DRAMA

CRITICISM

VOLUME

29

ISSN 1056-4349

DRAMA

CRITICISM

Criticism of the Most Significant and Widely Studied Dramatic Works from All the World's Literatures

VOLUME 29

Thomas J. Schoenberg
Lawrence J. Trudeau
Project Editors

GALE
CENGAGE Learning

Detroit • New York • San Francisco • New Haven, Conn • Waterville, Maine • London

GALE
CENGAGE Learning

Drama Criticism, Vol. 29

Project Editors: Thomas J. Schoenberg and Lawrence J. Trudeau

Editorial: Dana Ramel Barnes, Tom Burns, Elizabeth A. Cranston, Kathy D. Darrow, Kristen A. Dorsch, Jeffrey W. Hunter, Jelena O. Krstović, Michelle Lee, Russel Whitaker

Data Capture: Frances Monroe, Gwen Tucker

Indexing Services: Laurie Andriot

Rights and Acquisitions: Katherine Alverson, Vernon English, Shalice Shah-Caldwell

Composition and Electronic Capture: Gary Oudersluys

Manufacturing: Cynde Bishop

Associate Product Manager: Marc Cormier

Gale
27500 Drake Rd.
Farmington Hills, MI, 48331-3535

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER 76-46132

ISBN-13: 978-0-7876-8113-5
ISBN-10: 0-7876-8113-X

ISSN 1056-4349

Printed in the United States of America
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 12 11 10 09 08

Preface

Drama Criticism (*DC*) is principally intended for beginning students of literature and theater as well as the average playgoer. The series is therefore designed to introduce readers to the most frequently studied playwrights of all time periods and nationalities and to present discerning commentary on dramatic works of enduring interest. Furthermore, *DC* seeks to acquaint the reader with the uses and functions of criticism itself. Selected from a diverse body of commentary, the essays in *DC* offer insights into the authors and their works but do not require that the reader possess a wide background in literary studies. Where appropriate, reviews of important productions of the plays discussed are also included to give students a heightened awareness of drama as a dynamic art form, one that many claim is fully realized only in performance.

DC was created in response to suggestions by the staffs of high school, college, and public libraries. These librarians observed a need for a series that assembles critical commentary on the world's most renowned dramatists in the same manner as Gale's *Short Story Criticism* (*SSC*) and *Poetry Criticism* (*PC*), which present material on writers of short fiction and poetry. Although playwrights are covered in such Gale literary criticism series as *Contemporary Literary Criticism* (*CLC*), *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism* (*TCLC*), *Nineteenth-Century Literature Criticism* (*NCLC*), *Literature Criticism from 1400 to 1800* (*LC*), and *Classical and Medieval Literature Criticism* (*CMLC*), *DC* directs more concentrated attention on individual dramatists than is possible in the broader, survey-oriented entries in these Gale series. Commentary on the works of William Shakespeare may be found in *Shakespearean Criticism* (*SC*).

Scope of the Series

By collecting and organizing commentary on dramatists, *DC* assists students in their efforts to gain insight into literature, achieve better understanding of the texts, and formulate ideas for papers and assignments. A variety of interpretations and assessments is offered, allowing students to pursue their own interests and promoting awareness that literature is dynamic and responsive to many different opinions.

Approximately five to ten authors are included in each volume, and each entry presents a historical survey of the critical response to that playwright's work. The length of an entry is intended to reflect the amount of critical attention the author has received from critics writing in English and from foreign critics in translation. Every attempt has been made to identify and include the most significant essays on each author's work. In order to provide these important critical pieces, the editors sometimes reprint essays that have appeared elsewhere in Gale's literary criticism series. Such duplication, however, never exceeds twenty percent of a *DC* volume.

Organization of the Book

A *DC* entry consists of the following elements:

- The **Author Heading** consists of the playwright's most commonly used name, followed by birth and death dates. If an author consistently wrote under a pseudonym, the pseudonym is listed in the author heading and the real name given in parentheses on the first line of the introduction. Also located at the beginning of the introduction are any name variations under which the dramatist wrote, including transliterated forms of the names of authors whose languages use nonroman alphabets.

- The **Introduction** contains background information that introduces the reader to the author and the critical debates surrounding his or her work.

- A **Portrait of the Author** is included when available.

- The list of **Principal Works** is divided into two sections. The first section contains the author's dramatic pieces and is organized chronologically by date of first performance. If this has not been conclusively determined, the composition or publication date is used. The second section provides information on the author's major works in other genres.

- Essays offering **overviews of the dramatist's entire literary career** give the student broad perspectives on the writer's artistic development, themes, and concerns that recur in several of his or her works, the author's place in literary history, and other wide-ranging topics.

- **Criticism** of individual plays offers the reader in-depth discussions of a select number of the author's most important works. In some cases, the criticism is divided into two sections, each arranged chronologically. When a significant performance of a play can be identified (typically, the premier of a twentieth-century work), the first section of criticism will feature **production reviews** of this staging. Most entries include sections devoted to **critical commentary** that assesses the literary merit of the selected plays. When necessary, essays are carefully excerpted to focus on the work under consideration; often, however, essays and reviews are reprinted in their entirety. Footnotes are reprinted at the end of each essay or excerpt. In the case of excerpted criticism, only those footnotes that pertain to the excerpted texts are included.

- Critical essays are prefaced by brief **Annotations** explicating each piece.

- A complete **Bibliographic Citation,** designed to help the interested reader locate the original essay or book, precedes each piece of criticism. Source citations in the Literary Criticism Series follow University of Chicago Press style, as outlined in *The Chicago Manual of Style,* 14th ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1993).

- An annotated bibliography of **Further Reading** appears at the end of each entry and suggests resources for additional study. In some cases, significant essays for which the editors could not obtain reprint rights are included here. Boxed material following the further reading list provides references to other biographical and critical sources on the author in series published by Gale.

Cumulative Indexes

A **Cumulative Author Index** lists all of the authors that appear in a wide variety of reference sources published by Gale, including *DC.* A complete list of these sources is found facing the first page of the Author Index. The index also includes birth and death dates and cross references between pseudonyms and actual names.

