

Performing Shakespeare in the Original Pronunciation

David Barrett

A submission presented in partial fulfilment of
the requirements of the
University of South Wales
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

December 2013

Contents:

Abstract	4
Acknowledgements	6
Chapter 1 Introduction	7
Chapter 2 Original Pronunciation in Context	
2.1 Historically Informed Performance	15
2.2 The Shakespearean Voice	90
2.3 Accented Shakespeare	104
Chapter 3	
3.1 Shakespearean Original Pronunciation in Performance in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries	123
3.2 <i>Macbeth</i> at the Mermaid Theatre	181
Chapter 4 The Linguistic Context, Phonological Research and Reference	193
Chapter 5	
5.1 Transcription Policy	225
5.2 A Comparison of Transcription Styles	276
Chapter 6 Testing the Transcription Policy/ Developing a Method through Workshopping	290
Chapter 7 Conclusion	388
Works Cited	416

Textual Note:

Unless stated otherwise, all Shakespearean quotes are from:

Clark, W.G. and Wright, W.A. (1865) *The Works of William Shakespeare (Globe Edition)*, Cambridge and London: Macmillan.

Available at:

<http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/views/plays/plays.php>
(accessed 12.09.210)

Macbeth:

The complete works of William Shakespeare [electronic resource] Created by Jeremy Hylton; Operated by The Tech., Cambridge, Massachusetts (From Grady Ward's Moby Shakespeare). Available at:

<http://shakespeare.mit.edu/macbeth/index.html> (accessed 10.08.2011)

The Romeo and Juliet Transcription:

based on the First Folio (1623) from the Electronic Text Center, University of Virginia Library. Available at:

<http://web.archive.org/web/20080504221015/http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/toc/modeng/public/ShaRJF.html> (accessed 24.06.2010)

I share the view of Stephen Orgel, who views the acting text, prepared for performance, as the “authentic text” (2002, 237). Generally, Shakespeare’s plays may be assumed to include material other than the author’s. Most of the texts used in this study are modern editions with normalised spelling. Where spellings have been consulted, it is difficult to know where the text has been altered by the compositor’s hand. For the purposes of this project, I accept that the compositor was ‘of the age’ and that their spelling may reflect the contemporary pronunciation, even though it might not represent the author’s. In the case of Queen Elizabeth’s letters, many were transcribed from Elizabeth’s own hand and there is a remarkable level of consistency in the spelling, albeit with some variations. Henslowe’s papers, similarly, are largely in his own hand. Compositor’s interventions regarding pointing are unimportant in pronunciation study.

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to assess the merits and practicalities of performing Shakespeare in original pronunciation (OP) on the modern stage and to develop a pedagogy, through the medium of the actors' workshop. I have reviewed the major texts relating to Shakespearean pronunciation and used the findings to create a transcription policy which is workable and relevant to today's theatre. The transcription policy is tested in a series of workshops attended by drama students and professional actors. I have reviewed the past practice of performing Shakespeare in OP, which helps to place modern OP productions in context. In terms of language restoration, the project explores significant effects of the use of OP on rhyme, word-play and metre; examples of the positive effects of the repairs are included in Appendix 1 and an illustrative transcription of a Shakespeare play in Appendix 2.

This thesis proposes a possible methodology for presenting and rehearsing the text, based on discoveries made in the workshops. The choices available to drama teachers, voice coaches and directors wishing to use OP in Shakespeare are explained and the merits and drawbacks of the various methods of presenting the text and teaching the pronunciation are discussed. A complete transcription policy, which may be adopted by drama teachers or voice coaches in full or in part, presents

the major pronunciations and variants which were probably heard on the Shakespearean stage. The thesis includes evidence for the pronunciation choices from Shakespeare's works.

The appendix includes sample transcriptions and teaching materials used in the workshops, together with two booklets, which I wrote as an aid to actors taking part in the workshops. There is also a transcription, for illustrative purposes, of *As You Like It*.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Richard Hand and Dr Rob Dean of The University of South Wales for their support and advice throughout the research and writing up of this PhD. Their encouragement throughout the workshopping process has been immeasurable. I am grateful to The University of South Wales for enabling the workshopping of OP material with drama undergraduates.

Thanks go to Professor David Crystal for his invaluable advice in the early stages of the research and to Professor Paul Meier, of the University of Kansas, for his encouragement.

I would like to thank my family for allowing me to spend hours at my desk, researching for and writing this thesis. Without their encouragement this project would not have been possible.

Chapter 1, Introduction

David Crystal (2013, 1–2) remarks that “Shakespearean phonology – the sound system of Elizabethan English, as evidenced in the plays and poems – has been remarkably neglected.” From the point of view of the director and actor it is significant to note that in justification of the use of OP he goes on to say, “[d]espite the recognized difficulties of reconstruction, the exercise is well worth attempting. It is a commonplace in literary criticism and dramaturgy to acknowledge the centrality of the relationship between pronunciation and interpretation.” Moreover, he advocates that, “we need to try to get as close as possible to the sound system that Shakespeare himself would have heard and used, and not rely for our conclusions solely on the auditory effects introduced by a modern phonology” (2013, 1–2). The difficulties to which Crystal refers relate to the fact that there will always be uncertainty about the validity of any reconstructed Elizabethan sound system. There are too many variables and inconsistencies in the evidence ever to be a hundred per cent certain that a given pronunciation is correct. This is evidenced in Shakespeare’s own usage, which shows significant variation, depending on context.¹

¹ In *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, II, 1, Shakespeare rhymes ‘fear’ with ‘there’ (the vowel in both words would have been pronounced in a similar way to ‘there’ today) but in II, 2 ‘fear’ is rhymed with both ‘bear’ (pronounced as ‘bear’ today’) and ‘here’ (pronounced in a similar way to ‘here’ today, as the spelling shows). In *As You Like It* IV, 2 Shakespeare rhymes ‘deer’ (which was generally pronounced with a vowel like today’s) with ‘wear’ (which would have had a similar vowel to today – the final ‘r’ had a lowering effect and prevented the raising to [i:]).

Academic interest in original pronunciation (OP) was first aroused in the late nineteenth century when Shakespearean critic Richard Grant White reconstructed a passage from *Hamlet* in an approximation of Elizabethan speech (Ellis 1871, 973). In common with other academics who have reconstructed Shakespeare's language since then, White attempted to justify his pronunciation choices by citing rhymes, puns and spellings as evidence. White was hampered by the lack of an effective means of transcribing the language; this situation changed in 1888 when the international phonetic alphabet (IPA) was published.² A few attempts at reconstructing the pronunciation for the performance of short scenes by linguists were followed by a pocket of serious interest in the mid twentieth-century, when three full-length productions were staged, two in England and one in the US. Apart from a few extracts produced for radio and an OP scene within a regular production, the momentum for performing Shakespeare in OP was lost. It was not until early in the twentieth century that interest in Shakespearean OP was re-kindled by linguist David Crystal's and director Tim Carroll's work on *Romeo and Juliet* (2004) at Shakespeare's Globe.

² The IPA was first published in 1888 by Association Phonétique Internationale, a team of French language teachers led by Paul Passy. Originally devised for teachers of French, German and English, it was based on a script devised in 1847 by Isaac Pitman and Henry Ellis and remodelled by Henry Sweet as his Romic Alphabet.

This project aims to demonstrate that the use of reconstructed language has a place in modern performances in the same way that reconstructed playing spaces and conditions do. It aims to determine what is the best medium in which to present an OP text and what is the best method of coaching the actor with no experience of OP. This thesis will survey the work done in certain related areas of historically informed performance (HIP) to determine how this might relate to original pronunciation performance and to determine whether there is any correlation between performance in OP and other areas. As HIP is not the main focus of this project, the coverage given in the thesis will necessarily be selective rather than universal. OP is used in this thesis to denote ‘original pronunciation’. In the past, the abbreviation OP has been used to denote ‘original practices’. Whilst original practice is mentioned in Chapter 2, this project is partly concerned with discovering ways in which original pronunciation might inform, enhance and enliven a modern production, rather than with meticulously recreating an oral performance style from a given point in history. OP refers to the reconstruction of an historical pronunciation which can be from any historical period. In this project, I use the term to denote the reconstruction of the pronunciation of Shakespeare’s stage.

The thesis will examine critically the work on OP done in previous productions, focusing on the different styles of transcription which have

been used and proposing a style and method of transcription which is relevant to modern theatre. The thesis will detail a previously unknown professional OP production and will evaluate critically the style of pronunciation used in that production.

Unlike some commentators, who attempt to define OP as a definitive set of rigid pronunciations, I argue that the pronunciation on the Shakespearean stage is best defined by a set of parameters, within which the accent will function. This allows for a variety of pronunciation styles, including those used in OP performances to date. The focus of my pedagogical work has been on encouraging the development of a pronunciation within this tolerance, which allows for the enrichment of the language by regional variations. This would have been the case in Shakespeare's day as it is now. This thesis will clearly identify these parameters, which will be defined by the project's transcription policy. The practical application of this policy is exemplified in Appendix 2, where there is a complete transcription of *As You Like It*.

My critical examination of linguistic theory and pronunciation in the work of historical sources, such as the orthoepists and modern commentators, together with an analysis of the transcription styles of Arthur Gimson, Frank Blandford, Daniel Jones, Helge Kökeritz and David Crystal has informed the development of the transcription policy, which I tested and

developed further in workshops attended by drama students and professional actors. I have analysed evidence of pronunciation in the rhyme and rhythm of Shakespeare's works in order to establish both his general practice and his use of alternative pronunciations. I complemented this work with a study of Queen Elizabeth's and Philip Henslowe's possible pronunciations, as evidenced by their spelling habits, and with Walter Raleigh's rhyming practice, as determined by his poetic output. I chose these three subjects so that the social spectrum would be represented, from royalty through the middle class to a working person.

By experimenting with a variety of teaching methods, this project will establish a pedagogy for the teaching of OP to actors. This will be achieved by developing teaching materials and a methodology for their use in the rehearsal or workshop. This project will test and review the effectiveness of several types of orthography in order to determine what is the best method of communicating the pronunciation to the actor. This thesis will suggest that, not only might OP be taught as an accent in the workshop, but also it might operate as an accent in performance.

This thesis will establish areas for further study and research such as the relationship between OP performance and costume, and the links between actors' movements and OP. It will demonstrate that further

research is required on the best means of presenting original pronunciation orthographically so that actors with a variety of base accents might interpret the script with the same accuracy. For example, future research might focus on the possibility of teaching the pronunciation aurally, using a regular script, without the use of phonetics or other specialist symbols. This project does not attempt to engage with the audience, as the research focused on pedagogy and was conducted in the workshop setting, rather than in performance. Future research might focus on the effects of OP on an audience. In terms of the effects of the reconstruction on the effectiveness of the language, there is a need for more experimentation in order to discover previously unknown rhymes, word play and potential repairs to irregularities in the metre which can only be revealed by language restoration. Anomalies in rhythm and metre may arise over time as a result of language change. Use of OP potentially remedies these anomalies as well as revealing word-play which is concealed by modern pronunciations. One further significant area of future exploration would involve determining whether there is a link between the acceptability of OP as a performance medium and the normal style of stage pronunciation of a given period.

The Structure of the Thesis

The thesis moves from the rationale for performing in OP, through a review of the historical and recent Shakespearean OP productions, to a summary of research carried out in a workshop setting, via a critical review of the phonological sources, an assessment of the linguistic situation and the presentation of a transcription policy.

Chapter 2 aims to develop a rationale for the use of OP in modern productions by examining the success of historically informed performance in other areas of theatre practice, such as music, movement and gesture. Chapter 3 constitutes a review of the few productions which have been staged in OP over the last century. It is important that contemporary OP productions should embrace the good practice developed in these early performances. This chapter includes an account of the discovery, during the course of research for this project, of two previously unknown OP productions at the Mermaid Theatre. The second of these was the first complete twentieth-century professional production of Shakespeare in what was taken by Arthur Gimson, the production's pronunciation coach, to be an Elizabethan accent.

Chapter 4, the linguistic context, discusses the phonological sources relating to the historical pronunciation of Shakespeare's day. The

linguistic evidence is distilled in Chapter 5 and a transcription policy is presented. This policy is designed to be used by drama teachers, voice coaches and possibly directors who are interested in staging OP performances of Shakespeare. The choices of vowel and consonant sounds, as well as elisions and expansions, are illustrated by quotations from Shakespeare's works. This original contribution, which has been tested and refined in the rehearsal room, empowers the theatre professional to embark on an OP production without the need to spend months, or even years, searching the literature for references to Elizabethan pronunciations and interpreting the many variables. In addition to the element of scholarship involved, a significant research strand necessitated the examination of large quantities of Shakespearean text to determine which of the variations in pronunciation might have been used in a particular context.

Chapter 6 relates to the testing of the transcription policy and methods of teaching in a series of workshops given during the period 2011–13. The workshops involved students and professional actors with no previous experience of working with OP. Several ways of presenting the text, with and without phonetic symbols, were trialled and a number of different teaching styles and techniques employed. Workshop 5, for young professional actors, is taken as a case study and a thorough assessment is given of the workshop structure, pedagogy and materials used.

Chapter 2, Original Pronunciation in Context

2.1 Historically Informed Performance

The use of original pronunciation (OP) in modern productions may be viewed as a transfer of culture from one historical period to another. In this respect, it is analogous to the transfer of other cultural elements, such as costume, and practices, such as gesture and blocking. The pronunciation may work with other elements or may function independently of them. I would suggest that Pavis's model of *intercultural transfer* is helpful when considering the mechanics of the cultural importation (Pavis 1992). Pavis views the source and target culture as two opposing poles like the bulbs of an hourglass. The source culture (or elements of it) is filtered towards the target culture. Practitioners will choose to place their production somewhere on the scale between the two poles.

The process of filtering elements of the source culture in order to give meaning to contemporary performances is known as historically informed performance (HIP) and has been labelled 'authentic performance' and 'original practices'. One interpretation of the difference between 'authentic' and 'original practice' productions is elucidated by Rob Conkie, who maintains that 'authentic' productions have deployed historical accuracy in order to reveal historical meaning, whereas 'original

practices' productions have deployed historical accuracy in order to create present meaning. This would seem to imply that 'authentic' productions were not designed to engage with the audience and that 'original practices' productions are not about historical exploration (Conkie 2006, 231). This is not the case; it is a question of degrees. In a sense, the former might be about recreating something historical and the latter might be about creating something new with historical building blocks. Arising from this are the questions of whether 'authenticity' is even achievable and who 'authenticates' a performance. These are explored below.

Sensitivity to terminology appears to have caused a change in the use of terms at Shakespeare's Globe from 'authentic performance' to 'original practice'. *Henry V* (1997) was described as an 'authentic' production and *Twelfth Night* (2002) 'original practices'. Richard Olivier, director of *Henry V* (1997) states that, as part of the 'authentic' brief, "we would... undertake to explore certain authentic production methods or styles" (Kiernan, P. 1999). Olivier admitted that they would not be attempting to make every element 'authentic' but would decide in advance which things would be 'authentic'. I suggest that this represents a kind of selective 'authenticity' which is both arbitrary and subjective. I would question how an 'authentic' element can be truly effective when taken out of its original context. In contrast, director Tim Carroll, referring to *Twelfth Night*

(2002), says that “[o]ur brief in presenting an ‘original practices’ production is to explore ways of staging the plays that would have been possible at the time of the first Globe.” Carroll’s negative view of the term ‘authentic’ is expressed in his admission that the word implies a “fatuous value judgment” (Conkie 2006, 227). The implication is that someone is adopting the role of the ‘authenticator’. This view would seem to support my use of the words ‘arbitrary’ and ‘subjective’ above.

