (H4r). Again, Q1 does not include this show of

impatience. Consistent with the characterological choices signified in 1.3, Q2's Lady Capulet is more aggressive with her daughter than her counterpart in Q1. Q2's 4.2 also demonstrates how aggressive she can be with her husband, and it is this relationship which I would like to briefly trace from text-to-text.

After Juliet returns on Tuesday night from doing penance at Friar Laurence's cell for disobeying her father, she announces that she is now prepared to marry Paris as her father had previously arranged. Capulet reacts with characteristic impulsiveness and decides, joyously, to change the date for the wedding from Thursday to Wednesday morning. While this decision has many dramaturgical repercussions, I am most concerned with the reactions displayed by the two quarto versions of Lady Capulet.

Both versions of the character react negatively because both believe there will be insufficient time to make all the necessary nuptial preparations. But consider the differences in <u>how</u> they react negatively. In Q1, Lady Capulet first squeaks, "Methinks on Thursday would be time enough." When Capulet will not reconsider, she tries another, even more deferential, tune: "I pray my lord, let it be Thursday" (H4v). In stark contrast, the Lady Capulet in Q2 forcibly rebukes her husband's change of plans with the line, "No, not till Thursday; there is time enough." And moments later she rejoins, "We shall be short in our

provision,/ 'Tis now near night" (K1r).

But there is yet one other difference between these two versions of the character not signified by the lines alone; it shows in the placement of the stage direction "Exeunt" in Q2 and "Exeunt Nurse and Juliet" in Q1. As comparatively mild as Lady Capulet's challenges to her husband are in Q1, they are even less threatening when we realize they are offered in private. The Nurse and Juliet have exited, and the Capulets are alone. In Q2, however, the wife's delivers her preemptory "No, not till Thursday" in the presence of a child and a servant. This would make her transgression even more serious except that Capulet responds immediately with a simple reiteration of his plans--"Nurse, go with her. We'll to church tomorrow"--and to her subsequent challenge moments later with a playful, "Tush I will stir about,/ And all things shall be well" (K1r).

The development of Lady Capulet and the development of her relationship with her husband is clearly evidenced through the two quartos versions. The next text I would like to briefly examine--Franco Zeffirelli's 1967 film version--furthers those developments. If Q2's Lady Capulet is more aggressive and dominating than Q1's, Zeffirelli makes his version of the character more of each than Q2's; and if Q2's Capulet is more submissive that his Q1 counterpart, Zeffirelli's father seems at moments positively uxorious.

Consider a brief moment in 1.5 during the Capulet banquet. Romeo and Juliet meet here, but I would like to focus our attention elsewhere. Tybalt recognizes that Romeo, a detested Montague, has "crashed" the party, and he wants him thrown out. Capulet, overhearing his young nephew's protestations, approaches him hoping to calm him. When Tybalt continues to protest that he will not endure Romeo's presence, Capulet is faced with a difficult task: repress Tybalt's disruptive outbursts even while maintaining a festive atmosphere for his guests. The lines are carefully written so that we may easily visualize his shifting focus:

> Go to, go to.
> You are a saucy boy. Is't so indeed?
> This trick may chance to scathe you. I know what.
> You must contrary me. Marry, 'tis time--
> Well said my hearts--You are a princox, go
> Be quiet, or--More light! More light!--For shame,
> I'll make you quiet. What, cheerly my hearts!
>
> (C4v)

This speech, and the whole of 1.5, is nearly identical in both quarto versions. Zeffirelli's script, however, introduces some very interesting changes.

He assigns these lines to <u>Lady Capulet</u>! This not only changes the dialogue, it affects the stage picture and the relationship between the characters as well.

The stage picture (or film screen as the case may be) is significantly altered. Obviously Lady Capulet must be present in order to deliver the lines Zeffirelli assigns to her; neither quarto version, however, mentions her in the original entrance, nor do they assign her any lines in the scene. Indeed, the Nurse's lines to Juliet--"Madame your mother calls" in Q1, and "Madam, your mother craves a word with you" in Q2--suggest that Lady Capulet never appears in 1.5. Juliet, it seems, must momentarily exit in order to speak with her.

Besides the "stage picture," characterizations are also affected. In the film, Lady Capulet dismisses Tybalt with "You are a princox, go," but it is to her husband that she threatens, "I'll make you quiet." When this happens, Zeffirelli frames a close-up of the actor playing Capulet. He is shown responding to Lady Capulet's harsh admonition by avoiding direct visual contact with her and looking down at the floor instead. He then shuffles self consciously, playing, it seems, a dog with its tail between its legs. Instead of Capulet controlling his nephew by strength of will even while attempting to maintain an outward show of poise, Lady Capulet quells a verbal brawl among what appears to be two, immature "boys." This scene, different from the two quarto versions, effectively begins Zeffirelli's own development of Capulet marriage: she, not he, grows as the dominant force.

Why did he do this? Without the benefit of a personal interview we can only offer reasonable suppositions. Keeping in mind the changes in the character from Q1 to Q2 previously outlined, I believe Zeffirelli developed Lady Capulet's character along the same lines as Shakespeare and his fellow actors had done. Did he consult the two extant quartos before effecting his own further development of a domineering, aggressive Lady Capulet? Considering how effectively critics have discredited the First Quarto, we can neither suppose that he had access to it nor assume he would have been inclined to examine it even if access were his. I believe he furthered the development of Lady Capulet and of her relationship with her husband intuitively, sensing, as Shakespeare may have, the dramatic potency of plotting Juliet, a vulnerable and adolescent female protagonist, in a life-and-death struggle against a domineering mother.

The development of Lady Capulet and the Capulet relationship represents, I believe, an example of textual radiation that may be traced all the way back to Brooke's poem. In Brooke's poem, the narrator tells us that "I know her mother will in no case say her nay" (649), and describes Lady Capulet as "the maydens mother milde" (1947). By the time Zeffirelli has done with her, she says nothing but "nay" to her daughter and is anything but "milde." While we can draw no straight line between Brooke, the quartos and

Zeffirelli's film, an interdependence may be seen. Nor can we prove why Zeffirelli "ran with" Shakespeare's developments between Q1 and Q2. But whether intentional or not, Zeffirelli's text demonstrates a stage of textual evolution further "away from [its] source" than either Shakespearean text (Wells and Taylor, Oxford 295).

My reasons for calling structures like Zeffirelli's film a "text" were offered in previous chapters, but they may be profitably be recalled here. Dramatic playtexts anticipate and require public performances, yet performances do more than complete the texts from which they emanate. During performance, the physical signs of the actors' bodies--signs that "show"--reform the words of the playtext--signs which "say." The result of this semiotic confrontation, at least as far as the audience is concerned, is a distinctive textual statement

I would now like to examine another performance text. The last permutation of Lady Capulet I will describe was created during the rehearsals and performances of the Morris County College Shakespeare Company's 1993 production of Romeo and Juliet. While the textual transmission I have just discussed--Q1 > Q2, and Q2 > Zeffirelli--skipped innumerable intermediary texts between Q2 and Zeffirelli[21] (e.g., the several recorded cinematic and numerous unrecorded stage texts generated between 1599 and 1967), the one I will now discuss seems more immediately derivative:

Zeffirelli > Morris County.

The enduring effect of Zeffirelli's film on subsequent adaptations of Romeo and Juliet cannot be fully discussed here. Since sixty million people viewed it--more people than could have attended all the stage productions since 1594--Zeffirelli's film is the single most influential performance text on the play ever created. We may speculate, therefore, that few productions of the play on stage, film, or television can totally avoid its influence. The production in Morris County made no attempt.

Robert Cioffi, director of the production in Morris County, supplied the cast with individual copies of editor William Aldis Wright's 1936 Doubleday edition, 1936. Otherwise, Cioffi borrowed freely from Zeffirelli's film version. He employed the score Zeffirelli had commissioned from composer Nino Rota, and he cut the his text as mightily as Zeffirelli had cut his. Further, Cioffi followed Zeffirelli in transposing speeches between characters. If nothing else, this production demonstrated how remote the Q1 and Q2 texts could become to a modern audience without losing their powerful resonance.

But if this recent performance text created in Morris County often seemed removed from the quarto texts, one scene--the banquet scene--evidenced the close pattern of radiation we have seen before. Moving ever slightly further toward entrenching Lady Capulet as the dominant and most

aggressive member of the family, this performance text simultaneously evolved further from Brooke's characterization of her as "the maydens mother milde."

The banquet scene in 1.5 followed Zeffirelli's text and gave the lines I quoted previously to Lady Capulet: "Go to, go to./ You are a saucy boy...." Naturally, this affected emotional relationships in the scene. The actor playing Capulet, no longer responsible for quelling Tybalt's rage or for maintaining decorum for his guests, could allow himself to first meet, and then top, his nephew's violent rage mano a mano. The wife assumed dominance in the scene, as her counterpart in the 1967 film had done, by quelling this altercation even while remaining socially poised. The father figure, as in the film at the end of the exchange, seemed a chastened, wayward boy.

The actors in the Morris County production made one slight adjustment in the lines, however, and it developed the relationship between Capulet and Lady Capulet along the same lines as the other texts had done. This line change was small but significant, and it came in Capulet's last speech before the speech newly assigned to Lady Capulet.

In both quartos, Capulet responds to Tybalt's "I'll not endure him" with:

> He shall be endured.
> What, goodman boy! I say he shall! Go to,
> Am I the master here or you? Go to.

You'll make a mutiny among my guests.

Zeffirelli preserved all of these lines except "What, goodman boy"; the Morris County production also cut this line. But the actor delivering the remaining four lines in the Morris County production effected two small changes of his own. He changed the two pronouns in last line: "You'll" to "He'll" and "my" to "our." The line then read, "He'll make a mutiny among our guests."

Since I played the role, I can offer two reasons for this change. First, it justified Lady Capulet's physical presence on stage, and it placed her in the immediate vicinity of the Tybalt-Capulet confrontation. As I previously mentioned, the quartos apparently leave her off-stage or, at best, mute; Zeffirelli could easily bring her into the action by pointing his camera. Stage presentation, however, must conform to more natural laws of physical or proxemic relationships than the cinema: since this production had followed Zeffirelli and had scripted Lady Capulet into the scene, the actress had to be near enough to the altercation to allow the audience to believe she could hear it. Capulet's "He'll" presumes that she is near because it displaces Tybalt from the conversational context of "you and I," (i.e., Capulet and Tybalt) and makes of him (Tybalt) the objective "other" which is now spoken about and within the new conversational context of "you and I" (i.e., Capulet and Lady Capulet). The second pronoun change--from

Capulet and Lady Capulet). The second pronoun change--from "my" guests to "our" guests--then cements this newly shared perspective between Capulet and his wife.

The second reason for Capulet's pronoun manipulation is less technical, and it aligns more closely with the development of the characters previously discussed through the earlier texts. In this production's interpretation of the dramatic situation, Capulet includes his wife within his frame of discourse because he needs her help. Tybalt threatens to disrupt the most important social gathering of the year, and Capulet's efforts to suppress him have not only failed, they have drawn him into a brawl from which he cannot extricate himself. In this production, his supplication to her recasts the Capulet marriage: it appeared that she, not he, wore the pants in this family. And Capulet's supplication to his wife also demonstrates in microcosm the interpretive license actors and directors often use to reform the texts descending to them, reformations which do not diminish but rather revivify those texts instead.

One can only wonder what permutations of these characters and their relationships will occur next. They may be happening even "as we speak." The Romeo and Juliet descending to Shakespeare was forever changed by him, and we are truly fortunate to have the 1597 Q1 and 1599 Q2

treatments of it. That the Romeo and Juliet most people know in 1994 has departed from Shakespeare's in significant ways should not cause alarm: it is the way with all texts. Most are not born great; rather, they attain greatness through countless acts of private and public engagement.

Notes

1
Applying Bowers' diagram in this case would be confusing since it would look like this: Q1Q2 > Q3 and Q1Q2Q3 > Q4. Q3 and Q4, however, refer to quartos printed later in the seventeenth century which were influenced by Q1, Q2, and Q1Q2 but which are not the chosen object of my study. A discussion of Q3, Q4, etc. would no doubt be fascinating; however, I will discuss more modern textual offspring, both written and performed.

2
It is also universally agreed that Q3 provided the text for the First Folio edition in 1623 rendering it "non-substantive." And since subsequent folios in 1632 (F2), 1664 (F3), and 1685 (F4) were derived from F1, they are also considered non-substantive.

3
Evans position on both quartos may be summarized in one sentence: "despite its [Q1's] lack of authority, it carries us beyond Shakespeare's literary text (i.e. Q2) and tells us something of how the play was realized in contemporary production" (208). Gibbons believes that Q2 is "wholly superior" in its "unmistakably Shakespearian structure of action" (9), while "roughly equivalent dramatic purposes" in Q1 "are served by scenes containing only scattered fragments of Shakespeare" (7). Of Q1's theatrical value he says, "the stage directions in Q1 are of exceptional interest, since although they are descriptive, they are remarkably apt and vivid" (11).

4
Bowers challenges, among others, Frederick J. Furnivall in his EETS edition.

5
The presumption has long been that this section of the play was lost in the manuscript used to type-set Q2 and that the compositor was forced to consult the corrupt Q1 copy.

6
Q2 > Q1 represents a diagrammatic reduction of the elaborately contrived theory of textual transmission between the two quartos held by many editors of the New Bibliography. That theory is further explained in this chapter.

7
To name an example from each century, Alexander Pope, Richard Grant White, and Frank G. Hubbard.

8
See Gibbons' (4-13), Evans' (206-212), and Wilson's editions (113-118) of the play all listed in Works Consulted. See also Jackson (171-176), Hosley, Duthie's "Text," and Wiles (87).

9
See Wilson and Pollard in the Times Literary Supplement, Aug. 14, 1919 listed in my Works Consulted for the case against Capulet; see the Signet edition by J. A. Bryant for the case against Romeo and Peter (161).

10
Support for Shakespeare as a revisionist may be found in Stanley Wells and Gary Taylor's introduction to the Cambridge Edition of the Complete Works of Shakespeare, Grace Ioppolo's Revising Shakespeare, Michael Warren's The Complete King Lear, Steven Urkowitz's Shakespeare's Revision of King Lear, G. P. Jones' "'Henry V': The Chorus and the Audience", Gerald D. Johnson's "The Merry Wives of Windsor, Q1: Provincial Touring and Adapted Texts", and the following articles in Mary Beth Rose's edition of Renaissance Drama New Series XIX: Jonathan Goldberg's "Rebel Letters: Postal Effects from Richard II to Henry IV"; Annabel Patterson's "Back by Popular Demand: The Two Versions of Henry V"; Joseph Lowenstein's "Plays Agonistic and Competitive: the Textual Approach to Elsinore"; and Barbara Mowat's "The Form of Hamlet's Fortune." In direct reference to Romeo and Juliet, see A. W. Pollard's and John Dover Wilson's original assessment of Q1 as Shakespeare's first draft in "The 'stolne and surreptitious' Shakespearian texts" in the Times Literary Supplement 14 Aug. 1919, Frank G. Hubbard's introduction to The First Quarto Edition of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet, Jill Levenson's Shakespeare in Performance: Romeo and Juliet, and the introduction to Brian Gibbons' New Arden edition where he discusses Shakespeare's first and second versions of passages at 3.5.177-179, 5.3.102-103, and 3.3.39 (15-16).

