

Premodern Performance-based Research: A Partial Bibliography

Contributors: Angeline Morris, Riley Stewart

The following annotated bibliography examines secondary sources on the following subjects: the history of the part-script, original practice (OP) methods, performance-as-research/performance-based research, research at Shakespeare's Globe and the American Shakespeare Center, and historical theatrical documents, such as the backstage-plot, prologue and epilogue. Several trends have emerged in this research, primarily revolving around inconsistent definitions of OP methods across theatrical companies, and the lack of qualitative evidence that has come out of performance-based research endeavors.

The performance as research projects surveyed tend to focus on the perceived impact that OP had on the audience members, particularly through the use of reconstructed spaces. Unfortunately, these research endeavors tend to be anecdotal in nature, as they consist of no qualitative data, making it difficult to make conclusive claims. Additionally, these research projects do not publish their methodologies, making them difficult to replicate.

This annotated bibliography reflects a demand in the field of early modern drama for replicable, transparent, and qualitative methodologies for conducting performance research. In addition, it offers future lines of inquiry, such as testing additional theatrical documents through performance is needed, exploring the actor-audience member relationship under shared lighting, and the role of the scribe. This is an evolving document, first published in May 2021, envisioned to include gradual additions from ASP season dramaturgs as this field continues to develop.

— Last updated 1 May 2023

2023

Irish, Tracy, and Jennifer Kitchen. *Teaching and Learning Shakespeare through Theatre-based Practice*. Arden, Bloomsbury, 2023.

Forthcoming.

Menzer, Paul. *Shakespeare Without Print*. Elements in Shakespeare Performance, Cambridge University Press, 2023. DOI: [10.1017/9781009204217](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009204217).

Forthcoming.

Tavares, Elizabeth E. "Alive in the (Early) Modern Repertory." In *Early Modern Liveness: Mediating Presence in Text, on Stage and Screen*, edited by Danielle Rosvally and Donovan Sherman, 111–44. Bloomsbury, 2023. DOI: [9781350318502.0013](https://doi.org/9781350318502.0013).

Forthcoming.

Whipday, Emma. *Teaching Shakespeare and His Sisters: An Embodied Approach*. Cambridge University Press, 2023. DOI: [10.1017/9781108975650](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108975650).

Forthcoming.

Winkler, Amanda Eubanks, Claude Fretz, and Richard Schoch, eds. *Performing Restoration Shakespeare*. Cambridge University Press, 2023. DOI: [10.1017/9781009241212](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009241212).

Forthcoming.

2022

Brokaw, Katherine Steele, and Paul Prescott. "Reduce, Rewrite, Recycle: Adapting *A Midsummer Night's Dream* for Yosemite." In *The Arden Research Handbook of Shakespeare and Adaptation*, edited by Diane E. Henderson and Stephen O'Neill, 305–24. The Arden Shakespeare. Bloomsbury, 2022. DOI: [10.5040/9781350110335.ch-3.1](https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350110335.ch-3.1).

Forthcoming.

Hawkins, Ella. *Shakespeare in Elizabethan Costume: "Period Dress" in Twenty-First-Century Performance*. The Arden Shakespeare, Bloomsbury, 2022. DOI: [10.5040/9781350240360](https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350240360).

Forthcoming.

McCarthy, Harry R. *Boy Actors in Early Modern England: Skill and Stagecraft in the Theatre*. Cambridge University Press, 2022. DOI: [10.1017/9781009106658.004](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009106658.004).

Forthcoming.

2021

Dustagheer, Sarah. "Original Practices: Old Ways and New Directions." In *The Arden Research Handbook of Shakespeare and Contemporary Performance*, edited by Peter Kirwan and Kathryn Prince, 65–81. The Arden Shakespeare, Bloomsbury, 2021. DOI: [10.5040/9781350080706.ch-2.1](https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350080706.ch-2.1).

Dustagheer ruminates on the term "original practice" in relation to Emma Rice's time as the artistic director at Shakespeare's Globe. Rice's decision to bring new sound and lighting equipment into the venue sparked controversy, as some individuals felt that this removed OP elements from the theatre, while others contested the merits of OP, believing that the theatre should not be treated as a historical object. Dustagheer unpacks this debate, and she explains that generally, OP's relationship to the modern theatre scene is ambiguous; it offers the ability to conduct academic research through modern performance, but for some, OP's connection to the past makes it irrelevant for contemporary theatre-making. Dustagheer instead suggests that OP's work can be explained as, "seeking to emulate, engage with, or recreate Shakespearean practices" (68). This chapter illustrates the difficulties of conducting research that uses either PaR or OP methods, as the results of these methods are difficult to measure.

Hodgdon, Barbara C. *Ghostly Fragments: Essays on Shakespeare and Performance*. Edited by Richard Abel and Peter Holland. University of Michigan Press, 2021. DOI: [10.3998/mpub.11631033](https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.11631033).

Forthcoming.

Kidnie, M. J. "The Audience: Receiving and Remaking Experience." *The Arden Research Handbook of Shakespeare and Performance* Edited by Peter Kirwan and Kathryn Prince, 38–48. The Arden Shakespeare, Bloomsbury, 2021. DOI: [10.5040/9781350080706.ch-1.2](https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350080706.ch-1.2).

Kidnie ruminates on the inherently ephemeral nature of performance, and the multiplicity of challenges this presents to scholars of performance. She begins by thinking broadly about what constitutes an audience, and how a performance scholar might equitably write about a production without discrediting their own argument. This statement of positionality, combined with the style of ethnographic journalism displayed by McCarthy, seems key to creating equitable records of performance. Additionally, Kidnie notes that it is necessary to describe the aspects of the performance being written about for readers, thus the author must carefully blend their description of the performance with their analysis of events. Kidnie also suggests that future performance studies would benefit from more qualitative methodologies, such as those in the social sciences to measure audience response. Kidnie's chapter is particularly useful when thinking about how to write about live productions, and for providing sources that have attempted to develop a quantitative methodology for measuring audience response.

Schoch, Richard. *A Short History of Shakespeare in Performance: From the Restoration to the Twenty-First Century*. Elements in Shakespeare Performance, Cambridge University Press, 2021. DOI: [10.1017/9781108625838](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108625838).

Forthcoming.

2020

Escolme, Bridget. *Shakespeare and Costume in Practice*. *Shakespeare in Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2020. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-030-57149-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-57149-8).

Forthcoming.

Hay, Chris, and Robin Dixon. "'Until I Know This Sure Uncertainty': Actor Training and Original Practices." *Theatre, Dance and Performance Training* 12, no. 1 (2020): 45–61. DOI: [10.1080/19443927.2020.1778517](https://doi.org/10.1080/19443927.2020.1778517).

Forthcoming.

Jensen, Freyja Cox, Dana L. Key, and Emma Whipday. "*The Disobedient Child*: A Tudor Interlude in Performance." *Shakespeare* 16, no. 1 (2020): 60–67. DOI: [10.1080/17450918.2019.1657173](https://doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2019.1657173).

Forthcoming.

Marino, James J. "Parts and the Playscript: Seven Questions." In *Rethinking Theatrical Documents in Shakespeare's England*, edited by Tiffany Stern, 52–67. The Arden Shakespeare, Bloomsbury, 2020. DOI: [10.5040/9781350051379.ch-003](https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350051379.ch-003).