Regarding OP, I would argue that a reconstruction of the pronunciation can never be truly ‘authentic’ as, despite rigorous research, there is insufficient evidence available to be more than about 80% accurate in our reconstructions. Even if the reconstruction were wholly accurate, the audience would still be listening to and interpreting the language with twentieth-century ears. The value of OP, as I suggest elsewhere in this thesis, may be found not only in the restoration of rhyme and metrical patterns, but in the potential it holds to bring something new to the performance.

Adaptation may constitute a part of the cultural filtering process. This type of filtering might involve the rewriting of a script to increase its relevance to the target culture. As an example, I will briefly examine in this chapter *The Enchanted Island*, Davenant and Dryden’s adaptation of Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*. In terms of Pavis’s model, the adaptation

might represent a stage in the process of filtering the source material towards the target audience. In this case the source and target were only half a century apart.

Tim Keenan, who directed a revival of Davenant and Dryden's adaptation at the Donald Roy Theatre, Hull University (2008), maintains that, "[h]istorical knowledge can only be transferred directly in productions which aim to reconstruct or recover the lost theatrical moment; where this is not the aim, historical knowledge must be adapted" (Keenan, T. 2009, 70). He also believes that "theatrical production of a scripted play inevitably involves accommodation to a particular set of physical, historical and cultural circumstances and in this sense every production is an act of adaptation" (2009, 70).

Keenan draws an analogy between performing historical drama and producing intercultural theatre; our modern culture is radically different from that of the Elizabethan or Stuart eras. He cites Pavis's model of *intercultural transfer* (Pavis, P. 1992): "[u]sing Pavis it is clear that there are opposing poles of production dominated by either source or target culture. In the former, cultural (i.e. historical) specificity is the object, in the latter it is audience readability. It is the job of practitioners to decide where on this scale to place a production" (2009, 70). Keenan warns that either end of the scale risks becoming a "museum demonstration" or an

“ahistorical muddle” (2009, 70). Keenan places his revival of *The Enchanted Island* at a “midway” point on Pavis’s scale, “informed by historical contexts but capable of being easily read by a modern audience”.

Similar considerations may apply to performance traditions, which may cause a gradual change in production methods and values over a number of years. In musical terms, this might result in a gradual and imperceptible change in the tempo of scherzos from Beethoven’s symphonies over time or changes in string articulation as a result of improvements to instrument-making technology. In the theatre, changes in acting style may result from the increasing remoteness of the stage from the audience, greater efficiency in lighting technology, increases in the auditorium size or an audience which is all seated and indoors.

The performance of historical drama in OP may be viewed in the light of Pavis’s work. The question of readability by the ‘target’ audience deserves consideration; even given a strict historical-linguistic interpretation the pronunciation is reasonably readable by a modern audience. On Pavis’s scale, the focus of an OP performance is on the source cultural/historical pole and very little filtering is necessary to adapt the language for the ears of the modern audience. The very fact that language is both an oral and aural experience is important to the understanding of how OP can

work in performance. In psychological terms, an audience experiencing a production in period costume would consciously relate what they see to a given historical period and would make judgements about period and status based upon the visual element and their own experience. They might make assumptions of a cultural, social or political nature based upon their own knowledge of modes of dress. The audience response to language would be markedly different. In the same way that our ears very quickly become accustomed to interpreting the large variety of English regional accents, the listener's brain would subconsciously relate the actors' pronunciation to their past experience of hearing different modes of English. They would find it difficult to pigeon-hole the pronunciation and might recognise that it does not conform exactly to any modern regional accent. Audience members for whom English is a first language might easily understand the accent; those of other ethnic origins and with less experience of language varieties might initially find it a little more difficult to accommodate their ears to the sounds of OP.³ Ultimately, any

³ The statistics below are taken from an email survey (Burton, L. 2013) of the audience at Shakespeare's Globe, completed in November 2012 by 7,495 people who had booked a performance on-line for the 2012 season. 86% completed the survey to the end. The age profile of the audience reveals that "the majority of respondents were aged 45-64 (46%) or 25-44 (26%). Only 7% were under 24, and 12% were aged 65+." 18% were retired and 8% were students.

In respect of the country of residence, 76% were resident in the UK and 13% from overseas. Of this overseas percentage, 4% were from North America and 1% from Australia and approximately 0.5 percent from Ireland. This represents a significant number from English-speaking countries, although the survey does not reveal how many of these residents might have a first language other than

difficulties in understanding the accent would be comparable to the difficulties encountered in hearing a play with marked modern regional accents, such as Liverpudlian or Geordie.

Pavis's hourglass filters elements of the source culture into the target culture. The filters are created by the target culture and the audience. However, in OP there is much commonality of culture in the language of source and target. Additionally, the audience has experience of many of the sounds of the source culture in certain modern contexts.

This chapter will rationalise the performance of Shakespeare in OP by examining the way in which modern productions might be informed by

English. Of the 5% from Europe, over half were from Germany, France, Italy and Ireland. Of the high proportion of British residents one would expect to find some who were from the European Union, perhaps working in the country on a temporary basis. This group would not necessarily have English as a first language.

With regard to ethnicity, 81% percent of respondents were 'white', of which 78% were 'white British'. 6% belonged to other ethnic groups, half of which were 'Asian', 'Black', or 'Asian British' and 'Black British'. The remainder were 'mixed', Chinese or from another ethnic group. One might tentatively surmise from these ethnicity statistics that a little over 78% of the audience might have English as a first language.

This survey has limitations as only those who book in advance on line have been sampled. It is possible that overseas bookers may be more likely to book at the box office on the day of the performance and any analysis of these statistics should take this into account.

other related fields of HIP. Additionally, I will discuss how OP performance might follow in the recently established tradition of accented Shakespeare, and I will look at how it might easily form an extension of the sort of work that Shakespearean voice coaches already undertake.

I will use the term *historically informed performance* to indicate the research and employment of past performance practices and circumstances in order to enhance modern practice. I have chosen this term as it adequately describes the dual process of researching the pronunciation (historical information) and applying it (performance) that are necessary when attempting to use OP as a technique in the modern theatre. The term was originally used in the field of music to describe the adoption of historical instrumental techniques or practices (such as original lute tunings and ornamentation) which were performed on original or reconstructed period instruments.

The practice of HIP embraces a variety of art forms, including music, dance and drama. John Butt, in *Playing With History* (2002) suggests that the HIP movement in music has its roots in the musical debate which accompanied the anniversary of Bach's death in 1950. From then, the idea gained momentum until the early music movement began to flourish in the late 1960s. Butt points out that Hindemith (who was hugely

influential in promoting HIP and was a great influence on Nikolaus Harnoncourt,⁴ a leading exponent of the revival of period practices) may have been a little misguided in assuming that Bach “fits effortlessly and contentedly into the culture of his own age” (2002, 3), making the (perhaps false) assumption that Bach might advocate the instruments and performance practice of his day as the best tools for realising his intentions. We can only guess at what his intentions might have been.

The musicians’ interest in the twin focus of original instrument technology and period performance styles and techniques has encouraged academics and theatre professionals to investigate past theatre practice and performance conditions as a means of informing contemporary practice. I suggest that performing in OP parallels other HIP practice in that it draws on scholarship and historical practice as a means of informing and enhancing modern practice.

Exploring the Meaning of ‘Authenticity’

The word ‘authenticity’ is often used today to denote superior quality, as opposed to an inferior imitation or copy. In this sense, the meaning of the word is ‘quality’ and does not necessarily refer to its source. A

⁴ Hindemith’s 1943 realisation of Monteverdi’s score of *Orfeo* employed period instruments. In 1954 the realisation was performed and recorded in Vienna, a performance which included Harnoncourt on the gamba.

Shakespeare production may claim to be ‘authentic’ in certain elements of the production or the use of space, and the level of ‘authenticity’ may be a question of degrees.⁵ In this context, the word ‘authenticity’ must be linked to the source. It is a matter of debate whether a truly ‘authentic’ production is possible; this would assume that all the constituent elements of the production, including the theatre and the audience, were ‘authentic’. Experiments at Shakespeare’s Globe are revealing the complexities of the actor–audience relationship, but this audience brings with it the experience and expectations of the twenty–first century. It is not possible to recreate an audience from a point in history. The question then is what constitutes an ‘authentic’ element or practice and who ‘authenticates’ it?

In *The Globe Theatre Project: Shakespeare and Authenticity* (2006), Rob Conkie refers to Shakespeare’s Globe as an example of ‘reconstructed historical authenticity’ (Conkie 2006, 25) and he puts this reconstructed theatre building at the top of the list of aspects which are “regarded or marketed as authentically original” (2006, 3). Over the life of Shakespeare’s Globe, there has been an attempt to balance modern and ‘original practices’. Even the word ‘authentic’, much used in the early days, has now all but disappeared from the terminology, to be replaced

⁵ Regarding the space, Franklin Hildy (2008, 18–21) traces the existence of previous reconstructions of the Globe Theatre around America, which show various ‘degrees of authenticity’.

by the phrase 'original practices'.⁶ This may hint at a compromise between a desire to recreate original performance conditions and to use 'original practices' as a means of informing or enhancing modern productions.

Conkie appears to acknowledge the fact that a wholly 'authentic' performance may be impossible when he says, "[i]n the case of the new Globe building itself, and in many other aspects of the practice therein, such as performance style, the original upon which the conjectural copy is based has been lost" (2006, 3). Although research continually throws up new discoveries regarding original practice and architecture, it is inconceivable that a production will achieve universally recognised 'authenticity'. However, there may be value in gaining some sense of second-hand 'authenticity'. Conkie admits that "[t]he copy, for some, enables understanding (and experience) of the lost original" (2006, 3). In relation to the *Henry V* (1997) from the opening season, he chooses his adjective carefully when he writes about the production's adherence to the "principles and practices of reconstructed authenticity" (2006, 4).

Any use of the word 'authenticity' is problematic and should qualify the degree of 'authenticity' and the production elements under scrutiny.

⁶ Conkie points out that 'the majority of the official discourse of the new Globe,' since 1999, avoids the use of the word 'authenticity', preferring 'original practices' (2006, 201).

Conkie sketches a hierarchical order of productions at Shakespeare's Globe, ranked according to the degree of 'authenticity'. The first group, the 'most authentic' (including *Henry V*, 1997) used period costume and all-male casts; the second group, 'mostly authentic', used mixed casts with women playing women's roles (such as *Hamlet*, 2000); the third (including *The Comedy of Errors*, 1999) are 'somewhat authentic' and used sets and props, as well as including the yard in the performance space (but period costume was used); the fourth group, labelled 'anti-authentic', includes *The Winter's Tale* (1997), with its earthen floor and on-stage tractor tyre (Conkie, 2006, 5 and 247).

It is possible that the actor, through the experience of wearing 'authentic' costume (known as 'clothing'), might gain insight into early modern subjectivity, even in the absence of other 'authentic' elements. The costume worn by Toby Cockerell, who played Princess Katherine in *Henry V*, limited his movements and caused an upright posture. Cockerell reported that his costume "was so precisely made it forced me to move in a certain way – I would just glide across the floor. You can't walk fast at all. There was lots of restriction in the chest, I found it hard to breathe" (Kiernan 1998, 25).

Shakespearean texts present their own problems in terms of 'authenticity'. It is not possible to apply the same criteria one would with

a modern text, where the playwright may be the sole creator and the written text is often very close to the performance text. In his discussion of what constitutes an 'authentic' Shakespearean text, Stephen Orgel draws a distinction between the printed text – the autograph manuscript – and the acting text (2002, 237). He describes the printed text as the starting point and the acting text, prepared for performance, as the 'authentic' text. In justification, Orgel reminds his reader that "[o]ne indisputable fact about the plays is that they were written not for publication but for performance..." (2002, 237). He supports his argument by referring to the cuts evident in contemporary prompt books and the fact that most Shakespeare plays are too long for the two to two and a half hours generally accepted as the running time. "The realisation of the text, then," writes Orgel, "historically speaking, involves a considerable departure from the text" (238).

I would argue that Orgel's view is an extreme one. Shakespeare, as an actor, knew that his texts would be cut for performance and I suggest that the fuller, published texts were literary, rather than dramatic works, written with the reader in mind. This view is supported by Lukas Erne (2013) who believes that establishing "*what* was performed" should be a "precondition of any historically informed performance criticism." Arguing for Shakespeare as a literary dramatist, Erne believes that Shakespeare's plays were designed to be both "for the stage" and "to be read" (Erne, L.

198). Material cut for the stage, therefore, is not necessary for dramatic performance but is certainly relevant for a literary reading. What is significant is that as Shakespeare was closely involved in the rehearsal process himself, unlike many other authors, he is more likely than most to have had a hand in the shaping of the acting text.⁷

Referring to the collaborative process of play writing in Shakespeare's day, Orgel states that there was sometimes more than one playwright and "[t]he text thus produced was a working model, which the company then revised as seemed appropriate" (2002, 1). The prevailing situation was unlike today in that there was no authorial control over revisions of the text as it belonged to the acting company. Therefore, in terms of the performance text, Orgel suggests that "the very notion of 'the author's original manuscript' is in such cases a figment" (2002, 2). He maintains that what is 'authentic' in a Shakespeare play (which he describes as "Shakespeare's perfection") is something outside the play that it brings to life. He reminds his reader that the play is a vehicle "for the representation of... human nature or history" (2002, 245).

William Worthen (1997, 8) expresses the view that "[t]he conditions of production in a Renaissance playhouse militate against the final

⁷ Alan C Dessen's tenth commandment for the New Globe (2008, 238) reads: "Above all else, thou shalt trust the scripts... for the surviving scripts (as reflected, however accurately or inaccurately, in the early printed editions) are our only evidence.

ascription of an ideal, coherent work to a single, animating author.”

Shakespeare’s plays are shaped by performance conditions and revisions by both the author and his collaborators. Jay Halio agrees with Worthen’s position that the ‘authenticity’ of a performance is “not so closely identified as it may seem with the printed text of Shakespeare’s plays, which themselves involve questions of authenticity” (Halio, J. 2010, 99). All Shakespeare’s plays may be assumed to include material other than the author’s. This does not necessarily mean that the play is ‘inauthentic’ for the reasons mentioned above. Orgel gives as an example Dryden and Davenant’s *Enchanted Island* (1667) which was the standard version until 1832 (2002, 245). As an adaptation, this play may be viewed as ‘authentic’ in itself, even though it is heavily adapted to suit Dryden and Davenant’s time.

Rob Conkie identifies a conflict between the priorities of academics and practitioners when he discusses the difference of opinion between Andrew Gurr and Mark Rylance. He contrasts Gurr’s notion that actors will put the academics’ ideas into practice with Rylance’s interest in a practice which “explores human consciousness” and which “could be threatened by the latent museum potential⁸ in attempting to replicate authentic

⁸ Franklin Hildy (2008, 17–18) suggests that the promise of creating a “coherent approach to the staging of plays at Shakespeare’s Globe... has not yet been fully realised” due to fear of the phrase “museum theatre”. Hildy believes this fear should be “abandoned” and the term embraced as “museums are places where

staging.” By way of an example Conkie mentions the use of the yard, which Gurr believed to have moved beyond a practice that could be historically ‘authenticated’ (2006, 189). Alan Dessen (2008, 48), commenting on the use of the yard, highlights the dilemma: “To use the yard is often to set up some exciting theatrical effects.” But he admits that “there was no evidence that the yard was used for entrances, exits, processions or special effects at the first or second Globe.” He cites this as an example of “the collision between historical evidence and OP [original practices] as understood at the Globe.”