A **Cumulative Nationality Index** lists all authors featured in *DC* by nationality, followed by the number of the *DC* volume in which their entry appears.

A **Cumulative Title Index** lists in alphabetical order the individual plays discussed in the criticism contained in *DC.* Each title is followed by the author's last name and corresponding volume and page numbers where commentary on the work is located. English-language translations of original foreign-language titles are cross-referenced to the foreign titles so that all references to discussion of a work are combined in one listing.

Citing *Drama Criticism*

When citing criticism reprinted in the Literary Criticism Series, students should provide complete bibliographic information so that the cited essay can be located in the original print or electronic source. Students who quote directly from reprinted criticism may use any accepted bibliographic format, such as University of Chicago Press style or Modern Language Association (MLA) style. Both the MLA and the University of Chicago formats are acceptable and recognized as being the current standards for citations. It is important, however, to choose one format for all citations; do not mix the two formats within a list of citations.

The examples below follow recommendations for preparing a bibliography set forth in *The Chicago Manual of Style,* 14th ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1993); the first example pertains to material drawn from periodicals, the second to material reprinted from books:

Morrison, Jago. "Narration and Unease in Ian McEwan's Later Fiction." *Critique* 42, no. 3 (spring 2001): 253-68. Reprinted in *Drama Criticism.* Vol. 20, edited by Janet Witalec, 212-20. Detroit: Gale, 2003.

Brossard, Nicole. "Poetic Politics." In *The Politics of Poetic Form: Poetry and Public Policy,* edited by Charles Bernstein, 73-82. New York: Roof Books, 1990. Reprinted in *Drama Criticism.* Vol. 20, edited by Janet Witalec, 3-8. Detroit: Gale, 2003.

The examples below follow recommendations for preparing a works cited list set forth in the *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers,* 5th ed. (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1999); the first example pertains to material drawn from periodicals, the second to material reprinted from books:

Morrison, Jago. "Narration and Unease in Ian McEwan's Later Fiction." *Critique* 42.3 (spring 2001): 253-68. Reprinted in *Drama Criticism.* Ed. Janet Witalec. Vol. 20. Detroit: Gale, 2003. 212-20.

Brossard, Nicole. "Poetic Politics." *The Politics of Poetic Form: Poetry and Public Policy.* Ed. Charles Bernstein. New York: Roof Books, 1990. 73-82. Reprinted in *Drama Criticism.* Ed. Janet Witalec. Vol. 20. Detroit: Gale, 2003. 3-8.

Suggestions are Welcome

Readers who wish to suggest new features, topics, or authors to appear in future volumes, or who have other suggestions or comments are cordially invited to call, write, or fax the Product Manager:

Product Manager, Literary Criticism Series
Gale
27500 Drake Road
Farmington Hills, MI 48331-3535
1-800-347-4253 (GALE)
Fax: 248-699-8054

Acknowledgments

The editors wish to thank the copyright holders of the criticism included in this volume and the permissions managers of many book and magazine publishing companies for assisting us in securing reproduction rights. Following is a list of the copyright holders who have granted us permission to reproduce material in this volume of *DC.* Every effort has been made to trace copyright, but if omissions have been made, please let us know.

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL IN *DC,* VOLUME 29, WAS REPRODUCED FROM THE FOLLOWING PERIODICALS:

AUMLA, November 1983. Reproduced by permission.—***Cahiers Élisabéthains,*** October, 1998. Copyright © 1998 *Cahiers Élisabéthains.* Reproduced by permission of the publisher.—***Carlton Germanic Papers,*** vol. 14, 1986 for "'Schlug meiner Leiden letzte Stunde?': The Problems of the Resolution of Kleist's *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*" by Roger A. Nicholls. Copyright © 1986. Reproduced by permission of the author.—***Chicago Sun-Times,*** December 8, 1994. Copyright ©1994 by Chicago Sun-Times, LLC. Reprinted with permission.—***Chicago Tribune,*** November 24, 1994 for "Thrill Show" by Lawrence Bommer. Reproduced by permission of the author.—***Colloquia Germanica,*** 1992 for "Kleist's *Prinz Friedrich von Homburg*: A Comedic Lighting of Political Icons" by Lawrence O. Frye. Copyright © 1993 by A. Francke Verlag Tubingen und Basel. All rights strictly reserved. Reproduced by permission of the Literary Estate of the Author.—***Comparative Literature,*** v. 41, summer 1989 for "Sacrifice and the Semiotics of Power in *Der zerbrochene Krug*" by Kenneth S. Calhoon. Copyright © 1989 by the University of Oregon. Reproduced by permission of the author.—***Daily Mail (London),*** May 5, 1992. Reproduced by permission.—***Deutsche Vierteljahrs Schrift,*** v. 56, September 1982. Copyright © 1982 J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung und Carl Ernst Poeschel Verlag GmbH in Stuttgart. Reproduced by permission.—***English Studies,*** v. 70, February, 1989. Copyright © 1989 by Swets & Zeitlinger. Reproduced by permission.—***Exemplaria,*** v. 9, fall, 1997. Copyright © 1997 by Pegasus Press, Asheville, North Carolina. Reproduced by permission.—***George Sand Studies,*** v. 7, 1985. Copyright ©1985 by *George Sand Studies.* Reproduced by permission.—***German Quarterly,*** v. 69, spring 1996. Copyright © 1996 by the American Association of Teachers of German. Reproduced by permission.—***The Guardian,*** April 21, 1992; February 1, 2002. Copyright © 1992, 2002 Guardian News & Media Ltd. Reproduced by permission of Guardian News Service, LTD.—***Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England,*** v. 3, 1986; v. 12, 1999. Copyright © 1986, 1999 by Rosemont Publishing & Printing Corp. All rights reserved. Both reproduced by permission.—***Oxford German Studies,*** v. 14, 1983 for "Kleist's Metamorphoses: Some Remarks on the Use of Mythology in *Penthesilea*" by Roger Paulin./ v. 22, 1993 for "'Und was, wenn Offenbarung uns nicht wird': Kleist's Kantkrise and Theatrical Revelation in *Amphitryon*" by John Walker. Both reproduced by permission of the respective authors.—***Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Reforme,*** v. 24, 2000. Copyright © 2000 by Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies/Société Canadienne d'Etudes de la Renaissance. Reproduced by permission.—***Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama,*** v. 33, 1994. Copyright © 1994 by David M. Bergeron. Reproduced by permission.—***The Spectator,*** v. 288, February 9, 2002. Copyright © 2002 by *The Spectator.* Reproduced by permission of *The Spectator.*—***Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900,*** v. 26, spring, 1986; v. 34, spring, 1994. Copyright © 1986, 1994 by William Marsh Rice University. The Johns Hopkins University Press. Both reproduced by permission.—***Studies in Romanticism,*** v. 39, spring 2000. Copyright © 2000 by the Trustees of Boston University. Reproduced by permission.—***Sunday Times (London),*** February 3, 2002. Reproduced by permission.—***Times (London),*** April 18, 1992; February 1, 2002. Copyright © 1992, 2002 by Times Newspapers Limited. Both reproduced by permission.

COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL IN *DC,* VOLUME 29, WAS REPRODUCED FROM THE FOLLOWING BOOKS:

Brown, Hilda Meldrum. From ***Heinrich von Kleist: The Ambiguity of Art and the Necessity of Form.*** Clarendon Press, 1998. Copyright © Hilda Meldrum Brown 1998. All rights reserved. Reproduced by permission of Oxford University Press, Inc.—Cooper, Lisa H. From "Chivalry, Commerce, and Conquest: Heywood's *The Four Prentices of London,*" in ***Material Culture and Cultural Materialisms in the Middle Ages and Renaissance.*** Edited by Curtis Perry. Brepols, 2001. Copyright © 2001, Brepols Publishers n.v, Turnhout, Belgium. Reproduced by permission.—Courtland, Joseph. From ***A Cultural Studies Approach to Two Exotic Citizen Romances by Thomas Heywood.*** Peter Lang, 2001. Copyright © 2001 Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., New York. All rights reserved. Reproduced by permission.—Dessen, Alan C. From "'The difference betwixt reporting and representing': Thomas Heywood and the Playgoer's Imagination," in ***Acts of Criticism:***

Gale Literature Product Advisory Board

The members of the Gale Literature Product Advisory Board—reference librarians from public and academic library systems—represent a cross-section of our customer base and offer a variety of informed perspectives on both the presentation and content of our literature products. Advisory board members assess and define such quality issues as the relevance, currency, and usefulness of the author coverage, critical content, and literary topics included in our series; evaluate the layout, presentation, and general quality of our printed volumes; provide feedback on the criteria used for selecting authors and topics covered in our series; provide suggestions for potential enhancements to our series; identify any gaps in our coverage of authors or literary topics, recommending authors or topics for inclusion; analyze the appropriateness of our content and presentation for various user audiences, such as high school students, undergraduates, graduate students, librarians, and educators; and offer feedback on any proposed changes/enhancements to our series. We wish to thank the following advisors for their advice throughout the year.

Barbara M. Bibel
Librarian
Oakland Public Library
Oakland, California

Dr. Toby Burrows
Principal Librarian
The Scholars' Centre
University of Western Australia Library
Nedlands, Western Australia

Celia C. Daniel
Associate Reference Librarian
Howard University Libraries
Washington, D.C.

David M. Durant
Reference Librarian
Joyner Library
East Carolina University
Greenville, North Carolina

Nancy T. Guidry
Librarian
Bakersfield Community College
Bakersfield, California

Heather Martin
Arts & Humanities Librarian
University of Alabama at Birmingham, Sterne Library
Birmingham, Alabama

Susan Mikula
Librarian
Indiana Free Library
Indiana, Pennsylvania

Thomas Nixon
Humanities Reference Librarian
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Davis Library
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Mark Schumacher
Jackson Library
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Greensboro, North Carolina

Gwen Scott-Miller
Assistant Director
Sno-Isle Regional Library System
Marysville, Washington

Contents

Thomas Heywood
1573?-1641

English playwright, poet, biographer, and nonfiction writer.

INTRODUCTION

A prolific English playwright, Heywood is said to have authored some 220 plays in whole or in part. Of these, twenty-four survive. His plays include romances, tragedies, historical chronicles, comedies, and dramatizations of classical myths. He is best-known for his *A Woman Killed with Kindness* (1603), a domestic tragedy that is regarded as one of the first to focus on middle-class characters.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Heywood was born around 1573 in Lincolnshire to Reverend Robert Heywood, a country parson, and his wife, Elizabeth. Although very little is known with certainty about the circumstances of Heywood's early life, evidence suggests that he attended Cambridge University from 1592 until 1593, when his father's death forced him to leave school and begin working. Moving to London at that time, Heywood began his career as an actor and playwright. He probably first wrote for the Admiral's Men acting company in October 1596. By 1598 he was a regular actor in the company and had also established his reputation as a talented playwright. Thereafter, Heywood wrote a wide range of plays at the request of various theaters, including the prestigious Queen Anne's Men and Lady Elizabeth's Men.

Playwrights of the time had little interest in printing works written for stage production; while Heywood boasted that he had written or collaborated with other writers in over 220 plays, only twenty-four have been preserved. Although his plays were successful, Heywood remained poor throughout his life, as he ruefully expressed in his 1635 poem *The Hierarchie of the Blessed Angells*. Heywood was married twice, first to Anne Buttler, who died, and then to June Span; neither marriage appears to have produced children. Heywood died in August, 1641, and was buried at St. James Church in Clerkenwell, where he had been living since 1623.

MAJOR DRAMATIC WORKS

Heywood's plays are diverse and were mostly aimed at a middle-class audience. *Edward IV,* a two-part work written and first performed sometime between 1594 and 1599, is a chronicle history play that prominently features middle-class historical figures, including Jane Shore, who left her husband to become King Edward IV's mistress. Heywood's *The Four Prentices of London* (c. 1594-1600) is a chivalric romance involving a group of young English artisans who travel to the Holy Land in 1095, suggesting that apprentices as well as noblemen participated in the Crusades. Heywood's contemporaries Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher considered *The Four Prentices of London* absurdly grandiose, and they parodied it in their play *The Knight of the Burning Pestle.*

Heywood's *The Fair Maid of the West* is an extravagant romance in two parts, the first of which was staged around 1597-1610 and the second much later, around 1630-31. An exotic tale about a sea captain and an innkeeper, the play is set in England, the Azores, and Morocco. *If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody* a two-part historical chronicle first staged in 1603, compares the life of Queen Elizabeth I with that of Thomas Gresham, a prominent merchant whom she knights. Heywood's *The Wise Woman of Hogsdon* (1604) is a moralistic comedy involving deception and disguise.