In his book chapter, James Marino examines the relationship between cues and revision; in doing so, he posits seven questions to aid in the future development of a theatrical model of playtexts that specifically interrogates parts and cues. Marino suggests that focusing on the relationship between cues and changes in various texts across time can provide insight into early modern revision practices. Most notably, Marino further complicates the relationship between the early modern actor and the cue, as he explains that not only would these actors have to know all of their speeches, but they would also need to memorize all of their new

and old cues, remembering what cues to use and not based on the revision process. Marino's emphasis on the potential revision of cues relates to Palfrey and Stern's research regarding the dangers of "falling out," as this seems like a very real possibility for early modern actors.

McCarthy, Harry R. *Performing Early Modern Drama Beyond Shakespeare: Edward's Boys*. Elements in Shakespeare Performance, Cambridge University Press, 2020.
DOI: [10.1017/9781108893848](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108893848).

McCarthy synthesizes performance records of Edward's Boys with ethnographic interviews of company members to argue that with this company, early modern drama becomes the site of sport and play, as well as an exploration into contemporary boyhood. He provides an overview of the company's rehearsal process, which begins with "text work," or "getting the text on its feet." The goal of this stage is to make the actors familiar and comfortable with the text. Because the company is rooted in education, many of the members have other school related obligations, thus rehearsals occur over a six-month period. Notably, the recruitment process for Edward's Boys is vague, as McCarthy explains that there is not audition process, Perry Mills instead selects students who excel in certain areas and allows them to participate. McCarthy's piece is especially useful for thinking about the value of performing non-Shakespearean early modern drama, while providing context for this company's process. This might be useful for future research, as McCarthy provides sample entries from his diary during the rehearsals, which could provide a model for note-taking.

Rycroft, Eleanor. "Whither Will You Walke, My Lord?: Promenading, PAR, and Place-Realist Theatre." *The London Journal* 46, no. 2 (2020): 1–18. DOI: [10.1080/03058034.2020.1771908](https://doi.org/10.1080/03058034.2020.1771908).

Forthcoming.

Whipday, Emma, and Lucy Munro. "Making Early Modern 'Verbatim Theatre,' or, 'Keep the Widow Waking.'" In *Loss and the Literary Culture of Shakespeare's Time*, edited by Roslyn L. Knutson, David McInnis, and Matthew Steggle, 233–49. Early Modern Literature in History. Palgrave Macmillan, 2020. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-030-36867-8_14](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-36867-8_14).

In their book chapter, Munro and Whipday present a new approach for exploring lost early modern plays, which combines practice as research and archival research to illuminate the ways in which performance might provide new insight into lost texts. Munro and Whipday explore the relationship between the lost play, "A Late Murder of the Son Upon the Mother, Or, Keep the Widow Waking," (attributed to Dekker, Ford, Rowley, and Webster), and the surviving legal documents following Eldson's trial proceedings. The duo apply methods of verbatim theatre to the surviving documents, to ask new questions of the text, while thinking about the original fictionalized construction of Eldson's agency via the ballad as compared to her actual agency as evidenced by witness accounts in the trial proceedings. Munro and Whipday provide a new framework for working with lost texts, which emphasizing the importance of combining archival research with performance studies.

2019

Brokaw, Katherine Steele, and Paul Prescott. "Shakespeare in Yosemite: Applied Theatre in a National Park." *Critical Survey* 31, no. 4 (2019): 15–28. DOI: [10.3167/cs.2019.310403](https://doi.org/10.3167/cs.2019.310403).

Forthcoming.

McCorquodale, Dylan. "Creating 'Original' Shakespeare: The Work and Legacy of Patrick Tucker." Thesis, University of Guelph, 2019. [PDF](#).

Forthcoming.

Menzer, Paul, and Amy R. Cohen, eds. *Shakespeare in the Light: Essays in Honor of Ralph Alan Cohen*. Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2019.

Forthcoming.

Reimers, Sara, and Richard Schoch. "Performing Restoration Shakespeare Today: Staging Davenant's *Macbeth*." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 37, no. 4 (2019): 467–89. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2019.0057](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2019.0057).

Forthcoming.

2018

Griffin, Brent. "'Original Practices' and Jonson's First Folio." *Ben Jonson Journal* 25, no. 1 (2018): 19–31. DOI: [10.3366/bjj.2018.0208](https://doi.org/10.3366/bjj.2018.0208).

Forthcoming.

Purcell, Stephen. "Performing the Public at Shakespeare's Globe." *Shakespeare* 14, no. 1 (2018): 51–63. DOI: [10.1080/17450918.2018.1439091](https://doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2018.1439091).

Forthcoming.

Purcell, Stephen. "Whose Experiment Is It Anyway?: Some Models for Practice-as-Research in Shakespeare Studies." In *Stage Matters: Props, Bodies, and Space in Shakespearean Performance*, edited by Annalisa Castaldo and Rhonda Knight. Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2018.

Purcell opens his book chapter by examining Emma Rice's departure from Shakespeare's Globe within the context of theatrical research. He suggests that a potential reason for her departure has to do with the conflicting models of experimentation used by the Globe since 1990. Purcell names three models: the first is the expert and craftsperson model, which positions the academic as the possessor of knowledge about historical practices, and the practitioner as the craftsperson who puts this knowledge into practice. In this model, the theatre provides the grounds for scholarly tests. The second model, the witness and the source, places the practitioner at the center of the study, while the scholar's role is to observe the artistic practice; this model is the closest to ethnographic research. The third model, the coinvestigators, assumes that the scholar and the practitioner are equally knowledgeable in different areas, and they are brought together to investigate questions of interest to both parties.

Quarmby, Kevin A. "OP PC or PAR RIP?" *Shakespeare Bulletin* 36, no. 4 (2018): 567–98. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2018.0058](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2018.0058).

Forthcoming.

Tosh, Will. "Stagecraft in the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse." In *Playing Indoors: Staging Early Modern Drama in the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse*, 143–94. The Arden Shakespeare, Bloomsbury, 2018. DOI: [10.5040/9781350013858.ch-007](https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350013858.ch-007).

In the seventh chapter of his book, Tosh records the discoveries made during a series of public Research in Action workshops that took place at the Sam Wanamaker playhouse in 2014 and 2015. The goal of the workshops was to allow actors to respond to both their own instincts and the suggestions of audience members within the indoor theatre space. Actors ran scenes multiple times to explore different staging solutions, and audience members were allowed to offer feedback during the performance. Tosh explains that the workshop allowed researchers from the Globe to think about early modern indoor playing in relation to staging conventions, actor-playgoer relations, lighting, and music. Tosh provides an overview of the methodology of the project: essentially a group of professional Globe actors would work with scholars in the playhouse for a day on a series of research questions. The play would then be staged in front of an audience of non-theatre experts, who were encouraged to move around the space and to give feedback both vocally and via writing. (The transcript is available as part of the Indoor Performance Practice Project Archive held by Shakespeare's Globe.) Tosh's chapter provides brief descriptions of the various scenes performed as part of this endeavor. Unfortunately, Tosh does not provide an example of how the research project collected audience responses but finding the available transcripts from performance might be a useful next step for future research.

2017

Barnden, Sally. "Site-Specificity, Archaeology, and the Empty Space at the Contemporary Rose Playhouse." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 2 (2017): 207–26. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2017.0014](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0014).

Forthcoming.

Bennett, Susan, and Gina Bloom. "Shakespeare and Performance Studies: A Dialogue." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 3 (2017): 367–72. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2017.0029](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0029).