The notion that a practice should be ‘authenticated’ poses the problem of who should be the ‘authenticators’. Stephen Orgel maintains that ‘authenticity’ is not an ‘inherent’ quality but is ‘bestowed’. With regard to the Council of Trent’s rejection of Luther’s bible, Orgel suggests that “authenticity was a matter of authentication” (Orgel 2002, 235). In this case, the Council of Trent accepted the vulgate version of the bible as ‘authentic’, even though it was not the ‘original’, which was, of course, in Hebrew and Latin. The ‘bestower’ is making decisions about what constitutes ‘authenticity’. Should the ‘authenticator’ be the academic who has studied the literature for evidence of early modern practice, or should it be the practitioner who benefits from the research and is enabled to make discoveries of their own, or both? And who decides how much of

world class authorities share their expertise with the general public in exciting and dynamic ways.”

this practice is worthy of being adopted or how much the audience will tolerate? There was an attempt to define which elements of production should feature in a modern reconstruction at the end of the Globe Education conference ‘Within *this* Wooden O’.⁹ Conference delegates were given the opportunity to vote on their preferences from a list of ten preconditions, which included eliminating intervals, earlier matinee starting times, female parts being played by boys, costuming, audience participation and the use of original pronunciation.

Sometimes it is the commercial rather than research or practice aspect which drives the decision. For example, the omission of the interval and later matinee start times have not been adopted as this may have involved a loss of revenue.¹⁰ This type of decision highlights the conflicting priorities of the three groups (academic, artistic and commercial) involved in setting priorities.

In a discussion of what is meant by ‘authenticity’ and how present meaning might be created, one might include the audience in the equation. According to Mark Rylance (from the programme notes to

⁹ ‘Staging at the new Globe: a 1995 View’, quoted by Conkie (191) but no longer on the web.

¹⁰ Alan Dessen’s eighth commandment for the New Globe reads: “Thou shalt eschew intervals–intermissions so as to eliminate the anachronistic single fifteen–minute break that changes the rhythm and dynamics of performance” (2008, 237).

Hamlet, 2000),¹¹ “[i]f you want to measure the quality of the play, measure it against your own lives. Don’t think you need to compare it with another production or judge it according to the latest theory or idea of authenticity”. Rylance reveals here his interest in what Shakespeare had to say about human character and the way this might be viewed in the light of people’s own lives today. The existence of this type of ‘authenticity’ may be strengthened by an example cited by Conkie (2006, 46). A letter was sent to Mark Rylance by a lady who had recently seen his production of *Julius Caesar* (2000). The lady in question had recently suffered a trauma when her son was the victim of a knife attack. The experience of seeing the onstage attack on Caesar caused her to break down and weep in public, releasing her own pent up emotions. What is happening here is the theatrical enactment of a universal experience, which strikes a chord in the audience, especially if they themselves share a similar experience. This underlines the idea of a personal ‘authenticity’.

The Audience and the Past and Present Context of Musical Cues

Problems of present versus past context and the audience are evident in the use of musical cues which carry emotional and structural meaning. For example, the various stage directions which call for a variety of military fanfares, such as alarum, march, retreat, may trigger some sort

¹¹ Programmes are archived in the library at Shakespeare’s Globe.

of emotional response in a modern audience. However, an Elizabethan audience may have been more receptive to the actual significance of the fanfares, such as a call to arms. David Lindley (2008, 95) points out that this incidental music may have a structural role in the way it might signal the framework of a battle, from alarm to excursion to retreat. The instrumental sounds would guide the audience through the battle scene. Lindley maintains that these signals cannot “be comprehended by a modern audience for whom there is no musical language of war.” The context within which these incidental sounds operated is now largely lost and its effect on the listener diminished. Moreover, Lindley suggests that modern audiences do not get “unmediated acoustic access to Shakespeare’s world” (2008, 97) as there is noise pollution in any outdoor environment. In early modern times an audience might have been aware of the crowd roaring at a nearby bear-baiting; today it is the constant traffic hum, punctuated by bursts of mechanisation.

‘Original Practices’ at the Blackfriars Playhouse, Staunton, Virginia

As a model of the way in which ‘original practices’ might inform modern productions I will discuss certain elements of the experiments undertaken at the Blackfriars Playhouse in Staunton, Virginia, which opened in 2001. Plays are performed here on a simple stage under universal lighting conditions and utilising the rehearsal procedures of Shakespeare’s time.

The experiments are conducted in a scholarly fashion; the theatre is linked with Mary Baldwin College. The resident company, the American Shakespeare Centre (ASC), focuses on ‘original practices’ during the Actors’ Renaissance Season (January to March), when they memorise their parts from cue scripts and function on minimal company rehearsal without a director.¹² Their methodology is derived from Tiffany Stern’s *Making Shakespeare* (2004). As representative of the sort of discoveries which may be made under these conditions, I will briefly discuss the problems of characterisation, entrances and exits, and asides when working from cue scripts.

In common with Shakespeare’s Globe in London, experiments at the Blackfriars Playhouse are not confined to Shakespearean productions. Indeed, significant discoveries may be made in rehearsal for less-familiar plays by other early modern playwrights. Jacqueline Bessell, who has directed a number of ASC productions, notes the fact that, in group rehearsals for unfamiliar, non-Shakespeare plays, there is insufficient

¹² Alan C. Dessen (2008, 46) maintains that, even at Shakespeare’s Globe, “for a variety of reasons, the findings of theatre historians have had little impact on today’s productions... Most significant is the presence of a director... who provides a controlling point of view that can trump OP [original practice] concerns.” Tim Carroll (2008, 39) admits that directors are controlling when he says “...I do not think we would become directors if we were not control freaks.” However, he concedes that “[t]here are certain things that the architecture of the Globe, especially its rooflessness, remove from one’s control. The most obvious one is the weather.” Carroll goes on to explain how the weather, aeroplanes and even pigeons might influence a performance.

time for developed character work and an alternative means of working is developed to compensate for this. That is, the actors “develop a recyclable series of broad-stroke characterisations” (Bessell 2012, 87). The type of characterisation may be prompted by the character’s name in the script; Jonson’s Sir Amorous La-Foole, Morose and True-wit (*Epicoene*) might suggest stock characters. This type of characterisation may reflect the working practice of early modern actors who were operating within tight time schedules.

Broad-stroke characterisation, then, is a starting point for character study. This is reinforced by study of the cue script, which may reveal further evidence in the dialogue. This might reveal the character’s attitude towards other characters and even comments about himself but not what others say about him; this must wait for the group rehearsal. Bessell maintains that this type of collaborative characterisation is enabled by the actors’ training coupled with their experience of performing in the Blackfriars Theatre. Shakespeare’s actors would be highly experienced collaborators with a shared learning experience, possibly gaining their training in the company as apprentices. The shortage of group rehearsal and the focus on the actors’ individual learning experiences meant that actors concentrated on identifying the passions revealed by their role. Early modern writers described this process as ‘passionating’. The largely solitary working practice in the

Blackfriars Theatre is quite unlike the director-led, collaborative, text-based study which modern actors are used to. The ASC (American Shakespeare Centre) handbook explains that early modern actors were concerned with “determining what the emotions required by their roles were...” rather than determining the overall narrative (Bessell 2012, 92). The time-scale forces actors to commit to character decisions without the benefit of exploration and experiment they would be able to afford in a longer rehearsal period.

The actor did not work entirely alone, however, as there would often be an instructor, usually a more experienced actor or even the author, who would help them discover the passions and represent them vocally and with the art of ‘action’. The hierarchical structure of instruction is followed by the ASC, who employ ‘apprentices’ from Mary Baldwin College to take smaller roles. These students are given some individual coaching by the experienced actors (although time only permits limited help). The action associated with a particular part may have been passed down from one generation to the next. Tiffany Stern writes that personality traits are “often easy to pick up when examining a text that contains only a single actor’s lines with cues, but easy to miss when looking at the whole play as a unity” (Stern 2004, 84).

Bessell suggests that one discovery made by actors working from cue scripts is how important it is in the short amount of group time available to work out entrances and exits. ASC actors might adopt certain conventions relating to their own space in order to compensate for lack of rehearsal. According to Bessell, one of the two doors either side of the discovery recess in the Staunton Blackfriars might be associated with interior entrances and exits and the other exterior. Bessell says that 'narrative clarity' is achieved by use of the performance space to define imagined 'locales' in the narrative (2012, 97). This might replace other methods of achieving narrative clarity, such as the 'refinement of specific performance objectives within the scene' (97). The geography of the stage, then, allows actors to define fictional spaces within it, both on and off stage. The stage direction *go in*, sometimes used for an exit, may refer to fictional locations and appear contradictory. Tim Fitzpatrick (2011) explains that *go in* might refer to moving from an exterior fictional space on stage to an interior one off-stage. With regard to stage geography and stage directions, Walter Hodges points out the importance of certain stage directions in Shakespeare, which might trigger a familiar blocking procedure (such as *march about the stage*). This might then be carried over from one production to another (Hodges, C.W. 1999).¹³

¹³ See Hodges diagrammatic representation of the stage direction *marching/going about the stage* (1999, 25). The instruction '*the troop pass once about the stage*' appears in the scene directions at the start of *Henry V*, 5.

A problem encountered by ASC actors using cue scripts involves the aside. Bessel quotes Ryan McCarthy (from his account of a rehearsal in the 2008 Actors' Renaissance Season for *The Jew of Malta*) who notes a potential difficulty (2012, 98). Without sight of other actors' lines it is sometimes difficult to establish which parts of dialogue are not supposed to be overheard. One of the actors, John Harrell, suggested 'that an ostentatious gesture could be used to indicate asides so that not only the audience but the actors know when something isn't supposed to be heard' (2012, 98). Harrell confirms that actors discover these things through rehearsal.

There are occasions, however, when the metre of the verse might clarify the situation. It may be that an aside functions as a separate metrical entity, not compromising the integrity of the lines which frame it. Shakespeare, it appears, is reluctant to make a character complete a line which they are not supposed to have heard. This may be seen in the apparently irregular portion below:

Duke of Albany:

There is my pledge [throws down a glove]! I'll prove it on thy heart,
Ere I taste bread, thou art in nothing less
Than I have here proclaim'd thee.

Regan:

Sick, O, sick!

Goneril:

[aside] If not, I'll ne'er trust medicine.

Edmund:

There's my exchange [throws down a glove]. What in the world he is

That names me traitor, villain-like he lies. *King Lear, V, 3*¹⁴

Goneril's incomplete line (correctly marked as an aside here) occupies its own metrical space and is not, therefore, completed by Edmund, who is not supposed to hear it.

The absence of a director is a significant feature of 'original practice' at The Blackfriars Playhouse. However, a great deal more study is required before this area can be assessed adequately. It is difficult to gauge the impact of the lack of a director as there are so many styles and techniques of directing today, each of which has a different outcome in rehearsal. The effect may be even more difficult to test when the play is a familiar Shakespeare one, perhaps which the cast have performed a number of times in a variety of circumstances.

¹⁴ Quoted by Flatter, R. (1948), *Shakespeare's Producing Hand*

HIP at Shakespeare's Globe

This section explores some of the discoveries made through HIP at Shakespeare's Globe, including a brief survey of an 'original practices' production of *Twelfth Night*.

The Audience

The re-creation of Shakespeare's acting space has given actors and academics the chance to assess the techniques required to perform in an open-air amphitheatre. The universal lighting and highly visible and partially mobile standing audience, create a situation where the playgoers may influence what happens on stage, sometimes in unexpected ways. But just as the audience might more tangibly affect what happens on stage, so the performances of the actors might affect the audience in a powerful way. Referring to the removal of the boundary between audience and actors, usually created by theatre lighting, and the close proximity of the two groups, Pauline Kiernan says, "it requires the actors to work harder to draw the audience into a fictitious world, but, again, paradoxically, makes it in some senses easier for the playgoers to become absorbed in the story" (Kiernan 1999, 19). Tim Carroll believes that the actors can give extra help to the audience to compensate for the missing stage lighting. In his view "At the Globe, the eyes of the other actors are the equivalent of lights in conventional theatres. You have to have a very strong sense of what the target is on stage all the time and I

think you've got to use focus on that" (Bessell 2001). The fact that the actors can clearly see the audience in a Globe production, as Penelope Woods points out, means that "the audience have a lot more power, not as in a normal theatre where they are conditioned to be silent" (Harrison, A. 2012). She adds that actors find this difficult as "[t]hey are not used to noisy behaviour. And they have to get people's attention quickly and their good behaviour" (2012).

The audience certainly tends to become more vocal in this situation and willing to become part of the narrative. When performing *Henry V* (1997), Mark Rylance found himself confronted with an unruly section of the audience who cheered the announcement of the French dead. His response was to turn away from the crowd and address only those on stage, in a low voice. Thus, he preserved the dignity of the scene (Kiernan 1999, 20).

Direct address was problematic in this production of *Henry V*. When the French Lords addressed the audience some of the responses were not appropriate, the fictional world and characters were compromised so the narrative faltered. In these early days at Shakespeare's Globe, the actors were learning how to make contact with the audience without losing rapport with their fellow actors. The audience needed to learn what is and is not acceptable behaviour in the new space so that they would

contribute to but not disrupt the proceedings. Regarding this disruptive potential of an audience, Penelope Woods (2011, 20) quotes Dennis Kennedy (2009, 109) who describes the Globe audience in the yard “having fun as they are accustomed to at a football match or a rock concert or a panto.” Woods challenges the assumption that these people attend these other events and disagrees with Kennedy’s sweeping generalisation that the audience “refuse to stand still and listen carefully” (Kennedy, 2009, 114).

Alan Cohen, in his advice to directors (Cohen, R.A. 2015, 215) advocates that asides should be used sparingly; the word is used only four times in the folio in stage directions. Actors at the Globe have tended to cast the audience as players in the action. Cohen advocates this practice, both in crowd scenes, such as Antony’s speech at Caesar’s funeral, where the audience in the yard become mourners, or simply when comments refer to the nobility (the gallery) or working men (the yard). The practice extends to casting individuals in the audience where the text refers to characters not in the cast, although Cohen warns against addressing an audience member with a question other than a rhetorical one. Furthermore, he warns that if the audience is acknowledged, “to anchor that moment to the play the other actors on stage must act in the context of that choice” (2013, 221). This will ensure that the contact is rooted in the story.

The dangers of direct address are highlighted by Penelope Woods (2011) who describes an incident which highlights the actor–audience relationship under shared lighting. During a Globe Education *Romeo and Juliet* performance there were no servants (apart from the Nurse) in the company of ten so the dying Mercutio addressed his command “fetch me a surgeon” to the audience. One student was bold enough to shout out “call an ambulance.”¹⁵

It is predictable that the audience will become vocal in parts of the play where the playwright appears to be inciting a reaction through the use of dialogue. Geoffrey Beevers, who played Horatio in *Hamlet* (2000), wonders to what extent Shakespeare anticipated the audience response when Hamlet refers to the groundlings: “who (for the most part) are capable of nothing but inexplicable dumb shows and noise” (*Hamlet* III, 2). According to Beevers, “[y]ou have to wonder whether Shakespeare was aware that the actor is going to make a break before ‘and noise’, and has written it with that in mind” (Bessell 2001, 11). There is, however, a danger that the audience will dictate the atmosphere of the performance. This possibility became a reality in a production of *The Two Noble Kinsmen* (2000). Tim Carroll explains that the production was going well and the show was getting laughs in unexpected places. After several

¹⁵ Woods witnessed this incident in a performance of *Romeo and Juliet*, given as part of Globe Education’s *Playing Shakespeare* season in March 2009. Woods, P. 2011

successful shows the cast appeared to lose control of the performance and the groundlings “decided it was an out-and-out comedy” (Bessell 2001). According to Carroll, the groundlings “were not going to allow anything to be contemplative or quiet. They barely tolerated the quiet moments, in a way that was almost insolent.” There was a realisation amongst the cast that they had “shot themselves in the foot” (Bessell 2001).