Heywood drew on classical material as a basis for several plays, including *The Rape of Lucrece* (c. 1606-08), a tragedy interspersed with comedic songs. This was followed by a series of plays treating the myths and legends of ancient Greece and Rome: *The Golden Age* (c. 1609-11), *The Silver Age* (c. 1610-12), *The Brazen Age* (c. 1610-13), and the two-part play *The Iron Age* (c. 1612-13). Heywood's major late plays include *The English Traveller* (c. 1625), a marital drama; and *Love's Mistress* (1634), which adapts the story of Cupid and Psyche as told by Apulius.

Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness,* first staged in 1603, has always been considered his masterpiece. The play depicts the domestic lives of the English gentry. Its main plot concerns the recently married John and Anne Frankford, and a friend, Wendoll, whom John invites to live in their home. After John learns that Anne and Wendoll are having an affair, Anne starves

herself to death in remorse. The play's subplot involves Anne's brother, Francis Acton, who magnanimously pays the debts of a man, Charles, because he is in love with Charles's sister, Susan. Charles offers him Susan's "honor" for paying his debts, believing that Francis would not marry Susan because she has no dowry. But Francis offers to marry her, and she accepts.

CRITICAL RECEPTION

Heywood's works were performed frequently in their day, and some are known to have been revived decades after they were first staged. Further evidence of their popularity can be seen in the unauthorized versions of some of his plays that were surreptitiously published to capitalize on their success. Heywood wrote a wide range of plays, but remains best known for domestic drama and the depiction of everyday English life. Modern scholars find that Heywood's writings reveal much about domestic and commercial life during his era. Critical discussions of *A Woman Killed with Kindness* tend to consider the play's theme of morality, the relationship between the play's plot and subplot, Heywood's portrayal of marriage and friendship, and his characterizations of men and women. In discussing Heywood's plays in general, some critics lament that Heywood, like other writers of his era, has been overshadowed by William Shakespeare to such an extent that his writings are not given the serious appraisal that is their due.

PRINCIPAL WORKS

Plays

Edward IV, Parts 1 and 2 c. 1594-99
The Four Prentices of London, with The Conquest of Jerusalem c. 1594-1600
The Fair Maid of the West, Part 1 c. 1597-1610
Joan as Good as My Lady 1599
War without Blows and Love without Suit 1599
Christmas Comes but Once a Year [with Thomas Dekker, Henry Chettle, and John Webster] 1602
The Blind Man Eats Many a Fly 1603
If You Know Not Me, You Know Nobody, Parts 1 and 2 1603
A Woman Killed with Kindness 1603
The Wise Woman of Hogsdon 1604
The Rape of Lucrece c. 1606-08
Fortune by Land and Sea [with William Rowley] c. 1609
The Golden Age c. 1609-11
The Silver Age c. 1610-12
The Brazen Age c. 1610-13
The Iron Age, Parts 1 and 2 c. 1612-13
The Captives 1624
The English Traveller c. 1625
The Escapes of Jupiter c. 1625
The Fair Maid of the West, Part 2 c. 1630-31
Londini Artium et Scientiarum Scaturigo, or London's Fountain of Arts and Sciences 1632
Londini Emporia 1633
A Maidenhead Well Lost c. 1633
The Late Lancashire Witches [with Richard Brome] 1634
Love's Mistress 1634
A Challenge for Beauty c. 1634-36
Londini Sinus Salutis, or London's Harbor of Health and Happiness 1635
Londini Speculum, or London's Mirror 1637
Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's 1637
Porta Pietatis, or The Port of Piety 1638
Londini Status Pacatus, or London's Peaceable Estate 1639
Love's Masterpiece 1640

Other Major Works

An Apology for Actors. Containing Three Briefe Treatises (nonfiction) 1612
Gunaikeion: or, Nine Bookes of Various History. Concerninge omen (nonfiction) 1624
The Hierarchie of the Blessed Angells (poetry and prose) 1635
A Curtaine Lecture: As It Is Read by a Countrey Farmers Wife to Her Good Man (prose) 1637
The Exemplary Lives and Memorable Acts of Nine of the Most Worthy Women of the World (biographies) 1640

OVERVIEWS AND GENERAL STUDIES

Alan C. Dessen (essay date 2006)

SOURCE: Dessen, Alan C. "'The Difference Betwixt Reporting and Representing': Thomas Heywood and the Playgoer's Imagination." In *Acts of Criticism: Performance Matters in Shakespeare and His Contemporaries,* edited by Paul Nelsen and June Schlueter, pp. 46-57. Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2006.

[*In the following essay, Dessen suggests that Heywood's plays presented difficult-to-stage scenes, such as a battle or hunt, with extraordinary skill and creativity, using language, stage direction, costume, and sound effects.*]

The gap between critical theory and theatrical practice in the English Renaissance can be huge. In particular, neoclassical critics and professional playwrights of the

period differ significantly as to what should or should not be brought onto the stage (compare Ben Jonson's *The Alchemist* or a play by Jean Racine to *I Henry VI, Antony and Cleopatra,* and Thomas Heywood's ***The Brazen Age***). The best known exposition of the neoclassical position is Sir Philip Sidney's witty and incisive commentary on early Elizabethan drama. In such plays, he observes:

> you shal have *Asia* of the one side, and *Affrick* of the other, and so many other under-kingdoms, that the Player, when he commeth in, must ever begin with telling where he is, or els the tale wil not be conceived. Now ye shal have three Ladies walke to gather flowers, and then we must beleeve the stage to be a Garden. By and by, we heare newes of shipwracke in the same place, and then wee are to blame if we accept it not for a Rock. Upon the backe of that, comes out a hidious Monster, with fire and smoke, and then the miserable beholders are bounde to take it for a Cave. While in the meantime two Armies flye in, represented with foure swords and bucklers, and then what harde heart will not receive it for a pitched fielde?[1]