Forthcoming.

Brokaw, Katherine Steele. "Shakespeare as Community Practice." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 3 (2017): 445–61. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2017.0034](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0034).

Forthcoming.

Cantoni, Vera. *New Playwriting at Shakespeare's Globe*. Bloomsbury, 2017.

Forthcoming.

Dailey, Alice. "The Talbot Remains: Historical Drama and the Performative Archive." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 3 (2017): 373–87. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2017.0030](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0030).

Forthcoming.

Dustagheer, Sarah. “‘Intimacy’ at the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse.” *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 2 (2017): 227–46. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2017.0015](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0015).

Forthcoming.

Dustagheer, Sarah. *Shakespeare’s Two Playhouses: Repertory and Theatre Space at the Globe and the Blackfriars, 1599–1613*. Cambridge University Press, 2017. DOI: [10.1017/9781316996874](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316996874).

Forthcoming.

Dustagheer, Sarah, Oliver Jones, and Eleanor Rycroft. “(Re)Constructed Spaces for Early Modern Drama: Research in Practice.” *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 2 (2017): 173–85. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2017.0012](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0012).

Forthcoming.

Fischer, Susan L. “Staging *The Merchant of Venice* in Spain (2015): Felicitous ‘Romancing’ with Money and Willful Ambiguity?” *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 2 (2017): 317–34. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2017.0020](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0020).

Forthcoming.

Jones, Oliver. “‘Explain This Dark Enigma’: The Queen’s Men and Performance-as-Research in Stratford-upon-Avon.” *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 2 (2017): 267–87. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2017.0017](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0017).

Forthcoming.

Massai, Sonia. “Editing Shakespeare in Parts.” *Shakespeare Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (2017): 56–79. DOI: [10.1353/shq.2017.0003](https://doi.org/10.1353/shq.2017.0003).

Forthcoming.

Menzer, Paul. *Shakespeare in the Theatre: The American Shakespeare Center*. The Arden Shakespeare, Bloomsbury, 2017. DOI: [10.5040/9781472585066](https://doi.org/10.5040/9781472585066).

Forthcoming.

Purcell, Stephen. “Practice-as-Research and Original Practices.” *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 3 (2017): 425–43. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2017.0033](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0033).

In his article, Stephen Purcell outlines the similarities and differences between the two distinct movements that have influenced the ways early modern scholars use performance practices in their research: practice-as-research (PaR) and OP. Purcell explains that PaR tends to stay away from attempting to replicate historical methods in performance, and instead focuses more on modern practices, and what early modern theatre might mean to

contemporary audiences. OP, by contrast, aims to replicate what is known about early modern theatre through a myriad of methods, be it doubling, part-scripts, shared lighting, etc. Both PaR and OP run into the same issues, as it is not clear under either methodology what qualifies as evidence, and what this evidence might be indicative of. For example, actors engaged in original practice methods might make comments about the difficulty of having a limited rehearsal period, but this is evidence of the peculiarity of this practice to a contemporary actor, not of the technique itself. Purcell notes that both PaR and OP rely on responses from audiences and actors, but it is difficult to interpret evidence from either source, because what audience members, or actors might label as “strange,” likely has more to do with their contemporary setting. While it remains unclear what is quantifiable evidence for either scholarly camp, Purcell notes that both practices have the potential to open new questions about both the text and the time period.

Purcell, Stephen. *Shakespeare in the Theatre: Mark Rylance at the Globe*. The Arden Shakespeare, Bloomsbury, 2017. DOI: [10.5040/9781472581754](https://doi.org/10.5040/9781472581754).

Forthcoming.

Rycroft, Eleanor. “Place on the Late Medieval and Early Modern Stage: The Case of *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*.” *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 2 (2017): 247–66. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2017.0016](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0016).

Forthcoming.

Seremet, Molly. “‘A Theatre, A Giddy Receptacle?’: Architecture and Audience Tectonics in the ASC’s 2015 Actors’ Renaissance Season.” *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 2 (2017): 309–15. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2017.0019](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0019).

Forthcoming.

Weingust, Don. “Rehearsal and Acting Practice.” In *A Companion to Renaissance Drama*, edited by Arthur F. Kinney and Thomas Warren Hopper, 2nd ed., 250–67. Wiley Blackwell, 2017.

Forthcoming.

Whipday, Emma, and Freyja Cox Jensen. “‘Original Practices,’ Lost Plays, and Historical Imagination: Staging ‘The Tragedy of Merry.’” *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 2 (2017): 289–307. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2017.0018](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0018).

In their journal article, Whipday and Jensen use original performance practices in their attempt to gain a larger understanding of the content of the lost “Tragedy of Merry.” While their work on the ways in which performing *Two Lamentable Tragedies* may provide context for the “Tragedy of Merry,” most striking was their use of OP, and the documented experiences of their actors and audience members in response to these practices. Whipday and Jensen choose to use the following early modern practices: parts, a limited rehearsal period, shared lighting, costume contemporary to the performance, and a bookkeeper. In using these practices, they maintain that the performance helped illuminate the genre of the text, as well as spatial dynamics, and character development for both actors and audiences. Whipday and Jensen conducted some form of actor and audience survey (the methods of which are not

included), in which the actor's revealed that the found parts to be both "fun" and "nerve wracking," and the duo recommend not providing significant direction for the actors during rehearsal, so that the actors can construct their own understanding of the content. The comments actors provided on the parts seems aligned with Purcell's note about evidence; is the reaction of the actor to parts being "nerve wracking" actually evidence, or purely anecdotal? The remainder of Whipday and Jensen's article highlights the audience's response to the staged tragedy, and the ways in which this form of performance-based research can help to illuminate new information about genre and lost texts.

Worthen, W. B. "Interactive, Immersive, Original Shakespeare." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 3 (2017): 407–24. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2017.0032](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0032).

Forthcoming.

Worthen, W. B. "Free Reign?: Designing the Spectator in Immersive Theatre." In *The Routledge Companion to Scenography*, 302–10. Routledge, 2017. DOI: [10.4324/9781317422266-27](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781317422266-27).

Forthcoming.

Wright, Clare. "Ontologies of Play: Reconstructing the Relationship between Audience and Act in Early English Drama." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 2 (2017): 187–206. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2017.0013](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0013).

Forthcoming.

2016

Díez, José A. Pérez. "Editing on Stage: Theatrical Research for a Critical Edition of John Flether and Phillip Massinger's *Love's Cure, or the Marital Maid*." *Shakespeare Bulletin* vol. 34, no. 1 (2016): 69-88. DOI: [10.1353/shb.2016.0011](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2016.0011).

In his article, Díez narrates his process of theatrical research when staging *Love's Cure* to aid in his creation of a critical edition for this text. Díez argues that the processes used, such as prior consideration of the text, discussion with the actors, and exploration of scene blocking, create key methodologies for theatrical research. His project used OP methods, which he defines as an all-male cast, period costume and music, universal lighting, an empty stage, two doors for entrances and exits, and a wide central opening on the stage. Díez maintains that using OP in theatre research has the potential to illuminate the text as a historical document that emerges and responds to a specific theatrical context. Of additional interest for the purposes of ASP is that the actors in Díez's study performed with full, uncut scripts in hand. Díez's article is useful for defining OP, thinking about best practices for theatrical research, and as a potential reference for our work regarding on stage entrances and exits.

