Direct Address in Shakespeare: Unlocking Audience-Centered Moments in Performance

Bill Kincaid, Margie Pignataro and Peter Johnson
Western Illinois University

S hakespeare's plays provide abundant evidence that Elizabethan players directly addressed the audience. Obvious examples include the first and final speeches of *Romeo and Juliet*, Puck's epilogue to *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (as well as Peter Quince's prologue for "Pyramus and Thisbe"), and also the speeches opening and closing Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*. Other textual moments that could potentially utilize direct address are soliloquies and asides. In this article, we will demonstrate that the idea and use of direct address also includes non-monologue text and that this convention is a viable aspect of Shakespeare performance.

We will define *direct address*, especially as it differs from *soliloquy* and *aside*; discuss moments of direct address we utilized in *1 Henry IV* and *Henry V*; and review the tools used in rehearsal to discover moments of direct address, as well as moments and audience reactions created during production that we believe are authentically Elizabethan.

Lacking obvious choral speeches, *1 Henry IV* does not appear to require or offer moments of direct address. Falstaff's meditations on honor and life might play well as direct address, but few other opportunities are obvious from a reading of the text. *Henry V* is the opposite extreme: a play structured around five choral monologues obviously delivered directly to the audience. Our recent mainstage production of *1 Henry IV* at Western Illinois University revealed extraordinary moments of interaction between audience and actors. Our subsequent lab production of *Henry V* further demonstrated the power of direct address, its exceptional use within the structure of the play through the Chorus, and its presence in the play beyond the choral monologues. Hidden within these texts are myriad clues for vigilant actors to use in directly addressing the

audience—to challenge, question, and otherwise involve them. Pursuing these opportunities in production resulted in theatrical events that fully engaged the audience.

A definition of *direct address* as it differs from other terms is necessary. Literary and theatrical scholars use the terms *aside*, *soliloquy*, and *direct address* interchangeably to describe character speeches or monologues. A monologue, for purposes of this discussion, is a speech by any character of four or more lines of prose or poetry. St. Augustine coined the term *soliloquy* from the Latin roots *solus* and *loqui*, meaning 'talking to oneself'; a more modern definition is 'speaking alone.' A soliloquy is a speech given when a character believes he or she is alone or is sufficiently consumed in his or her own thought to be effectively alone.[1]

Another category of speeches exists—choral prologues, epilogues, and interludes, as we see throughout Shakespeare's *Henry V*—which do not fit the definition of soliloquies as they *acknowledge* and *speak* to the audience.[2] These speeches are monologues that accomplish more than revealing inner feelings of the character, for example, or furthering plot, or endowing scenery. They require the active participation of the audience. This element of participation is the crux of direct address, an aspect of performance that is different from aside or soliloquy and can happen outside traditional monologues.

In an aside, the speaker addresses certain thoughts to the audience, never forgetting the presence and proximity of others.[3] Bernard Berkerman divides asides into two categories: "conversational," addressed by one figure to another; and "solo," spoken by one figure in the presence of others, but unheard by them.[4] The purpose of the aside, both in conversational and solo forms, is to alert the audience to thoughts, information, and motives of characters which would not be gleaned from the action of scenes. This information is typically a contradiction of the apparent action occurring in a scene, clarifying subtextual action for the benefit of the audience. Examples from Iago in *Othello*, Richard in *Richard III*, and Aaron in *Titus Andronicus* are illuminating: we hear these characters plotting and we recognize their lies as they play out. The audience sees the "true" motivation of the characters who offer these asides. The audience is aware of the multiple layers of performance—perceived and actual truth within the greater "lie" of the theatre event. Asides create a frank relationship between characters and audience, as well as complicity: not only does the audience understand more about the drama, they are *participants* in the drama.

The activity of the audience establishes the differentiation between an aside and direct address. For our purposes, all forms of direct address are asides, but not all asides are direct address. The character may be including, but not directly engaging the audience. Single lines embedded within scenes between characters, but intended to be directed at the audience, we will refer to as *petite asides* or, as the case may be, *petite direct address*.

In moments of direct address, the audience turns from a passive listener into a verbal *actor*. The most prevalent modern form of audible audience response is laughter, but it may include shouting statements to actors, booing, hissing, or any other verbal response which involves the action of the scene being presented. This does not include insults as to the abilities of the actor, but insults can become unavoidable when an audience is fearless about participating. The texts of *Hamlet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* offer examples of theatre audience behavior, which we suggest Shakespeare modeled on actual Elizabethan theatre experiences.