Regarding the way that Shakespeare engaged his audience by referring to topical issues, Mark Rylance (2008, 194–5) states, “The first of the ‘original practices’ I tried to follow was my understanding that Shakespeare and his company responded to the topical issues of the Elizabethan and Jacobean audience ... To be a theatre, our plays had to reflect the world outside.” The inclusion of references which are relevant to today’s audience, then, may be considered an original practice. Rylance confirms this when he says, “I always felt that if this was just an experiment in recreating the past, then it would fail. Part of why the plays occurred originally was that they were connecting with the themes of the day; they were topical” Rylance (2008, 112).

The shared-lighting experience at the Globe affects not only the actor–audience relationship but also that of the audience with one another. Penelope Woods states that “the nature of the Globe playing space, where

audience members are visible to one another, produces self-consciousness and a certain amount of exposure.” This can result in “suspicion or antagonism towards other audience members...” (Woods 69). In conversation with researchers about their Globe experience, Woods states that “the second most-consistent statement given by audiences was their impression that a key demographic in the audience were ‘tourists’.” However, those interviewed were not at all sure how to distinguish the tourists in the audience (Woods, 101). According to Woods, in 40 interviews, ‘tourists’ were mentioned 29 times (Woods, 98, footnote). On the positive side, Woods refers to the “heightened sense of ‘community’ feeling and behaviour generated by moments of performance” (Woods, 69). The community feeling can even extend as far as audience members sharing a response to action on stage with others whose sight-lines are impaired by a pillar.

Regarding the way in which a modern audience physically inhabits a recreated Elizabethan space, Woods believes that a modern audience might share “embodied audience practices” with an Elizabethan one. These include “negotiating their space with each other and “straining to hear and see”. Woods goes on to say that these practices can generate “extraordinary visceral responses to the effects of performance in the space” (Woods, 266).

Staging and the Space

As early as the Prologue season at Shakespeare's Globe it became clear, according to Pauline Kiernan, that playing at Shakespeare's Globe demanded a rethink of the normal rules of blocking. The stage offers 'hot spots' (on the outer corners, outside the pillars – ideal places for direct address) and 'cold' spots, the use of diagonals in the blocking is desirable and greater separation is needed between two actors in dialogue. Kiernan labels these outer, corner 'hot spots' the "authority position", ideal places from which to deliver a soliloquy (Kiernan 1999, 66). David Fielder (Llewellyn, *Henry V*) explains how the 'hot spots' might be used to an actor's advantage in the scene "where Llewellyn greets the king about the bridge." Fielder needed to find a good position to say his lines and he explains how the blocking was worked out so that Llewellyn uses a 'hot spot' before relinquishing it and moving into a 'cold spot' for Montjoy to enter and deliver his lines (Kiernan 1998, 29).

The pillars force actors to play to the sides of the stage as well as to the galleries and they make it necessary to keep moving when delivering speeches. A section of the audience will always have their view blocked by the pillars so it is wise to keep moving to avoid being masked for too long. However, they do provide an ideal place for the many scenes where actors are hiding or eavesdropping. Actor Geoffrey Beevers believes you

should not ignore the pillars as they constantly block the view of a section of the audience. Beevers maintains that this is not a problem as long as the actor remembers that there is always a section of the audience who are only listening, rather than watching (Bessell 2001, 11). Kiernan warns against a proscenium–arch format, playing to the crowd in the yard. Richard Olivier, director of the opening–season *Henry V*, maintains that “[t]he relationship between the actors and the groundlings can make those in the galleries feel excluded... (Kiernan 1998, 32).

It soon became apparent that audience members were deserting the galleries for the yard in order to be more a part of the performance. The actors were compelled to find ways of involving the gallery audience and reducing the influence of the yard playgoers in order to maintain the pace of the action.

Gesture

A surprising discovery at Shakespeare’s Globe related to gesture. Steven Skybell (actor, *Henry V*) expected to have to “play broad, with big gestures, sweeping things...” and was surprised to find that “the audience could pick out the movement of an eyebrow” (Kiernan 1998, 40). Of course, this statement needs to be qualified by saying ‘the portion of the audience whom Skybell was facing’. In a reference to the fact that

meaning and emotion is carried by the text, Skybell says that “you would think this space calls for a less subtle form of acting, but in fact you can have trust that a nuance can be read. It's not about large, bombastic gestures.” The early modern playwright communicated the inner passions in the text and the actor was able to signify interior passion with exterior restraint,¹⁶ allowing the language to express the emotion.

Voice

The use of the voice at Shakespeare's Globe has revealed a similar paradox. Contrary to the expectations of some actors, such as Michael Gould, who played Polixenes in *The Winter's Tale*, for such a large space, open to the elements, an overprojected voice is not appropriate. Gould explains: “[w]e developed quite big boomy voices... but when we moved into the space we realised just how intimate it could be” (Kiernan 1999, 88).

¹⁶ Hamlet urges restraint here (III, 2):

...for in the very torrent, tempest, and (as I may say) whirlwind of your passion, you must acquire and beget a temperance that may give it smoothness. O, it offends me to the soul to hear a robustious periwig-pated fellow tear a passion to tatters, to very rags, to split the cars of the groundlings, who (for the most part) are capable of nothing but inexplicable dumb shows and noise. I would have such a fellow whipp'd for o'erdoing Termagant. It out-herods Herod. Pray you avoid it.

Strengthening the argument for restraint, Jeanette Nelson (voice coach for the opening season) explains: “[a]s for the way the language worked in the theatre, I think that the more actors are encouraged to allow the language to express the emotion, rather than to push feeling into the voice, the better it will work (Kiernan 1998b). Richard Cottrell, director, who conducted a workshop in the theatre had a notion that the actors would have to work hard to project in the space but later conceded that “[n]atural speaking is better than roaring” (Kiernan 1999, 89). Rather than volume of sound, what was required was adequate support and clarity of diction. This is confirmed by Polly Pritchett (Emilia in *The Winter’s Tale* and Olympias in *The Maid’s Tragedy*) who says, “[t]he old-fashioned vocal training that a lot of us have thrown away... comes back in this theatre” (Kiernan 1999, 90).

Actors performing in this space need to be able to adapt their voices to a variety of situations. The lack of a roof means that when it rains the acoustic can become more difficult to deal with. The actress Kate Fleetwood says “I find it hard when it is raining heavily and there were no groundlings, because I tend to overcompensate. I think ‘I’m just going to shout’ and of course I use the wrong part of my throat, and it messes up my voice” (Bessell 2001, 23).

Candle Lighting

An area which has attracted little exploration in the past involves theatre lighting. The creation of the new indoor theatre at Shakespeare's Globe has presented an ideal opportunity for Martin White, historic theatre lighting scholar, to recreate the candle-lit conditions of Shakespeare's day. White has already (in 2009) successfully reconstructed a Jacobean theatre at Bristol University and lit productions with wax and tallow candles. As part of the research, professional actors were filmed performing extracts from plays of the period, including *'Tis Pity She's a Whore* (2009) and *The Duchess of Malfi* (2009). The production is filmed in such a way that the viewer is able to experience the action from four different viewpoints around the auditorium and is able to select a viewpoint (University of Bristol, 2009). I found it enlightening to be able to enjoy the scenes from the viewpoint of a rich noble in their stage box or a common person in the pit. The difference in quality and effect between the candlelight, lanterns and torches is quite striking and the atmosphere lent by the various light sources is tangible, even when viewed on DVD.

White hopes the creation of the new theatre will "enable audiences, actors and scholars to encounter Jacobean plays written for indoor performance in a way unavailable in any other theatre in the world, and to experience

the extraordinary atmosphere and impact of a candle-lit performance” (University of Bristol, 2012). Candlelit productions contributed to the structure of the modern play; it was the need to manage the candles which led to the act divisions found in Jacobean plays.

The experience of candle light will enable the audience to interpret the production in the light of the new discoveries which will inevitably accompany the restoration of original lighting circumstances. In one sense, this is innovative and pushes the boundaries of modern production techniques, whilst at the same time it draws on our heritage in order to recreate the original context of the plays as a means of discovery. The actor, too, is likely to react differently in this unfamiliar environment and may re-discover former techniques of stylised gestures and frontal acting, which have been given a new lease of life in reconstructed theatres such as the one at Český Krumlov in the Czech Republic.

The design of the new space, with its two galleries, and the close proximity of the seating will almost certainly encourage greater interaction between performer and audience, as it already has in the outdoor space at Shakespeare’s Globe. The acoustics and candle lighting may also contribute to our understanding of the workings of Jacobean theatre in a way which will inform and benefit modern productions.

According to Franklin Hildy (2008, 22–3), “Shakespeare’s Globe offers the opportunity for a new generation of directors to learn the theatrical language of the age of Shakespeare and learning that language will make it possible to translate the plays more effectively for audiences in the twenty–first century.”

Twelfth Night

The Globe Theatre’s production of *Twelfth Night* (2012, which ultimately transferred to the West End) continued the theatre’s experiments in ‘original practices’: this production was staged with an all–male cast. Paying tribute to the production, Alex Needham, writing in *The Guardian*, says “it is difficult to imagine that *Twelfth Night* could be performed more effectively than it currently is at the Globe theatre” (Needham, A, 2012). Tim Carroll’s production featured Stephen Fry as Malvolio and Mark Rylance as Olivia. Referring to the fact that Sebastian and Viola are both played by men, in identical costume, Needham comments that “for once, the gender confusion is convincing” (Needham, A, 2012). The effect of this gender confusion is two–fold: it enables the audience to experience the gender casting as it would have been in the original production; and it takes the production to a new, post–modern place, redefining the relationships between the characters in a way which is entirely new to the modern audience.

However, the casting for this production was problematic in respect of the age of the actors. In his enthusiasm for all-male casting, Needham, in his review, overlooks the fact that the males cast in women's roles would have been boys, quite probably with unbroken voices. The choice of older and more experienced actors may benefit the production but does not aid our understanding of how the gender casting would have functioned in the original production. In this case, an element of the source culture has been filtered in such a way as to inhibit its original function. In contrast, the Globe Theatre's 1997 production of *Henry V* cast a boy as Katherine and some members of the audience were apparently unaware that the role was played by a boy actor (*Shakespeare's Globe Research Bulletin*, Issue 2, March 1998). Shakespeare's audience, however, would have been quite aware of the actor's gender. Ultimately, what is important is what the audience believes when they are watching the play.

Tiffany Stern maintains that "[h]aving an audience trained to 'read' clothes in a very literal way also allows the playwright to play games with people's expectations" (Stern 2004, 105). Referring to the fact that Viola in *Twelfth Night* and Rosalind in *As You Like It* are boys playing a girl who dresses as a boy, Stern suggests that the audience "recognise that they are seeing a girl dressed as a boy, although what they are actually seeing is a boy dressed as a boy" (2004, 105). This would seem to imply that the audience might track one layer of gender disguise but not two. In any

case, it is the character they are tracking, rather than the actor. She suggests that in the case of Viola and Sebastian, the audience might have shared with the characters in the play the inability to distinguish the two. Stephen Orgel, in *Impersonations: The Performance of Gender in Shakespeare's England*, appears dismissive of gender difference when he remarks: “[o]n Shakespeare’s stage it is a difference we would regard as utterly superficial; a matter of costumes and mannerisms” (Orgel 1996, 18). He adds that “[g]ender disguises in this theatre are represented as all but impenetrable” and that the boy actor provides “an extra layer of travesty” (18). I would suggest, in the light of Stern’s comment, that the extra layer is irrelevant. The audience is aware that a character is a double agent but they act the part so convincingly that their real allegiance is obscured. I have explored the question of boys voices in Elizabethan theatre in the section on *The Shakespearean Voice* below.

Past Performance Practice

The value added to a production which takes the rich heritage of ‘original practices’ into consideration is well proven in related theatrical disciplines. The fact that, according to Crystal (2013, 1–2), literary and drama critics acknowledge the importance of the relationship between pronunciation and interpretation is worth examining further. In the same way that, in drama, pronunciation style is related to interpretation, so too

is the style of vocal delivery in opera, the use of gesture, action and body-language in drama, and the use of articulation, ornamentation, phrasing and instrumentation in music. *The Oxford Dictionary* defines 'interpretation' as 'a stylistic representation of a creative work or dramatic role' (Soans, C. and Stevenson, A., 2008). The versatility of drama ensures that no two productions (or stylistic representations) are ever identical, and one of the functions of the actor or musician must surely be to explore every aspect of the play, opera or symphony, leaving no stone unturned. It is the turning over of these stones which has motivated creative people to strive to uncover the secrets of past practices in order to determine their relevance to today's audience. Those researching the contribution that pronunciation might make to the 'stylistic representation' of a dramatic text might gain inspiration from practitioners in other theatrical disciplines and performing arts.

In her essay, "Performance Practice: Issues of Authentic Performance" (1995), Catherine Webb reminds us of the problems associated with the Renaissance 'musica ficta'. The term relates to the non-appearance of accidentals in the score, where the composer would simply assume that the performer would insert them, an example of the implicit practice mentioned above. This demands some care from the editor when reproducing or arranging music of the period. Webb quotes Giovanni Spataro, a sixteenth-century music theorist from Bologna, who appears

to have been somewhat frustrated with *musica ficta* in a letter of 1524 where he wrote, “the musician or composer is obliged to indicate his intention in order that the singer may not chance to do something that was never intended by the composer...” (Webb, C. 1995, 63).

The *musica ficta* tradition parallels the Shakespearean custom of not always showing syncopations or elisions in the text, even when they are necessary for metrical symmetry. As in the musical context, it was assumed that the performers would naturally apply the practice, as it was second nature to them. These are important examples of performance practice which, as they are unscripted, may easily become lost over time.

The Performance Space

As well as language, acting style and lighting conditions, other important considerations in HIP are the architecture and physical properties of the performance space. According to Franklin Hildy “Previous attempts to reconstruct the theatre started with the assumption that concessions had to be made to modern tastes, modern notions of audience comfort and modern building codes. Such concessions became excuses for not attempting to identify, let alone answer, the important questions” (2008, 14). Andrew Gurr (1997, 36) defends the ‘authenticity’ of the current Globe reconstruction by identifying five areas of knowledge in which

primary evidence was sought: pictorial evidence, evidence of the plays (including stage directions), archaeological evidence, evidence found in surviving structures of contemporary age, and evidence of art historians regarding iconography and decoration. Gurr rightly points out that, in the future, a further body of evidence will build up as actors gain experience of performing in the space.

The layout of the Renaissance theatre frequently influenced performance practice, some of which is evident in stage directions. C.W. Hodges, in his book *Enter the Whole Army* (1999), based on drawings for *The New Cambridge Shakespeare*, explains many of the stage directions from Shakespeare's plays in the light of his research regarding the design, layout and conventions of the theatre. His findings go back to the work of Edmund Malone, who collaborated with George Steevens on a new Shakespeare edition and arrived in London in 1777. Malone's work on the history and design of English theatre, which started life as an appendix to the 'new' edition, was published as a separate volume in 1780 with the title *An Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of the English Stage*.