Lewis, William, and Niki Tulk. "Editorial: Why Performance as Research?" *PARTake: The Journal of Performance as Research* 1, no. 1 (2016): 1–7. DOI: [10.33011/partake.v1i1.325](https://doi.org/10.33011/partake.v1i1.325).

Forthcoming.

Weingust, Don. "Original Practices." In *The Cambridge Guide to the Worlds of Shakespeare, 1474–81*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Forthcoming

2015

Billing, Christian. "Historiography, Rehearsal Processes, and Performance as Translation; or, How to Stage Early Modern English Drama Today?" In *Performance as Research in Early English Theatre Studies: The Three Ladies of London in Context*, 1–40. McMaster University, 2015.

URL: threeladiesoflondon.mcmaster.ca/par/ChristianMBilling.htm.

Forthcoming.

Conkie, Rob. "'Fain Would I Dwell on Form': Performance / Publication / Pedagogy." In *Performance as Research in Early English Theatre Studies: The Three Ladies of London in Context*, 1–30. McMaster University, 2015.

URL: threeladiesoflondon.mcmaster.ca/par/RobConkie.htm.

Forthcoming.

Jenkins, Jacqueline. "Practice-Based Research and Early Period Theatre Histories: A Performance Methodology." In *Performance as Research in Early English Theatre Studies: The Three Ladies of London in Context*, 1–14. McMaster University, 2015.

URL: threeladiesoflondon.mcmaster.ca/par/JacquelineJenkins.htm.

Forthcoming.

Kesson, Andy. "Acting out of Character: A Performance-as-Research Approach to *The Three Ladies of London*." In *Performance as Research in Early English Theatre Studies: The Three Ladies of London in Context*, 1–10. McMaster University, 2015.

URL: threeladiesoflondon.mcmaster.ca/par/AndyKesson.htm.

Forthcoming.

Quarmby, Kevin A. "Enactment and Exegesis: Recontextualizing Wilson's *The Three Ladies of London* through Performance as Research." In *Performance as Research in Early English Theatre Studies: The Three Ladies of London in Context*, 1–20. McMaster University, 2015.

URL: threeladiesoflondon.mcmaster.ca/par/KevinQuarmby.htm.

Forthcoming.

Stern, Tiffany. "Before the Beginning; after the End: When Did Plays Start and Stop?" In *Shakespeare and Textual Studies*, edited by Sonia Massai and M.J. Kidnie, 358–74. Cambridge University Press, 2015. DOI: [10.1017/cbo9781139152259.023](https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139152259.023).

Forthcoming.

2014

Bennett, Susan, and Mary Polito, eds. *Performing Environments: Site-Specificity in Medieval and Early Modern English Drama*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. DOI: [10.1057/9781137320179](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137320179).

Forthcoming.

Carson, Christie. "Influencing Editors, Influencing Performers: The Page to Stage Relationship." In *Editing, Performance, Texts: New Practices in Medieval and Early Modern English Drama*, edited by Jacqueline Jenkins and Julie Sanders, 198–217. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. DOI: [10.1057/9781137320117_11](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137320117_11).

Forthcoming.

Netzloff, Mark, Bradley D. Ryner, and Darlene Farabee, eds. *Early Modern Drama in Performance: Essays in Honor of Lois Potter*. University of Delaware Press, 2014.

Forthcoming.

Pye, Valerie Clayman. "Shakespeare's Globe: Theatre Architecture and the Performance of Authenticity." *Shakespeare* 10, no. 4 (2014): 411–27. DOI: [10.1080/17450918.2014.938688](https://doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2014.938688).

Forthcoming.

Syme, Holger. "My Trouble with Practice-as-Research." *Dispositio* (blog), 26 March 2014. URL: dispositio.net/my-trouble-with-practice-as-research/.

Forthcoming.

Syme, Holger. "Where Is the Theatre in Original Practice?" *Dispositio* (blog), 25 July 2014. URL: dispositio.net/where-is-the-theatre-in-original-practice/.

Forthcoming.

Weingust, Don. "Authentic Performances or Performances of Authenticity? Original Practices and the Repertory Schedule." *Shakespeare* 10, no. 4 (2014): 402–10. DOI: [10.1080/17450918.2014.889205](https://doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2014.889205).

Forthcoming.

Worthen, W. B. *Shakespeare Performance Studies*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Forthcoming.

2012

Aebischer, Pascale, and Kathryn Prince, eds. *Performing Early Modern Drama Today*. Cambridge University Press, 2012. DOI: [10.1017/cbo9781139047975](https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139047975).

Forthcoming.

Jones, Oliver. "The Queen's Men on Tour: Provincial Performance in Vernacular Spaces in Early Modern England." Thesis, University of York, 2012.
URL: [etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/3833](https://theses.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/3833).

Forthcoming.

Kidnie, M. J. "Textual Clues and Performance Choices." In *Shakespeare and the Making of Theatre*, edited by Bridget Escolme and Stuart Hampton-Reeves, 1–13. Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Forthcoming.

Mazer, Cary M. "Historicizing Spontaneity: The Illusion of the First Time of 'The Illusion of the First Time.'" In *Shakespeare's Sense of Character: On the Page and from the Stage*, edited by Michael W. Shurgot and Yu Jin Ko, 85–98. Ashgate, 2012. DOI: [10.4324/9781315608778-12](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315608778-12).

Forthcoming.

Stern, Tiffany. "(Re:)Historicizing Spontaneity: Original Practices, Stanislavski, and Characterisation." In *Shakespeare's Sense of Character: On the Page and from the Stage*, edited by Michael W. Shurgot and Yu Jin Ko, 159–74. Ashgate, 2012. DOI: [10.4324/9781315608778-13](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315608778-13).

Forthcoming.

Woods, Penelope. "Globe Audiences: Spectatorship and Reconstruction at Shakespeare's Globe." Ph.D., Queen Mary, University of London, 2012.
URL: qmro.qmul.ac.uk/xmlui/handle/123456789/8299.

Forthcoming.

2011

Dobson, Michael. *Shakespeare and Amateur Performance: A Cultural History*. Cambridge University Press, 2011. DOI: [10.1017/cbo9780511801259](https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511801259).

Forthcoming.

Fitzpatrick, Tim. *Playwright, Space and Place in Early Modern Performance: Shakespeare and Company*. Routledge, 2011. DOI: [10.4324/9781315600857](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315600857).

Forthcoming.

Kidnie, M. J. "Staging Shakespeare for 'Live' Performance in The Eyre Affair and Stage Beauty." In *Shakespeare/Adaptation/Modern Drama: Essays in Honour of Jill L. Levenson*, 76–92. University of Toronto Press, 2011. DOI: [10.3138/9781442689916-007](https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442689916-007).

Forthcoming.

Worthen, W. B. "Intoxicating Rhythms: Or, Shakespeare, Literary Drama, and Performance (Studies)." *Shakespeare Quarterly* 62, no. 3 (2011): 309–39. DOI: [10.1353/shq.2011.0061](https://doi.org/10.1353/shq.2011.0061).

Forthcoming.

2010

Cornford, Tom. "Reconstructing Theatre: The Globe under Dominic Dromgoole." *New Theatre Quarterly* 26, no. 4 (2010): 319–28. DOI: [10.1017/S0266464X1000062X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266464X1000062X).

Forthcoming.

Escolme, Bridget. "Being Good: Actors' Testimonies as Archive and the Cultural Construction of Success in Performance." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 28, no. 1 (2010): 77–91. DOI: [10.1353/shb.0.0153](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.0.0153).