In *Hamlet* 3.2, Hamlet comments on his play, *The Mousetrap*, with the ironic rudeness of a groundling. Hamlet speaks with Ophelia about the play itself between acts, criticizing, "Is this a prologue, or the posy of a ring?"[5] He also interrupts the scene between the Player King and Player Queen. Hamlet becomes a choral character, invading the action of the play through commenting, foreshadowing, and criticizing: "You shall see anon how the murderer gets the love of Gonzago's wife" (3.2.241-42). Similarly, in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*'s act 5 meta-play, "Pyramus and Thisbe," the characters watching make jokes, comment upon the action, and criticize the quality of the play. Their commentary is continual, creating a model of the direct address interactive theatre experience.

Direct interaction between actor and audience is a longstanding aspect of western theatre. Greek playwrights Aristophanes and Menander wrote specific scenes designed to accommodate audience response. Though little is known about audiences of medieval morality plays and biblical dramas, there is evidence that even during the sermon-like material, the audience was vigorous. In *The Staging of Religious Drama in Europe in the Later Middle Ages: Texts and Documents in English Translation*, we see that audience brawling became such a problem that the Church and the cities of York and Chester joined their authorities and posted proclamations banning violent behavior and the wearing of weapons to performances.[6]

The need to prohibit weapons seems ludicrous to a twenty-first century sensibility thoroughly ingrained in modern theatre etiquette. Because of our contemporary assumptions about the behavior of theatre-going, the existence of direct address and response is difficult to locate within texts: we lack context and permission. The gentrification of the theatre event, as well as the perception of theatre as frozen art—a static event intended for passive viewing—is partially to blame. However, contemporary examples of less etiquette-driven theatre behavior exist.

In 2004, the Alabama Shakespeare Festival toured a production of *Macbeth* to U.S. Military bases. In the article "Operation *Macbeth*," Kent Thompson, director of the production, describes the typical audience response from military personnel:

> The Maxwell audiences would prove characteristic of audiences on the road. They were rowdy. They laughed, they oohed and aahed. I was particularly taken with a pair of African-American servicewomen sitting in front of me. When Lady Macbeth laid into her husband during the banquet scene ("Are you a man?"), they started with vivid vocalizations. There were children of all ages, including babies in arms. Sodas in cups were served at intermission, so there was a lot of ice-clinking during the cauldron scene in Act 4. There was a constant traffic of audience members in and out of the theatre during the show. But when the drama intensified, the audience grew quiet and rapt. And at the end, they jumped to their feet, cheering and clapping. They treated the Witches like rock stars. Remi, Howard, Sonja Lanzener (a Witch) and Kathleen McCall (Lady Macbeth) came out front in costume to meet audience members. As I watched them talk with fans, I thought that this responsive, rowdy audience, not used to live theatre, was a lot more like Shakespeare's audience than the ticket-buyers at ASF. They hadn't learned our theatre etiquette, which has made our usual audiences so well-behaved and quiet. It was refreshing.[7]

The absence of modern theatre etiquette allowed the natural provocative nature of the text to affect the audience, and the audience to respond accordingly. The audience "had permission" to interact with the players and the play.

It is difficult to find direct address in modern drama. Robert Schwartz points out that direct address is a device not employed in modern realistic drama: the work of Ibsen, Chekhov, and, by extension, Miller, Williams, and O'Neill, are theatrical texts which can largely be understood from a reading of the text. It is primarily

in the older forms of drama that "the spectator remains a potential actor and the actor a potential spectator."[8]

We found that the presence of actors and an audience uninhibited by modern theatre etiquette can bring this crucial difference to light in a way textual analysis cannot. Our primary tool to break down modern theatre etiquette was based on a set of guidelines, found in Patrick Tucker's First Folio Cue Script Technique (hereafter FFCST). In this technique, actors receive scrolls with only their own lines, stage directions, and two iambs of cue line for each exit, entrance, or line. The text is that of the First Folio with original spelling and punctuation.[9]

FFCST casts light on the use of text as a tool to govern staging and action, and prevents individuals from considering the plays of Shakespeare as primarily written literature. A text intended for performance requires performance in order to be adequately discussed. FFCST also calls upon the actor to be aware of the audience, include them, and engage them. The application of FFCST in *1 Henry IV* and *Henry V* required the actors to apply the text to their bodies and the stage: for example, adjusting their spatial relationship with each other, using other actors, referencing other characters, and suiting action to the word. Essentially, the actors' bodies were directed by the text. The text was illustrated to the audience, with their active participation.