Hodges' study explains many of the confusing stage directions by including designs of the stage, and traffic flow diagrams showing possible solutions to the staging. In the chapter from which the book takes its name, *Enter the Whole Army*, Hodges explains that the text of

All's Well That Ends Well appears to be compiled from Shakespeare's drafts or possibly a working prompt book. This is evident in some of the stage directions, which seem to be taken from author's notes or a cue script. Hodges quotes the direction, "*Parolles and Lafeu stay behind, commenting on this wedding,*" to which he adds, "which at once they do at length, without the slightest need for a stage direction" (Hodges, C. W. 1999, 70). In Act III, scene 5, there is the direction, "*Drum and Colours. Enter Count Rossillion, Parolles, and the whole army.*" Hodges proposes that this direction may have been inserted by the 'book holder', "as a memorandum to the tiring-house staff, who would have to organise... a spectacular parade around the stage..." (1999, 71). Hodges calculates that the company could have comprised twenty-seven men and "[b]y timing the space of dialogue in which the spectators comment on the parade as it goes by, the whole thing could easily have been over in three or four minutes, yet in that short time it must have made an effective show" (1999, 71).

Performance informed by the study of the architecture of theatre design and structure can greatly enhance the effectiveness of the play and make sense of otherwise confusing directions. This is the case in 'discovery' scenes where flats are flown away or the curtains covering the central recess are opened to reveal new scenes or characters in a moment. This device may explain the 'descent' of Romeo into the tomb where Juliet lies,

which in effect is gained by the opening of the curtain in the upstage recess of the stage. Hodges refers to the direction, "*They march about the stage*" (1999, 34), in *Romeo and Juliet*, I, 4, which appears to describe a random movement but may refer to movement around the perimeter of the stage, outside the two pillars, as opposed to a simple crossing of the stage, upstage between the two doors. Hodges explains that this "seems to have been a well-established convention for a processional movement or a march" (1999, 34). In an era when rehearsal time for new plays was very limited, it seems natural that acting companies would have fallen back on well-established conventions, which could be transferred from production to production and signalled by easily understood stage directions. The hiding places frequently mentioned in Shakespeare's plays are explained in various ways by Hodges, most notably by the concealment of the actor behind one of the two stage posts, but in full view of most of the audience. This is one of the possibilities he proposes for *Much Ado About Nothing*, II,3, where Benedick conceals himself and eavesdrops to discover Beatrice's love for him.

Hodges' study, linking stage conventions, blocking and design, fills many of the gaps in our knowledge of Shakespearean practice and gives very plausible interpretations of many of the hitherto confusing or contradictory stage directions in the texts. Problems may easily arise if a director attempts to interpret Shakespearean stage directions through

modern eyes without appreciating the unwritten customs and conventions, which would have been taken as read, and without considering the performance space and conditions of the early productions. It is, of course, impossible to recreate the original context, where the audience was grounded in an entirely different culture and not holding the expectations or bringing with them the experience and preconceptions of today's audiences.

As an experienced actor, Shakespeare would have been able to anticipate the audience's reaction to stage business and may well have written in some business purely in order to achieve the reaction. Ralph Alan Cohen (2008, 223) relates his experience of using the discovery space, not visible to a section of the audience, for the placing of Hermione's 'statue'. He felt that the audience would be content to hear the play at that point. Mark Rylance also believes that "[s]ound is a more powerful tool in staging at the new Globe than sight" (Kiernan P. 1999, 132). However, this was not the case and some of the audience moved in order to see into the space. Cohen wonders whether this may have been the playwright's intention all along as the actor's lines may easily be directed to a mobile audience: "[t]hen all stand still" and "[n]o foot shall stir" (*The Winter's Tale* V, 3). David Lindley suggests that, in contrast to the way present audiences hear incidental music, which is assumed not be heard by the characters on stage (Lindley 2008, 97), "at least until the latter

part of the seventeenth century all music performed in the theatre was assumed to be heard by both” (2008, 97). If then the music is tied up with the action, the early modern listener may have interpreted it as causative. In the way that the alarum calls the army to action, Lindley believes that the music underscoring the animation of Hermione’s statue in the same scene from *The Winter’s Tale* might be seen as causative.

Paulina:

Music, awake her; strike!

[Music]

'Tis time; descend; be stone no more; approach;

Strike all that look upon with marvel.

The Winter’s Tale V, 3

Original Pronunciation in Vocal Music

The interest which musicians have traditionally shown in HIP has led to experiments in performing Elizabethan and Jacobean vocal music in the original pronunciation. This is an area which merits further research as the singer may use OP as an accent to develop a character in the same way that an actor might. The Camerata of London, under Barry Mason, used Elizabethan pronunciation in their recording of *Shakespeare’s Musicke* (Meridian Records, 1990). The CD sleeve informs the listener that the pronunciation used is based on the work of E.J. Dobson and “also

on practical application in performances of Elizabethan music by members of the Camerata of London.” This information communicates the scholarly basis of the performance as well as the consideration that the pronunciation is being used for a practical purpose, rather than merely to re–create an Elizabethan soundscape. The blurb goes on to claim that “this pronunciation, with its pungent short vowels and characteristic rolled ‘r’s would be familiar to Shakespeare himself.” The writer admits that there will be a certain amount of speculation involved. The reconstructed pronunciation is not the only historically informed element in this performance of songs from Shakespeare’s plays, which is given on period instruments such as theorbo, lute, sackbut, shawms, baroque guitar and viols.

This was not the first time the Camerata had reconstructed Elizabethan speech; their earlier recording of English ayres and duets advertises the original pronunciation practice in the title: *English Ayres and Duets Sung in Authentic Elizabethan Pronunciation* (1983, Hyperion, CDA 66003). This recording includes vocal music by Dowland, Pilkington and Campion. The note on the record sleeve suggests that “one area of authenticity appears so far to have been largely overlooked, perhaps because it involves an altogether different field of scholarship – that of language.” The writer declares that the making of this record “marries the fruits of scholarship in two quite separate fields.” The work of E.J. Dobson in

coaching the performers in the Elizabethan accent is acknowledged and an extensive note by Dobson justifies the pronunciation choices by means of a brief language history. He states that the pronunciation chosen by the performers is an advanced one for the date, even though the rhymes in the lute songs tend to suggest a more conservative pronunciation of lyrics written by an older generation. The dubious justification given by the performers for the advanced pronunciation is that the lute songs were a “modern fashion”. Dobson points out that some adjustment of vowel length was necessary where a short vowel was slurred over a series of notes. It is significant that the application of original pronunciation in vocal music gives rise to a different set of policy decisions from a spoken language performance, such as vowel length and, in this case, the marriage of speech style with the perceived modernity of the musical genre. Red Byrd and the Rose Consort of Viols attempt a similar language reconstruction in tandem with reconstructed performance aspects, such as instrumentation, on their CD of *Elizabethan Christmas Anthems* (Red Byrd and the Consort of Viols, 1989), which contains performances of works by Gibbons, Tomkins, Byrd and Amner.

The use of OP in Elizabethan vocal music may be beneficial in restoring syllable patterns and end rhymes, which are an important feature of song performance. The OP is generally used in association with the employment of early instruments as a means of recreating the perceived

original aural effect. In song, there is also the possibility of using the accent to define a character in the same way that it can be used in drama. The idea of character representation is easier to rationalise than the idea of recreating a soundscape as it contributes to the interpretation of the song and might enhance the performance. The orthographic representation of the speech sounds is as much of a problem here as it is in a dramatic script and there may still be reliance on an 'expert' to advise on pronunciation.

The Spoken Word

It is less usual to consider the performance of the spoken word in an historical context. Language poses its own peculiar problem in that changes occur slowly over periods spanning generations. The changes largely involve the pronunciation of the vowels but can also include the use of elision and syncope (syllable reduction) as well as changes of stress which occur when foreign vocabulary is adopted into a language and accommodated (adapted to fit the patterns inherent in the host language). There is a great deal of evidence in English spelling of the pronunciation changes undergone by the language (for example, the former pronunciation of 'meat', the vowel of which is preserved to some extent in PDE 'steak' and 'break'). These changes pass unnoticed, especially as they tend not to affect the intelligibility of the spoken word

in the short term. Rhymes which go out of currency might perhaps be kept alive artificially for a short time until the pronunciation becomes too far removed from the current usage (such as ‘eye rhymes’ where a word like ‘love’ was paired with ‘move’ even as late as the eighteenth century by William Blake in *Love’s Secret*).

If it were not for the huge amount of word–play and rhyme in Shakespeare and the use of pentameter as the vehicle for carrying the text, Shakespeare’s plays would still function as they did in the seventeenth century, despite their antiquated grammar and lexis. Reconstructing the original context and, therefore, restoring the original rhymes (which might herald an entrance, exit or end of scene), puns (where humour may have been appropriate) and metre (which might affect the actor’s reading of the line), in whole or in part, is beneficial to the production and, therefore, should be a consideration. This thesis will explain that restoration of rhythm, rhyme and word–play is but one benefit of language reconstruction.

The fundamental principles which govern our understanding of language give a clue as to why it is that an Elizabethan accent can be understood by English speakers today. Gimson’s explanation of the way language is decoded by the listener helps us to understand the processes involved (1962, 1–2). He states that the efficiency of our language’s sound system

as a means of communication does not depend on the perfect production and reception of every single element of speech. He also points out that two utterances by the same speaker of the word 'cat' may show marked differences when measured instrumentally. According to Gimson (1962, 3), in the phrase, "these men are working", the quality of the vowel in 'men' is not vitally important as the grammatical context clarifies the fact that 'men' is intended, rather than 'man'. The demonstrative adjective adds additional information in that it determines the plurality of the noun. Significantly, Gimson doubts the importance of vowel quality as an aid to intelligibility as he points out that the twenty English vowel sounds could be replaced by a neutral [ə] and a high degree of intelligibility would be maintained, provided that the rhythmic pattern is preserved. He says that many of the cues contained in an utterance are likewise 'redundant', although the large number of cues serves to counteract the quality divergences which exist between speakers of two dialects of the same language.

The fact that our language is 'loaded' with an abundance of cues, expressed in grammar, rhythm, intonation, and vowel and consonant quality explains how it is that speakers of present day English are able easily to understand historic reconstructions of their own language. The major differences between present day English (PDE) and OP are to be found in the vowel sounds, which Gimson hints are not so vital to

intelligibility. He states that exaggerated articulation for the purpose of achieving clarity may well be beyond the requirements of speech as a means of communication and that “certain obscurations of quality are, and have been for centuries, characteristic of English” (1962, 4). This would seem to vindicate the casual delivery of Elizabethan English.

The Challenges of OP Performance

The performance of Shakespeare in OP presents its own set of challenges. The use of OP involves an interpretation of the text, informed by the study of the phonology of the language and the linguistic customs of the time. The interpreted text must be presented in a transcript, in a form which is easily understandable by a modern actor. Rather than a clearly defined set of sounds, which the musical notation might represent, the orthography defines a set of parameters, within which the actor interpreting the transcript may place his vowel and consonant sounds. The actor is involved to a greater extent in the process of interpreting the phonology of the text than the musician in realising the musical notation. It follows that the actor should not be completely divorced from the research process and should be in a position to make informed choices about the pronunciation. This decision might be affected by character, metre, rhyme and the context of the lines within the play. In the process

of rehearsing and performing a play, the sounds of the language cannot be depicted orthographically as effectively as the sounds of music can.

The question of the interpretation of the transcript is an important one. When actors read a text they are realising their own idea of how the words should be pronounced; an Irish actor will give a very different interpretation from a Scots actor when given the same script. The OP transcription is designed to focus the actors' pronunciation into a broadly acceptable spectrum of sounds which might be identified as OP. The text, therefore, needs to contain more information than the author has supplied.

Research, such as that conducted by E.J. Dobson (1957), Helge Kökeritz (1953) and Fausto Cercignani (1981), has shown that consonant simplification, elision and weak stress were prolific in early modern English (EME) and the variety of vowel qualities in use was large, yet we imagine that all speakers of the language were able to communicate with one another with no problems. After all, people living in Shakespearean London would have been exposed to a plethora of regional and foreign accents on a daily basis. As a result of today's wide exposure to different accents in the media, the listener is well equipped to tolerate variations in our language and modern audiences have shown a ready acceptance of Shakespearean English.

The practice of presenting drama in OP is very much linked to the idea of the transference of culture from one period to another. In this case the differences of culture do not arise from geographical separation but chronological remoteness. Customs, manners, etiquette, artistic practice, and language change over time and this change may be viewed as a change in culture. As a result, a play written for an audience at a particular point in history may not be so easily 'readable' by an audience in a later period. This poses the question: should the audience be relating the play to their own time or enjoying it as an historical piece?

The Enchanted Island, Adaptation to Suit a Culture

I will briefly discuss here the adaptation of Shakespeare's *Tempest* by Davenant and Dryden, which they named *The Enchanted Island* (1667). This play is a product of its own period and an example of the successful filtering of the elements of a piece, by adaptation, to account for changes in culture.

During the Commonwealth and the long closure of the theatres between 1642 and 1660 there was dearth of new writing for the theatre. Following the Restoration, it became expedient to revive productions which had previously been successful, notably Shakespeare. However, the particularly social and political nature of some of the storylines was by

then viewed as dated. This prompted theatre managers to commission adaptations of these works to suit their own audiences. During the exile of the court in France, King Charles II and his followers had grown accustomed to the courtly manners of Louis XIV's household. The manners and etiquette were ridiculed in the new drama, the 'comedy of manners'.

After the restoration, Charles permitted two noblemen to found theatre companies in order to breathe new life into the dormant genre. Sir William Davenant established The Duke's Company at Lincolns Inn Fields (sponsored by the Duke of York, later James II) and Thomas Killigrew founded The King's Company at the Theatre Royal. The inclusion of women in The King's Company in 1661 radically altered the possibilities for using gender as a device, particular in romantic and comedic plays.

It is in this context that Davenant and Dryden set about adapting Shakespeare's *Tempest* for The Duke's Company in 1667. Their adaptation includes generous cuts and a bias towards royalist themes, designed to gain favour with the restored aristocracy. The play upheld the idea of the monarchy being the most effective form of government and affirmed the notion of inheritance of estate through the male line. There was also an emphasis on the authority of noble patronage in matters of

education and marriage. Thus, the adaptation is able to reflect the social and political situation in England in the 1670s.

Dryden and Davenant introduce extra characters into the plot; a sister, Dorinda, for Miranda and a sister for Caliban, Sycorax. Prospero also has a son, Hippolito, who has never seen a woman. Ironically, Hippolito was often played by a woman; this enabled the actress to show more leg than was generally permitted and gave comedic value. Instead of being played by a boy, as in Shakespeare's day, Miranda would now be played by a woman; this had huge significance in respect of characterisation and interaction between the characters and enabled the gender to be emphasised in a more meaningful way.

Speech Perception, OP and Accent

The question of interculturalism and speech perception in OP needs to be addressed. Looking at Pavis's model for interculturalism, one notices that the use of OP necessitates transference of the language in its entirety from one culture to another with no filtering, adaptation or diluting. The target culture is expected to accept the source language in its original form. Prior to the performance, the reconstruction of the source pronunciation from the orthography paves the way for the wholesale adoption of that element of the source culture. This is only able to work

in performance because of the nature of the audience's perception of speech.

Although the reconstructed sounds of OP are as close as we are able to establish to the sounds of Shakespeare, the modern audience has the ability to 'read' the pronunciation with very little adjustment to their normal listening habits. Listeners pick up acoustic cues when decoding language; these might involve the voicing or unvoicing of consonants, placing of stress, vowel length, the place in the mouth where the sound is articulated and the intonation. When listening to language we subconsciously categorise sounds and are more likely to be able to differentiate the sounds of different phonemes than the variant sounds within the same phoneme. This is significant in OP terms as there is a fair degree of tolerance of variation in vowel sounds in language decoding. These processes are applied subconsciously every time we listen to a speaker of our own language with an accent different from our own and this might apply to both a modern regional dialect and OP. The more we hear unfamiliar accents, the better we become at decoding the meaning.