Forthcoming.

Falocco, Joe. *Reimagining Shakespeare's Playhouse: Early Modern Staging Conventions in the Twentieth Century*. Boydell & Brewer, 2010.

Forthcoming.

Kanelos, Peter, and Matt Kozusko. *Thunder at a Playhouse: Essaying Shakespeare and the Early Modern Stage*. Susquehanna University Press, 2010.

Forthcoming.

Rokison, Abigail. *Shakespearean Verse Speaking: Text and Theatre Practice*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Forthcoming.

Sauter, Willmar. "Thirty Years of Reception Studies: Empirical, Methodological, and Theoretical Advances." *About Performance* 10 (2010): 241–63.

Sauter details a series of various performance-based studies he engaged in over a thirty-year period, while providing an overview of his methodological frameworks. When first beginning his reception research, Sauter worked primarily with theatre students and was able to ask participants to write a short essay following a performance, and while this method works, there was too much freedom as the students could write about whatever they wanted, thus there was too much room for deviation. The essay model of collecting data was scrapped during Sauter's next research project, and he and his team instead organized twenty-five "theatre talk groups" composed of 180 participants, with groups of seven. Each group had a leader who asked guided questions to the group members. While this method worked for Sauter and his team, he notes that this gave them "soft data," rather than the type of data they might have gathered from a survey. Sauter's team continued with the theatre talks but instead broke the groups based on experience with theatre; regular theatre goers were placed in groups together while those with little experience with theatre were

placed together. During this form of research Sauter crucially notes three trends across these groups, which are observations based on the performer, observations on the skill of the actor, and attributions of meaning to the experience: or sensory, artistic, and symbolic levels of communication. Sauter and his team then developed a two-part questionnaire to be taken by audience members before and after the show. While Sauter's narration of the ways in which his team approached performance-based research is interesting, perhaps most important is their use of the two-part survey, as this allowed the team to compare audience members reactions before and after performance. Since we already do this type of survey for our actors, it might be an important next step to adopt this for our audience members as well.

2009

Mazer, Cary. "Sense/Memory/Sense-Memory: Reading Narratives of Shakespearian Rehearsals." *Shakespeare Survey* 62 (2009): 328-48. DOI: [10.1017/CCOL9780521111034.026](https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL9780521111034.026).

Forthcoming.

Purcell, Stephen. *Popular Shakespeare: Simulation and Subversion on the Modern Stage*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Forthcoming.

Rycroft, Eleanor. "The Play of the Weather in Performance in the Great Hall at Hampton Court," *Medieval English Theatre Journal* 31 (2009): 13-27.

In her article, Rycroft provides an overview of an experimental performance of John Heywood's *The Play of the Weather*, which was performed at the Great Hall of Hampton Court Palace. One overarching goal of this production was to interrogate the relationship between drama and the organization of space at the court of Henry VIII. In an effort to reach this goal, audience members were arranged by "academic eminence" and age, and Rycroft maintains that performing the text in this space, with the audience arranged in this way revealed the text's sympathy for characters with courtly affiliations. Rycroft crucially gestures to the importance of rehearsal, both in this project and as a research tool. She argues that rehearsal is a valid research methodology on its own, as it draws attention to aspects of the play that can be missed when reading.

Stern, Tiffany. "Scrolls." In *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*, Cambridge University Press, 2009, 174-201. DOI: [10.1017/cbo9780511635625](https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511635625).

In this book chapter, Stern examines the physical layout of the early modern scroll, with particular attention to the typographical features. By examining such features, Stern maintains that many of the font discrepancies and instructional pieces included in the scroll were not intended for the actor or prompter, but rather the person cutting the roles, which she calls the scribe. Such instructions have historically been confused with stage directions, and has left contemporary editors baffled, but these instructions instead need to be read within the context of the part-script technology. The significance that Stern places on the role of the scribe is important for OP endeavors, as to fully mimic the part technology in all of its forms from stage to page, dramaturgs probably should be working from a facsimile of

the text, rather than a critical edition, so that they can fully act as the scribe and use the instructional text.

Stern, Tiffany. "Backstage-plots." In *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*, Cambridge University Press, 2009, 201-31. DOI: [10.1017/cbo9780511635625](https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511635625).

In this chapter, Stern focuses on the possibilities offered by backstage-plots, while asking if the plots are specific to only a certain moment in theatre history, or a particular theatre company. While the exact purpose of the backstage plot, and its theatrical origin is difficult (if not impossible) to determine, Stern provides an overview of the known elements of these theatrical documents, and current scholarly opinions on the purposes of this document. Collier maintains that the plot was written by the playwright for the actors, while Greg maintains that the plots would have been kept backstage for performance, and would have been written by the prompter. Tribble finds a middle ground between Collier and Greg, by suggesting that the primary purpose of the plot was to benefit the actor, and King and Ippolo believe that the plot functions as a summary with entrances and exits that would have been bought by various companies. By examining the seven surviving plots, Stern seems to agree with Greg and Tribble. She first examines the physical composition of the plots, and Stern demonstrates that each was created with heavy and repeated use in mind. The primary interests of the plot (or trends across all seven), involve entrances (both mid-scene and at the beginning), props being brought on stage by entering actors, and fictional character names. Stern crucially notes that the plots appear to be more invested in entrances than exits; why would the plot need to cue an exit, when an exit is included on the actors scroll which they hold in performance? The relationship between the part and the plot seems to be an important avenue of exploration.

Stern, Tiffany. "The Approved Book and Actors Parts." In *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*, Cambridge University Press, 2009, 232-51. DOI: [10.1017/cbo9780511635625](https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511635625).

In this chapter, Stern is interested in the differences between the physical written playbooks and the performed texts. Previous scholars have ignored the ways in which unapproved passages would have been heard on stage, which emphasizes one of Stern's main points: texts can only be censored notionally, because you cannot approve what an actor might say during performance. Unapproved materials then, have an easier outlet on stage than in print. Stern provides a brief overview of the approval process, and she explains that while receipts of approval were expensive, most of the plays performed would have been approved. The official sanctioned approval would have protected the playing companies from any potential trouble that a text could bring them. But the approval does not account for differences between the playbook and the actor's part. In some instances, Stern hypothesizes that actors would have memorized their parts prior to the approval process, thus they may potentially perform the unapproved version of a text. The physical written playbook and the part would have been very different according to Stern, and the two should not be conflated.

Steigerwalt, Jenna. "Performing Race on the Original-Practices Stage: A Call to Action." *Shakespeare Bulletin* 27, no. 3 (2009): 425-35. DOI: [10.1353/shb.0.0104](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.0.0104).

Forthcoming.

2008

Carroll, Tim. "Practicing Behavior to His Own Shadow." In *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, edited by Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper, Cambridge University Press, 2008, 37-44.

In his book chapter, Carroll narrates his experience working at Shakespeare's Globe, and the theatre's lack of a roof contributes to his key observations about OP at the Globe. Carroll primarily focuses on the way that shared lighting transforms both the actors and audience members experience at the Globe. He suggests that Globe's lack of roofing opens performances to new level unpredictability, such as animals joining the performance, or outside noise impacting the performance. Despite this, Carroll maintains that the most unpredictable element at the Globe is the audience, and the shared lighting contributes to this because the behavior of the audience members is more visible. Shared lighting seems to allow for a different audience-actor relationship, and Carroll provides several examples of audience members directly responding to actors or responding in unexpected ways.