11
The one extant part is Edward Alleyn's leading role in Orlando Furioso. See Greg's discussion of it on pages 45-46.

12
All references to Brooke's poem are taken from Evans' appendix in his New Cambridge Shakespeare, pages 213-247.

14
This is the date given by Brian Gibbons in his Arden edition (26 ff). Evans believes it could be as late as 1596 (1 ff). The Furness Variorum of 1871 puts the date at 1591 (43).

15
MacD. P. Jackson supports collaborative authorship for Timon of Athens as well as for these other four plays in his article, "The Transmission of Shakespeare's Text." Further critical support for collaborative authorship in Timon may be found in R. V. Holdsworth's "Biblical Allusions in Timon of Athens and Thomas Middleton." Notes and Queries 37 (1990), 188-192 and in M. W. A. Smith's "The Authority of Timon of Athens." Text 5 (1991), 195-240. Further critical support for joint authorship of Henry 8 may be found in R. A. Foakes' Arden edition (1986) and in Jonathan Hope's "Applied Historical Linguistics: Socio-Historical Linguistic Evidence of the Authorship of Renaissance Plays." Transactions of the Philological Society 88 (1990), 201-226; for 1 Henry 6 in H. C. Hart's Arden (1909), John Dover Wilson's New Shakespeare (1952), and in Wells and Taylor's Textual Companion; for Pericles in F. D. Hoeniger's Arden (1986) and M. W. A. Smith's "A Note of the Authorship of Pericles." Computers and the Humanities 24 (1990), 295-300; and for Macbeth in Kenneth Muir's Arden edition (1986) and J. M. Nosworthy's "The Hecate Scenes." RES xxiv (1948).

16
Pollard and Wilson indentified several contributors to Sir Thomas More including Shakespeare, Thomas Dekker, and an anonymous playhouse scribe. Shakespeare is thought to be "Hand D" (Shakespeare's Fight). Wells and Taylor also believe Shakespeare is Hand D along with Henry Chettle (Hand A), Thomas Dekker (Hand E), Thomas Heywood (Hand B), and an anonymous scribe (Hand C) (Textual 124-125).

Strictly speaking, even these three leaves may not be unmediated since a handwritten text, which may have been copied from notes, may intentionally or unintentionally introduce variants which remove it from the "original" composition.

17
Richard Proudfoot, editor of the Arden edition, leads those who believe it is wholly Shakespeare's. MacD. P. Jackson doubts that it is. Critics who agree with Jackson include R. V. Holdsworth, and M. W. A. Smith. (Full details of their contributions to this debate may be found in note 15.) Further, in Gary Taylor's forthcoming Oxford edition of The Complete Work of Thomas Middleton, Timon of Athens is one of the play's included (Shakespeare Newsletter 42).

18
Wells and Taylor include this play in their Oxford edition of Shakespeare's complete works.

19
As noted, Mac. P. D. Jackson and M. W. A. Smith also believe Pericles to be the product of playwright collaboration.

20
Tanselle quotes Hans Gabler's "The Text as Process and the Problem of Intentionality" in Text 3: 1987, 107-116.

21
Most editions of the play since 1599 derive from either Q2, Q1, or Q1Q2. Q3, published in 1609, is considered to be directly derived from Q2; Q4, published in 1622, is considered to be derived from Q3, "with occasional consultation of Q1" (Gibbons 2). Gibbons' edition derives from Q1Q2, as do all of the editions listed in "Works Consulted" except Hubbard's edition of Q1. Hubbard, employing not a single variant from Q2, nonetheless offers his own clarifications of stage directions in scenes where he feels Q1's are opaque. Hubbard's edition, then, might be represented something like this: Q1Hubbard. All modern performances of the play that I have seen--including the productions mentioned in this chapter--use an eclectic text: Q1Q2.

I begin this chapter where I ended the last: comparing variations of several texts of Romeo and Juliet. But while the objects of my textual study remain constant, my critical perspective towards them grows. Having previously applied literary and semiotic analyses to several performance texts, I now offer insights on one of those texts from within.

I played Lord Capulet in the production of Romeo and Juliet mounted by the County College of Morris mentioned in the previous chapter. And I "took the job" specifically with this discussion in mind. I wanted to combine the useful, yet sometimes elusive, vocabularies of semiotic theory with the actor's pragmatic, problem-solving approach to his craft in order that I might more fully explore collaborative playtext development. This acting opportunity gave me access to a pragmatic path toward an approximation of Elizabethan performance no less revealing in its way than the theoretical one I have previously traveled.

Just how near to Elizabethan theatrical practices this combined perspective has led me I cannot be certain. Cultural contexts specific to the Chamberlain's Men of the 1590's no doubt limit any analogies I might draw between the performance texts they have left us and the live performances our contemporary ensemble in Morris County developed from them. No modern company can duplicate the acting style the original actors may have used, for

instance, even if that style could be discerned, for it was surely dependent on a host of historically and culturally specific variables: e.g., the size and shape of the theatre, the actor's role in society, daytime playing, and the generally more exuberant participation of the audience in the performance. However, these and other unnamed limitations aside, performing the play before a live audience in 1993 allowed my fellow actors and me to more closely experience the possibilities of on-stage negotiations likely to have happened in 1594 than any other method at our disposal.

What follows later in this chapter, then, is an assessment of our production from what I expect is an unconventional perspective. Having spent a good deal of the last three years of my life studying this play and writing about it, I came to the first rehearsal armed with a body of textual and literary knowledge I expect few actors, whenever they lived, could match. But my preparation for this performance project began long before I had decided to write my doctoral dissertation on the two quartos of Romeo and Juliet. Having spent much of the decade from 1973-1983 as a professional actor, I commenced this dissertation project with a practical working knowledge of stage craft which I expect, in turn, few dissertation writers could match. Never during those ten years, however, had I been fortunate enough to perform this play; and never, it now seems, could

a confluence of opportunities have been more auspicious.

I discuss performed and imagined scenes in this production as demonstrable examples of the inevitable confrontations between word and body signs, and the rehearsals that paved the way for those scenes as examples of the negotiations between the theatrical collaborators who attempted to exploit those confrontations. I mainly focus on 1.2 and 3.4. Generally speaking, 1.2 is discussed as it happened; in contrast, some of the performances choices I discuss in 3.4 are actual, some imagined, and others those which I proposed but which our director would not accept. I claim none of the performance decisions we made in either scene to be definitive nor in any manner of speaking paradigmatic; however, I do believe some of them were likely similar to the decisions made by actors in ages past. Although many of our negotiations were no doubt particular to our production in 1993 (e.g., those involving the stage director or the lighting and sound technicians), many others, I believe, were likely similar to past negotiations by the long dead actor-collaborators who were known as the Chamberlain's Men.

Generally speaking, the process through which playtexts are theatricalized has remained constant since Shakespeare's time.[1] That process requires actors to first interpret the meaning of the playwright's written words, and then to physically vivify those meanings within the "here and now"

of the on-stage fiction. Inevitably, this "making flesh" of the playwright's words may involve more than the interpretation of texts; instead, performance may reform (or adumbrate) those texts. But whether we choose to call actors' performances "interpretations," "reformations," or "adumbrations" depends first upon the extent to which we think we can determine the text's "original meanings," and second, the extent to which we believe we should maintain those meanings should we find that they are, indeed, determinable. The word sign/body-sign dialectic at the heart of all theatrical discourse confuses these two determinations. At times, theatrical discourse evidences semiotic systems working in concert to promote what may be called "original meanings"; in these instances, actors' performance may seem solely interpretive. At many other times, however, these two diametrically opposed systems of word and body signs clash dissonantly, producing on-stage meanings not apparently found in the text from which the performance emanates. In these instances of semiotic dissonance, actors' performances may be said to reform or adumbrate the playwright's original textual meanings.

Gaps: linguistic

> My ears have not yet drunk a hundred words
> of thy tongue's uttering, yet I know the sound.

Art thou not Romeo, and a Montague?

2.2.58-61

In the balcony scene, Juliet first identifies the hidden man who has eavesdropped on her private counsel not by what he says but by how he says it. In doing so, she elevates the sensory materiality of the voice as "meaning"--pitch, timbre, and volume--above its value as a vehicle for, or deliverer of, word meanings. In this early moment in the scene, Romeo's words serve merely as the excuses for his enunciation of them, thereby drawing our attention once again to the theatre's most fundamental dialectic: the tension between linguistic signs and the material signs of the body.

I have previously described as <u>a confrontation</u> that process by which the written words of the author's playtext and the physical signs of the actors' bodies create a theatrical performance (Pavis, <u>Languages</u> 18); Veltrusky, "Dramatic Text" 115). Since I believe that performances sometimes reform and sometimes adumbrate the meanings of the written texts on which they are based, a metaphor of semiotic confrontation only seems capable of describing performance adumbrations. Using Veltrusky's article once again, I now question whether the metaphor of confrontation should not be combined with one of <u>compensation</u> in order that the process by which the text may be <u>reformed</u> through

performance also may be considered. Although Veltrusky seems to offer performance as a preserver of what he calls "the unity of the text," I believe performance rather creates-with-text a newly unified set of meanings:

> One of the fundamental oppositions within drama as a literary work is between direct speeches and author's notes and remarks, usually though somewhat misleadingly called the stage directions. In theatrical performance, these notes are eliminated, and the resulting gaps in the unity of the text are filled in by other than linguistic signs. This is not an arbitrary process but essentially a matter of transposing linguistic meanings into other semiotic systems. Yet, even where it endeavors to be as faithful as possible, it necessarily brings about important modifications in the meanings themselves. (96)

Veltrusky has combined (or mixed) metaphors of confrontation and compensation in order to describe the dynamic relationship between text and performance. While he begins with a description of "fundamental oppositions," he next turns to the notion of "other than linguistic signs" compensating for "gaps" which threaten the "unity of the text." In his construct, whether the various sign systems employed in theatrical production aid one another or clash with one another is, therefore, left in doubt. Finally,

Veltrusky reverts back to describing a semiotic confrontation, though, by this time, it seems less frontal assault than guerilla tactic: "it is only the semiotics of acting...[that can]...divert attention from the text" when the loss of the author's notes and remarks causes gaps in that text (114; my emphasis).

Instead of trying to unravel a straight message from an apparently contradictory presentation--do sign systems supplement one another or irrevocably clash--perhaps it would be better to consider the possibility that Veltrusky's mixed metaphor serves appropriately to describe a decidedly complex and variable process. Although I question the idealized structure he calls "the unity of the text," I nevertheless agree with his most important, underlying point: audiences seek expository coherence in performance from whatever sources they may find it.

While each sign type produces meaning differently, audiences impute direct referential value to all of them through the fictional matrix of the stage world. Charles Pierce offers this taxonomy of signs: (1) "the diagrammatic sign or icon which exhibits a similarity or analogy" to its referent, (2) "the index which... forces the attention to the particular object intended without describing it," and (3) the word or symbol "which signifies its object by means of an association of ideas or habitual connection" with it (Pierce 181). While fundamentally different to the

semiotician, these signs are nevertheless unified by the audience as it participates in a performance.

Rather than a unity of the text, then, we have what might be called a unity of reception. And audiences construct this unity even in those instances where playwrights or (as is often the case in modern drama) directors make a priori artistic decisions to foreground the performance as performance, to drive a wedge between the fictional on-stage world of the dramatic characters and the "real" off-stage world: the audience sitting in the theatre. In "From Text to Performance," semiotician Patrice Pavis details a moment from a play where authorial and directorial decisions combine, but ultimately fail, to subvert stage mimesis. The written text, "What! Are you not going to the table?", the written but unheard paratext, "Dorante does not go towards the table," and the stage set containing "no visible table," only forcibly induce the audience to imagine "a table...in the mind's eye" (89).[2] In instances such as this, when theatre semioticians strive mightily to remind the audience that the on-stage fiction is a mere contrivance, audiences may often thwart those intentions by their instinctive reunification of sign and referent. Pointing to a "table" in the several different ways described by Pavis--without providing a material referent for "table"--is meant to expose the disjunct between representational and presentational aspects of theatrical

discourse. Audiences are inclined to seek referents for performances signs, however, even when those referents are not provided by actors and directors, thereby encoding representational unity to even the most disjunctive presentational expositions.

The audience's need for expository clarity, and its imaginative reflexive resources for creating that clarity, ameliorate the theatre's natural semiotic confrontations, paradoxically making rough paths smooth. The actor's goal is very much the same. Being in direct contact with the audience under the stress of live performance, the actor's success depends on aiding the audience as it attempts to unite word and action into coherent expository meanings. Whether the playwright or director decides to "make strange" the on and off-stage worlds (what Bertolt Brecht called verfremdung from the Russian Formalists' ostranenie), audiences and actors habitually strive to make "familiar," "comfortable," or "recognizable." In the light of these two approaches to the text/performance dynamic, Veltrusky's mixed metaphor of confrontation-compensation seems appropriate.

Of course, playwrights and directors often aim to clarify exposition as well. Metatheatrical diversions only resonate when they are placed as if in ironic counterpoint to mimetic "realism." Shakespeare's texts demonstrate, on the one hand, a careful integration of words and actions

and, on the other hand, an apparent indifference to the seamless exposition so important to actors and their audiences. Before I offer scenes from Romeo and Juliet which may serve to expose these differences, I want to first use an example from a modern play to demonstrate how expository clarity may be very obviously threatened by the segregation of text and paratext.

Veltrusky's analysis, quoted earlier, focuses on plays in which the written word is segregated into text ("direct speeches") and paratext ("authors' notes and remarks" or stage directions) because the elimination of those stage directions in performance forces the audience's attention elsewhere as it seeks for clarity. But he fails to make a distinction between those stage directions which actors may easily incorporate into action, and those which present actors with serious performance difficulties.