The development of our ideas and observations concerning direct address began with experiments in the First Folio Cue Script Technique during rehearsal of *1 Henry IV*. The tenets of this technique, based on the work of Patrick Tucker and practiced in performance by the New England Shakespeare Festival, include the following guidelines:

1.   The words *thee, thou, thy* and *thine* connote familiarity or intimacy, which can manifest physically in performance through close proximity. Actors should keep more distance when using *your, you,* and *yours.*

2.   The adjectives *this* and *these* indicate literal possession of or contact with the noun they modify; the adjectives *that* and *those* indicate distance. If actors are not touching the modified object when they begin a line containing the word *this*, they should be touching it by the time they speak the word. The converse is also true.

3.   As Hamlet instructed the players, action should be suited to the word. This precept applies both for the actor who is speaking, if he or she is describing his or her own physical activity, and for other actors who hear implied stage directions in lines.

Shakespeare is well known for writing sparse stage directions (*The Winter's Tale*'s "Exit pursued by a bear" [3.3.57] being a notable exception), and instead delivers specific instructions through the text. Actors must listen to the words as they are working to discover what physical actions they should perform.

4.   Include the audience whenever possible.   Our modern conventions of lighting and act curtains were not in use when Shakespeare wrote, and the plays were constructed accordingly. Twentieth-century ideas of passive viewing, exemplified by contemporary relationships to television and film, did not influence sixteenth-century audiences' response to performances. Theatre-going was an interactive experience for the Elizabethans—and because it was in broad daylight, the actors could see the audience as well as the audience could see them.   Interaction with the audience was inevitable, and an integral aspect of the event.

It should also be noted that the actors *read* from their cue scripts during the first week of *1 Henry IV*, and during the lab production of *Henry V*. We needed actors to pay close attention to the rules and the text simultaneously and be prepared for any possible response from the audience.

Never intending the Western Illinois University *1 Henry IV* to be performed strictly according to the technique's guidelines, the production team spent the first week of rehearsal exploring the text with the FFCST. The intent was primarily educational, but it was understood that the experience would illuminate the text for production team and actors alike. In rehearsal, we suspended the notion of a backstage, wanting to encourage participation from the "audience" of actors waiting to join the action onstage. Actors were permitted to enter from the audience if necessary. The process was aided and abetted by the willing support of the actors; a strong camaraderie developed among the cast, who supported one another during the experiment. They responded enthusiastically when the script called for anything. Having been instructed to respond to stage directions they heard, the actors applied this to their role as audience members as well, answering questions posed directly to them by onstage characters or providing sound effects that were implied by the text. Out of this spirit, a petite direct address was found in act 1, scene 3 when the actor playing King Henry delivered his line, "Shall our coffers then be emptied to redeem a traitor home?" (1.3.84), to cast members sitting in the audience. They obliged, answering with a resounding, "No!" We continued to receive this response from audiences in performance as well.

The most noteworthy discovery during the *1 Henry IV* experimentation with FFCST came in act 4, scene 2. Falstaff, in a monologue that immediately precedes his conversation with Hal and Westmerland, describes his ragtag soldiers, but never uses the words *these* or *here,* which would indicate their presence onstage with him. Nor is there a stage direction specifying the entrance of soldiers, as shown in *King Lear* or *Macbeth.* The specificity of his description and the vividness of the language implies that the emaciated troops were an unachievable stage effect. Shakespeare is extra-precise with language describing unachievable effects, as we see often in his descriptions of celestial bodies, weather, and settings running the gamut from oceans to forests to palaces.

When Falstaff finishes his speech Hal enters, and the language shifts. Hal refers to the soldiers with a demonstrative, asking, "Whose fellows are *these* that come after?" (4.2.54-55). The actor playing Hal, working within the parameters of FFCST, must justify using the demonstrative *these.* If the soldiers were offstage and out of view, the word should be *those,* indicating distance. *These* mandates proximity. With no other resource at hand, the actor playing Hal used the nearest resource available, crossing downstage as close as possible to the audience, and indicated them as *these.* Westmerland, a few lines later, calls the soldiers "*pit*iful rascals" (4.2.57), and Falstaff comments that they will "fill a *pit*" (4.2.59) when they die. This recurring use of the syllable *pit* in reference to the soldiers complements Hal's audience reference. The three actors were elevated above their audience, as they would have been in Elizabethan England also, looking down in the "pit" from which "mortal men" stared back at them.