Carson, Christie. "Democratizing the Audience?" In *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, edited by Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper, Cambridge University Press, 2008, 115-27.

In her book chapter, Carson endeavors to determine whether or not the Globe is a democratic and accessible theatrical space, while removing the romanticism that tends to pervade scholarship on the Globe theatre. Carson argues that the Globe is known for its accessibility, which she breaks into three categories: physical, cultural, and intellectual accessibility. The physical location of the Globe is easily accessible, and the Globe's intellectual accessibility revolves around the notion that audience members come prepared to take part in the creation of meaning making. This largely contributes to Carson's claim regarding the democratization of the Globe; she maintains that the Globe is viewed as a democratic theatrical space that has allowed both actors and audience members to think about performance. In terms of cultural accessibility, Carson names the low price of the Yard tickets, and the Globe's rave exit surveys as indicators of the Globe's impact culturally. In constructing this argument, Carson regularly contrasts the critical views on the Globe and Royal Shakespeare Company; while the Globe is seen as democratic, RSC tends to be viewed as elitist and monolithic. Her comparison of the Globe and the RSC is useful for thinking about community involvement in the creation of accessible theatre, and the measures that she uses to define cultural accessibility.

Dessen, Alan. "Original Practices at the Globe: A Theatre Historian's view." In *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, edited by Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper, Cambridge University Press, 2008, 45-55.

In his book chapter, Dessen is interested in examining the use of OP in productions with directors, actors, designers, publicists, and playgoers from 1990-2000. Dessen suggests that the term "original practice" causes a murky, and often controversial overlap between theatre history and commercial theatre. He uses the term "theatrical essentialism" to explain the resistance some actors, directors, and other theatrical professionals have to historical scholarship; such proponents assume that regardless of cultural changes, there is an intrinsic core value at the heart of the theatrical text which can only be understood by theatrical

community members, rather than scholars. In addition to theatrical essentialism's conflict with historical findings at the Globe, Dessen points to another trend among the theatre community, which is "if you have it use it," regardless of recent historical findings. Dessen's chapter touches on some of the key conflicts between theatre historians and the contemporary theatre community, which results in the varied definitions of OP that scholars like Lopez and Purcell have written about.

Lopez, Jeremy. "A Partial Theory of Original Practice." *Shakespeare Survey* 61 (2008): 302–17. DOI: [10.1017/CCOL9780521898881](https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL9780521898881).

Lopez begins his article by asking how early modern scholars can account for the rise of the OP movement in the production of early modern drama. He works to situate the OP movement within the world of literary discourse, while at the same time destabilizing its authoritative claims. Lopez argues that the OP movement is paradoxically both a critique of, and an attempt to co-opt New Historicism as both a critical and ethical practice. He examines various competing definitions of OP by theatrical companies that claim to employ original practice techniques, and in doing so, Lopez maintains that original practice does not have a set definition, because it is a range of practices and critical methods. Lopez seems to be particularly interested in the OP claims made by students affiliated with the American Shakespeare Center, as they tend to highlight the potential OP offers for discovery. Rhetoric regarding discovery and teaching is a trend across the OP companies that Lopez explores, and it most often manifests through claims regarding the theatrical companies refusal to let audience members be intimidated or confused by the drama, while at the same time positioning OP as a critical tool for learning. Lopez believes that this rhetorical trend is indicative of the ways in which scholars communicate the materials they study to both students, and playgoers, but as long as OP has this underlying pedagogical lens from the academic community, then it will be unable to avoid making embodiment irrelevant. While Lopez is invested in critiquing OP, he notes that it has utility in that it articulates a desire within the field to apply the theory for an audience. Lopez's article is useful for providing context on the understanding of original practice within the field of early modern literature, while pointing to inconsistencies, and problems within the practice.

Phelan, Peggy. "Reconstructing Love: *King Lear* and Theatre Architecture." In *A Companion to Shakespeare and Performance*, edited by Barbara Hodgdon and W. B. Worthen, 13–35. John Wiley & Sons, 2008. DOI: [10.1002/9780470996706.ch2](https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996706.ch2).

Forthcoming.

Rylance, Mark. "Research, Materials, and Craft: Principles of Performance at Shakespeare's Globe." In *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, edited by Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper, Cambridge University Press, 2008, 103-15.

This book chapter documents a conversation between Mark Rylance, Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper. Rylance provides his input on the experimental nature of playing at Shakespeare's Globe, and he argues that the Globe theatre is the most experimental space in England, and that it has challenged the ways that other English theatre companies think about their relationship to audience members. He chalks the players unique relationship with playgoers at the Globe theatre up to the use of OP, which he claims allows the players to act

in a more engaging way. Rylance maintains that original practice at the Globe allows the audience to be a part of the creative process; rather than viewing an artifact, they are immersed in the Globe experience. He crucially notes an antagonistic relationship between proponents of original practice and what he calls “free-hand work,” which is the notion that theatre artists should be able to apply their modern instincts to performances at the Globe. Despite this difficult relationship, Rylance maintains that the original practices have helped to define the experimental nature of the Globe, but, he paradoxically notes that he “did not have a hypothesis [he] was trying to prove,” when performing or directing at the Globe (103). The overt lack of scientific method reiterated by Rylance across the interview might make a unique intervention for a company who commits to a defined set of OP standards.

Wallace, James. “That Scull had a Tongue in it and Could Sing Once: Staging Shakespeare’s Contemporaries.” In *Shakespeare’s Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, edited by Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper, Cambridge University Press, 2008, 147-67.

In his book chapter, Wallace describes the goals and practices of the *Read Not Dead* project. According to Wallace, the project endeavors to give staged readings of the surviving plays of Shakespeare’s contemporaries, while also performing adaptations, and the “bad” Shakespeare quartos. The project relies solely on volunteers for participation, and the audience tends to be comprised of scholars and interested community members. *Read Not Dead* typically performs 12-15 plays in one year, but these are divided into three seasons within the year; one problem with this system suggests Wallace, is that the plays are often unrelated, so the various seasons typically don’t have a theme. Actors meet six hours prior to the performance to read through the text and establish entrances and exits; actors are also responsible for their own costuming, and the project most often uses “current dress.”

White, Martin. “Research and the Globe.” In *Shakespeare’s Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, edited by Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper, Cambridge University Press, 2008, 166-74.

In his book chapter, White focuses on the relationship between architecture and research – specifically, the opportunities that the reconstruction of the Globe has offered early modernists. White argues that true OP research is not possible without a reconstructed space, because there is an axiomatic link between stage languages (both physical and verbal) and the performance spaces where these languages are articulated. He explains that reconstruction-based research allows for an exploration of the material factors that would have shaped playing, and audience perception at early modern playhouses. White names the shared lighting feature as one of the most noticeable differences between theatre at the Globe and other contemporary companies, and he, like many other scholars, continues to emphasize this as key to shaping audience responses. While White’s chapter is useful, it points to one problem with many of the entries in this book: many scholars make claims regarding audience member responses to the shared lighting, but they have no quantitative data to back this up.

2007

Orlin, Lena Cowen, and Miranda Johnson-Haddad, eds. *Staging Shakespeare: Essays in Honor of Alan C. Dessen*. University of Delaware Press, 2007.

Forthcoming.