Speech recognition is also aided by the hierarchical structure of language. Recognition of where and how a sound fits into a phrase or sentence is an indicator as to what its function is. If a phoneme in a word is masked by an extraneous sound, the listener can often supply the missing phoneme

in order to decode or categorise the word. This is known as the 'phonemic restoration effect'. Restoration may be 'bottom up', replacing sounds at word level, or 'top down' in terms of the hierarchical structure of language. These processes are, of course, largely subconscious. The fact that the brain decodes language in this way is helpful to an audience listening to an OP performance, as much of the language is identical to certain strands of PDE and the small number of unfamiliar sounds can be decoded according to their context.

An important facet of language recognition is the audience's interpretation of the particular colouring of the accent itself. Audiences may have certain preconceptions when they hear an actor dropping his 'h's and final 'g's and using unstressed forms of words. In the past there has been a stigma attached to so-called 'incorrect' pronunciation in regional varieties such as Cockney. Shakespearean actors have always been expected to enunciate clearly, pronouncing every consonant. The use of OP, with its casual delivery and colloquial style, may cause the characters in a play to appear less formal and less educated, and audiences may have to be prepared to leave normal perceptions of 'good pronunciation' behind when they enter the theatre.

Gimson (1962, 83), points out that the modern British listener is able to understand a greater variety of English accents owing to improved

communications and radio. He also mentions that “when the first sound films were shown in this country, an American pronunciation [was] considered strange and even difficult to understand” (1962, 84). It is also important to note that, with the explosion in communications, many of the prejudices relating to the use of regional dialects have been broken down; this is evident in the regional accents heard today on the BBC.

David Crystal maintains that modern productions which use regional accents in an attempt to enable members of the audience to identify with the language can cause the opposite effect. Those who do not use the regional accent may view themselves as outsiders. This phenomenon does not occur with OP as Crystal points out that it “occupies a unique dialect space, resonating with several modern accents and yet at a distance from all of them” (Crystal, D, 2005, 149). Ben Crystal describes the accent as “a universal sound”, which English speakers identify with “the accent of their home”.¹⁷

The archaism of languages is quantified by Roger Lass (2000, 27) with reference to linguistic features such as inflectional endings, grammatical gender, presence of the dative case, inflected definite articles, inflected adjectives and so on. On his scale of 1.00 to 0.00, with 1.00 being the most archaic, Gothic and Old Icelandic are at one end (1.00), closely

¹⁷ In a private conversation, 25 July 2012.

followed by Old English (0.95) and Old High German (0.90). Middle English appears at 0.35 and modern English at the 0.00 point.

Considering the linguistic features of Early Modern English, this would appear very close to zero. Clearly, this analysis focuses on features of the language other than pronunciation. However, it is reassuring to take evidence into account which seems to suggest that, in terms of archaism, Early Modern English is very close to the language spoken by a modern audience.

On the intelligibility of OP to modern audiences, Terttu Nevilainen (2006, 118) quotes Roger Lass (2001, 257) who writes the following about Elizabethan pronunciation: “[a] modern listener would find the (probably rather small) part of the language that was comprehensible at all both surprising and rather confusing.” Nevilainen gives the following example as evidence of a pronunciation where a modern RP speaker would notice a total absence of rhyme:

PUCK:

Through the forest have I gone,
But Athenian find I none,
On whose eyes I might approve,
This flowers force in stirring love.
Night and silence: who is here?
Weeds of Athens he doth wear:

This is he (my master said)

Despised the Athenian maid:

A Midsummer Night's Dream, II, 2

However, there are many other passages where the rhyme works perfectly well. In fact, the remainder of Puck's speech makes perfect rhyming sense in today's pronunciation, but for one instance of a secondary stress on the ending of 'courtesy' which we do not give in PDE:

And here the maiden, sleeping sound,

On the dank and dirty ground.

Pretty soul! she durst not lie

Near this lack-love, this kill-courtesy.

Churl, upon thy eyes I throw

All the power this charm doth owe.

When thou wakest, let love forbid

Sleep his seat on thy eyelid:

So awake when I am gone;

For I must now to Oberon.

James Milroy's view provides a balance to Lass's. In *The Legitimate Language* (2002, 22), Milroy states that Shakespearean pronunciation "would sound like a somewhat archaic dialect of English." As such, it would be comprehensible to many people today.

Historical Background to *Macbeth* at the Mermaid Theatre (1952)

As case studies, it seems appropriate briefly to summarise several historically informed performances of the last sixty years which have included language reconstruction in tandem with other elements of Elizabethan theatrical practice. In December 1949, the opera singer Kirsten Flagstad was staying over Christmas with Bernard Miles at Duff House, Acacia Road, St John's Wood. A walk in the garden prompted a conversation about the old sixty by thirty feet wooden school building which lay preserved at the bottom of the garden and Miles confided to Flagstad that he hoped to convert the old building into an Elizabethan theatre. On hearing this, Flagstad promised to come and sing in the theatre if the plan ever came to fruition. That promise was enough to spur Miles into action and, with the help of two designers, the scholar of Elizabethan theatre Walter Hodges and Michael Stringer, Miles created an Elizabethan stage and converted the building into a two-hundred seat theatre in time for the opening on Sunday 9th September 1951. This short opening season was to include a landmark reconstruction of the opening scene of *Hamlet* in OP (Glow, G. 1969).

Miles's use of OP was part of a larger plan of staging historically informed performances, which included his re-creation of an Elizabethan acting space and the use of an Elizabethan acting style. This opening season

included recitals and performances of *The Tempest* (1951) and *Dido and Aeneas* (1951). Attention to historical detail is evident in an article in *The Guardian* (25 July 1952) which describes the final preparations for the opening season. According to the article “a roof hut is being built above the auditorium so that ‘apparitions’ and the like can be lowered onto the stage in the correct Elizabethan fashion.” Significantly, this article states that Miles “is a close student of WJ Lawrence’s important works on the subject, and has proved their practical as well as their academic qualities.” An article in *The Observer* (14 September 1952) mentions the “subterranean cauldron effects”. *The Guardian Review* (13 September 1952) mentions the close proximity and sight-lines of the audience: “Miss Joan Swinstead’s production makes a virtue of the necessity of the nearness of the audience and the fact that they ‘can see all round’ the players.” A review of *Dido and Aeneas* in the *New York Times* (1 September 1952) gives us an insight into the placing of the musicians in the opera: “In a balcony above stage, harpsichords and strings did justice to the music of Purcell, who might have matched his contemporary Bach if he had lived longer.”

The works of W.J. Lawrence referred to in *The Guardian* are: *Pre-Restoration Stage Studies* (1927) and *The Elizabethan Playhouse and Other Studies* (1913). In these works Lawrence describes in detail the physical makeup of the Elizabethan stage as well as general conventions

and elements of practice. In *Pre-Restoration Stage Studies*, there is a very detailed chapter entitled *Hamlet, As Shakespeare Staged It* (1927, 102), where the author discusses in depth the entrance of the ghost and concludes, “[i]t is obvious that there was absolutely no other way by which the ghost could suddenly make itself visible to the three [Bernardo, Horatio and Marcellus] save by emerging in front of them through a trap.” Lawrence devotes several pages to a discussion on the workings of the ‘ghost trap’, discussing the characteristics of the trap in order to understand the “mechanism and *modus operandi* of these early graduated trap effects” (1927, 106). In a chapter entitled *Inn-Yard Playing Places* (1927, 3), Lawrence refers to contemporary texts to ascertain the physical properties of the Elizabethan stage, such as the means of access to the upper stage. He traces the development of early public theatres from the inn-yards stating that “the principle pursued in the inn-yards was fundamentally identical with the principle pursued in the first public theatres” (1927, 27). There is a strong possibility that Miles modelled his stage, with its tiring house, roof hut, and probably trap doors, on the sort of construction described by Lawrence.

It was not only the stage architecture and technical construction which interested Miles. The pursuit of historical accuracy led him to seek the help of A.C. Gimson and B.L. Joseph in reconstructing the speech and gesture of the Elizabethan actors to accompany the physical

manifestation of Shakespeare's stage. In the programme notes for the 1952 production, BL Joseph revealed that "[t]he acting style will be based upon contemporary accounts of the art known as 'Action'." This art in essence involves the use of particular gestures to heighten corresponding emotional states in the action and was a popular tool for the actor in Elizabethan theatre. Joseph states in the programme that he has consulted Renaissance sources of this "art of Action" in order to research the Elizabethan "gracefulness of action" and gives as examples Bulwer's *Chirologia* (Bulwer, J. 1644), a book on the principles of rhetorical action or the use of gestures in rhetoric, and *Chironomia* (Bulwer, J. 1644b), a treatise on rhetorical delivery (see Appendix 1 for illustrations). The book is based on John Bulwer's personal observations of contemporaries, as well as classical and sixteenth century Italian texts." The description of the book also maintains that most of the gestures are still used today (that is, 1644).

In *Chirologia, or The Naturall Language of the Hand*, Bulwer explains in detail, citing biblical and classical references, the gestures of the hand used in rhetorical speaking. For example, the gesture known as 'explodo' (see illustrations, Appendix 1), is "to clap the right fist often on the left palm," and "is a natural expression used by those who mock, chide, bawl, insult, reproach, rebuke and explode..." (Bulwer 1644, 34), whereas to "put out the raised hand and to shake it as it were into a shout,"

designated 'triumpho', "is their natural expression who exalt, brag, boast, triumph... and express the raptures of their joy" (1644, 46). The book gives a detailed explanation of the emotions associated with many different hand gestures and actions as well as references to their use in literature. The author includes illustrations of each gesture at the end of the book together with numerical designations of each one "to serve for privy ciphers for any secret intimation" (1644, 150). Presumably this was intended for the purposes of annotating speeches.

In *Chironomia* (Bulwer 1644b, 240), Bulwer declares, "the gesture of the actor is unrestrained except that he is forbidden by the great master to 'overstep the modesty of nature'." Furthermore, he maintains that "[a]lthough his action is required to be various and graceful, it is never to degenerate into triviality or affectation; and although it should be energetic, it should never transgress by extravagance" (1644b, 240). Bulwer believes that if the actor truly conceives the character, he is able to represent it strongly and is unlimited by restraint except by the bounds of decency and nature (242).

Joseph's reliance on Bulwer's material to inform the acting process is problematic. Bulwer has plenty to say about the use of rhetorical gesture but little about the actual process of Renaissance acting and Joseph appears to be relying heavily on Bulwer (together with Abraham Fraunce's

The Arcadian Rhetoric, 1588) as a source. It is not clear exactly how much of the technique was employed in Bernard Miles's productions at the Mermaid Theatre, although Joseph's book, *Acting Shakespeare*, includes some photographs of Miles, Josephine Wilson and Elizabeth Shepherd using some of Bulwer's gestures in performance (Joseph, 1969). The reviews of the Mermaid Theatre's *Macbeth* (September–October 1952) do not mention the success or otherwise of BL Joseph's experiments with gesture. One can only assume that the critics did not notice anything unusual in the execution of the movement in the production, in which case the system must have been applied with great care and subtlety so as not to draw criticism for overacting. Joseph and Miles apparently took to heart Bulwer's warning not to 'overstep the modesty of nature'.

John Barton's *Julius Caesar*

The dual features of Elizabethan theatre and language were again explored by John Barton in his 1952 *Julius Caesar*. He attempted a reconstruction of an Elizabethan playhouse and filled it with actors speaking in an accent which was close to that used in Shakespeare's day. Barton used the descriptions of Elizabethan theatres found in the 1599 diary of Swiss traveller Thomas Platter (*Norton Anthology of English Literature*, 2013), from Basel, as inspiration for his reconstructed theatre. Platter describes a trip to the Globe Theatre on the south bank of the

Thames to see *Julius Caesar*: “On September 21st after lunch, about two o'clock, I and my party crossed the water, and there in the house with the thatched roof witnessed an excellent performance of the tragedy of the first Emperor Julius Caesar with a cast of some fifteen people; when the play was over, they danced very marvellously and gracefully together, as is their wont, two dressed as men and two as women” (Norton Anthology of English Literature, 2013).

Platter goes on to describe the theatre in some detail: “The playhouses are so constructed that they play on a raised platform, so that everyone has a good view. There are different galleries and places, however, where the seating is better and more comfortable and therefore more expensive” (Norton Anthology of English Literature, 2013). Platter describes the richness of the actors’ costumes and even suggests how the company comes by such finery. He states that “it is the English usage for eminent lords or knights at their decease to bequeath and leave almost the best of their clothes to their serving men, which it is unseemly for the latter to wear, so that they offer them then for sale for a small sum to the actors” (Norton Anthology of English Literature, 2013).

Barton had his theatre converted into an Elizabethan–style playhouse, in the manner of the Globe, by building a straw–covered thrust stage, side

galleries and a tiring house (Greenwald 1985, 28). In this setting, the reconstructed language must have seemed perfectly natural.

***Romeo and Juliet* in OP**

Given the *raison d'être* of Shakespeare's Globe at Bankside, it is not surprising that this was the theatre which staged the first OP production of Shakespeare in the 21st century (in 2004), after an absence of fifty years. Shakespeare's Globe is built around a thrust stage with three tiers of seating and an open yard space for standing 'groundlings', all of which replicates features of the original 1599 theatre. The existence of this theatre is in itself an experiment in historically informed performance and in this space discoveries about Elizabethan theatre continue to be made, not least of all about the interaction between audience and players. It was perhaps inevitable then that at some point an innovative director would attempt a production which would include reconstructed language. This was the case in 2004 when Tim Carroll asked David Crystal to advise on just such a production of *Romeo and Juliet*. The weekend of OP performances, within a longer run in PDE, was so successful that *Troilus and Cressida* was staged in OP for a longer run the following year. *Romeo and Juliet* is examined in detail in Chapter 3.

In Conclusion

Rustom Bharucha, in *Theatre and the World: Performance and the Politics of Culture* (Bharucha 1993, 244), suggests that interculturalism “evokes a back-and-forth movement, suggesting the swing of a pendulum.” He criticises Pavis’s “unidirectionality” and maintains that, with Pavis, the target culture acquires the status of a destination. His theory works very differently from Pavis’s hourglass with its re-arrangement or filtering of elements from source to target culture. Bharucha’s is a two-way process which shows mutual understanding and respect between the cultures, giving them equal status.

I suggest that a third model should be sought when assessing the mechanics of interpreting OP in HIPs. It may not be sufficient to assess the production in terms of either Pavis’s filtering process or Rustom Bharucha’s swinging pendulum. The audience are expected to understand the language in whatever context the play is presented, irrespective of design, costume, acting style or arrangement of the space. The language can, therefore, work with or independently of other elements placed in any cultural context. Significantly, the language may be exploited in its various forms to enhance the production in terms of characterisation, comedic value or differentiation between characters of differing statuses or nationalities. Although there was not a ‘prestige accent’ in

Shakespeare's day, there were certainly regional variations and differences in speech between educated and uneducated people. The use of OP alone, OP juxtaposed with RP or contrasting forms of OP within the same production may serve to highlight these social or cultural differences in character. In this respect, the language might work with elements such as costume, manners, and stylised movement to highlight these differences.

Pavis reminds us that the text is only one of several components of a performance, "others being the actors, the space, the tempo" (Pavis, P. 1992, 24). OP concerns not only the dramatic text, "the verbal script which is read or heard in performance" (1992, 24), but also the actors (voices and bodies) and the tempo. OP constitutes one part of the dramatic text, a part which has nothing to do with grammar, syntax or lexis but everything to do with pronunciation, rhythm, stress and maybe intonation (although little is known of how the latter functioned in Shakespeare's day). OP belongs to a cultural and artistic modelling subset, which might include: acting style, fashion, etiquette, gesture, movement, social conventions and performance space. Etiquette and social conventions may be seen to affect the way speech is delivered in a particular context, such as at court or in the home. In a similar way to other cultural elements, language is a product of its era and its context. It

follows, therefore, that language may be used to define that era or context in the way that costume might.