When the paratext describes the use of a prop such as in Q1 Romeo and Juliet ("The Nurse enters wringing her hands, with the ladder of cords in her lap"), the actor can easily translate this information into stage action. When stage directions attempt to program the actor's emotional motivations, however, direct translation of the playwright's intentions become nearly impossible. For instance, the actor playing Mat Burke in Eugene O'Neill's Anna Christie is directed to first deliver a line "delighted-proudly," and next to continue speaking "more seriously, but still in a

boastful manner, confidentially."[3] Programmatical stage directions such as this one from Anna Christie, which contain a dramatic character's emotional motivations, may, or may not, find form in an actor's performance depending on his interpretation of the role. But even if he chooses to incorporate motivational clues such as these, the specific intentions of the playwright may become lost to the audience. In those texts which include large "gaps" between what is only written (paratext) and what is written and heard (text), even actors of the textually faithful sort compensate by filling in the holes with "other than linguistic signs" in order to aid the audience's decoding processes. A short scene from another play by Eugene O'Neill may serve to illustrate the text-paratext disjunct.

In All God's Chillun Got Wings, the white female protagonist, Ella, is confronted by her militant, black sister-in-law, Hattie. Both have been consumed by racial hatred, and O'Neill places them in dramatic counterpoint. Since this is the only moment in the play when these two characters meet, we might expect their confrontation to be cathartic. And it is. But many of the theatrical fireworks that this scene creates are left on the page, hidden from the audience within mostly unseen and unheard stage directions. Here is the conclusion to the scene without paratextual additions:

Ella I didn't know you'd been to school so long.

Where are you teaching? In a colored school suppose.

Hattie Yes. A private school endowed by some wealthy members of our race.

Ella Then you must have taken lots of examinations and managed to pass them, didn't you?

Hattie I always passed with honors!

Ella Yes we both graduated from the same high school, didn't we? That was dead easy for me. Why I hardly even looked at a book. (2.1)

Supported by this dialogue, the audience would undoubtedly sense an emotional friction between the characters: Hattie's black pride surfaces when she speaks of her educational and vocational successes; and Ella's stereotyping and stereotypical--"Where are you teaching? In a colored school, I suppose"--would succeed as effective contrapuntal prejudice. But a good deal of the theatrical power in this scene derives from the playwright's notes spliced between the spoken dialogue, notes which the audience cannot read.

Earlier in the scene, O'Neill's paratext instructs the actress playing Ella to deliver her first line "queerly - with a frown of effort"; Hattie accompanies her first words with gesture and movement as she "[comes] forward with a forced smile" and "holds out her hand". As the emotional confrontation builds, the paratextual directions become

increasingly explicit. On the first line of the passage quoted, "I didn't know you'd been to school so long," Ella must take Hattie's hand "looking at it with a queer defiance"; Hattie must then be "stirred to hostility by Ella's manner," and she is directed to deliver her speech about her educational successes "in a tone which, as if in spite of herself, becomes bragging." When she finishes, she "suddenly checks herself," and she becomes "ashamed, and stung by Ella's indifference". Finally, paratextual explicitness reaches absurdity when the playwright's notes aim for total control of those semiotic choices perhaps best left to performers. Ella must have "an indifferent superiority in her words that is maddening to Hattie" as she later "turns and smiles at Jim [her husband]--a tolerant, superior smile but one full of genuine love."

I will argue that actors cannot play "indifferent superiority," nor can they create a smile which is all at once "tolerant," "superior," yet also "full of genuine love." Indeed, before studying a script, many performers confronted with such author's notes or stage directions immediately blot them out. They consider them impediments to the motivational license they must exercise in translating written words into stage action. Given the widespread resistance to these paratextual directions, if the actor cannot (and often will not) attempt to convey this important "information," and the audience in the theatre

cannot read it on a page, the disjunct between the literary playtext and the performance text becomes manifest.[4] Further, the direct authorial voice is lost or significantly reformed by those signs the performers invent instead.

Consider the potential disjunct between what O'Neill apparently intends that the actor convey and what an audience may manifestly observe. O'Neill evidently aims to create a character of emotional and psychological depth. Apparently, he wants his white Ella to feel "superior" to her black husband and, at the same moment, genuinely in love with him. We readers know this. And actors who read the script with its written paratext know it too. But audiences may "see" something quite different from O'Neill's emotionally torn protagonist.

If the actor playing Ella chooses, for instance, to emphasize the character's white supremicist feelings, she might deliver the line, "But Jim says it [passing school] was awfully hard for him" by stressing __HIM__. She might then follow that paralinguistic stress with an intolerant, superior laugh. In this instance, the audience may interpret the character antipathetically, seeing Ella only as a white supremicist. If, instead, the actor playing Ella chooses to deliver this line while gently stroking the face of the actor playing Jim, the audience might only see a sympathetic "Ella" who is full of "genuine love." Finally, if the actor somehow manages to convey both superiority and

love during this very short moment (a nearly impossible feat), the audience might focus upon the actor's emotional vacillation in and of itself. And if the audience focuses on the actor's emotional pyrotechnics (if she plays "mad"), Ella's psychopathological nature, revealed more fully later in the play when she tries to stab her husband, might adumbrate any consideration of her paradoxical feelings toward Jim in this scene. The removal of important information included within the paratext creates "gaps" between what the playwright has apparently intended and what the audience sees in performance. The actors' bodily performance signs, which must somehow convey this information lest it be completely lost to the audience, fills these gaps and, by so doing, often changes the original intentions of the playwright.

But what of those Renaissance playtexts which often contain fewer and less specific notes in five acts than O'Neill here includes in this one short scene? If linguistic gaps are created by the elimination of stage directions in performance--and there are few stage directions to eliminate--we either must conclude that there are no gaps or that they are hiding elsewhere.

I believe they are hiding within the dialogue itself. Because actors-in-performance reform playtexts, and do not merely "carry out the instructions of the text...as though these had the illocutionary force of a 'cake recipe'"

(Pavis, "From Text" 89), their engagement of the playwright's dialogue inevitably fills out, if not in, whatever expository clarity audiences may find wanting. We can apply Veltruský's point about gaps, then, if we know to look at the dialogue instead of around and in between it.

My previous discussion on the relative abundance of intra-dialogic stage directions found in Shakespeare's plays aimed to locate performance information embedded within, or suggested by, his written texts. At this juncture, however, I would like to suggest that while intra-dialogic stage directions are usually found in Shakespeare's plays, they are not always, and not in the same force. That is to say, while on the one hand Shakespeare's texts contain a great many important intra-dialogic stage directions or "author's notes and remarks," they do not, on the other hand, always contain as many in one scene or one passage as they do in another scene or passage.

Consider briefly two short passages from Romeo and Juliet which demonstrate this difference. As the Nurse enters in 3.2 to inform Juliet of Tybalt's murder and Romeo's banishment, Q2 supplies Juliet with the line, "Ay me! What news? Why dost thou wring thy hands?" (G2v). In a production that followed standard representational conventions, the actor playing the Nurse must play this action or cut the line: if the actor playing Juliet says the line, the audience hears it and would be jarred out of

belief in the on-stage reality if the action didn't fit the words. In Q1, this same direction is supplied extra-dialogically; Juliet only utters, "What hast thou there, the cords?" while the stage direction reads, "Enter Nurse wringing her hands, with the ladder of cords in her lap" (F3r). In this version, the dramatic "fact" is that the actor must enter with the cords if paratextual directions are followed. Whether that same actor chooses to be "wringing her hands," however, is a matter of interpretation.

Consider one additional line from the Q1 text which offers more intriguing performance interpretations. Immediately after the Nurse enters, Juliet asks, "O Lord, why look'st thou sad?" (F3r). How does an actor "look sad?" Entering the stage, he may pull the facial muscles down and squint the eyes, hold the hands as if in prayer (what B. L. Joseph reprints in Elizabethan Acting as "Ploro"), or, like Hamlet's ghost, "with solemn march" trudge "slow and stately by" (1.2.202). Or he may combine all of these signs. Or he may, of course, use completely different ones.

By containing this "paratextual" authorial note within the dialogue, Shakespeare makes it incumbent upon the actor to effect "sadness." Unlike O'Neill's highly specific extra-dialogic note to the actress to effect a "tolerant, superior smile, but one full of genuine love," Shakespeare's directorial notes cannot be completely avoided without

causing "noise" in the audience's reception. How Shakespeare's Nurse should effect sadness, however, is a matter of interpretation.

According to Veltrusky, a performance's theatrical structure "depends mainly on the number and weight of the author's notes in the text, that is to say, on the importance of the gaps created by their deletion" (96: my emphasis). He poses what I believe to be a correct relationship between text and paratext: the presence or absence of "author's notes and remarks," whether within or without the dialogue, is a relativistic rather than a essentialistic equation. Some texts have more notes, some less. Some less gaps, some more. I offered the scene from All God's Chillun Got Wings as an example of a disjunctive theatrical structure resulting from a relative plethora of important stage directions which, when eliminated in performance, obscure the scene's exposition as the playwright apparently intended it. In Shakespeare's plays, however, Veltrusky's equation is turned on its head: more notes create fewer, smaller gaps since they are, or are not, included within the dialogue itself.

I devote space to "gaps" because a clear understanding of what they are is essential to my forthcoming analyses of Romeo and Juliet in performance. My definition of "gaps," then, qualifies Veltrusky's in two important ways with respect to the plays of Shakespeare and other Renaissance

playwrights. First, it is usual for Shakespeare's plays to contain notes, remarks, and other paratextual additions within the dialogue spoken by the actors although scenes and passages may differ in the number and specificity of the notes contained within. Second, larger gaps are produced in those scenes which contain notes that do not seem to direct performance options. Veltruský's oversight with respect to Shakespearean texts may be attributable to these two qualifications: both notes and the absence of notes are found (or not found, as the case may be) within the dialogue, making them harder to identify than the presence or absence of paratextual notes in the work of many other playwrights.

A useful illustration of the relationship between textual determinacy/indeterminacy and performance semiotics is offered by Marvin Rosenberg in "Sign Theory and Shakespeare." His analysis supports several of the points I made when previously discussing the two quarto versions of the scene between the Nurse and Juliet.

When, in Hamlet, Ophelia describes the distraught Hamlet to Polonius, she says, "And, with his other hand thus o'er his brow/ He falls to such perusal of my face/ As 'a would draw it." Rosenberg wonders, "How 'o'er his brow'" and, as Ophelia, how would an actor signify exactly what Hamlet did "with his hand?" He then offers two choices taken from reviews of past performances. One, which he

calls a gesture "directed mainly outward," is "to shade the eyes from the light"; the other, directed "mainly inward," is to press "hard on the forehead" (33). Shakespeare's text gives no sure indication here, nor does it contain intra-dialogic stage directions which point the way: the actor may then invent a motivational reason which will support the gesture he chooses. Though Rosenberg fails to mention it, "such perusal of my face," is also textually and paratextually indeterminate. Again, the actor may invent an inner voice that leads him to fill out what Shakespeare has left "unsaid."

But even within this single speech by Ophelia, textual indeterminacy may exist side-by-side with textual determinacy. Immediately before the lines I quoted, she describes another movement by Hamlet which leaves somewhat less room for the actor's performance variations: "He took me by the wrist, and held me hard;/ Then goes he to the length of all his arm." While actors playing this scene may still offer a variety of signs in order to signify "hard" (a facial grimace, tension in the voice, etc.), one would like to believe they cannot avoid miming being grabbed by the wrist and being held at arm's length. In these instances, actors are advised that the text's "the thing." An audience hears an action described as taking place simultaneously with the speaking of the text, and it expects, I believe, clearly denoted actions in the text to be iconized by

actors.

Theoretically, actors use rehearsals to explore the script for the ideas contained therein and to negotiate exactly how they might convey these ideas to the audience. No cast of actors makes the same decisions as another, but all engage in the same dynamic process of reforming words into physical actions. I now want to highlight instances from our rehearsals and performances of Romeo and Juliet during which my colleagues and I found ourselves, much as Ophelia, to a greater or lesser extent modifying and revising the written playtext. I can only hope that we clarified and vivified that text as well. In some scenes, our modifications and revisions were minimal owing to the relative completeness of the text: some scenes appeared to us to have small gaps. In scenes which seemed to us to have a program which was more linguistically indeterminate, however, we invented performance additions which appeared to more radically reform the written text.

I focus on two scenes: the interview between Capulet and Paris in 1.2, and the related exchange between Capulet, Paris, and Lady Capulet in 3.4. I played Capulet, Paris was played by Jonathan DeLura, and Lady Capulet was played by Gemma Wells. Our production was played on a modern proscenium stage and was costumed in Italian Renaissance dress: doublet and hose for the men, floor length gowns for the women. We made use of modern stage lighting fitted with

colored gels to approximate "day" and "night." We employed the musical score taken directly from the Franco Zeffirelli 1967 film version of the play, and additional sound cues indicated off-stage horses, sword fighting, crying, etc. The overall performing principles of the cast were relatively traditional: enunciate the words clearly and give each stage action a "history"--an imagined off-stage life for each character.

This last value is particularly important to understanding the forthcoming analysis. Assuming that everything on-stage serves synecdochically for a world of things off-stage, we attempted to bring--or to suggest--as much of that world as possible before the eyes of the audience. In some instances, we may have overstuffed an already replete linguistic program; in other instances, we tried to compensate for an unclear linguistic program. As I have suggested, however, whether the playwright's text is apparently indifferent to expository clarity or not, or whether the contempory director's "design" aims to subvert a clear or obscure textual exposition, actors and audiences seem to work together to create coherent meanings from all that is done and said on stage.

1.2: The text's the thing

In many playtexts developed by Shakespeare and his

fellow actors of the Chamberlain's Men, plot exposition and character development complement one another. Because of this, modern interpreters feel, on the one hand, entrusted with the task of clarification of possible obscurities and, on the other, licensed with the freedom to explore a range of new potential meanings and experiences. In our rehearsals and performances of Romeo and Juliet, we found 1.2 an excellent example of this ambiance of creative collaboration. The scene begins:

> Capulet But Montague is bound as well as I,
> In penalty alike, and 'tis not hard, I think,
> For men so old as we to keep the peace.

A brief outline of the dramatic situation will help provide a basis against which we may consider the ensuing performance analysis. This being the play's second scene, a relatively small amount of preceding exposition is needed.

The first scene of the play seems to have two major expository goals: to introduce the Capulet-Montague feud as the unfortunate "fact" of Veronese society and to introduce Romeo as the prototype for the self-indulgent lover.

The feud exposition begins with a salacious game of humiliation and with fantasies of sexual assault. At first, an innocent game of one-upmanship between the servants of the Capulets and Montagues, that playful surface is soon shattered, however, and the city quickly erupts into a full-scale civil brawl. The presentational potentials written

into this scene, which include hand-to-hand combat and swashbuckling swordplay, seldom fail to capture an audience's attention once they are shaped into action. The second half of this scene, in contrast, uses verbal rather than physical pyrotechnics--"feather of lead, bright smoke, cold fire, sick health"--to display Romeo as the self-indulgent, Petrarchan lover par excellence. Although modern audiences may not be as qualified to appreciate the conceits Shakespeare mocks through Romeo's bathetic speeches as Elizabethan audiences once were, in our performances in 1993 they nonetheless seemed engrossed by the verbal rococo.