Consider, however, an alternative, more positive approach to the same onstage activity that builds upon the imaginative participation of the audience in the spirit of *as if.*[2] A sixteenth-century playgoer would infer from "foure swords and bucklers" in combat an army and, in general terms, "a pitched fielde"; given appropriate dialogue and acting, when a monster enters through a stage door, for a moment that door would become a cave mouth; if ladies gather flowers, even if only in pantomime, a spectator would supply the garden; the sighting of a shipwreck would imply a vantage point near the water, Sidney's rock. His terms ("Now . . . By and by . . . Upon the backe of that . . . While in the meantime . . .") adroitly express a witty incredulity that all these events are being presented "in the same place"; but from another, more sympathetic point of view, this chameleon-like flexibility could be seen as a major asset. Like Jonson and George Chapman two decades later, Sidney rejects many popular dramatic conventions (what "the miserable beholders" have to "beleeve" or "accept" if the scene is to work) that *were* shared by less fastidious playgoers.

Sidney concludes his skewering of the excesses of English theatrical romances of the 1570s with the commonsensical comment that "many things may be told which cannot be shewed" if dramatists would only observe "the difference betwixt reporting and representing."[3] With this latter distinction, however, the battle lines between critics and theatrical practitioners are not so clearly drawn. To substitute the *reporting* of a chorus or choric figure for the sweep of onstage action (as with Shakespeare's presentation of the battle of Actium in *Antony and Cleopatra,* 3.10) *is* a stock device throughout the period. Comparable is the use of elaborate dumb shows to bring complex events onstage (often with a chorus or presenter to spell out what the playgoer is seeing)—as in *Edmond Ironside* (1595), where the Chorus would prefer to have the audience "see the battailes Acted on the stage," but since "theire length wilbe to tedious / then in dumbe shewes I will explaine at large / theire fightes, theire flightes and *Edmonds* victory."[4]

Still, most popular drama before and after Sidney's strictures ranged widely in space and time and brought onstage exciting events that would seem either to strain the limits of a playgoer's credulity or to pose insuperable difficulties for the players. In his argument on behalf of the classical *nuntius,* Sidney remarks: "I may speake (though I am heere) of *Peru,* and in speech digresse from that to the description of *Calicut*; but in action I cannot represent it without *Pacolets* horse,"[5] yet in the closing moments of John Day, William Rowley, and George Wilkins' *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* (1607), the dramatists do introduce a version of Pacolet's horse: a perspective glass that enables the three brothers, widely dispersed in different countries, to see and communicate with each other: "*Enter three severall waies the three Brothers; Robert with the state of Persia . . . ; Sir Anthonie with the King of Spaine and others, . . . ; Sir Thomas in England. . . . Fame gives to each a prospective glasse, they seme to see one another and offer to embrace, at which Fame parts them, and so: Exeunt.*"[6] Despite the position taken by figures like Sidney and despite the practical limitations of their stages, Elizabethan playwrights, players, and playgoers clearly relished big scenes and effects that would seem to us to burst the bounds of the Globe.

How, then, did playwrights deal with the challenge posed by theatrical exigency? One response was to provide the audience with an apology or a plea for pardon. Readers of *Henry V* are familiar with the series of appeals to the playgoer to *suppose* or *imagine* what cannot be represented in the wooden O. The Prologue apologizes for the limits of "this unworthy scaffold" in conveying "So great an object" as Agincourt; still, the players can "On your imaginary forces work" if the viewers are willing to "Suppose" and "make imaginary puissance" by dividing one man into a thousand parts, to "Think, when we talk of horses, that you see them / Printing their proud hoofs i' th' receiving earth," in short, to "Piece out our imperfections with your thoughts." Again, the Chorus to act 3 pleads with the audience to "Suppose," "behold," "do but think," "Grapple your minds," "Work, work your thoughts, and therein see a siege," and, finally, "Still be kind, / And eche out our performance with your mind." Before Agincourt, the Chorus to act 4 apologizes in advance for disgracing this great event "With four or five most vile and ragged foils / (Right ill dispos'd in brawl ridiculous)" but asks the audience: "Yet sit and see, / Minding true things by what their mock'ries be."[7]

Repeatedly, this choric spokesman asks the audience to accept a part for the whole, to supply imaginatively what cannot be introduced physically onto the open stage.

That same appeal, moreover, is found in comparable if less familiar passages outside the Shakespeare canon. Instructive but atypical is *suppose* used in a stage direction as an imperative verb to set up an *as if* situation: "*Suppose the Temple of Mahomet*" (*Selimus* [1592]).[8] More common is the use of *suppose* or comparable terms to streamline a narrative: "You must suppose king Richard now is deade, / And John (resistlesse) is faire Englands Lord" (Anthony Munday, *The Death of Robert Earl of Huntington* [1598]);[9] "Now let your thoughts as swift as is the winde, / Skip some few yeares, that *Cromwell* spent in travell, / And now imagine him to be in England" (*Thomas Lord Cromwell* [1600]);[10] "Now be pleas'd, / That your imaginations may help you / To think them safe in Persia . . ." (John Fletcher and Philip Massinger, *The Prophetess* [1622]);[11] "Our Sceane lies speechlesse, active but yet dumbe, / Till your expressing thoughts give it a tongue" (*The Travels of the Three English Brothers,* 6); "Imagine now that whilst he is retired, / From Cambridge back unto his native home, / Suppose the silent, sable visaged night, / Casts her black curtain over all the world" (*Mery Devil of Edmonton* [1602]).[12]

As in *Henry V,* such appeals often are linked to events that cannot be represented onstage. The Chorus in *Captain Thomas Stukeley* (1596) notes that three kings died in one battle and adds:

> Your gentle favour must we needs entreat,
> For rude presenting such a royall fight,
> Which more imaginatian must supply:
> Then all our utmost strength can reach unto.[13]

A similar entreaty is provided by Thomas Dekker's Prologue to *Old Fortunatus* (1599):