In this brilliant moment, the actors can delight the audience by including them, attain a laugh through the insult, and issue a somber social comment on the lower classes, from which both Falstaff's soldiers and the Elizabethan groundlings would have come: they are "good enough to toss; food for powder" (4.2.58-59). This instance is historically reminiscent of a scene in Aristophanes' *Frogs.* Aristophanes often employed direct address through insulting the audience for comic effect. In *Frogs,* after Dionysos has reached the underworld and is looking for landmarks Herakles has warned him to expect, he indicates these landmarks by gesturing to the audience, referring to audience members as "dung," "parricides," and "oath-breakers."[10]

During the run of the production, we observed that the play lost momentum during act 2 scene 5, the tavern scene. The actors were working well and the scene played, but the audience was not

fully engaged. Recalling the FFCST experiments early in the rehearsal process, we realized that every scene prior to 2.5 had some instance of direct address. We looked again in 2.5 for opportunities for direct address and found two that worked wonderfully well. First, Falstaff's line, "Let them speak" (2.5.157), which had previously referred to Bardolph and Peto, would now be a reference to people sitting in our audience. Hal's subsequent line, "Speak, sirs, how was it?" (2.5.159), was also redirected to the house and required a response. The scene further included the audience when Hal invited Falstaff, "Do thou stand for my father," to which Falstaff responded, "Shall, I?" (2.5.342-44). Falstaff addressed this interrogative to the audience and waited for an audience member to respond in the affirmative. The effect of these direct addresses was electrifying. The scene no longer lost momentum; rather, it brought the audience more fully into the fold, acknowledging their role as significant contributors to the theatrical event—demanding their participation and attention.

These examples are similar to the opening comic sequence in Aristophanes' *Wasps* between Xanthias and Sosias; the scene as written indicates the audience was familiar with the form of improvisational comedy in which the performers reacted to comments shouted from the audience.[11]

We applied our discoveries and ideas about direct address from *1 Henry IV* to a lab production of *Henry V*. We felt the production would (1) illuminate the text through performance in ways textual analysis would not, (2) further solidify our understanding of the concept by introducing a character who speaks only in direct address—the Chorus, and (3) illustrate examples of direct address, either in petite or full examples within the body of the play, separate from the work of the Chorus. We utilized FFCST. Fourteen actors were triple-cast to fill the roles. The actors had experienced FFCST previously from rehearsal of *1 Henry IV* or from coursework at Western Illinois University.

The resulting event was exciting and educational. FFCST and the interaction of the actors with their audience illuminated the text in many ways. Before discussing the major structural device and perfect example of direct address, the Chorus, we will discuss a few findings from within the fabric of the play which reinforce our growing definition of direct address. As a general rule, longer speeches (the exhaustive explanation of the Salic Law by Canterbury, for example, [I.2.33ff]) had turning points when the actors began directly addressing the audience. These were

reminders to the audience that they were active participants: the actor checking in with the audience to make sure they were coming along.

A good example of petite direct address occurred in the traitor scene, act 2, scene 2. FFCST staging introduced a surprising element of comedy to this scene: the use of the words *we* and *thou* caused shifting stage pictures between the king, the lesser lords, and the traitors. The king used a petite direct address with the audience in reference to the traitors: "See you my princes and my noble peers, these English monsters" (2.2.81ff). The description of the traitors' crimes brought boos and hisses from the audience. We also found in this scene that Henry's final monologue, beginning "Now lords for France" (2.2.178), was addressed entirely to the audience, involving the audience in his victory, and implicating them in his resolve to press the English claim to the French throne.

In act 2, scene 4, Exeter's address of the French Court also used petite direct address. When Exeter warned the French, "You'll find a difference, as we his subjects have" (2.4.134), the use of the word *we* in the text directed him to include the audience. He did so, and they rumbled in response. The text had set them up to identify with Exeter, the sole English character in the scene, as their emissary, and to respond with favor to his words.

The primary and most powerful example of direct address functioning in *Henry V* is through the Chorus, the central interactive/inciting character. He is the perfect user of direct address. He initiates the audience into the conventions of the play; he enables great leaps of time, space, and character; and he requires that the audience actively empower the super-reality of the play. In acclimatizing the audience, the Chorus makes them complicit in the dramatic action of the play. The Chorus humbly acknowledges doubts about the verisimilitude of the production— instead of covering up the theatrical experience, he enhances it, making the audience his partners.