Palfrey, Simon, and Tiffany Stern. "History of the Cue." In *Shakespeare in Parts*, Oxford University Press, 2007, 83-90. DOI: [9780199272051.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1017/9780199272051.001.0001).

In their book chapter, Palfrey and Stern provide an overview of the relationship between cues and early modern drama. Specifically, the two examine the relationship between cues and early modern actors, the possibility of non-verbal cues, and the general length of the cue. Palfrey and Stern highlight the importance of the "tail," or the line preceding the cue word for both early modern writers and actors, as the tail indicates an absence of speech, it is what they have not been given prior to performance, and thus gestures towards anything that might have been said during the in between. The relationship between the actor and the cue is significant, as falling "out" can change the trajectory of the performance, which Palfrey and Stern elucidate through numerous documented examples. Additionally, the duo examines non-verbal entrance cues, and they explain that entrances were most often indicated by backstage-plots, whereas exits are more likely to be textually indicated, either via stage directions or cues.

Palfrey, Simon, and Tiffany Stern. "Interpreting Shakespeare's Cues: Introduction." In *Shakespeare in Parts*, Oxford University Press, 2007, 91-95. DOI: [9780199272051.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1017/9780199272051.001.0001).

In the following chapter, "Interpreting Shakespeare's Cues: Introduction," Palfrey and Stern examine the limits and possibilities of the cue in terms of performance and characterization in Shakespearean texts. The early modern actor would have received a body of text which included all the speeches they had to memorize, as well as their cue words, which Palfrey and Stern maintain largely contributed to the knowledge the actor would have had about the play. Cues had a wide-ranging utility, as they could be used by the actor to cut off another player's speech, provide commentary on a situation, or inject humor into a performance. Notably, while cues could be incredibly helpful, they also represent a possibility for failure, as, if a cue is missed, the world of play stops. Palfrey and Stern complicate this notion by explaining that cue-lines were not often named, thus further opening such performances to risk of failure, however, the lack of naming had the potential to work in the actor's favor, as they had to be grounded and attentive to the world of the play.

Palfrey, Simon, and Tiffany Stern. "Cues and Characterization." In *Shakespeare in Parts*, Oxford University Press, 2007, 96-119. DOI: [9780199272051.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1017/9780199272051.001.0001).

Palfrey and Stern's next chapter, "Cues and Characterization," builds off the work of the previous chapter, as the duo analyzes various entrance, transitional, and recurring cues in Shakespeare's texts. In doing so, Palfrey and Stern continue to highlight the wealth of information contained within the cue. The entrance cues for Hamlet, Macbeth, and Coriolanus/Martius, for example, provide distinctly different descriptions of these three characters, while illuminating past and future tensions, which would provide actors with a keen insight into the world of the play. Transitional cues, by contrast, mark changes in a character's temperament or passions, whereas a recurring cue might have worked to draw attention to a character's circumstance or station. Palfrey and Stern suggest that Shakespeare's cues imply that he purposefully scripted "meta-performative surprises," which in turn would allow the actor to create an existential identity for their character.

Palfrey, Simon, and Tiffany Stern. "Waiting and Suddenness: The Part in Time." In *Shakespeare in Parts*, Oxford University Press, 2007, 120-54. DOI: [9780199272051.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1017/9780199272051.001.0001).

In their following book chapter, "Waiting and Suddenness: The Part in Time," Palfrey and Stern focus on the gaps of time actors would have been faced with between their various cues. The duo specifically examine various cues for Falstaff and MacDuff to attend to the ways in which actors would have leaped from ignorance to awareness. Actors could have read ahead in their cues to get a sense of the plot; the actor playing MacDuff likely knew that his family was going to die in the play and that he would have a speech to express his grief. But he would not have known when exactly, or how this information would be delivered to his character, thus he has several marked moments of ignorance across the text, particularly when he is lamenting Scotland's widows and orphans, with his family previously being murdered the act before. This chapter and the examples provided by Palfrey and Stern were useful for continuing to think about the options provided to the early modern actor, and how the part could influence the actor's characterization.

Walker, Greg, and Thomas Betteridge. "Performance as Research: Performing John Heywood's *Play of the Weather* at Hampton Court." *Medieval English Theatre* 27 (2007): 86–104.

Forthcoming.

2006

Conkie, Rob. *The Globe Theatre Project: Shakespeare and Authenticity*. Edwin Mellen Press, 2006.

Forthcoming.

Menzer, Paul, ed. *Inside Shakespeare: Essays on the Blackfriars Stage*. Susquehanna University Press, 2006.

Forthcoming.

Reason, Matthew. "Young Audiences and Live Theatre, Part 1: Methods, Participation and Memory in Audience Research." *Studies in Theatre and Performance* 26, no. 2 (2006): 129–45. DOI: [10.1386/stap.26.2.129/1](https://doi.org/10.1386/stap.26.2.129/1).

In part one of his two-part article, Reason narrates the findings of his qualitative research project, which was designed to explore perceptions and responses to live theatre. Reason chooses to use teenage students from five different schools as his demographic, as he stresses the importance of homogeneity in such research because it allows meaningful analysis to occur. Reason held a series of one-off workshops with his subjects shortly after they saw a production of *Othello*. The workshop was broken into three sections: warmups and introduction, where the researchers were transparent with the intentions behind their study; memory, where students practiced recalling their entrance into the theatre; and discussion and synthesis where the students reflected on the production. Reason regularly stresses the importance of "participatory enquiry," and while he provides examples of how his team sought to encourage this, the term is never defined, but he does include several resources for researchers engaging in similar projects.

Reason, Matthew. "Young Audiences and Live Theatre, Part 2: Perceptions of Liveness in Performance." *Studies in Theatre and Performance* 26, no. 3 (2006): 221–41.
DOI: [10.1386/stap.26.3.221/1](https://doi.org/10.1386/stap.26.3.221/1).

While the second half of Reason's article appears less related to the goals of OP as the first, Reason provides a great example of how future researchers might organize similar results. For example, the majority of Reason's data is based on drawings participants made during the project, which he includes for readers to see, while providing some analysis. Reason also includes moments of transcribed dialogue from the workshop, and the way that he has incorporated this into the writing will likely be useful for ASP in the future. Reason primarily chooses to organize the article around common trends from the audio, which was easy to follow as a reader.

Weingust, Don. "First Folio Acting Techniques: Richard Flatter, Neil Freeman, and Patrick Tucker." In *Acting from Shakespeare's First Folio: Theory, Text, and Performance*. Routledge, 2006, 1-77.
DOI: [10.4324/9780203968970](https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203968970).

In his first book chapter, Weingust provides an overview of various theatrical approaches to reading the first folio in performance. While Weingust appears to be particularly skeptical about Tucker's work, he categorizes the acting techniques provided by both Tucker and Freeman into the following: word choice in the first folio and modern editions, which relates to both Freeman and Tucker as both are interested in the ways that spelling and editorial emendations in modern editions might impact performance. Tucker, is specifically interested in the category of spelling, as he maintains that the differences between short and long spellings impact performance. Additionally, Tucker is invested in the category of capitalization as well, as Tucker suggests that capitalized words have been specifically chosen and deserve specific emphasis. Both Freeman and Tucker emphasize the importance of Weingust's category of punctuation, as the full end stop that is caused by a period rather than an enjambed line, impacts performance, in addition to their combined investment in speech-prefixes, and metrical variations and lineation's. At times Weingust seems to critique Freeman and Tucker's scholarly methods, but he ultimately seems to believe that these methods may be useful for both students and actors when approaching early modern drama. This chapter is particularly useful for providing an overview of the existing accepted Shakespearean acting models, and these categories might be useful to bear in mind when conducting actor interviews, as some actors might self-categorize their techniques with the part technology into an existing category.