> And for this smal Circumference must stand,
> For the imagind Sur-face of much land,
> Of many kingdomes, and since many a mile,
> Should here be measurd out: our muse intreats,
> Your thoughts to helpe poore Art, . . .[14]

A Chorus in John Kirke's *The Seven Champions of Christendom* (1635) notes the problems posed by "the shortnesse of the time" and the many exploits of the champions that would "fill a larger Scene than on this Stage / An Action would containe." The solution is to have each champion "beare a little part / Of their more larger History" and to appeal to the playgoer: "Then let your fancies deeme upon a stage, / One man a thousand, and one houre an age."[15] More elaborate is the appeal in the Prologue to *The Travels of the Three English Brothers*:

> Imagin now the gentle breath of heaven
> Hath on the liquid high-way of the waves
> Convaid him many thousand leagues from us:
> Thinke you have seene him saile by many lands,
> And now at last, arriv'd in *Persia,*
> Within the confines of the great *Sophey,*
> Thinke you have heard his curteous salute
> Speake in a peale of shot, . . .
>
> (6)

Events at sea are particularly difficult to stage. Note this passage from Heywood's ***The Four Prentices of London*** (1600):

> Imagine now yee see the aire made thicke
> With stormy tempests, that disturbe the Maine:
> And the foure windes at warre among themselves:
> And the weake Barkes wherein the brothers saile,
> Split on strange rockes, and they enforc'd to swim:
> To save their desperate lives.[16]

An especially elaborate appeal is found in Fletcher and Massinger's *The Prophetess,* where a Chorus introducing a dumb show notes that "So full of matter is our Historie / . . . that there wants / Room in this narrow Stage, and time to express / In Action to the life . . ." the necessary events but then asks that "Your apprehensive judgments will conceive / Out of the shadow we can only shew, / How fair the Body was . . ." so that the playgoer can "behold / As in a silent Mirrour, what we cannot / With fit conveniency of time, allow'd / For such Presentments, cloath in vocal sounds" (362-63).

Such apologies and appeals to the imagination, especially when coupled with the strictures of neoclassical purists such as Sidney and Jonson, would seem to suggest severe constraints upon what could be introduced onto the Globe or other stages. But given the available conventions or shared assumptions (at least in the public theaters), such limits seem to evaporate. For example, consider battle scenes, among the most difficult to realize effectively on any stage. Sidney could mock "two Armies . . . represented with foure swords and bucklers"; Jonson could sneer at the players who "with three rustie swords, / And helpe of some few foot-and-halfe-foote words, / Fight over *Yorke,* and *Lancasters* long iarres: / And in the tyring-house bring wounds, to scarres" (Prologue to *Every Man in his Humour*).[17] Shakespeare himself, as already noted, was conscious of the danger of lapsing into the "brawl ridiculous" in presenting Agincourt through only "four or five most vile and ragged foils." Nonetheless, rather than avoiding battle scenes, the Lord Chamberlain's Men and the other companies found practical solutions. As Alfred Harbage observes: "The audience did not see the battles so much as hear them. What it saw was displays of skill by two or occasionally four combatants on that small

sector of the battlefield symbolized by the stage." In addition, the players made adept use of *alarums* or offstage sound effects ("a gong insistently clanging, trumpets blaring recognizable military signals, then steel clashing, ordnance firing") and *excursions* ("individual pursuits and combats onstage").[18] Thus, from *Captain Thomas Stukeley*: "*Alarum is sounded, diverse excurtions, / Stukly pursues, shane Oneale, and Neale Mackener, / And after a good pretty fight his Lieftenannt and Auntient rescue Stuklie, and chace the Ireshe out / Then an excurtion berwixt Herbert and OHanlon, and / so a retreat sounded*" (1170-75). Through such theatrical synecdoche, the whole of a battle is to be imagined or inferred through the parts displayed, an approach to mass combat well suited to a large platform stage and limited personnel.

Playwrights and players of this period were, therefore, ready to 1) apologize or beg pardon for their limitations or 2) appeal to the playgoer to imagine what could not actually be represented onstage, but they were also prepared to 3) defy neoclassical strictures and take on what (given the available resources) would appear to be daunting scenes or effects, including moments involving fire and water.[19] Among professional playwrights, the most inventive and adept in responding to the challenge of representing X rather than reporting X is, without doubt, Heywood.

At times Heywood, like Shakespeare, does resort to a Chorus and an appeal to the playgoer's imaginary forces. Thus, the Chorus in ***1 Fair Maid of the West*** (1610) laments that "Our Stage so lamely can expresse a Sea, / That we are forst by *Chorus* to discourse / What should have beene in action"; the playgoer is then exhorted to "Now imagine" the heroine's passion and "Suppose her rich, and forst for want of water / To put into Mamorrah in Barbary" (2:319). Here, as elsewhere, complex narratives need assistance from a Chorus and from the playgoer's imagination. Another widely used device to economize or sidestep staging problems is the entrance *as from* a shipwreck, battle, dinner, tournament, or other event. As a knowledgeable professional, Heywood regularly resorts to this device. For example, he twice signals a shipwreck by concentrating upon the recently completed action: in ***The Captives*** (1624), Palestra is to enter "*all wett as newly shipwracke and escapt the ffury of the Seas,*"[20] and in Heywood's ***The Four Prentices of London,*** a reported shipwreck is followed by dumb-shows that display Godfrey "*as newly landed & halfe naked,*" Guy "*all wet,*" and Charles "*all wet with his sword*" (2:176, 177).