The scene which follows these two different, but equally compelling flourishes in 1.1 has, as the theatre adage aptly reminds us, a "hard act to follow." As the actor whose lines immediately followed the end of this first scene, I knew first-hand how difficult my job was going to be. Not only did I need to wrench the audience's attention away from the compelling excesses of the first scene, but I also had to develop Capulet as a major force in the play while simultaneously advancing several new expository points of the plot.

After the lights faded to black after the final line in 1.1, stage hands removed the now untended swords previously used by the combatants in the brawl and reset the stage for 1.2. As the lights came up thirty seconds later, the audience was encouraged to believe the setting for 1.2 was

"Capulet's banquet room." (Neither the Q1 nor the Q2 text, designed for Elizabethan open stages, indicates this specific location.) Paris and Capulet entered upstage center (the middle of the stage and farthest from the audience) and played most of the action downstage left (nearest to the audience and on the audience's right). During the blackout after 1.1, the stage had been set with two chairs, a table with writing paper, a quill pen and inkwell, and two goblets. As Capulet and Paris enter, servants were scurrying to and fro as they prepared the room for the banquet to be held that same night: some carried trays of food across the stage, some cleaned and dusted, and others decorated the room with garlands of flowers.

By setting the scene as I have, I hope to make clear how polysemic or semiotically rich theatrical discourse can be made. Sometimes that is a blessing, however, and sometimes it is a curse. As the actor who began the dialogue in this scene, I not only had to compete with the audience's still recent memory of Romeo's lamentations over Rosaline, but also I had to override the servants' constant movement and the stage food they carried (made amazingly "real" by our properties' manager). But the first line in the text seems not to be concentrated on what is happening in 1.2--what might be called the theatrical "present." Instead, it seems focused on what happened in the theatrical past sometime between the end of 1.1 and the beginning of

1.2: i.e., Capulet and Montague had met with the Prince and signed an agreement to cease the feud.

Since the feud plays a major role in determining the outcome of the play, as Capulet I knew that I must find a way to draw attention to it despite all that was happening around me. Speaking my first line--"But Montague is bound as well as I/ In penalty alike"--I entered rolling up a scroll so as to give the audience a physical sign of the agreement forced upon Montague and me (Capulet) by the Prince. As I walked in with Paris, I wagged the scroll twice as I spoke "in penalty alike," confirming to Paris that I had not weakly capitulated to the Prince's demand, but rather that our written agreement committed both of us to a cessation of hostilities.

Simple props such as, in this instance, a scroll, may exert considerable informational power since "the audience will agree to take the motions that the actors go through, which do not in themselves add up to anything, as the impersonation of the complete act" (Elam, Semiotics 29). The text's first line seemed to invite me to clarify the action which the audience is expected to believe has taken place off-stage between Romeo's final words in 1.1 and my first ones in 1.2. Although banquet preparations surrounded me, I decided to invent an iconic sign which might accomplish that necessary clarification. During this moment in our production, I believe the actor and the text worked

in concert against the polysemic staging that our director had planned.

As I say, I planned the first line--"But Capulet is bound..." exclusively to advance exposition. Whether it was taken to mean more or less by the audience I cannot say. I planned the second line, however, with the goal of signifying my character's attitude toward that exposition: i.e., Capulet doubted the signed contract would permanently end the feud. Instead of leading with an iconic sign, I choose to begin this characterological signification with several[5] paralinguistic ones. On the line "And 'tis not Hard , I THINK ,/ For men so old as we to keep the peace," I opted for an initial vocal stress on the word "Hard," followed by even greater stress on the word "THINK." After that, I allowed my voice to trail away without stressing any other word in the line. I planned this progression of stresses in conjunction with two other paralinguistic techniques: pace and volume. The pace quickened and the volume rose until the word "think." After that, I allowed my vocal pace to precipitously slacken and my volume to gradually approach inaudibility right through until the end of my line at "peace."

My intention, as may be apparent, was to signal that Capulet had little faith in himself or in Montague to "keep the peace." I wanted him to appear blustery at first, trying to convince himself of that which he did not in truth

believe. I first used stress, pace, and volume to demonstrate his bluster, and then adjusted those signs to demonstrate his underlying pessimism. Finally, I added two gestural signs to supplement the vocal ones. As I approached "for men so old as we," I sat down on a chair slowly and laboriously, hoping to signify that Capulet, indeed, was old. My next gestural sign, however, signified that while he was old, he was not yet wise. As I approached the word "peace," I ran my hands through my hair, a gesture reprinted in B. L. Joseph's book, Elizabethan Acting, as "sollicite cogito" (50). This was meant to appear an involuntary gesture that signified my emotional stress more truly than my "mere verbal reports on [it]" (Scholes 144). I have often observed this distinction studying human behavior: I have often noticed people using such gestures when the meaning of their words seems in conflict with the meaning behind their words. As I played these lines, Capulet was saying that peace would not be hard to achieve, but he did not believe it.

We confront, in this instance, the textual relationship between written words and the actor's hidden subtext, a relationship no less fascinating than the one between spoken dialogue and silent paratext. Patrice Pavis describes the subtext as "the unconscious element of the text [which] is supposed to accompany, in a parallel text, the continuous and in itself pertinent flow of text actually spoken by the

characters" ("From Text" 97). Actors create subtexts if not to fill in, at least to motivationally fill out, the words playwrights give them to speak. But while all actors engage in this process, no two actors will ever agree exactly what elements in their texts (or scripts) need filling out. I used the scroll to point synecdochically backwards in time just prior to what was presently happening on stage in 1.2. I call that playing the text since the line given to the actor--"But Montague is bound as well as I..."--concerns the Capulet-Montague feud. Moments after, however, I invented a subtext which some might accuse of obscuring the text since Capulet's pessimism about ever resolving his feud with Montague might seem to some to be a cosmetic choice rather than a structural necessity: Capulet's attitude toward the feud is never mentioned in the lines any actor speaks and therefore cannot be proven to spur any character's actions. Although I felt it important to supplement my words with my unspoken subtextual motivations--what might be called filling "gaps"--my decision was a subjective one since it is questionable whether a gap existed in the first place. Expository clarity is, I believe, the most frequent goal in performance; however, Shakespeare's texts often allow the actors to decide just what (or what not) should be exposed.

For this scene, our production in Morris County used a text constructed from elements of both Q1 and Q2. I would like to "deconstruct" our script at this juncture so that I

might expose how the original texts offer different (though no less open to subjective interpretation) configurations of text, paratext, and subtext.

The semiotic analysis of the first three lines of 1.2 from our production analyzed previously would offer little aid in understanding the Q1 version since these lines do not appear in Q1. In Q1, Paris' lines--not Capulet's--introduce the scene:

> Of honorable reckoning are they both,
> And pity 'tis they live at odds so long:
> But leaving that, what say you to my suit? (B2r)

The actor playing Paris in this version has much the same task as I had playing the Morris County script: clarification of the feud. His script, however, offered different opportunities for doing so.

First, unlike Q2, the Q1 script does not necessarily imply that any action has occurred between the beginning of this scene and the ending of 1.1. Without Capulet's mention of being "bound in penalty alike" with Montague, the audience cannot assume that the families have had any contact subsequent to the brawl. Capulet, in fact, never mentions the feud. His first line focuses squarely on Juliet: "What should I say more than I said before./ My daughter is a stranger in the world."

Second, Paris' line, which serves a similar purpose to Capulet's opening line in our version in Morris County,

offers only an oblique reference to the feud. In our production, my proper noun "Montague" and first person "I" in "But __MONTAGUE__ is bound as well as _I_" offer textual clarification for an implied "we"; in contrast, Paris' "they" in "Of honorable reckoning are they both" is indeterminate. If the actor decides his goal is to supplement or fill in what the Q1 text only infers, then he must manipulate the performance text in order to motivate the semiotic choices he uses.

If Paris' "they," for instance, refers to the two families as we must presume it does, he must address the line to someone other than Capulet, perhaps a character such as the Nurse who may have been on stage but whom the Q1 text failed to record. But if the stage direction in Q1 has correctly recorded all of those characters who were on stage, however--"Enter Countie Paris, old Capulet"--then the actor playing Paris would have no one but Capulet to whom he might deliver the line. In this instance, Paris' "they" might serve to exclude Capulet from the more irascible members of the family (e.g. Tybalt, Gregory, and Sampson) as if Paris were saying, "They, not you, are the source of our problems."

The scroll I used, and the inclusion of Capulet in the conversational context the actor playing Paris in Q1 may have used, serve similar functions: they make concrete that to which Shakespeare's words seem to strongly allude. While

these semiotic choices at the beginning of the scene are only inferred, I believe both texts profit immensely from such iconic supplementation. Other interpreters however, will inevitably invent their own performance text supplementations of the linguistic text.

Further, I would like to consider the other variants of this scene as presented in Q2. Our production in Morris County used the spoken text as it appears in Q2 so there is no need to repeat it. The differences between Q2 and our production may be found in the paratext.

Those paratextual variants between our script and Q2 are both recorded and inferred since Shakespeare places his "authorial notes and remarks" both within and outside of the dialogue. Shakespeare's one extra-dialogic stage direction in Q2--a stage direction we did not follow in our production--suggests several intriguing performance variations. That stage direction reads: "Enter Capulet, County Paris, and the Clown" (my emphasis). Our production only had Paris and Capulet entering to begin this scene. While the difference in the number of characters entering the scene may at first glance seem inconsequential, we must remember that all evidence suggests that Will Kemp played the Clown in productions based upon the Q2 text. Consider now the inferences we might make about the performances of Romeo and Juliet based upon the Q2 text. Imagine for a moment the semiotic variants--gesture, facial mugging, etc.-

-that Kemp might have introduced in what he may have considered to be gaps between the spoken lines of the other characters. Because a good part of chapter 2 focused on the celebrity text's potential for obfuscating more "necessary questions of the play," I do not feel the need to recapitulate the points of that discussion here. It is enough if we remember that Kemp was the Charlie Chaplin of his era, a celebrity who could "find no place in an 'ensemble'" (Quinn 156).

Kemp's presence on-stage during the beginning of 1.2 demonstrates just how difficult clear exposition can be made. As the actor playing Capulet in Morris County, I felt I had to compete with the servants, props, "food" etc. in order to signify that Montague and I had temporarily ceased our feud. To do so, I supplemented my first line with an iconic sign (the scroll). The actor playing Capulet in Q2 with Kemp on stage, however, had more formidable competition for the audience's attention. Although the clown has no lines in the early part of the scene, Kemp's "simple biological presentation--[his] physique and... personality signs" (Rosenberg, "Sign Theory" 37), in addition to his "ill face" (Wiles 24) and clown's motley, may likely have caused immediate laughter as soon as he walked on stage. This suggests to me that the Capulet in the Q2 version may have played the scene in one of two ways. First, he may have played the scene very broadly, with exaggerated gesture

in order to wrench the audience's attentions away from Kemp and toward himself, or, second, he may have allowed the laughter which likely accompanied Kemp's presence to dictate a generally ribald quality to the scene. Either way, the scene produced in Elizabethan playhouses must have been considerably different from ours in Morris County or the one indicated in Q1.

These three versions of 1.2 illustrate a wide range of performance options offered to actors, both past and present, when staging Shakespeare's texts. While the beginning of this scene in all three versions seems to demand performance choices by the actors which will clarify the contract signed by Capulet and Montague just prior to the scene, each version also presents impediments to that expository clarification. How casts of actors avoid, compensate for, or surmount those impediments depends on those paratextual cues each finds wanting in their chosen scripts, and on the subtextual motivations each must create in their stead.

Before examining the Morris County, Q1, and Q2 versions of 3.4, I want to extend the comparison between Renaissance and twentieth century playtexts introduced earlier. The relative absence of paratextual authorial notes in Renaissance texts saddles actors with different interpretive problems than the relative surplus of paratextual notes in

many twentieth century playtexts. Happily, this same contrast, not merely of the quantity of paratextual notes but also of their quality and specificity, offers actors different interpretive opportunities as well. I want to briefly demonstrate these differences by comparing acting experiences from the careers of two modern actors: Colleen Dewhurst, a renowned Broadway actress, and Richard Pasco, a leading player with London's Royal Shakespeare Company.

When being interviewed following a performance of O'Neill's Moon for the Misbegotten, Dewhurst lamented, "Look at O'Neill's stage directions. You're supposed to laugh, cry, I don't know what--all in three seconds...that's impossible."[6] Recalling the passage quoted earlier from All God's Chillun Got Wings when O'Neill instructs the actress playing Ella to effect "a tolerant, superior smile, but one of genuine love," or "an indifferent superiority in her words which is maddening," Dewhurst's observation has obvious textual justifications. Like the reader of an O'Neill play, the actress sees the paratext; in performance, however, it is doubtful that she can then translate this paratext verbatim as the playwright apparently wishes. Often the result of such authorial dictatorship is the actor's artistic frustration.

O'Neill's paratextual stage directions create serious anxiety for actors because in performance much of the text to which they feel beholden--containing, as it were, the

author's direct "voice"--remains mute on the page. To mediate this obvious disjunct between page reality and stage reality, actors create elaborate parallel subtexts which, in turn, motivate the iconic and indexical signs they construct to provide missing expository clarity. Still, it is unlikely that, in this instance at least, O'Neill's intentions can be realized in the same form and with the same specificity as he seems to have desired. That exciting performances of All God's Chillun Got Wings and other O'Neill's plays nevertheless "happen" testifies to the great creative license actors assume in iconizing what they interpret to be his notes lost within the silent paratext. In most cases, however, actors prefer to be saddled with fewer, not more, prescriptive notes to translate since they will have fewer reasons to blame themselves when they ultimately fail to completely translate these notes into action.

Shakespearean actors exercise creative license as well, and they also construct marvelous subtexts to support the words they speak. The difference is that the words they speak more often embed or strongly suggest the paratextual performance signs originally developed by Shakespeare and his fellow actors. As I have suggested earlier, Shakespearean dialogue contains variable amounts of performance suggestions. Some of it, as in the beginning of 1.2 recounted earlier, seems very programmatical; to me, at

least, it was almost as if an inner directorial voice were saying, "Capulet, you must remind the audience of the contract recently signed with Montague." In other passages, however, the embedded paratext seems much less clear.