Weingust, Don. "First Folio Techniques and the Death of the Bibliographer." In *Acting from Shakespeare's First Folio: Theory, Text, and Performance*. Routledge, 2006, 78-137.
DOI: [10.4324/9780203968970](https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203968970).

The second chapter of Weingust's book provides an overview of the relationship between Shakespeare's text and bibliographic techniques across time. Weingust suggests that new bibliography create hegemony in Shakespeare editing, but the move away from new bibliography opens up the field to many different techniques. He points to the constant production of new editions of various Shakespeare texts as one manifestation of this, but he

believes that this has more to do with cultural currency of Shakespeare than any actual textual investigation. Weingust returns to Freeman and Tucker, and he suggests that part of the scholarly resistance to their work stems from the general rejection of theatrical approaches to reading Shakespeare. Weingust is particularly invested in understanding Freeman and Tucker's constant invocation of Shakespeare, and while this is interesting, perhaps most notable is the thoughtful way that Weingust pushes back against Tucker's approach to Shakespeare in performance.

Weingust, Don. "First Folio Techniques in Performance: The Original Shakespeare Company and the International Shakespeare's Globe Center." In *Acting from Shakespeare's First Folio: Theory, Text, and Performance*. Routledge, 2006, 137-91. DOI: [10.4324/9780203968970](https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203968970).

The final chapter of Weingust's book has the most utility, as he reads Tucker's practices with OSC within the context of scholarship on early modern drama. Weingust notes that the work of Tucker's company is centered primarily around the actor, audience, text, and the possible connections between these elements. He provides a more in-depth explanation of the processes used by OSC than Tucker himself did, and he significantly notes that actors who want to participate in OSC must take part in a workshop, which acts as both part instruction and an audition. Additionally, OSC tends to feature seasoned professional actors, and there is typically crossover between OSC and RSC. While Tucker provided an outline of OSC's methods in his book, Weingust elaborates on these methods and explains that Tucker only provides first folio-based parts, and that the company meets for a talk-back after each production to discuss what they learned during performance. Perhaps most notable is Weingust's idea that the actors in OSC learn more from their audience members than typical theatrical companies because they do not rehearse. He suggests that actors with OSC are able to garner more of a response from playgoers because of the level of improvisation that goes into such productions.

2005

Crystal, David. *Pronouncing Shakespeare*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
DOI: [10.1017/9781108566759](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108566759).

Crystal's book is comprised of biographical, narrative, and academic content, detailing his experience aiding in Tim Carroll's OP production of *Romeo and Juliet*, which included original pronunciation as part of one of its features. Crystal explains that original pronunciation is simply the early modern English printed text, but phonetically pronounced. To aid in this production, Crystal essentially provided transcribed parts for each actor, in an effort to help with their original pronunciation. Original pronunciation is built around early modern spelling, direct evidence obtained from contemporary accounts of the language (typically from orthoepists), and sound patterns. Crystal provides an account of his and Carroll's process getting Shakespeare's Globe to accept this idea and implementing this among the actors. Crystal additionally includes several transcribed interviews from the actors, and he maintains that overall original pronunciation gave the actors a new sense of their characters; Bette Bourne's Nurse maintained that OP gave him an entirely new outlook on the character.

Kidnie, M. J. "Where Is *Hamlet*? Text, Performance, and Adaptation." In *A Companion to Shakespeare and Performance*, edited by Barbara Hodgdon and William B. Worthen, 101–20. Blackwell

Companions to Literature and Culture. Malden, Blackwell, 2005.
DOI: [10.1002/9780470996706.ch6](https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996706.ch6).

Forthcoming.

Palfrey, Simon. *Doing Shakespeare*. The Arden Shakespeare, 2005. DOI: [10.5040/9781408160466](https://doi.org/10.5040/9781408160466).

Palfrey's book endeavors to provide guidelines for individuals to understand how to "do" Shakespeare, and thus, Palfrey notes that the book does not need to be read in chronological order, because it is intended to work with the reader in further developing their understanding of Shakespeare. Each chapter in the book explores a particular formal technique or dramatic phenomenon, and the first half of the book thinks about how to "do" or use the language of Shakespeare, while the second half thinks about Shakespeare's characters. Given that Palfrey cites no actual sources (outside of his rather scarce further reading page), very little of his book appears to be of little use to practitioners. He does, however, briefly explain the part in chapter eight, and Palfrey thinks about the role as a "symbol of blank character" as it has nothing more than material or textual traces, thus the meaning making is up to the actor. Palfrey thinks about the part primarily in relationship to the actor, and he suggests that characters such as Richard and Falstaff likely would have had too much text to scroll through at one time, so the actors would likely create the part in the places they needed, rather than un-scroll.

2004

Erne, Lukas, and M. J. Kidnie. *Textual Performances: The Modern Reproduction of Shakespeare's Drama*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Forthcoming.

Stern, Tiffany. "'A Small-Beer Health to His Second Day': Playwrights, Prologues, and First Performances in the Early Modern Theater." *Studies in Philology* 101, no. 2 (2004): 172–99.
DOI: [10.1353/sip.2004.0010](https://doi.org/10.1353/sip.2004.0010).

In her article, Stern examines prologues and epilogues from early modern drama, and she maintains that these two features were temporary and intended only for opening day performances. By examining prologues and epilogues from various early modern texts, Stern argues that plays were packaged differently for their first performance than how they were later packaged, and subsequently, printed plays without prologues engage in different types of statements. Through the article Stern demonstrates the ways in which prologues and epilogues were treated by the playhouse; these theatrical documents were often kept separate from the playbook, and this separation marks their impermanence. Additionally, Stern highlights the separation from the actor who gave the prologue from the rest of the cast, as these actors occupied a liminal space, and did not dress like either the actors or the audience members.

2002

Tucker, Patrick. *Secrets of Acting Shakespeare: The Original Approach*. Routledge, 2002.

Tucker's book includes a wide range of topics, such as his theories regarding parts, the early modern actor's process, and his experience founding the Original Shakespeare Company (OSC). While Tucker's thoughts regarding the part technology are useful and should probably be included on a reference list, perhaps most useful was his explanation of the schedule for actors working with OSC. Actors working with Tucker receive their parts the day of performance, and then the company partakes in "Burbage hour" where entrances and exits are decided. Tucker additionally meets individually with all actors and the book-keeper to go over lines, and he maintains that this is a fundamentally empowering experience for his actors. Tucker's research, while interesting, is confusing, as outside of the parts and rehearsal window, few other OP methods seem to be employed. Tucker does not use shared lighting, and while the actors do not have character-specific costumes, they seem to have company-specific costuming that matches the group as a unit.

1989

Thompson, Ruth, and Marvin Thompson, eds. *Shakespeare and the Sense of Performance: Essays in the Tradition of Performance Criticism in Honor of Bernard Beckerman*. University of Delaware Press, 1989.

Forthcoming.

1985

Milhous, Judith, and Robert D. Hume. "The Concept of Producible Interpretation." In *Producible Interpretation: Eight English Plays, 1675-1707*, 3-34. Southern Illinois University Press, 1985.

Forthcoming.