But Heywood often goes beyond *as from* directions or appeals to the imagination. Consider ***Fortune by Land and Sea*** (1609), where he brings onto the platform stage a battle between two ships at sea. After "*A great Alarum and shot,*" the two pirates, Purser and Clinton, enter with prisoners from their most recent conquest. Once the stage has been cleared, young Forrest appears "*like a Captain of a ship, with Sailors and Mariners, entering with a flourish*"; a boy is told to "Climb to the main-top" to "see what you kenne there"; "*Above,*" the boy calls out "a sayl" and shouts down details; Forrest instructs his gunner, steersman, master, and boatswain; "*A peece goes off*" when the pirates raise their colors (as reported by the boy above). Again, with the stage cleared, Purser and Clinton return "*with their Mariners, all furnished with Sea devices fitting for a fight*"; they urge on their gunner ("Oh 'twas a gallant shot, I saw it shatter some of their limbs in pieces") and debate strategy. Again, Heywood switches to Forrest exhorting his men not to spare the powder. Finally, "*A great Alarum, and Flourish. Enter young Forrest and his Mates with Purser and Clinton with their Mariners prisoners*" (6:410-18). The key to the effect lies in the combination of alternating scenes and appropriate signals: the boy above, nautical language, costume (e.g., Forrest "*like a Captain of a ship*"), and sound effects, along with the reported action. There is no evidence that shots are actually fired on stage (although there is considerable talk of guns and gunnery), but there is frenzied activity, much noise, and presentation of "*Sea devices fitting for a fight,*" all appropriate for two ships in battle at sea. The players perform *as if* in such a battle, and (if the sequence is to work) the playgoers suppose or imagine the event.

Similarly, Heywood's plays include many night or darkness scenes with a typical emphasis upon silence, stealth, even tiptoeing. For example, in ***A Woman Killed with Kindness*** (1603), Frankford, about to steal back into his house at night, asks for his dark lantern and tells Nicholas to "Tread softly, softly"; the latter responds: "I will walke on Egges this pace" (2:137). Perhaps the most revealing scene for "playing" night comes from the Trojan horse sequence of Heywood's ***2 The Iron Age*** (1612). After Synon has called upon "sweet mid-night" to mask "mischiefe and blacke deedes," the Greeks come on stage "*in a soft march, without noise,*" while Agamemnon urges: "Soft, soft, and let your stilnesse suite with night, / Faire *Phebe* keepe thy silver splendor in, / And be not seene to night." After Synon appears above "*with a torch,*" speaking again of "horrid night," Menelaus proclaims: "March on then, the black darkness covers us." The stage direction reads: "*They march softly in at one door, and presently in at another. Enter Synon with a stealing pace, holding the key in his hand.*" When Synon unlocks the horse, "*Pyrrhus, Diomed, and the rest, leap from out the Horse. And as if groping in the darke, meete with Agamemnon and the rest: who after knowledge imbrace*" (3:377-80). The *as if* formula spelled out here in "*as if groping in the darke*" is usually implicit in signals

elsewhere and is basic to many comparable onstage effects that depend upon a combination of onstage activity and playgoer imagination.

Again, Heywood, like other dramatists, regularly introduces hunt scenes or *as from* hunt situations, as when Hercules enters "*with the Lyons head and skin*" (***The Silver Age*** [1611], 3:131), but he also provides the most elaborate such scene in the period, the hunt for the Caledonian boar in ***The Brazen Age*** (1611). The sequence starts with Venus dressed "*like a Huntresse,*" horns wound offstage as "The summons to the chace," a group of heroes "*with Javelings, and in greene,*" and Atlanta "*with a Javelin.*" Then follow: "*Enter Adonis winding his horne*"; cries of "Charge, charge"; "*a great winding of hornes, & shouts*"; reports of wounds and pursuits; "*hornes and shouts*"; "*Hornes*"; "*After great shouts, enter Venus*"; "*A cry within.*" After the dying Adonis is carried on and off and "*The fall of the Boare being winded,*" the successful hunters enter "*with the head of the Boare*" and "*with their javellins bloudied*" (3:184-94). The combination of distinctive sounds, properties, costumes, and entrances creates a sense of the hunt without an onstage forest or a live boar.

In addition to this extensive hunt and a battle at sea, Heywood stages the story of Horatius at the bridge (***The Rape of Lucrece,*** 5:242-45) wherein, in order to save Rome from Tarquin, one heroic individual guards a passage against an army while his comrades tear down a bridge. After Valerius urges "Breake downe the Bridge, least the pursuing enemy / Enter with us and take the spoile of *Rome,*" Horatius volunteers: "Then breake behinde me, for by heaven il'e grow / And roote my foote as deepe as to the center, / Before I leave this passage." Heywood cannot bring a bridge onstage but can use dialogue to place it just out of sight, as when Horatius challenges Tarquin and his followers: "Soft *Tarquin,* see a bulwarke to the bridge, / You first must passe, the man that enters here / Must make his passage through *Horatius* brest." The actual fight and the offstage activity is described by two opposing figures above (e.g., "passe *Horatius* quickly, / For they behind him will devolve the bridge" versus "Yet stand *Horatius,* beare but one brunt more, / The arched bridge shall sinke upon his piles"). Also important for the effect are offstage sounds: first "*A noise of knocking downe the bridge, within*" and then "*Alarum, and the falling of the Bridge.*" The fate of Horatius is displayed by an exit, some dialogue ("Hee's leapt off from the bridge," "And hark, the shout of all the multitude / Now welcomes him a land"), and more sounds ("*Shout and flourish*").

Two scenes, both from ***The Brazen Age,*** best demonstrate Heywood's skills and inventiveness in staging difficult, seemingly impossible moments. Consider first his presentation (3:175-76) of the confrontation between Hercules and the shape-shifter Achelous by which the hero wins Dejanira. The narrative fiction requires that Achelous start in his own shape, shift three times, and reappear in his own guise to confess defeat. The actual stage directions read: "*Achelous is beaten in, and immediatly enters in the shape of a Dragon*"; "*Alarme. He beats away the dragon. Enter a Fury all fire-workes*"; "*When the Fury sinkes, a Buls head appeares*"; "*He tugs with the Bull, and pluckes off one of his horns. Enter from the same place Achelous with his forehead all bloudy.*" The now bloodied figure spells out the results of the confrontation: "No more, I am thy Captive, thou my Conqueror."