Whether the dialogue is performatively clear or opaque, some Shakespearean actors seem to want more, not less of it. Richard Pasco, who played the title role in Timon of Athens for the Royal Shakespeare Company in 1980, recounts yearning for more dialogue with which to signify Timon's conflicting emotions. He relates:

> One of my problems in rehearsal was the comparatively little text concerned with the antithetical passions: the passion and urgency of giving in the first half of the play, with only brief scenes in which to convey this instinctive munificence, [sic] in order, to justify later, [sic] the free-ranging misanthropy which makes up the bulk of the latter part of the play." (Brockbank 132)

Later in his interview with Phillip Brockbank, Pasco states that when Timon writes his epitaph, "there are no stage directions as to when and how this is performed" (137). Indeed, he might have added that neither is Timon provided with dialogue that illustrates this action. Finally, concerning the protagonist's death, Pasco laments "We are left uncertain as to how Timon dies" (138).

Pasco wants more dialogue to work with, not less. Quite unlike Dewhurst, who felt tethered by O'Neill's silent authorial intrusions which she could not translate, Pasco yearns for clearer and more extensive directions from within the words he shares with his audience.

In our performance of 3.4 in Morris County, we found variable amounts of performance suggestions within the dialogue. When there seemed to be sufficient information, our job seemed relatively easy: speak our lines with sincerity and, in Noel Coward's memorable phrase, avoid "walking into the curtains." When performance information seemed scant, however, we plotted a very careful performance text in order to aid our audiences' reception.

3.4: A need to bustle

The subject of the action, as in 1.2, is Paris' pursuit of marriage with Juliet; however, much has changed in the interim. Tybalt has just been murdered by Romeo, and the Capulets are in a state of emotional shock. Before fully examining the expository plot of this scene, I would like to set the stage as it appeared in our production at Morris County.

The three characters in this scene are Capulet, Lady Capulet, and Paris. It is night, and the stage is bare save for a small table downstage left (i.e., closest to the

audience and on its right) on which a single lit candle has been pre-set. As the lights come up, the audience hears Juliet's crying for ten odd seconds. After the crying stops, Paris enters the stage followed by two of his servants carrying what appear to be wedding gifts: fine cloth, jewelry, etc. Soon after, Capulet and Lady Capulet enter upstage right. Capulet is costumed in a black cape and Lady Capulet in a long black dress and black veil. On the sleave of his tunic, Paris is wearing a black arm-band.

As I proceed with my analysis, I will connect these semiotic choices of our production team to several related questions concerning text, paratext, and subtext. First, how do these signs supplement and extend meanings apparently suggested by the written text? This analysis includes meanings suggested in this particular scene (3.4) and throughout the play. Second, how successful can a semiotically "rich" performance text such as the one I just introduced from our production--off-stage sound cues, highly suggestive costuming, etc.--compensate for those paratextual stage directions actors find wanting <u>within</u> their dialogue? And last, what is the relationship between the actors' silent subtexts and the signs they employ to concretize it to their audiences?

Since I aim to chart the actors' full motivational journeys through text, paratext, and subtext, I quote the

entire scene below with the reminder to read between the lines.

Capulet Things have fall'n out, sir, so unluckily
That we have had no time to move our
daughter. Look you, she loved her kinsman
Tybalt dearly, And so did I. Well, we were
born to die. 'Tis very late; she'll not come
down tonight.
I promise you, but for your company,
I would have been abed an hour ago.
Paris These times of woe afford no times to woo.
Madam, good night. Commend me to your daughter.
Lady Capulet I will, and know her mind early
tomorrow; Tonight she's mewed up to her heaviness.
Paris offers to go in, and Capulet calls him
again.
Capulet Sir Paris, I will make a desperate tender
Of my child's love. I think she will be ruled
In all respects by me; nay more, I doubt it not.
Wife, go you to her ere you go to bed;
Acquaint her here of my son Paris' love
And bid her (mark you me) on Wednesday next--
But soft? What day is this?
Paris Monday my lord.
Capulet Monday! Ha, ha! Well, Wednesday is too
soon. A Thursday let it be--a Thursday, tell her,

She shall be married to this noble earl.
Will you be ready? Do you like this haste?
We'll keep no great ado--a friend or two,
For hark you, Tybalt being slain so late,
It may be thought we held him carelessly,
Being our kinsman, if we revel much.
Therefore we'll have some half a dozen friends,
And there an end. But what say you to Thursday?
Paris My lord, I would that Thursday were tomorrow.
Capulet Well, get you gone, a Thursday be it then. Go you to Juliet ere you go to bed,
Prepare her, wife, against this wedding day.
Ah, lights for my chamber?
Afore me, it is so very late that we
May call it early by and by.

This is the script we used in Morris County. It is eclectic, deriving, as do all modern playing scripts that I have witnessed, from Q1 and Q2. Most of the dialogue came from Q2, yet we introduced significant changes. I will highlight them as I proceed. We borrowed an important stage direction from Q1--"Paris offers to go in, and Capulet calls him again" (G3r). (It does not appear in Q2.) Although we naturally did not "voice" this paratextual information, I will soon show how it nevertheless "spoke with most miraculous organ."

Now that I have set the stage we created in our production and transcribed the text we used, I want to analyze how our performance and linguistic signs may have succeeded--or failed--to provide the audience with a clear exposition of plot and character both as they appear in 3.4 and throughout the play. I focus mainly, but not exclusively, on Capulet's character and its importance to the plot for two compelling reasons. First, I played Capulet, and can therefore offer an actor's insights from within the role to complement my reader's insights from outside the play. And second, Capulet is almost exclusively entrusted with driving 3.4 through its emotional whirligig. An arithmetic tally of the lines in the scene support this contention: of thirty six lines, he is given twenty nine of them. Since I aim to explore the relationship between performance signs and dialogue, my primary focus on Capulet seems reasonable.

In rehearsals, the three actors and the director decided to "plot" the thirty six line scene into thirds, Capulet's changing intentions providing the divisional markers. We played the first third, from lines one to eleven, intent on signifying that we were mourning Tybalt's death. Capulet and Lady Capulet aimed to dissuade Paris in his suit for Juliet's hand; Paris, malleable to their wishes, allowed himself to be dissuaded and prepared to exit

from the stage. His attempted exit marked the end of the first third of the scene.

The second third, from lines twelve to twenty two, begins with Capulet's decision to marry Juliet to Paris: "Sir Paris, I will make a desperate tender of my child's love...." That decision is not fully revealed, however, until line twenty one: "She shall be married to this noble earl." As I will demonstrate, my fellow actors and I found this section the most difficult to clarify to the audience (and the most necessary). We designed most of our performance text, therefore, with the goal of clarifying this sudden change in Capulet's intentions at the very moment that it apparently happens.

Finally, we decided that the final third of the scene, from line twenty two to thirty six, should contain a mixture of goals from the other two thirds. In particular, we wanted Capulet to vacillate between the despair we decided he <u>should be feeling</u> over Tybalt's murder and the joy we felt he <u>could not prevent</u> himself from feeling in anticipation of Juliet's wedding to Paris.

As may be inferred from my descriptions of his abrupt emotional transitions, we had decided during rehearsals that the play called for a characterologically impulsive and mercurial Capulet. In 3.4 and throughout the play, Shakespeare's text strongly suggests this. In 1.2, he first blunts Paris' hopes for marriage to Juliet--"Earth hath

swallowed all my hopes but she"--and then immediately encourages it--"But woo her, gentle Paris, get her heart." In 1.5, he first placates Tybalt's ire over Romeo's unexpected presence at the Capulet ball--"Content thee, gentle coz, let him alone"--and then turns quickly irate himself when Tybalt refuses to be placated--"He shall be endured.... Am I the master here or you?" And when, in 4.2, the penitent Juliet returns to submit (apparently) to her father's will and marry Paris "a Thursday," his joy overwhelms him. He immediately decides to marry them one day earlier--"I'll have this knot knit up tomorrow [i.e., Wednesday] morning."

His preemptory decision to change the date of the wedding in 4.2 creates major repercussions in the play's dramatic narrative and illustrates how carefully Shakespeare has woven character and plot. A Wednesday wedding contracts dramatic time, leaving Juliet and the Friar with one less day to implement their desperate plan. Decisions Capulet makes in 3.4 prepare the audience for these later events.

In 3.4, Capulet's apparent motivational journey seems no less tumultuous than in 4.2. Capulet enters trying to dissuade Paris from his active pursuit of marriage with Juliet: Tybalt has just been murdered, and the entire Capulet family is in a state of mourning. For Capulet, the dominant notes to be played are shock and despair; however, soon after convincing Paris to temporarily cease his suit--

"'Tis very late. She'll not come down tonight"--Capulet springs into an apparently unmotivated joy. He then immediately reverses his original position on delaying the marriage, offers Juliet's hand to Paris, and, before waiting for Paris' assent, he plans the nuptial arrangements: date--"A Thursday let it be"--and guest list--"So, we'll have half a dozen friends or so/ And there an end." In this last third of his emotional plot as constructed by my colleagues and me in Morris County, he then instructs his wife to immediately inform Juliet of his decision--"Go you to Juliet ere you go to bed/ And prepare her wife against this wedding day"--and finally exits with a joke that only he seems to appreciate--"It is so very late/ That we may call it early by and by."

We constructed a performance text for this scene which we believed would help extend Capulet's characterological portrait as apparently suggested by the written text. In order to create a mood of funereal gloom during the first third of the scene, we used Juliet's off-stage weeping and the costume of the on-stage characters: Paris' black armband, Lady Capulet's black dress and veil, and Capulet's black cape. Since the text suggests that Capulet and Juliet experience deep remorse--"Look you, she loved her kinsman Tybalt dearly. And so did I"--we wanted to provide specular and auricular referents to signify that remorse.

In the second third of the scene, after Capulet decides

to marry Juliet to Paris, we had him remove his cape and Lady Capulet's veil in order signal this emotional change which is only obliquely suggested by the dialogue. Further, Paris' early entrance before the Capulets, an entrance as may be recalled which was accompanied by servants carrying gifts, was also planned in order to help the audience "see" Capulet's sudden change. But the importance of the gifts may have not have been understood immediately upon Paris' entrance.

As Paris entered, the servants paraded the gifts downstage (nearest the audience), and then placed them on a part of the stage that was out of Capulet's and Lady Capulet's immediate sight lines as they entered seconds later. Further, the servants remained quietly near the gifts so as not to attract Capulet's attention. To the audience, we hoped these iconic signs clarified Paris' intentions beyond all reasonable doubt: he had come, once again (and against all odds), to secure Capulet's consent to marry Juliet. To the other characters, however, particularly Capulet, we hoped the physical location of those signs delayed his understanding of Paris' full intentions until he reached the line beginning, "Sir Paris...."

They gave us, in effect, an ace-in-the-hole to be played at the appropriate moment. Taking no note of those gifts at first, I, as Capulet, played sincere remorse over

Tybalt's death; however, when Paris turned up-stage right to begin to exit (i.e, away from the audience), I turned toward him to gesturally signal a polite "good night." But as I turned, I spied the gifts and suddenly realized that Verona's most eligible, most wealthy bachelor was about to leave my house profoundly disappointed at not having secured his marriage to my daughter.

This was the most difficult transition for me in the scene. More will come of it a little later. At this juncture, however, I want to conclude my side-by-side analysis of the linguistic text/performance text relationship by considering the last third of the scene as we divided it.

We constructed no other iconic signs in order to illustrate Capulet's vacillating emotions in the last third of the scene: e.g., he seems buoyed about the now impending wedding--"Do you like this haste?" he brags to Paris--and all at once embarrassed about trampling on the memory of his nephew not eight hours dead--We'll keep no great ado--a friend or two;/ For hark you, Tybalt being slain so late,/ It might be thought we held him carelessly/ Being our kinsman, if we revel much." Instead, we used the same signs already on stage to show his inner conflict: my visual recognition of the gifts motivated my buoyancy; my visual recognition of Paris' black armband (a conventional sign of "death") served to remind me of the prior funeral.

We planned what may be called a highly polysemic production in hopes of achieving two related goals. Since Capulet's impulsiveness seemed to us to be important to the play's structure, we wanted to provide the audience with signs which might appear to legitimately motivate Capulet's sincere remorse at the beginning of the scene, as well as his sudden jubilation only moments later. We thought his impulsiveness would "read" better if constructed around these two highly antithetical emotions. Second, we felt the dialogue had motivational lacunae which, without the visible signs offered by our performance text, might have left the audience guessing at why or when Capulet's impulse occurred.

This being said, the audience may have still been left guessing even after we performed the scene. Each and every sign encoded by theatre semioticians--actors, playwrights, directors, costumers etc.--may not be decoded by audiences. Indeed, a highly polysemic performance text constructed with the intent to clarify plot and character may instead only muddy them. More signs, and more kinds of signs, may perhaps only increase the competition for the audience's attention, further dispersing and fragmenting it instead. It is possible that a semiotically spare construct--perhaps a staged reading sans costume, sans set, sans everything but the spoken dialogue--might have had as strong a possibility of signifying the necessary questions of this scene as did our highly wrought production in Morris County. Although I

believe our choices made good theatrical sense, they were, after all, only choices.

At least one of our choices has a theatrical analogue, however. The Q1 stage direction--"Paris offers to go in, and Capulet calls him again"--suggests a precedent for our own proposed solutions to the problems in this scene. Is it possible that the original actors had had difficulty in signaling Capulet's mercurial about-face just as we had? The answer is a qualified, "Yes." While the stage direction might have been imperative (i.e., "You, Paris, are directed to turn away at which point you, Capulet, must begin your line 'Sir Paris'"), it might just as easily have been descriptive: (i.e., "Since Paris exited before Capulet's line in yesterday's performance, I'll record that move in my promptbook"). If it was descriptive, moreover, it would indicate that consciously or intuitively the actor playing Paris exited--and therefore forever changed the recorded, written text--in order to aid the motivational change the actor playing Capulet had decided to signify. A purely theatrical concern may have inspired this textual reformation, a reformation, it might be noted, included within most modern editions of the play.[7]

I have already begun addressing the second question I posed earlier: did our performance text compensate for what we perceived to be linguistic gaps in the written text? My earlier qualification on Veltrusky's analysis as it pertains

to Shakespeare's texts may now be recalled. Unlike the texts of most modern playwrights in which the size and number of gaps seems inversely proportional to the amount of extra-dialogic directions, Shakespearean texts exhibit gaps which appear directly proportional to the absence or presence of intra-dialogic stage directions.

Colleen Dewhurst, it may be recalled, felt motivationally constricted by O'Neill's paratextual stage directions; in contrast, Richard Pasco lamented that there was "comparatively little text concerned with [Timon's] antithetical passions." As Capulet I felt as Pasco did: I wanted more words with which I could clarify my character's "antithetical passions." Because Shakespeare's texts contain few extra-dialogic stage directions, those performance suggestions which he does include inhere within the dialogue itself. In 3.4 at least, I felt more words would have granted me a better opportunity of being understood.