The necessity of this partnership is clear: the playwright must accomplish a significant transformation with the audience. The goal is to occupy and engage the audience to the point where they are not critical of the title character's behavior. The new king had recently spurned Falstaff, Shakespeare's most successful and endearing character, turned his back on a life of ease and tavern-lazing, and put down a self-proclaimed rightful heir to the throne to become king.

The power of the Chorus and his direct address abilities become clear as the Chorus functions as the king's ardent public

relations manager. Shakespeare makes a great show of the new-found god-like qualities of King Henry. His transformation was initiated in *1 Henry IV*, when young Prince Hal resolved that he "will henceforth be more [him]self" (3.2.92-93), and foreshadowed to the audience by an awestruck Vernon: "I saw Harry with his beaver on" (4.1.105). In *Henry V* the process of transformation is fully realized, and the king's methods of achieving it cannot be discounted, criticized, or questioned. There is no character remaining equal to the task. The only character who might have served the purpose—Falstaff—is quietly put away. By eliminating Falstaff from the equation, Shakespeare ensures that the new king's inconsistencies are not clear to an audience, even though textual analysis might reveal them. An audience in a theatre does not have that analytical critical distance, and if the text can sweep the crowd along in the fervor of the play, they cannot question or compare— they can only react as they are coached to react. In this, the primary coach is the Chorus.

From the Chorus's first entrance, the audience is groomed for active participation. The Chorus uses the three elements indicative of direct address: (1) commands: "Admit me" (1.0.32); (2) interrogatives: "Or may we cram within this wooden O?" (1..0.12-13); and (3) address by name: "gentles all" (1.0.8). By identifying himself as a mere commentator to great deeds, the Chorus forges the links of the dramatic action without detracting from the size and magnitude of the principal characters. His instances of direct address are more focused than we experienced with Falstaff—it is a formally structured assault on the audience. Falstaff was an agent of action both within the play and with the audience— sometimes guide and sometimes mischief-maker. In contrast, the Chorus sets the stage, engages the audience, and allows the great and mythic characters to act out their history. The Chorus elevates the historical events and characters to mythic proportions, making certain that the audience is along for the ride. He claims the events of the play are too great to fit into the theatre. He asks the audience "gently to hear, kindly to judge our play" (1.0.34) and invokes their "imaginary forces" (1.0.38) to assist in making the story real. It is these imaginary forces he uses to great effect.

Using FFCST with an eye toward interacting with the audience *as the text dictates* helps show the power of direct address. Among FFCST's tenets, one of the most useful to the Chorus is that which requires that references to characters and items have parallel action onstage. For example, in the opening monologue, when the Chorus indicates "the war-like Harry" (1.0.5), the actor playing Harry enters

the playing space. At "Two Mighty Monarchies" (1.0.20), Harry and the French King take their places on opposite sides of the stage. As the instigator, the actor playing the Chorus slavishly suits the action to the word and expects audience response and interaction, to the point of waiting for answers to questions or signs of participation before continuing with his text. Each monologue is filled with examples of the power of direct address to engage the audience.

Throughout the play, the reappearance of the Chorus consistently reinforces the participatory aspect of direct address. For example, in the second Chorus monologue, he announces, "Now all the youth of England are on fire" (2.0.1), and suiting action to the word, the audience cheered and rumbled. It was obvious that they recognized their place in the world of the play. Following the FFCST convention of allowing pronouns to dictate proximity, the Chorus walked into the house and talked to audience on the lines, "What mightst *thou* do, what honor would *thee* do" (2.0.18-19) and "O England, model to *thy* outward greatness" (2.0.16). The dramatic action of the play, the mounting war between France and England, directly impacts the commoners of the realm. The Chorus brings this conflict quite literally to the audience.

Continuing this trend, the third Chorus monologue is a virtual soundscape. The Chorus acts as a maestro playing the responsive audience with these evocative words all suggesting participation from them: "Upon the hempen tackle ship-boys climbing"; "Hear the shrill Whistle which doth order give / To sound confus'd" (3.0.8-10); "creeping Wind," "furrowed Sea" (3.0.11-12); and "now the devilish cannon touches" (3.0.33). In our laboratory setting, the audience and actors answered the Chorus' every command; actors suited action to the word, and audience provided aural atmosphere. It was into this martial and vital atmosphere that King Harry and his entourage entered for act 3, scene 1. They strode onto the stage and the king himself invoked direct address, speaking "Dear friends" to the audience. The spectators that were endowed as "England" and "the youth of England" in the previous Chorus monologue, the king himself addressed as his army. The Chorus and all other actors have told of his might, his power, his knowledge. The audience has watched him in scenes, experienced his potency, but now, they meet him face to face. As his subjects and his army, the audience willingly follows his instructions:

> Now set the Teeth, and stretch the Nostril wide,
> Hold hard the Breath, and bend up every Spirit
> To his full height. (3.1.15-17)

Here half the audience stood; the king continued:

> I see you stand like Grey-hounds in the slips,

The rest of the audience rose to their feet.