Although not all the details can be pieced out, Heywood's solution in his theater to what might seem an insurmountable staging problem is clear. To reenter "*in the shape of a Dragon*" is to establish the shape-shifting not by means of onstage trickery but by means of a rapid transition ("*immediatly*") that draws upon the playgoer's imagination. The "Dragon" may be thrust forth from a trap or stage door; clearly the "Fury" sinks through the trap (and may arise "*all fire-workes*" in the same fashion); the "Buls head" could appear from a door or the trap (anywhere within Hercules' reach), but a door would be practical if the Achelous-actor is immediately to "*Enter from the same place*" with his bloody forehead. The in-the-theater timing is crucial here: the players provide the rapid actions; the playgoer (in the spirit of *as if*) supplies the continuity that underlies such signals so as to make the connections between Achelous and the three shapes. This combination of strong onstage signals with the imaginary forces of the spectators epitomizes the unspoken contract essential to this (or any) theater.

Consider a second equally revealing moment from the same play, Heywood's rendition of the death of Nessus the centaur (3:180-82). Here, one would suppose, is an event too complex to be enacted on the open stage, for it involves 1) Nessus carrying Dejanira on his back across a river and 2) Hercules then shooting an arrow across that river to kill the centaur. How does Heywood do it? First, after the departure of Nessus and Dejanira, Hercules, alone on stage, describes for the audience their progress through the water ("Well plunged bold Centaure") but then must rage impotently as he witnesses the attempted rape and hears his bride cry for help (four times). Finally, Hercules announces: "I'le send till I can come, this poisonous shaft / Shall speake my fury and extract thy bloud, / Till I my selfe can crosse this raging floud." The stage direction then reads: "*Hercules shoots, and goes in: Enter Nessus with an arrow through him, and Deianeira.*" Moments later, "After long strugling with *Evenus* streames," Hercules reappears to "make an end of what my shaft begunne."

To depict a figure on one side of a river shooting a figure on the other side, Heywood has resorted to rapidly alternating scenes, reported action, offstage sounds, and, most important (in his version of what in our age has become a stock cinematic effect), a presentation of the initiation and then the immediate resolution of the central event ("*Hercules shoots . . . Enter Nessus with an arrow through him*") rather than the full sequence (the complete flight of the arrow and the striking of its target). If the choric passages from *Henry V* provide the "theory" behind the open stage (e.g., that the audience is expected to use their imaginary forces to "eche out our performance with your mind"), the arrow in Nessus provides a telling demonstration of the resulting theatrical practice. The spectator sees 1) the shooting of the arrow and 2) the result but then must supply 3) the connection between the two (I am assuming that Nessus enters immediately at another door), including any sense of the river and the distance involved. As with Hercules' confrontation with Achelous, for the scene to work the actors must provide the timing and energy, the audience, the imaginative participation.

At first reading, a stage direction such as "*Enter Nessus with an arrow through him*" may seem quaint or silly, worthy only of amused contempt (and readers familiar with Francis Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* [1607] may conjure up "*Enter Ralph, with a forked arrow through his head*" [6:229]). We should remember, however, that Heywood, like Shakespeare, Fletcher, and Massinger, was a working professional linked to a specific theatrical company who not only knew his craft well but also knew his theater from the inside, both its potential and its limits. If we chuckle at the arrow in Nessus, we are (like Sidney) implicitly asserting our superiority to a "primitive" dramaturgy (how could anyone be expected to believe that?) and, in the process, revealing more about ourselves (e.g., how we read playscripts) than about Heywood and his contemporaries. If we are not responsive to this and other such moments (e.g., Jupiter descending on an eagle [*Cymbeline* 5.4.92], Gloucester's "suicide" at Dover Cliffs [*King Lear* 4.6.1-80], or, closer to home, "*Enter Clifford wounded with an arrow in his neck*" [*3 Henry VI*, 2.6.sd])[21] are we not in danger of reconceiving the plays to suit our sensibilities, of rewriting the clues to suit our solutions? Rather, to characterize the theater or theatrical conventions of another age is to face squarely those moments that do cause problems for us (and for neoclassicists such as Sidney and Jonson) and make us conscious of the gaps between then and now. A major key to unlock what is distinctive about drama in the age of Shakespeare, therefore, lies in the anomalies, the surprises, the moments that make us aware of the full stretch of the dramaturgy. And, in my view, the best place to go for evidence of such theatrical range and inventiveness (in the spirit of *as if*) is the canon of plays linked to Thomas Heywood.

Notes

1. Philip Sidney, "An Apologie for Poetrie," in *Elizabethan Critical Essays,* ed. G. Gregory Smith, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1904), 1:197.

2. For a fuller discussion of *as if* staging and assumptions, see "Much virtue in *as,*" in my *Recovering Shakespeare's Theatrical Vocabulary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 127-49.

3. Sidney, "An Apologie for Poetrie," 198.

4. *Edmond Ironside or War Hath Made All Friends,* ed. Eleanore Boswell, Malone Society (London: Oxford University Press, 1927), 970-73. For the convenience of the reader, I have attached to the non-Shakespeare plays the dates listed in Alfred Harbage, *Annals of English Drama, 975-1700,* 3rd ed., rev. S. Schoenbaum, rev. Sylvia Stoler Wagonheim (London: Routledge, 1989).

5. Sidney, "An Apologie for Poetrie," 198.

6. *The Works of John Day,* ed. A. H. Bullen, 2 vols. (London: Chiswick Press, 1881), 2:90. Subsequent references to *The Travels of the Three English Brothers* are from this edition and are cited parenthetically.

7. *Henry V,* in *The Riverside Shakespeare,* 2nd ed., ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1997), Prologue, 10-11, 18-19, 25, 26-27, 23; Act 3 Chorus, 3, 10, 13, 18, 25, 34-35; Act 4 Chorus, 50-53. Subsequent references to Shakespeare's plays are from this edition and are cited parenthetically.

8. *The Tragic Reign of Selimus,* ed. W. Bang, Malone Society (London: Oxford University Press, 1908), 2021.

9. Anthony Munday, *The Death of Robert Earl of Huntington,* ed. John C. Meagher, Malone Society (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), 903-4.

10. *Thomas Lord Cromwell,* ed. John S. Farmer, Tudor Facsimile Texts (Amersham, 1911), D1v-D2r.

11. John Fletcher and Philip Massinger, *The Prophetess,* in *The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher,* ed. Arnold Glover and A. R. Waller, 10 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905-12), 5 (1907): 364. Subsequent references to Beaumont and Fletcher's plays are from this edition and are cited parenthetically.