However, OP is not simply an indicator of chronology. It might be used by a subsection of the cast as an indicator of informality (perhaps amongst ordinary soldiers) or inferiority (as a working-class accent might) or it might signify age differences in the characters (by the use of conservative vowel sounds for the older generation). OP may be used equally in modern productions and in those which aim to re-create other elements of Shakespearean culture. David Crystal used advanced and conservative vowel systems to differentiate between the older and younger generations in *Romeo and Juliet* (2004) at Shakespeare's Globe. Character differentiation was aided by a similar approach in my workshopped reading of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

At present, there is a need to test the effectiveness of the use of OP (focusing perhaps on its use as an accent to represent a form of informal or regional speech) in productions in modern dress. The only production which has tested this, *Troilus and Cressida* (2005),¹⁸ performed entirely in OP at Shakespeare's Globe, was not universally well received or supported. In fact, over the run of performances, only 1,571 attended. Sunday Telegraph critic Miranda Sawyer writes that it is a "strange choice"

¹⁸ Wednesdays, 24th August – 28th September

for an experiment in pronunciation and she suggests that a better known play such as *Romeo and Juliet* (which was trialled the previous year) would have been a better choice (Sawyer, 2005). Sawyer claims that it takes twenty minutes to adjust to the style of speech. She describes the performance as a “confusing, academic night out” where one is “bamboozled not only by the accent and the ropey plot, but also by the fact that many actors are doubling up on parts” (Sawyer, 2005). It is essential to our understanding of how OP works for the accent to be trialled in a variety of productions and venues, used by part of the cast as well as the whole, and in a variety of period settings. Only when this research is complete can conclusions be drawn about the contribution OP might make to the audience’s understanding and enjoyment of the play.

The question of where on the cultural scale from source to target to place the production deserves careful consideration as it is important to achieve a balance. In his production of *The Enchanted Island*, Keenan chose to employ certain stylistic features from the source culture, such as direct address in soliloquies, interaction with the audience before the play commenced, the use of designated areas of the stage for specific purposes and the use of ‘discovery’ scenes where a new location might be revealed by flying off masking flats or by exposing the central recess.¹⁹ In consideration of the target culture, Keenan carefully

¹⁹ The word ‘discovers’ appears in the stage directions of *The Enchanted Island*.

considered information contained in stage directions and scene headings when blocking the play “to allow a modern audience to experience the adaptation on its own terms” (Keenan 2009, 71). In the finale, the pendulum swung significantly towards the source culture when he introduced some Louis XIV costume and restoration dance steps to the music of Matthew Lock, as used in the original production.

As a result of the above survey of HIP practice, I suggest that it may be convenient to identify three separate functions of OP within a modern production. Firstly, it may act, with other elements, as a cultural signifier, helping to define the historical period of a production. Secondly, it may act as a social indicator, helping to define differences in generation or status of characters on stage. Thirdly, it may function independently of other stylistic elements as an accent, in the place of a modern regional accent. The use of accents in Shakespeare is explored later in this chapter and all of these functions are tested in Chapter 6. Whatever the purpose is of using OP, I would suggest that ‘readability’ by the target audience is an important consideration and that this should be a factor under consideration when devising a transcription policy.

2.2 The Shakespearean Voice

The Cracked Voice – Boy Actors on Shakespeare’s Stage

The vulnerability of the voice and its social implications may be examined by assessing the treatment given to the subject by early modern writers.

In *Voice in Motion, Staging Gender, Shaping Sound in Early Modern England*, Gina Bloom tackles the subject of how early modern writers “conceived of the materiality of spoken articulations” (2007, 2). She considers the early modern scientific view that the voice is “crafted air”, moulded by the organs of speech and propelled through the air to arrive at the “air-filled chambers of the listener’s ears” (2007, 2). Significantly, the spoken articulations might be “produced by unstable bodies, transmitted through volatile air, and received by sometimes disobedient listeners” (3). In the case of boy actors, the bodies from which the sounds emanate might be unstable simply as a result of the onset of puberty and the cracking of their voices. Bloom examines the social effects of cracked voices in an age when “authority and power are imagined to inhere (or fail to inhere) in the material attributes of the voice” (2007, 3).

According to humoral theory, it is the relatively greater degree of heat in a man’s (as opposed to a woman’s or child’s) body which affects the size of the windpipe and causes the deepening of the voice, by cracking. The humoral equilibrium is explained by Francis Bacon in *Sylva Sylvarum*

(1626). Bacon states that “[c]hildren, women, eunuchs have more small and shrill voices than men. The reason is, not for that men have greater heat, which may make the voice stronger... but from the dilation of the organ which is likewise caused by heat.” Bacon goes on to say that the cause of the changing voice at puberty is “most obscure” (1626, 44). He theorises that the moisture in the body is drawn down towards the spermatical vessels leaving the body “more hot than it was; whence cometh the dilation of the pipes.” According to Bacon, boys reached puberty at “about twelve or fourteen years of age...” (1626, 55). Moreover, the qualities of the male voice are indicative of his social and political sphere. The male is expected to exhibit vocal control, which is a sign of balanced humours. A lack of control, which might manifest itself in a squeaky voice, would make for an inferior performance.

Shakespeare capitalises on the notion of a high-pitched voice demonstrating a lack of authority or manhood here:

Why, I, in this weak piping time of peace,
Have no delight to pass away the time,
Unless to spy my shadow in the sun
And descant on mine own deformity: *Richard III*, I,1

The use of 'descant' here is significant, as it means both to talk tediously or at length, and a treble melody. Likewise, piping's double meaning embraces the sound of an effeminate voice.

This notion of a 'piping' voice is evident in the two extracts below:

His youthful hose, well sav'd, a world too wide
For his shrunk shank; and his big manly voice,
Turning again toward childish treble, pipes
And whistles in his sound. *As You Like It*, II,7

Well, I must do't:

Away, my disposition, and possess me
Some harlot's spirit! my throat of war be turn'd,
Which quired with my drum, into a pipe
Small as an eunuch, or the virgin voice
That babies lulls asleep! *Coriolanus*, III, 2

The latter includes a reference to the continental castrati who were so popular in the opera houses of Italy.

In this extract, the notion of a small voice embraces both the loudness and the physical size of the windpipe and the choice of the name 'Flute' reinforces the theme of a piping voice:

Quince:

Flute, you must take Thisby on you.

Flute:

What is Thisby? a wandering knight?

Quince:

It is the lady that Pyramus must love.

Flute:

Nay, faith, let me not play a woman; I have a beard coming.

Quince:

That's all one: you shall play it in a mask, and

you may speak as small as you will. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, 1, 2

Bloom points out that “[t]he director of an all-boy theatre company was, in a very real sense, playing with creatures of time: “the cracked voice... reveals the precarious, shifting nature of male identity” (2007, 39). Early modern writers divided life into stages, as revealed by Jacques in *As You Like It*, II, 7. The fact that boys’ voices inevitably change in the teenage years might be seen as inconvenient for those who are playing women or patriarchal roles on the stage. Gender categorisation may be complicated by the ‘piping’ voice of adolescent boy actors.

The early modern theatre drew attention to the problem of cracked boys’ voices by sometimes making it the subject of humour or drama. Indeed, the word ‘crack’ came to be used to signify a roguish youth who engaged

in adolescent violence, much like the apprentices, who were known for their street brawling and testosterone-fuelled outrageous behaviour.

There is a reference to 'cracks' in *Henry IV*:

Robert Shallow:

The same Sir John, the very same. I see him break

Scoggin's head at the court gate, when 'a was a crack not

high; and the very same day did I fight with one Sampson

Stockfish, a fruiterer, behind Gray's Inn. *Henry IV, II, III,2*

In *Making Shakespeare* (2004, 70) Tiffany Stern reminds us that texts would be revised if necessary to compensate for cracked voices, such as in *Cymbeline* (IV, 2) when Arviragus and Guiderius are about to sing when Guidarius announces he will "weep, and word it with thee". Stern points out that there appear to have been second thoughts in *Twelfth Night*. After Viola decides to join Orsino's court she announces that she is able to "sing and speak to him in many sorts of music" (*Twelfth Night* I, 2). However, Viola never does sing, although Feste does. Stern suggests that a basic revision of the text has seen Viola's songs reallocated to Feste (70). She points out that "Viola, had she sung it, would be subject to the same melancholy as Orsino." This would have established commonality in the emotions of the two characters (2004, 71). As it stands, the song, 'Come Away, Come Away Death', sung by Feste, is an "ironic commentary on what is going on" (71).

The notion of a cracked voice signifying deceit or dishonesty is exemplified in the passage below. This shows a lack of control over the voice, an undesirable quality in a mature male. The cracked voice would expose his false pleading.

Timon:

Consumptions sow

In hollow bones of man; strike their sharp shins,

And mar men's spurring. Crack the lawyer's voice,

That he may never more false title plead,

Nor sound his quilllets shrilly

Timon of Athens, IV,3

It may be seen, then, that the boy's cracked voice was an occupational hazard on the stage in an age when women could not be used to play female roles. Moreover, the youthful 'piping' voice represented a lack of masculinity that might also be attributed to aged men, those who practised falsehood and even those lacking manhood. Although the early moderns did not fully understand the physical cause of breaking voices, they fully exploited the social and psychological implications.

The Shakespearean Voice Coach

For the scholar of OP, an examination of the work of the Shakespearean voice coach is enlightening; it shows that the work already being done might easily be adapted to suit an OP production. In order to illustrate this, this section briefly examines the ideas of Cicely Berry, voice coach to the Royal Shakespeare Company since 1969, and Kristina Linklater, voice coach and Head of Acting at Columbia University.

In line with most voice coaches, Cicely Berry is very concerned with movement and the way voice production involves the whole body. A favourite warm-up exercise involves delivering a speech while walking around the studio, with a change of direction on every punctuation point. In Berry's own words: "I get actors walking briskly around the room, until they feel the movement of the language in their bodies..." (Barnett, L. 2011). The juxtaposition of movement and speech is central to Berry's method. She aims to "release the actors' bodies and thus free their minds, opening up their understanding of the text." She goes on to make an analogy with blues singing, pointing out that "[t]here is a rhythm there that is part of the meaning" (Kaufman, J. 2011).

Berry's holistic approach is evident in her rehearsal method. She describes the first stage of the development of the voice as the exercises

for relaxation, breathing and dexterity of lips and tongue. The second stage consists of applying this to the performance material. “You cannot consider voice by itself, only in relation to the job you are doing,” says Berry (2011, 11). She maintains that “voice work should not be something that is done at the last minute to make the play ‘clear’ and the actor communicate ‘better’: it should be integral to the creative exploration of the play itself and of the character” (2011b, Introduction).²⁰ This should be a central axiom in the performance of OP.

Importantly for OP performance, Berry mentions the resonances of Shakespeare’s language: “[w]e want the modern actor to make Shakespeare sound as though it’s being spoken for now. But we also want to honor all the resonances, which are part of the meaning of the text” (Kaufman, J. 2011). In the context of OP David Crystal writes, “there are resonances of about a dozen modern accents in EME, thanks to the way the sound structure of individual words has pulled the vowels in different directions over time” (Crystal, D. 2005, 91–92). In relation to the OP productions at Shakespeare’s Globe (2004–5) he states, “[t]he actors were enthralled by these resonances.” And, “[t]he audience heard these resonances too and readily identified with them (2005, 92). Modern English does not honour all the resonances inherent in Shakespeare’s language.

²⁰ On-line, not paginated.

Berry believes that there are clues embedded in the vowel and consonant structure of Shakespeare's verse which aided the understanding of his largely illiterate audience. She points out, "[t]hey got the thought out of the rhythm of things and the sound of things. When Ophelia says 'oh, what a noble mind,' there are long sounds. It's like keening: 'I have seen what I have seen, to see what I see.' We have to notice those sounds" (Kaufman, J. 2011). This mechanism is mentioned by Kristin Linklater, who says that "[c]onsonants and vowels are sensory agents of speech communicating information on sound waves which carry subliminal messages from speaker to listener" (Linklater, K. 1992, 14). This relates to her belief that Shakespeare's language is communicating more than just the sense of the words or even poetic or metaphorical nuances, but a dramatic stimulus in the form of repeated sounds of vowels or consonants, alliteration or assonance, light or dark vowels and cutting or hissing consonants.

Berry frequently talks about the importance of an awareness of the texture of the language, echoing the expression used by Barton when referring to the sounds of the language in his *Julius Caesar* (1952). According to Berry, it is important to listen "for the shaping of the phrases, on the texture of vowels and consonants, so that an awareness of form becomes part of the way we approach text." (Berry, C. 2011b, Chapter 3).

Referring to the rhythm of the Prologue to Act IV of Henry V, Berry explains that understanding comes “through the rhythm as well as through the individual word.” and that the “suspensions at the end of the lines are an essential part of the meaning, as is the punctuation, which gives you the different lengths of phrases...” (2011, 124). She maintains that, as iambic pentameter resembles ordinary speech rhythm, “a lot of the time we observe the metre instinctively – or accidentally – and it easily falls into a naturalistic speech pattern.” However, she stresses that this can cause us to be “inexact about the precise beat, and so lose something valuable which it gives us.” She describes the missing element as “the sense of continuum throughout the line, for it provides the emotional pulse of the speech” (1993, 53). Crucially she adds, “The Elizabethan audience must have been so attuned to this pulse that they would have picked up immediately on the dramatic nature of the writing by the way the beat was behaving. The quality of their listening must have been different: more focused on the word.” Berry believes that the beat held the tension and the attention for the Elizabethan audience (1993, 53).

There is a strong argument here for restoring the metrical nuances of Elizabethan pronunciation in order to understand the way in which the audience was affected by the subliminal information inherent in the rhythm. This applies equally to the vowel sounds, restoration of which,

through the application of OP, can create entirely different patterns in the assonance which both Berry and Linklater consider to be such an important facet of the interpretation.

The “infinite variety of movement within a single line of iambic pentameter,” says Berry, is caused by “the interplay between sense stress and metre stress, plus the length and weight of vowels and consonants.” She points out that although a line may vary each time it is spoken, the line’s rhythm will keep its focus (2011b, Chapter 3). In an analysis of the rhythm of the opening of *Hamlet* in *Text in Action*, Berry identifies the pertinent pauses in the pentameter which serve to heighten the dramatic action.

BARNARDO:

Who’s there? (4 silent beats)

FRANCISCO:

Nay, answer me. Stand and unfold yourself.

BARNARDO:

Long live the King!

FRANCISCO:

Barnardo?

BARNARDO:

He. (this is one shared 4-beat line, but there is a space somewhere)

Berry is attempting to “make us aware of an underlying dynamic in the rhythm which we have to hear first before we find the possible variations” (2011b, Chapter 1). Work on OP has shown that underlying metrical patterns differ in OP as a result of the Elizabethan poetic tradition, differences in accentuation, and the informality of speech on the Elizabethan stage. It may be possible to get closer to the dramatic possibilities embedded in the structure of the verse if we are aware of the way the rhythm would have functioned when first written.

Berry appears to be in favour of using regional accents. Her view is shared in *Your Voice and How to Use it*, where she writes: “[n]owadays, if you speak in an accent, unless there is a good reason to change it I believe you should keep it.” She goes on to say, “RP should be used as an accent,” and that “the native dialect should not be discarded” (1994, 9). When talking about working in different countries, cultures and languages, she holds that “solid voice work is common to all.” This enables her to “hear where their voices are in relation to their own language, i.e. the particular placement of the vowels and consonants, and the different speech patterns” (2011b, Chapter 3). There is a direct correlation here with the need to be aware of the speech patterns found in OP, sometimes strange to modern ears, and the location of sounds within the vowel space, which is often different from modern English.