> Straying upon the Start. The Game's afoot:
> Follow your Spirit; and upon this Charge,
> Cry,

In an electrifying moment, actors and audience echoed the king as commanded, shouting together:

> God for Harry, England, and Saint George! (3.1.31-35)

The Chorus had groomed the audience to function as King Harry's de facto army.

The play then moves into battle sequences, and the audience is fully aware of its role in the play—they are part of the victorious army watching Harry's ascent to power. This play is not constructed to reveal an unexpected truth, or question established norms or forms; it is a familiar story that reinforces an ideal of national pride, honor, and a lionized leader. The structure of the play and the playwright's conscious use of direct address, especially through the Chorus, support this reading of *Henry V*.

Parallels between the Chorus in *Henry V* and Falstaff in *Henry IV* are appropriate, as both are primary examples of the efficacy and use of direct address. However, the role Falstaff plays in *Henry IV* is inappropriate within the context of *Henry V*. The rejection and elimination of Falstaff in *2 Henry IV* was structurally (and politically) necessary to formalize the relationship between the audience and actor and, therefore, control any direct address commentary on the action of *Henry V*. The Chorus prepares the audience to see Henry in a light Falstaff never would allow. The "mad wag" (1.2.39) assumes the port of Mars. The honor of war, dismissed as a "mere scutcheon" in *1 Henry IV* (5.2.138), is instead a celebration of patriotism and faith in the king in *Henry V*.

Prince Hal has effectively thrown off his previous father figures in *Henry IV*—both Henry IV and Falstaff are dead and forgotten, while the new king has total command of his troops and audience. His new role has been enabled by the Chorus, who involves the audience in the action, grooms their responses, and overrides their objections. The Chorus serves the king and his mythic reputation. Falstaff was an antithesis: fun and clever, but ultimately politically inconvenient.

The lab production of *Henry V* furthered our conception of direct address as a playwright's tool, as well as an actor's

performance tool. It demonstrated that Shakespeare as a playwright intentionally and meaningfully utilized direct address in dramatic, thematic, and structural ways. *Henry V* was an experiment that gave us a control sample and additional definitive examples of direct address. We conclude that the power of direct address, as a convention for the production of Shakespeare, can restore a vitality and immediacy to the work which is lacking in modern productions as a result of theatre-going etiquette.

Notes

1. Morris LeRoy Arnold, *The Soliloqies of Shakespeare: A Study in Technique* (New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1965), 2.

2. Ibid., 3.

3. Ibid., 4.

4. Cited in Jean E. Howard, *Shakespeare's Art of Orchestration: Stage Technique and Audience Response* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984), 53.

5. William Shakespeare, *Hamlet,* in *The Norton Shakespeare: Based on the Oxford Edition,* ed. Stephen Greenblatt (New York: Norton and Company, 1997), 3.2.135. Subsequent references to Shakespeare's plays from this volume will be noted in the text.

6. Peter Meredith and John E. Tailby, eds., *The Staging of Religious Drama in Europe in the Later Middle Ages: Texts and Documents in English Translation* (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 1983), 68.

7. Kent Thompson, "Operation *Macbeth*: How the Alabama Shakespeare Festival Took the Front Line in a New Cultural Campaign," *American Theatre* 22 (February 2005): 78.11.

8. Robert Schwartz, ed. *Shakespeare and the Popular Tradition in the Theatre: Studies in the Social Dimension of Dramatic Form and Function,* by Robert Weimann (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), 7.

9. Patrick Tucker, *Secrets of Acting Shakespeare: The Original Approach* (New York: Routledge, 2002).

10. Kenneth McLeish, *The Theatre of Aristophanes* (New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, 1980), 88-89.

11. Niall W. Slater, "Making the Aristophanic Audience," *American Journal of Philology* 120, no. 2 (1999): 355-56.