Some moments in 3.4 seemed to play clearly to our audiences; during other moments--especially the major change from funereal gloom to pre-nuptial jubilation--we were particularly unsure if we had been understood. Describing our performance text in greater detail might help to point out these differences.

As I describe how our performance attempted to compensate for those moments during which the intra-dialogic

paratext seemed performatively "mute," I want to reintroduce the textual entity which actors create beneath their dialogue to serve this purpose: the actor's motivational subtext.

Kier Elam describes its goal as "bridging the psychological and experiential divide between the actor's saying and the character's doing" ("Much Ado" 46). The subtext, then, like the paratext, is never voiced, yet it aims to make the audience's "hearing" or "reading" perhaps more recognizable. In a production such as ours, which emphasized the theatre's synecdochic power to make "one little room" seem "an everywhere" (and every character's most minute twitch and gurgle significant), we meant our subtext to justify the signs we chose, and we meant for the signs we chose to reveal our subtext.

3.4: Micro-description

What follows, then, is a sign-by-sign analysis of moments in 3.4 as we played it in Morris County. I use the three-part division of the scene which I have previously outlined as a structural guide to my following analysis, recalling, as I do, the signs I have already introduced (i.e., Paris' servants and nuptial gifts, Juliet's off-stage crying, and the black veil, armband, and cape), and cataloging gestural and intonational signs not previously

mentioned. Moreover, here I attempt to draw connections between the motivational subtext beneath these signs, the signs themselves, and the spoken dialogue.

Actors working within contemporary twentieth-century traditions of their craft frequently construct a motivational subtext from their characters' goals: "I want this," or "I must have that." And then, a few moments later, "Now I want this" after dramatic circumstances have inevitably evolved. These constitute the actor's objectives, objectives which dictate his motivational plot throughout a series of actions. While directors in rehearsal and playwrights in paratextual notes may often instruct actors to play "adjectives" or "verbs"--be happy, show love--actors have found that only by playing a dynamic series of objectives will their performances easily translate into actions that an audience can see and understand. (Recall Dewhurst's complaint that she couldn't "laugh [and] cry... all in the same moment.") For Capulet, I therefore played subtextual objectives, not characterological qualities. The audience was at its pleasure to give those qualities its own nomenclature.

In the first third of the scene (lines 1-12), I decided Capulet's objectives were to temporarily dissuade Paris from his pursuit of marriage to Juliet so that he and his family might be left alone as they grieved Tybalt's murder. But he does not want to insult Paris since he eventually plans to

accede to Paris' objective: "I must marry Juliet." My objectives as Capulet in the first third of 3.4 led me to paraphrase my speeches to him in modern language such as: "Don't go away angry, just go away."

The actor playing Paris obviously wanted something quite different, and the dramatic tension in the beginning of this scene derived from the clash between the antithetical objectives of these two characters. Paris wanted nothing less than a promise of marriage despite surrounding events which had apparently made the achievement of this objective highly unlikely (e.g., Tybalt's murder, Juliet's distress, etc.). As a production team, therefore, we constructed a performance text which aimed to display the antithetical motivational subtexts of Capulet and Paris.

As I outlined earlier, our production crew added several semiotic elements to our performance in order to lay the foundation for this motivational confrontation <u>before the dialogue began</u>. First, Juliet's off-stage wailing cast a funereal pall over the dialogue which was soon to ensue. It acted as an acoustical index which pointed <u>to</u> its referent (i.e., Juliet's grief), and it presupposed the actual existence of this grief as a condition the audience was expected to factor into the emotional subtext of the scene. The moment before Paris appeared on-stage, then, the audience was immediately warned that his goal of marrying Juliet might be met with impediments.

Deictic reference may be the theatre's most characteristic way of making meaning since it "forces the attention to the particular object intended" (Pierce, Pierce 181). Deictic signs include the personal and demonstrative pronouns which situate the basic conversational dialogue (I and you), and which locate the objects of that dialogue either unemphatically (she/he/it) or emphatically (this, that, etc.). Further, deixis includes adverbs of time and place which situate dramatic discourse in time and space: (here and now, there and then). Juliet's off-stage wailing happened not on-stage (here) but off (there), yet, since it was heard by the audience, it inhered within the dramatic present (the now). Deictic power, however, also situated her crying in the dramatic past (the then). Like the proverbial "smoking gun," it led the audience's collective imagination back toward Tybalt's murder.

It may have also led them to the true source of Juliet's grief: Romeo's banishment. In this instance, deictic reference proved to be marvelously economical and subtly ironic. The simple addition of ten seconds of Juliet's crying not only helped prepare the audience for Capulet's grief which was to ensue, but it also pointed back in time to the discrepancy between what Juliet knows and what her father yet does not: she is already married to Romeo. The audience's horror which likely accompanies Capulet's decision to change his mind and allow Paris to

marry Juliet later in the scene draws directly upon this discrepancy.

After Juliet's off-stage wailing had ceased, Paris entered followed by two servants carrying what we hoped the audience would understand to be "wedding gifts": fine cloth and jewelry. On Paris' gestural command, his servants placed the gifts downstage center (nearest the audience) and thereafter stood at attention next to them. He inspects the gifts, decides that they are worthy with a nod of his head, and gesturally orders the servants to deposit the gifts upstage right (on the audience's left). He then takes a small box from a pocket in his cloak, opens it, and inspects the "wedding ring" inside of. With a nod to show that he approves of the ring, he puts it away. And in a final moment in the performance text immediately prior to the spoken dialogue, he begins to pace nervously to-and-fro.

As may be obvious, these signs were meant to appear to be the concrete manifestations of Paris' subtextual objective which might be translated as, "I must convince this old man to allow me to marry his daughter." And these signs were also meant to hint at the imagined dramatic past: i.e., he had been elaborately preparing for his audience with Capulet for some time. As with Juliet's crying, we once again attempted to indicate both immediate and prior dramatic "facts." In this instance, however, Paris' subtextual motivations were the primary focus.

By the time we arrived at the first spoken line, therefore, we had already "said" quite a lot. Whether the audience understood all of it is impossible to know. Nevertheless, by exploiting the theatre's synechdochic resonance, we aimed to infuse the discourse in 3.4 with an imaginary but clear narrative history.

The first line of the scene, Capulet's "Things have fall'n out, sir, so unluckily/ That we have had no time to move our daughter" is likewise synechdochic, for it seems a response to an unheard question which we as actors and audience are encouraged to infer happened immediately before off-stage. That question--Paris'--might be imaginatively phrased as "Have you asked her if she'll marry me yet?" But however our audiences may have imagined this inferred question, our production team in Morris County provided several costume signs to supplement Capulet's politely elaborated denial when he speaks his first line.

As I previously mentioned, we costumed Capulet and Lady Capulet in traditional black in order to signify that they were in a state of mourning: Lady Capulet in long black dress and veil, Capulet in hooded black cape. We moved and spoke slowly at the beginning of the scene, reinforcing the solemnity signaled by the costumes. In contrast, Paris' costume included only a black arm-band over the sleeve of a resplendent gold-and-maroon robe. Not of the immediate family, but wanting to show his sympathies, his mourning

"statement" was considerably more restrained than theirs. His movements, moreover, reflected his tepid remorse. His pacing in short, staccato strides before Capulet entered signaled his nervous anticipation of his audience with the man whom he hoped would soon be his father-in-law. After Capulet and his wife entered, however, his movements assumed a more strained lugubriousness. He abruptly halted his nervous, twitchy movements and stood choir-boy-like with his hands folded in front of his waist. As I (Capulet) spoke my first speech, the actor playing Paris avoided direct visual contact with me, directing his gaze deferentially toward the stage floor instead.

Though we might pose many more questions about the Morris County performance text during the first third of this scene--for instance, does Capulet signify bitterness or resignation with his "Well, we were born to die," and how would each of those qualities be signified--I want to move on to the very beginning of what we called the second part of the scene. We decided that Capulet's impulsive decision to marry Juliet to Paris began somewhere after the last line in his first big speech--"I promise you, but for your company,/ I would have been abed an hour ago"--but before the first line of his next speech--"Sir Paris, I will make a desperate tender/ Of my child's love." We found the subtextual motivational change beneath this dialogue--from "Paris, you must leave" to "Paris you must marry her"--

difficult to signify.

As Capulet, I wanted words that stated this change. Since Shakespeare gave the character none until nine lines later when he finally and explicitly says, "She shall be married to this noble earl," our production team sought to build a performance text to compensate for what we perceived to be this linguistic gap.

Shakespeare may have been indifferent to this "gap," leaving it to his fellow actors to fill-it-out in performance, or he may have consciously delayed mentioning Capulet's about-face in the dialogue in order to allow his fellow actors the freedom of choosing their own means of clarifying it. "Genuinely performable" dramatic texts, says Kier Elam, "will leave space for the movement and self-display of the body and its accessories on stage, pointing to them explicitly through direct reference or calling upon them implicitly through the 'gaps' left by the incomplete linguistic reference" (Shakespeare 50). In our production, we found 3.4, indeed all of Romeo and Juliet, "genuinely performable." And it was the actors' bodies and their "accessories" which we ultimately employed to clarify this difficult moment in 3.4.

As Capulet, I had to manipulate my subtext: all of a sudden, I had to demand that Paris stay rather than leave. While Capulet's speeches do not explicitly state this change, our performance text borrowed elements from both of

the original quarto texts which help to implicitly infer it.

After Paris agrees to temporarily cease his suit, Q1 contains the stage direction, "Paris offers to go in, and Capulet calls him again." Q2 does not contain this paratextual note. Q2, in contrast, includes dialogue for Lady Capulet which Q1 does not. To Paris' "Commend me to your daughter," Lady Capulet replies, "I will, and know her mind early tomorrow./ Tonight she's mew'd up to her heaviness." We constructed our performance text around Q1's showing and Q2's saying in order to provide several external justifications for Capulet's subtextual transition.

After I had delivered my line, "But for your company/ I would have been abed an hour ago," I crossed downstage right away from Paris. I wanted to remove myself from his immediate proximity so that I might express what I, the performer, paraphrased as Capulet's rather blunt feeling: "You must leave now, damn you, for it is very late." Even though Capulet tries to remain polite to Verona's most eligible bachelor, I decided that this line seemed less polite than the ones prior to it: ("Things have fall'n out, SIR , so un Luck ily, etc.).

Consequently, my physical distancing allowed me to deliver my line "I promise you, but for your company,/ I would have been abed an hour ago" to the audience while simultaneously suggesting that I was not sharing it with Paris. Further, I spoke the line in an audible "stage

whisper," the semiotic code for which allows audiences to hear what other dramatic characters apparently cannot. While I did not deliver the line as a formal aside by turning directly to the audience, my stage position and vocal aspiration served the same function: "to explore the dramatic situation of an individual versus the rest, making distinctions between characters and providing visual [and audio] ironies within the framework of the scene itself" (Styan, "The Actor" 57).

After my move and line, Paris delivered his lines "These times of woe afford no time to woo./ Madam, good night. Commend me to your daughter" and began to exit. I remained facing away from him downstage right. But when Lady Capulet delivered her line with the following paralinguistic stress, "__I__will, and know _Her_ mind early tomorrow," I suddenly realized that my wife and my thirteen year old daughter would soon be making a decision that only I, the patriarch, should make. As I abruptly turned to rebuke my wife for making such an absurd suggestion, Paris had reached his servants who had been standing motionless in the dimly lit upstage area. Spying the gifts which they were beginning to hoist onto their shoulders, I suddenly realized that by dismissing Paris I could lose my opportunity to improve my family's societal standing by marrying my daughter to nobility. If Paris left, he might not come again. I changed my subtext; it was now "I must

marry them quickly." Q1's stage direction and Q2's speech given to Lady Capulet helped me construct a complex characterological portrait of Juliet's father: sincerely remorseful over Tybalt's death, paternalistic and overbearing towards his daughter, and shrewd enough to comprehend the wisdom of uniting his family with Paris'.

Before continuing with my description of our production in Morris County, I would like to consider several other possible performance texts suggested by Q1 and Q2 at this moment in 3.4.

In Q1, Lady Capulet is mute both at this moment when Paris exits and throughout the scene. Unfortunately we have no way of knowing how the actor who played the role in the original performances gestured, or which part of the stage "she" occupied while the other characters spoke. We may infer, however, that her silence may signify the character's respectful obedience: she lives in a man's world and marital alliances are a man's business. We may also compare the comportment of the character in this scene to her deferential and private suggestion to her husband in 4.2. Contritely she asks him to delay Juliet's wedding for a day--"I pray my lord, let it be Thursday" (G1v). The character in Q2 seems much more assertive.

As discussed in the last chapter, Lady Capulet reacts much differently in Q2's version of 4.2. Instead of waiting for the Nurse and Juliet to exit as her counterpart does in

Q1, she publicly contradicts her husband about advancing the date of the wedding: "No, not till Thursday." In 3.4, her aggressive and domineering qualities can also be inferred from the line which only Q2 includes. Although she assures Paris that she will go to Juliet to "know her mind" tomorrow morning, her earlier insistence in Q2 that Juliet strongly consider marrying Paris in 1.3 suggests that she will instruct, not consult, her daughter "tomorrow" morning.

What do the two versions of Lady Capulet lead us to infer about the Capulets in Q1 and Q2? And how would an actor semiotically signal different portraits of Capulet through sign-by-sign action. Discounting for a moment those performance signs which we can only imagine, the actor playing Capulet in Q1 seems to have Paris' attempted exit as the primary sign through which to motivate his sudden change, while the actor playing Capulet in Q2 seems to have Lady Capulet's self assertive power play as the motivation for suddenly deciding that only he himself will decide to marry Juliet to Paris. Our production, constructed from Q1's stage direction, Q2's dialogue, and many of our own performance inventions, presented a semiotically overdeternmined performance text which hoped to characterize Capulet as remorseful and paternalistic and entrepreneurial.

As I have cautioned previously, no one can say if the audience decoded all--or even most--of what our production team attempted to signify. The nature of theatrical

discourse relies upon a plurality of sign systems, all of which may, at any moment in the performance, produce signs simultaneously. This simultaneous semiotic pressure on an audience necessarily fragments its ability to decode all that is happening on stage. Dialogue, for example, may submerge "below the surface of the spectator's conscious attention" while stage "business" is consciously attended to, or gesture may submerge below the consciousness while the spectator focuses on dialogue, etc. (Honzl, "Dynamics" 90). In my previous discussion of 5.3 in chapter 2, the dead bodies of Paris and Romeo, the dialogue of Juliet and the Friar, and the off-stage sound announcing the arrival of the Prince's guard were shown to encourage the audience's bifurcated attention. Comparing this to our performance text at 3.4, some members of the audience would have doubtless taken no note of my redirected gaze as I spied the gifts, and others might have been watching Lady Capulet's reaction to Paris' servants as they began to take the gifts off stage with them. (Noticing them the moment I did, she rushed toward the servants and physically obstructed their exit.) Still other audience members, perhaps attending to the stage set or the characters' costumes, may have failed to understand the signification of the "gifts" from the start.

But iconic signs such as these produce sustained semiotic pressure. As the dead bodies of Romeo and Paris

gave ironic connotations to Juliet's "Ah, comfortable friar," so too did the physical presence of Paris' wedding gifts "comment" upon the early action in 3.4 even before the Capulets apparently noticed them. Further, the funereal costuming of the Capulets drew ironic attention to Paris' colorful tunic only superficially supplemented by a black arm-band. The contrast in costumes aimed to show the Capulets' sincere grief against Paris' mere politic statement of it.

Although iconic signs like gifts and servants offer a kind of material presence linguistic signs cannot match, performers can seldom be sure that the same information they encode into such material signs will be decoded by the audience. In short, although our production team felt the additions to the stage picture I have previously mentioned would have helped clarify Capulet's evolving intentions in this scene, we also felt we had more work to do. If his sudden change might not be clarified immediately upon the line which apparently marks it--"Sir Paris..."--we believed we should develop stage action that might grasp the audience's attention as soon as possible after the line.

In effect, we hedged our bets against the audience's fragmented consciousness by inventing costume-iconic signs to supplement the servants and gifts. These served not only to immediately remind the audience of Tybalt's prior murder as I mentioned earlier, but they also served to signify

Capulet's dynamic series of modulating objectives as the scene progresses. If Capulet's initial subtextual objective was "Paris, you must leave us to our grief," his next--inspired by Paris' attempted exit--was "I can't let Verona's most eligible bachelor get away." After that decision was made, the costume signs worn by the characters triggered his incipient objective: "I must dispel this oppressive funereal gloom that hangs over my family."

The characters wore the overlays of black on their costumes so I, as Capulet, might take them off. As I have discussed, we decided that Capulet's change of intentions occurs at line twelve but is not textually stated until line twenty one--"She shall be married to this noble earl." In that nine line section we decided to use the doffing of mourning attire as a sign that Capulet had put his remorse over Tybalt's death suddenly behind him.

By the use of various gestural signs, I, as Capulet, essentially removed from myself and my two fellow actors the "signs of death." That is to say, I planned to demonstrate an escalating sense of purpose in the character to "put this funereal gloom behind him" by using the costume signs in dynamic configurations.

Capulet may make a sudden decision to marry Juliet to Paris, but the actor playing him may decide that all the ramifications of his decision need not dawn upon Capulet at once. While audiences experience a fragmented consciousness

during performance due to the polysemous nature of theatrical discourse, actors, depending on the needs of the play, may often choose to play a character whose own consciousness appears fragmented or dispersed. I chose to play Capulet this way in this scene.

First, at line twelve, he reflexively implores Paris to remain in order that Juliet's chances for this most attractive groom will not be irreparably lost. After committing this "desperate tender of [his] child's love," however, he hesitates. It does not take him long to reassure himself that she will obey him, but the escalation from hesitancy to assurance provided the perfect point at which to use the first costume sign: the black mourning cape.

The two lines in question read: "I think she will be ruled/ In all respects by me; nay, more, I doubt it not." I placed focal or intonational stress on "think", "me" and "not" in order to first signify hesitancy--"I Think " (but am not sure)--and, shortly after, growing self confidence--"that she will be ruled in all respects by ME !" (Why, of course! Who else but me?). I gesturally signaled this growing confidence by extending my arms from my body and by broadly spreading my hands and fingers apart. (B. L. Joseph reprints a gesture quite like the one I used and calls it "Triumpho" 8.) Finally arriving at "I doubt it NOT ," I simultaneously moved my hands from my chest to my black cape

and grandly swept it off my shoulders.

Unlike some iconic signs, paralinguistic signs such as stress, intonation, pace, and volume change from performance to performance. Further, many of them are not planned but simply "happen." It is therefore likely that past performers of this scene created subtly or extravagantly different qualities. For instance, if an actor consciously or subconsciously altered the stress pattern to sound like this--"I think she will be RULED in ALL respects by me"--subtle differences in the character might be noted. He might be indicating that he would decide whether the marriage would take place, not Lady Capulet or Juliet. Further, instead of inferring that he will coax Juliet into acquiescing to the marriage ("I think"), his stress on RULED would boldly assure Paris that the marriage was for all practical purposes fait accompli. Finally, by stressing ALL, he might be alerting his wife that we would manage the wedding arrangements entirely. (In fact, he says in 4.2 that "I'll play the housewife for this once.")

Other paralinguistic options would no doubt shape a subtly different Capulet. All possibilities cannot be examined. Before returning to our production in Morris County, however, I would like to briefly consider just one other set of variations.

Our dialogue originated from Q2. In Q1, linguistic and paralinguistic variations may have caused a more than subtle

difference in Capulet's characterological portrait. As Paris begins to exit, the Q1 text reads:

> Sir Paris? I'll make a desperate tender of my child.
>
> I think she will be ruled in all respects by me:
>
> But soft what day is this. (G3r)

In contrast to Q2, Capulet offers to tender not his child's love, but Juliet herself. On the one hand, this unconditional forfeiture of his very daughter seems desperate indeed; in contrast to Q2 on the other hand, he doesn't seem to need to reassure himself that Juliet will accept his decision. Since the line "Nay, more, I doubt it not," does not appear in Q1, the character may "read" as being more decisive than his Q2 counterpart.

Paralinguistic choices could reaffirm or annul this apparent characterological decisiveness as indicated by the Q1 text. In comparison to the set of options I previously introduced in the Q2 text, stressing the pronoun in I'LL and the words RULED and ALL might confirm a decisive, paternalistic Capulet; however, by placing great stress and a rising, speculative intonation on thiiiNK, the actor might annul the characterological portrait suggested by the words of the text.

By briefly considering only those paralinguistic possibilities suggested by the two quarto texts, it is apparent that both recorded versions of Romeo and Juliet

have inspired (and will no doubt continue to inspire) different performance text reformations. When gestural and iconic variations are imaginatively figured in, those reformations seem significant. Our production in Morris County is valuable because its performance reformations need not be imagined: for me, as an interested participant and observer, they happened. This is testimony to the peculiar power of performance to reify the abstract possibilities of the written text. I now return to my description of that production.

As I (i.e., Capulet) swept the black cape off my shoulders, the gesture was meant to first serve as the physical exclamation for the thoughts and emotions which had just been concluded: I was convinced Juliet would accept the marriage. But our team also planned the gesture to motivate Capulet's developing subtextual desire "to put the gloom of the funeral" behind him. To this effect, signs from several of our technical semioticians were added to our performance text.

Removing the cape, for instance, revealed the bold green and orange colors our costume designer had decided aptly defined the qualities of the Capulet family: nouveau riche and culturally boorish. Input from the lighting designer may have further enhanced the costume change from full black to orange and green: lighting intensity was slightly increased, and the palette of gels or filters which

cover the lights subtly switched from blues to yellows. When I swept off my cape, then, I was sweeping away the memory of Tybalt's murder along with it--even if my character was not immediately aware of it. At least that was the goal of the production crew and the actors who together had contrived, at that exact moment, such a stunning reformation of the stage picture.

Once I had impulsively swept the cape from my shoulders, however, I could let the significance of the action slowly grow upon me. I looked down at it, and then tossed it on a chair. The action of sweeping off the cape provided the physical cue--externally to the audience, but internally to me--to begin to exploit the second subtextual motivation on which I had based the emotional plot of the character in this scene: i.e., "A wedding would be the perfect antidote to the funeral." I manipulated the next costume sign now fully conscious of my intention to put Tybalt out of my mind.

I also wanted to put Tybalt out of my wife's mind. Because I wanted to share with her my sudden realization of the potential joy Juliet's wedding might reap, I signaled that new intention by lifting her veil over her face and detaching it from her hat. The two lines which follow the line, "I doubt it not," provided the opportunity.

They read: "Wife, go you to her ere you go to bed/ Acquaint her here of my son Paris' love." I first turned to

face her at the beginning of this two line sequence. That alone was significant since I had maintained exclusive visual, gestural, and linguistic focus vis-a-vis Paris before this moment. To further emphasize my relationship with Lady Capulet at this moment, I approached her directly, moving on a straight line toward her while I delivered the first of the two lines. As I reached her and the second line simultaneously, I lifted the veil, detached it from her hat, and tossed it off-stage left. The removal of the veil at this moment, and of the cape several moments before, were intended to provide visual cues to clarify Capulet's intention to put Tybalt's murder behind him. Whether the audience would have fully decoded these signs is, again, impossible to guess.

Some might object to the characterological impressions resulting from some of the actions I have just described. Does throwing the veil take Capulet's self confidence past reasonable bounds and into the realm of melodramatic bluster? Who can say for sure? Capulet seems incapable of exercising emotional control elsewhere in the play, as anyone who has read with horror his cruel and violent treatment of Juliet in 3.5 can attest.[8] Still, we actors--or should I say this actor--may have gone too far here in this production at Morris County. But we all thought it necessary to clarify as soon as possible Capulet's changing intentions in this scene. The costume signs were planned

for just that reason. Yet there remained one more sign--Paris' arm-band--which I, as Capulet, did not remove but which served, we hoped, to add a shading of embarrassment to the portrait of a man who had just trampled on the memory of his nephew not eight hours dead.

After discarding Lady Capulet's veil on "She shall be married to this noble earl," and stressing the word MARRIED in order to emphasize the reason for my newly discovered joy, I took delight in the sudden realization that my own change in plans may not as yet have been fully appreciated by the prospective groom. On my next two lines, I (1) crossed to Paris on "Will you be ready?" and (2) grabbed his arm in a gesture of burly bonhomie on "Do you like this haste?" As I grabbed his arm, however, accompanying the line with full-throated laughter, I "found" my hand resting on his black arm-band. (As the actor I obviously planned it, but the character was meant to appear surprised). This visual reminder of the very recent death of Tybalt helped me signal the last major shift in the scene.

I used Paris' arm-band to begin the next section of vacillating intentions. After clasping his arm on "Do you like this haste," I took note of his arm-band. Suddenly I became aware of having gone too far and of a need to assume a respectful attitude toward Tybalt. My next lines read: "We'll keep no great ado--a friend or two;/ For hark you, Tybalt being slain so late,/ It may be thought we held him

carelessly/ Being our kinsman, if we revel much." During this passage, I retrieved the black cape I had earlier discarded and placed it on my shoulders.

Again, the Q1 script provides an interesting counterpoint to our production of this scene. The lines apparently suggesting Capulet's embarrassment at having momentarily forgotten Tybalt's murder are not included in Q1. Instead, most of his speech following his announcement of the wedding--"On Thursday let it be: you shall be married"--seems primarily concerned with instructing his wife:

> Wife go you to your daughter, ere you go to bed. Acquaint her with County Paris love. Farewell my lord till Thursday next. Wife get you to your daughter.

His commands to his wife, much nearer to one another than they are in the Q2 version, emphasize not only his control, but also his impatience. More interesting yet, his pronomial indices indicate a strange disassociation with Juliet now that the marriage contract has been made. Capulet refers to Juliet twice as "<u>your</u> daughter," while he had earlier told Paris that "we have had no time to move <u>my</u> daughter." It seems as if his earlier appropriation of Juliet--"<u>my</u> daughter" and "I'll make a desperate tender of <u>my</u> child"--now complete, he willingly disowns her. Considering the alarming threat he makes to Juliet later in

the play--"Hang, drown, starve, beg./ Die in the streets; for by my soul/ I'll never more acknowledge thee" (H1r)--his sudden divestiture in 3.4 seems characterologically consistent.

Q2's text would also provide useful counterpoint to our production in Morris County, for although we made use of the Q2's dialogue in Q2, our performance text significantly reformed the words as they exist on its page. By including Q1's important stage direction, we added breadth to the relationship between Capulet and his wife, and by planning Paris' early entrance, we shaped a round character from an apparently "flat" one. Finally, the wedding gifts, servants, costumes, lighting changes, and off-stage crying attempted to provide the audience with a history prior to the stage "present" while simultaneously indicating the possibility of actions which were yet to come.

The performance signs of our past, present, and future may or may not derive directly from those others have used before us, and they may or may not influence the ones others will subsequently choose. Our product, then, cannot be called definitive; our process, however, may be called paradigmatic.

Romeo and Juliet, incorporating the contributions of Shakespeare and the actors of the Chamberlain's Men, may only live anew when modern actors and their fellow semioticians embrace it in performance. And each embrace is

but prologue to yet another act of intriguing reformations.

Texts descending to us from Shakespeare offer unusually rich opportunites to explore these reformations because I believe they were originally conceived with and through collaborations with actors. Modern interpreters sense this almost immediately upon first picking up a Shakespearean script. Modern editors sense this too. When those editors fail to appreciate the full value of scripts like Q1 Romeo and Juliet, however--which they nevertheless believe to be performance tested--they deprive themselves of a fuller working knowledge of Shakespeare's theatre and our own. Semiotics offers the means by which this knowledge may be fed.

Semiotics teaches us that meaningful codes are contained within texts whether or not we can discern who was responsible for those codes. Indeed, semiotic inquiry encourages us to focus on the meanings, not the authors of those meanings, and on what is marvelously "open, incomplete, [and] insufficient" (Scholes 15) about those meanings. When we are led to this exciting yet provisional conclusion, we may then begin to complete them for ourselves. Shakespeare's own contribution to the two quartos of Romeo and Juliet is not diminished by our knowledge that he may not have been "after all, the first speaker" of this story "the one who disturb[ed] the eternal silence" (Bakhtin 69). For modern readers, performers,

students, and editors, the multiple versions of Romeo and Juliet demonstrate the voices of various Elizabethan speakers. And within that collaborative context, we are invited to join in the on-going dialogue ourselves.

Notes

1 New historicists have demonstated how many of Shakespeare's plays often respond to, and are shaped by, highly specific cultural phenomena, and these new readings have immensely broadened our knowledge of the Elizabethans. From a professional performer's perspective, however, I believe the process of transferring words on the page to action on the stage remains for modern performers much as it was for the Chamberlain's Men.

2 This production information comes from Marivaux's Les Fausses confidences.

3 See Eugene O'Neill: Anna Christie, The Emperor Jones, and The Hairy Ape. New York: Vintage Books, 1972: 97.

4 See my earlier discussion of this passage in "Semiotic Transformability in All God's Chillun Got Wings." The Eugene O'Neill Review. Spring, 1992: (25-37). My source for the play is The Plays of Eugene O'Neill. New York: Random House, 1955. Vol. II, 299-342.

5 Throughout this chapter I discuss stress as an important element in the actor's paralinguistic arsenal. Indicating stress on paper, however, is ungainly, especially when a line is meant to show primary and secondary stresses. To indicate primary stress (i.e., the __MOST__ important word in a line as read by the actor), I use all capitals and underlining which begins two spaces before, and continues two spaces beyond, the stressed word. To indicate secondary stress (i.e., a _Very_ important but not __MOST__ important word), I use one space of underlining before and after and begin the word with a capital.

6 As reported in the Eugene O'Neill Review 6.2. (1982):52.

7 Among other editions, this stage direction is included in Gibbons' Arden, Evans' New Cambridge, and Wells' and Taylor's Oxford.

8

He calls her "baggage," "disobedient wretch,", and, worst of all, "green-sickness carrion." He is also willing to disown her completely if she does not obey him and marry Paris: "Hang! Beg! Starve! Die in the streets! For by my soul I'll ne'er acknowledge thee,/ Nor what is mine shall never do thee good." I found this the most difficult (and most interesting) scene to play.

Works Consulted

Abel, Lionel. Metadrama. New York: Hill and Wang, 1963.

Allen, Michael J. B. and Kenneth Muir, Eds. Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto. Berkeley: U of California Press, 1981.

Alter, Jean. "Decoding Mnouchkines's Shakespeare (A Grammar of Stage Signs)." Issacharoff and Jones 75-85.

Bakhtin, M. M. Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Eds. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holoquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986.

Barthes, Roland. Elements of Semiology. Trans. Annette Lavers and Colin Smith. New York: Hill and Wang, 1964.

---. The Responsibility of Forms. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, 1985.

---. "From Work to Text." Image/Music/Text. Trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.

Bentley, Gerald Eades, ed. The Seventeenth Century Stage. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1968.

---. The Profession of Dramatist and Player in Shakespeare's Time. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984.

---. The Life of the Drama. New York: Atheneum, 1964.

Blayney, Peter W. M. The Texts of King Lear and Their Origins. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.

Bogatyrev, Petr. "Semiotics in the Folk Theatre." Trans. Bruce Kochis. Matejka and Titunik 33-50. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989. 33-50.

---. "Forms and Functions in the Folk Theatre." Trans. Bruce Kochis. Matejka and Titunik 51-56.

---. "Costume as Sign." Trans. Yvonne Lockwood. Matejka and Titunik 13-19.

Bowers, Fredson. On Editing Shakespeare. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1966.

Bowers, John M. "Hoccleves's Two Copies of Lerne to Dye: Implications for Textual Critics." The Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America 83 (1989): 437-472.

Bradbrook, M. C. "The Triple Bond: Audience, Actors, and Author in the Elizabethan Playhouse." Price 3-19.

Brecht, Bertold. Brecht on Theatre. Ed. and Trans. John Willett. New York: Hill and Wang, 1964.

Brockbank, Phillip, ed. Players of Shakespeare. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.

Brown, John Russell. "On the Acting of Shakespeare's Plays." Bentley 41-54.

Bullough, Geoffrey, ed. Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare Vol. 1. New York: Columbia UP, 1966.

Burke, Kenneth. A Grammar of Motives. Berkeley: U of California P, 1945.

Byrne, M. St. Clare. "Dramatic Intention and Theatrical Realization." Price, 30-49.

Calderwood, James L. Shakespearian Metadrama. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1969.

Chambers, E. K. The Elizabethan Stage. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1974.

Craig, Hardin. A New Look at Shakespeare's Quartos. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1961.

Davis, Robert Murray. "Writing as Process: Beyond Hershel Parker." Literary Research 12.4 (1987): 179-186.

De Grazia, Margreta. Shakespeare Verbatim. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.

Derrida, Jacques. Of Grammatology. Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1976.

Dessen, Alan C. Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.

Duthie, G. I. "The Text of Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet." Studies in Bibliography IV. University of Virginia Bibliographical Society (1951-52): 3-29.

Eco, Umberto. Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.

Ede, Lise. Work in Progress. 2nd ed. New York: St. Martin's, 1992.

Elam, Kier. Semiotics of Theatre and Drama. London: Metheun, 1980.

---. Shakespeare's Universe of Discourse. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.

---. "Much Ado About Doing Things with Words." Issacharoff and Jones 39-58.

Fisch, Harold. "Character as Linguistic Sign." New Literary History. Spring (1990): 593-606.

Foley, John Miles. "Oral Tradition into Textuality." MLA Convention, New York, Dec., 1992.

Gabler, Hans Walter. "The Text as Process and the Problem of Intentionality." Text 3 (1987): 107-116.

Gamez, Luis R. "The Clown and the Copy-Text: Colley Cibber's Comic Timing and the 1713 Cato Duodecimo." Editing Plays. STS Convention. New York, Apr. 16, 1993.

Gericke, Robert. "Romeo and Juliet nach Shakespeare's Manuscript." Shakespeare Jahrbuch 14 (1879): 270-272.

Goffman, Erving. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Woodstock, N.Y.: Overlook Press, 1973.

Goldberg, Jonathan. "Rebel Letters: Postal Effects from Richard II to Henry IV." Rose 3-28.

Greg, W. W. The Editorial Problem in Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon, 1942.

---. Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare. London: H. Milford, 1928.

---. The Shakespeare First Folio. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.

Hawkes, Terrence. Structuralism and Semiotics. Berkeley: U of California P, 1977.

Hill, T. H. Howard. "Modern Textual Theories and the Editing of Plays." The Library, 6th ser., 10 (1988): 89-115.

Hjort, G. "The Good and Bad Quartos of Romeo and Juliet and Love's Labour's Lost." Modern Language Review. 21.2 (1926): 140-146.

Honzl, Jindřich. "Dynamics of the Sign in the Theatre."

Trans. I. R. Titunik. Matejka and Titunik 74-93.

---. "The Hierarchy of Dramatic Devices." Trans. Susan Larson. Matejka and Titunik 118-127.

Hosley, Richard. "The Corrupting Influence of the Bad Quarto on the Received Text of Romeo and Juliet." Shakespeare Quarterly 4 (1953): 11-33.

---. "The 'Good Night, Good Night' Sequence in Romeo and Juliet." Shakespeare Quarterly 5 (1954): 96-98.

Hornby, Richard. Script into Performance. Austin: U of Texas P, 1977.

---. Drama, Metadrama, and Perception. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1986.

Issacharoff, Michael and Robin F. Jones, eds. Performing Texts. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1988.

Issacharoff, Michael. "Stage Codes." Issacharoff and Jones 59-74.

Jackson, MacD. P. "The transmission of Shakespeare's text." Wells Re-editing: 163-185.

Jakobson, Roman. "Linguistics and Poetics." Style in Language. Ed. Thomas A. Sebeok. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1960. 355-377.

---. Selected Writings. II: Word and Language. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.

Joseph, B. L. Elizabethan Acting. 1st ed. London: Oxford UP, 1951.

---. Elizabethan Acting. 2nd. ed. London: Oxford UP, 1964.

Knutson, Roslyn Lander. The Repertory of Shakespeare's Company, 1564-1613. Fayetteville: U of Arkansas P, 1991.

Kowzan, Tadeuz. "The Sign in the Theatre." Diogenes 61 (1968): 52-80.

Leech, Clifford. "Notes on Dr. Richard Hosley's Suggestions Concerning the Received Text of Romeo and Juliet." Shakespeare Quarterly 5 (1954): 94-95.

Levenson, Jill L. Shakespeare in Performance: Romeo and

Juliet. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1987.

---. "Editing Romeo and Juliet, Quarto 2." Shakespeare. STS Conference. New York, April 16, 1993.

Levin, Harry. Shakespeare and the Revolution of the Times. New York: Oxford UP, 1976.

Lowenstein, Joseph. "Plays Agonistic and Competitive: The Textual Approach to Elsinore." Rose 63-96.

Matejka, Ladislav and Irwin R. Titunik, eds. Semiotics of Art. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1984.

McGann, Jerome J. A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.

Mowat, Barbara. "The Form of Hamlet's Fortunes." Rose 97-126.

Mukařovský, Jan. "Art as Semiotic Fact." Trans. I. R. Titunik. Matejka and Titunik 3-9.

O,Neill, Eugene. All God's Chillun Got Wings. In The Plays of Eugene O.Neill. New York: Random House, 1955. Vol. 2, 299-342.

Patterson, Annabel. "Back by Popular Demand: The Two Versions of Henry V." Rose 29-62.

Pavis, Patrice. Languages of the Stage. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1982.

---. "From Text to Performance." Issacharoff and Jones 86-100.

Pierce, Charles. Collected Papers. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1958.

---. Pierce on Signs. Ed. James Hoopes. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina P, 1991.

Pollard, Alfred W. amd J. Dover Wilson. Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates and Shakespeare's Hand in Sir Thomas More. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1920.

Pollard, Alfred W. and J. Dover Wilson. "The 'stolne and surreptitious' Shakespearian Texts." Times Literary Supplement. Aug. 14 (1919): 434.

Price, Joseph, ed. The Triple Bond. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1975.

Quinn, Michael. "Celebrity and the Semiotics of Acting." New Theatre Quarterly 6 (1990): 154-161.

Rabkin, Gerald. "Is There a Text on this Stage?: Theatre/Authorship/Interpretation." Performing Arts Journal. 9.2-3 (1985): 142-159.

Ringler, William A. Jr. "The Number of Actors in Shakespeare's Early Plays." Bentley 110-134.

Rose, Mary Beth, ed. Renaissance Drama. New Series XIX. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1988.

Rosenberg, Marvin. "Elizabethan Actors: Men or Marionettes?" Bentley 94-109.

---. "Sign Theory and Shakespeare." Shakespeare Survey 40 (1988): 33-40.

Sams, Eric. "Shakespeare or Bottom? The Myth of of 'Memorial Construction'." Encounter Jan. 1989: 41-45.

Saussure, Ferdinand. Course in General Linguistics. London: Fontana, 1974.

Schechner, Richard. Performance Theory. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Scholes, Robert. Semiotics and Interpretation. New Haven: Yale UP, 1982.

Shakespeare, William. Romeo and Juliet: Q1. London, 1597.

---. Romeo and Juliet: Second Quarto. London, 1599.

---. The First Quarto Edition of Romeo and Juliet. Ed. Frank G. Hubbard. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1924.

---. Romeo and Juliet. Ed. Richard Hosley. New Haven: Yale UP, 1954.

---. Romeo and Juliet. Eds. John Dover Wilson and George Ian Duthie. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1955.

---. Romeo and Juliet. Ed. George Walton Williams. Durham: Duke UP, 1964.

---. Romeo and Juliet. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.

---. Romeo and Juliet. Ed. Brian Gibbons. London: Metheun, 1986.

---. Romeo and Juliet. Eds. Barbara Mowat and Paul Werstine. New York: Washington Square Press, 1992.

---. Romeo and Juliet. Ed. J. A. Bryant, Jr. New York: Signet, 1986.

---. The Merchant of Venice. Ed. John Russell Brown. London: Metheun, 1984.

---. Pericles. Ed. F. D. Hoeniger. London: Metheun, 1986.

---. King Henry 8. Ed. R. A. Foakes. London: Metheun, 1986.

---. Titus Andronicus. Ed. J. C. Maxwell. London: Metheun, 1985.

Shattuck, Charles H. The Shakespeare Promptbooks. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1965.

Sommers, Nancy. "Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers." College Composition and Communication 31 (Dec. 1980): 378-388.

Shillingsburg, Peter L. "Text as Matter, Concept, and Action." Studies in Bibliography 44 (1991): 29-82.

Stanislavski, Constantin. Stanislavski's Legacy. Trans. and Ed. Elizabeth Reynolds Hapgood. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1958.

Styan, J. L. Shakespeare's Stagecraft. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967.

---. "The Mystery of the Play Experience: Quince's Questions." Issacharoff and Jones 9-26.

---. "The Actor at the Foot of Shakespeare's Platform." Shakespeare Survey 12 (1959): 56-63.

Suchy, Patricia A. "The Stage Direction as Utterance." Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism 4.1. (1991): 69-82.

Tanselle, G. Thomas. "Textual Criticism and Literary Sociology." Studies in Bibliography 44 (1991): 83-143.

Thomson, Leslie. "Broken Brackets and 'Mended Texts: Stage Directions in the Oxford Shakespeare." Rose 175-193.

Thomson, Peter. "Playhouses and players in the time of Shakespeare." Wells 67-83.

Trousdale, Marion. "A Second Look at Critical Bibliography and the Acting of Plays." Shakespeare Quarterly 41.1 (1990): 87-96.

Urkowitz, Steven. Shakespeare's Revision of King Lear. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1980.

---. "Good News about 'Bad' Quartos." "Bad Shakespeare". Ed. Maurice Charney. Rutherford: Farleigh Dickinson Press, 1988.

---. "Five Women Eleven Ways: Changing Images of Shakespearean Characters in the Earliest Texts." Images of Shakespeare. Ed. Werner Habicht. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1988: 292-304.

Van Laan, Thomas. Role-Playing in Shakespeare. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978.

Veltruský, Jiři. "Dramatic Text as a Component of Theatre." Trans. Jiri Veltruský. Matejka and Titunik 94-117.

---. "Construction of Semantic Contexts." Trans. Jiři Veltrusky. Matejka and Titunik 134-144.

Vygotsky, Lev. Thought and Language. Trans. Eugenia Hanfman and Gertrude Vakar. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1962.

Warren, Michael. "Repunctuation as Interpretation in Editions of Shakespeare." Reader in the Language of Shakespearean Drama. Eds. Vivian Salmon and Edwina Burness. Philadelphia: John Benjamin's, 1987. 455-469.

Weimann, Robert. Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theatre. Baltimore: John's Hopkins UP, 1978.

Wells, Stanley. Re-editing Shakespeare for the Modern Reader. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.

---, ed. The Cambridge Companion to Shakespeare Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.

---. "The Bettering of Burby." Times Literary Supplement. June 20 (1980): 710.

Wells, Stanley, and Gary Taylor et al. William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.

Wells, Stanley, and Gary Taylor, gen. eds. William Shakespeare: The Complete Works. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.

Werstine, Paul. "McKerrow's 'Suggestion' and Twentieth Century Shakespeare Textual Criticism." Rose 149-173.

---. "Narratives About Printed Shakespeare Texts: 'Foul Papers' and 'Bad' Quartos." Shakespeare Quarterly 41.1 (1990): 65-86.

Wiles, David. Shakespeare's Clown: Actor and Text in the Elizabethan Playhouse. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.

Wilson, John Dover. "The New Way with Shakespeare's Texts: Recent Work on the Text of Romeo and Juliet." Shakespeare Survey 8 (1955): 81-99.

Zefferelli, Franco, dir. Romeo and Juliet. Dialogue Script. Paramount Pictures, 1968.

Zeller, Hans. "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts." Studies in Bibliography 28 (1975): 231- 264.