Kristin Linklater makes some valuable comments regarding voice production, which may be helpful for actors using OP in performance. These comments may relate to the way the OP originates in the core of the body. In *Freeing Shakespeare's Voice* (1992), Linklater explains that the art of conversation around the dinner table and communal singing have diminished and the “experience of thought and language has moved from the body into the head” (Linklater 1992, 4). She believes that “voice and language belong to the whole body rather than the head alone” (1992, 4). She goes on to affirm that the actor’s breath originates deep in the abdomen, eventually creating the sound waves in the voice. She explains that today, more often than not, the breath originates in the top of the lungs and “the act of speaking is centred in the throat and mouth” (1992, 5).

The way that the OP vowels and diphthongs are produced appears to have a profound effect on the actor’s experience of Shakespearean language. Comments made by actors in OP workshops have shown that there is awareness of the lower centre of gravity of the language. The sounds seem to emanate from lower in the body than is the case with RP. Ben Crystal draws attention to this physical experience when he points out that OP helps the actor to “engage the emotional core more strongly,”²¹ and that “RP tends to have its focus in the actor’s head and

²¹ Private conversation with B. Crystal, 25.07.12

can restrict movement but that OP has a lower centre of focus which gives the actor a greater sense of freedom of movement.” Linklater states that “[w]hen today’s actor starts to *experience* Shakespeare’s language as a whole–body process, s/he is led to a larger and deeper experience of thought and emotion, and from there to a more fundamental, more individual and enlarged experience of ‘truth’” (Linklater, K. 1992, 7).

Raw emotion is expressed in the vowels and the clarity of speech and meaning is supplied by the consonants. The greatest differences between OP and RP lie in the vowel sounds and it appears that the OP sounds may allow a more effective release of emotion than is the case with RP.

Linklater has this to say of the vowel: “The beauty of a vowel... lies in its intrinsic musicality, its sensuality, its expressiveness” (1992, 13). This would seem to affirm that the humble vowel is the conveyor of emotion in language and that this emotion emanates from the core of the body.

It is apparent that the use of OP in modern productions may inform and enhance the voice work which coaches already undertake. It may also serve to clarify the work being done in rehearsal on rhythm and stress, perhaps making sense of lines which at first glance might seem irregular. The idea of subliminal information being carried on the text in the form of patterns of long and short vowel sounds is one which deserves further study in the field of OP as this project has shown that patterns of

assonance within and between lines may vary considerably between PDE and OP. Our understanding of the physical relationship between voice and movement and the question of the origin of vocal sounds and how this affects the actor's craft may be augmented by thinking about the sounds of Shakespeare's day.

2.3 Accented Shakespeare

Experiments in performing Shakespeare in regional accents and even other languages have helped to acclimatise the public to hearing a pronunciation other than RP and have enabled directors to rethink the possibilities of using pronunciation for characterisation, to establish a context, culture or period, or simply to make the language accessible to a wider audience. This in turn has led to the acceptance of OP as another accent.

A Yorkshire Shakespeare – Northern Broadsides

The company which has done the most to alter theatre-goers' perceptions of the use of regional accents in Shakespeare is Northern Broadsides. Formed in 1992 and based at Dean Clough Mill in Halifax the company has been instrumental, under artistic director Barrie Rutter, in breaking down the taboo of non-RP Shakespearean performance. According to their website (Northern Broadsides, not dated), their

performance “has a directness and immediacy which is liberating and invigorating, breaking the southern stranglehold on classical performance and making the audience hear the words afresh.”

There are, however, potential problems with regional accent performances, particularly regarding the use of actors from outside the narrow target area of speech. In an article on the Northern BroadSides website titled *Northern Voices*, Edward Pearce, author and columnist for *The Guardian*, points out the pitfalls. He cites the problems with ‘authenticity’ encountered by John Mills when playing Willie Mossop in *Hobson’s Choice* (1954), a character of a lower social class and from two hundred miles further north. Pearce describes Northern character roles as “a steel trap waiting to snap on the genteel outsider” (Pearce 2013).

There was always a danger of actors playing stereo-types for convenience and there was a time when stereo-types may have been acceptable to a wider audience, excepting perhaps those whose own accent was being attempted. David Crystal is in favour of the use of regional accents but maintains that to perform a play in a modern regional accent is to “get rid of one kind of baggage, but to replace it with another.” He explains further: “[a] performance of *Romeo and Juliet* in, say, a Yorkshire accent may make for a fresh intimacy as far as the people from Yorkshire are

concerned, but for people outside that dialect a distance nonetheless remains” (Crystal, D. 2005, 149).

Pearce enlarges on the notion of southerners performing in northern accents when he points out that “the southern ear, even where the actor means kindly and is conscientious, invariably starts with the wrong assumptions. You will see these spelt out when a London journalist tries transcribing northern speech, writing ‘oop’, as in ‘op for t’ coop’. Probably you will find it next to ‘Eh bah goom’” (Pearce, E. 2013). There are obvious parallels here with the attempts by critics to represent OP in the regular alphabet. Pearce falls into this trap himself when he attempts to notate examples of ‘Queenspeak’ such as “‘actually’, ‘heah’ and ‘glarss blewing’.”

Pearce concludes by making a valid point about the naturalness of speech which was evident prior to the gentrification of Shakespeare in performance. He explains that the purpose of Northern Broadside “is an insistence upon the plainness of classical English speech.” He neatly sums up in a simple sentence: “[t]he whole purpose is that, through this northern filter, we may speak Shakespeare (and other masters) plain” (Pearce, E. 2013).

Referring to Northern Broadsides' production of *Othello* (2009), Lyn Gardner of *The Guardian* points out that Eileen Atkins was recently critical of Lenny Henry's Birmingham accent. Atkins believes that "the Northern Broadsides production would set a bad example to training actors because if you want to play Shakespeare at the highest level, it is absolutely necessary to have Received Pronunciation" (Gardner, L. 2009). Gardner goes on to express her own view that "[t]he infinite variety of non-RP-spoken Shakespeare can only add to the spiciness of the rich stew" (2009).

Comments made by the cast of Northern Broadsides' *The Tempest* (Northern Broadsides, 2007) demonstrate that actors are conditioned by their training and their conception of Shakespeare remains that of a pronunciation rooted in RP. Unrestrained by conventions of RP, the actors are able to find their own voices and the acting may as a result be more natural and unrestrained. In any case, there is always the possibility of the re-interpretation of familiar roles.

Sarah Cattle (Miranda) admits that she initially struggled to read the lines in her own accent: "my brain just automatically switches onto a different kind of voice" (Northern Broadsides, 2007). In fact, the accent initially sounded amusing to her. However, she did find that in a northern accent "it's very easy to connect with the language..." Revealingly, she confides

that “[t]he language defines the character.” She explains, “[t]he delivery of the verse is defined by the style of pronunciation, which logically must contribute to the definition of the character.” This introduces the concept of a pronunciation leading the actor towards a particular interpretation, which may not be the one they are familiar with. The implication that pronunciation influences interpretation opens up all sorts of new dramatic possibilities and may well be relevant to actors using OP. Tim Barker (Gonzalo) reveals that the rehearsal technique employed by the company for *The Tempest* allowed the verse to inform the character, rather than “imposing an idea or a concept onto the character” (Northern Broadsides, 2007). In justification, Barker claims that “when people come to see Broadsides work, they tell you that it is the first Shakespeare play they have seen that they’ve understood clearly...” It is highly significant that comments relating to pronunciation and delivery of the verse, and definition of character are echoed by actors performing in OP.

Multi-Cultural and Multi-Lingual Shakespeare

A Midsummer Night's Dream

It is but a short step from accented Shakespeare to multi-lingual productions. The way in which the audience listens and responds to a foreign language production may be similar to that of an accented or OP production. A pioneer in the field of multi-cultural, multi-national and multi-lingual productions of Shakespeare is director Tim Supple of The Royal National Theatre, The Royal Shakespeare Company and The Young Vic. Supple has also directed opera and musical theatre.

For his production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (2006), Tim Supple assembled a cast from all around India and from a range of backgrounds. The text was heard in English and six Indian languages. According to the Royal Shakespeare Company's website, "[t]here was no need for sur-titles – the language retained its beauty in all the languages" (The Royal Shakespeare Company, 2006). Rather than detracting from the audience's focus on the language, the multilingual element may have the opposite effect. Michael Billington of *The Guardian* admits that "[t]he result, unpredictably, is to heighten attention to language, because the action is perfectly suited to the word" (Billington, M. 2006). In a reference to the cognitive schema with which the audience is armed on arrival at the

theatre, Paul Taylor, of *The Independent* explains: “[t]he story is so familiar that one soon acclimatises to the linguistic shifts, and the visual imagery is stunning...” (Taylor, P. 2006).

Supple, in an interview for the Royal Shakespeare Company’s website, explains how he approaches the concept of a multi-lingual production: “That is a real challenge whenever you do Shakespeare: trying to communicate to people with a language that is really not spoken or deeply understood. So this was just a more extreme version of what we have to do anyway” (Supple, T. 2006).

When the dialogue changes from English to one of the Indian languages, Supple maintains that the rhythm and energy remain virtually constant. This may be due in part to the skill of the translators, acting on Supple’s instructions. The six translators were briefed not to modernise the speech and not to alter the balance of verse and prose but to preserve the rhyme. The latter must have been a difficult point to interpret, given the abundance of redundant rhymes in modern English. The metrical integrity of the piece is demonstrated by Supple’s comments about the boundaries where the languages meet. He points out that “[t]he mechanicals flick between English and Hindi very easily,” and that “Lysander will move from

English to Bengali within a speech and you shouldn't feel any sort of dip or shift in the rhythmic energy of it" (Supple, T. 2006).²²

²² In order to shed some light on this seamless juxtaposition, I shall briefly look at the common features and metrical traditions of the languages. In addition to English, Supple used Hindi, Bengali, Malayam, Marathi, Tamil and Sanskrit. With the exception of Hindi, which is predominantly syllable-timed, the other languages are predominantly mora-timed. This means there is only a slight variation in the interval between syllables. In syllable-timed Hindi (see Savithri, 2009) there may be less distinction between long and short vowel length and each syllable in normal speech has approximately the same duration. This is unlike English, where the interstress interval is relatively constant and syllable lengths vary accordingly. Secondary stress and reduced vowels do not generally occur in syllable timed languages, although vowel reduction is a rare feature of Bengali and secondary stress appears to be commonplace in that language.

A seamless transition may be attributed to other non-rhythmic factors, such as assonance. There are ten vowels in Hindi, each of which has an approximate equivalent in English, although each of these vowels has a secondary characteristic in that they may be nasalised. As Hindi is a syllable-timed language, there is generally little distinction in vowel quantity (length) in everyday speech. Bengali has seven vowels, all of which have near equivalents in English and each of which may be nasalised. Due to a predominant mora timing system, vowel reduction is rare in Bengali but 'shwa' is possible. This feature is shared with English, where 'shwa' represents the unstressed form of any of the vowels. Owing to the shared quality of the vowel systems, and the possibility of weak stress, I suggest that there may well exist a congruity in assonance which assists the transition between languages.

Additionally, one should consider the juxtaposed metrical systems to establish any commonality. The rhythm in Indian prosody is constructed around patterns of heavy and light syllables (the terms refer to syllable length, rather than stress). In Sanskrit, and other Indian languages, the heavy syllable consists of a long vowel or a short one followed by two or more consonants, the latter having a lengthening effect on the syllable. The light syllable is a short vowel followed by a maximum of one consonant. Metrical systems are complex and may take several forms: fixed syllable verse (strictly syllable-timed, as in French verse), fixed line or quantitative verse (dependent on patterns of long and short syllables) and a hybrid form, which is a mixture of the two.

Fixed syllable metres generally contain four identical feet (not to be confused with the western concept of the poetic foot) of eight to twenty-one syllables. These are constructed of heavy and light syllable combinations and this system represents a fixed pattern with a predictable quantity. Fixed line, or Moric metres, by contrast, have a construction where syllable length is balanced by giving a weighted syllable two measures and a light syllable just one. This is significant in that it shares elements of stress timing, a feature of English prosody, where the time interval between stressed syllables is relatively constant. North Indian languages, such as Bengali, Marathi and Hindi generally use the Moric metre. It is common practice for the line to be united by a regular beat (as it was intended to be sung). It is not possible for this beat to occur on the second half of a long syllable. The nature of the Moric metre may be gauged by the standard methods of grouping below, showing the possible variations of rhythm within the 'foot', where each group has an initial stress. S represents a short syllable and L a long one: L L, L S S, S L S, S S L, S S S S. L is given approximately double the duration of S and four short units (measures or 'matra') equal one beat. The number of units per line is fixed according to the particular metre. I suggest that, although quantitative rather than qualitative, these patterns are not dissimilar to those found in English prosody, where the tempo of unstressed syllables is increased to facilitate equal intervals between stresses. This is evident in irregular lines, where the number of weak syllables between stresses is inconstant. The greater the number of adjacent weak syllables there are the faster they are

The Indian *Tempest*

In a similar multi-cultural vein is Footsbarn's *Indian Tempest* (2013). With a cast of twelve different nationalities, this production is performed in English, Malayam, French and Sanskrit and focuses on visual

articulated. Contrast these two lines: the first preserves a constant rate of articulation between weak and strong syllables, the second, with its initial choriamb, necessitates the more rapid voicing of adjacent weak syllables:

It is the bloody business which informs...
Words to the heat of deeds too cold breath gives. *Macbeth* II,1

This suggestion is problematic, however, in that the Moric metrical patterns quoted above have initial stress. Additionally, as well as disyllables, trisyllables and tetrasyllables are allowed. Iambic patterns are absent and the initial stress would appear to produce trochees in the disyllables as well as dactyls and anapests in the trisyllables. In fact, Hindi verse is known to have a trochaic nature, which might seem to put it at odds with English pentameter. However, I suggest that it is the versatility and adaptability of the Moric system which allows for its integration within the framework of pentameter.

Bengali prosody, which uses the three traditional Indian metrical forms described above, customarily switches between and adapts metres in a way which is far more common than in English poetry. In fact, metre switching within a poem is used to show changes of mood (in the way that 'ragas', or scales, are used in music). This might be compared with Shakespeare's practice of switching from prose to verse, blank verse to rhyme or regular to irregular metre. There is also flexibility in the Bengali metre as some inherent vowels are not pronounced (in the way they would be in Sanskrit). It is significant that in the Bengali language, stress is predominantly initial and most words are trochaic. (In longer words, secondary stress occurs on odd-numbered syllables.) This means that, although stress patterns are inverted when compared with pentameter, the use of a disyllabic foot is established.

In conclusion, there are many differences in form between the Indian poetic traditions, although they also have much in common. For example, the Tamil system adopted the two main Sanskrit forms (described above) as well as developing a hybrid form of its own, which resulted in a standardisation of feet within metrical lines. I have suggested that the Indian forms also share common features with English prosody and the vowel systems have much commonality. The implied regular beat in fixed-line metres might be a contributory factor in enabling smooth transitions, as might a regular trochaic rhythm in Bengali metre. The Indian forms with their complex metrical systems were very adaptable and often adopted hybrid forms. It may be significant that Supple refers to both the rhythm and the energy: "the aim is that when we shift from Shakespeare to one of the Indian languages, you don't feel a radical change of rhythm. There's a change of language but there's a sustained rhythm or energy in the language" (Supple, T., 2006). This might suggest that the intrinsic rhythmic energy of the verse carries it over the language boundaries, even if there are rhythmic shifts or inversions taking place. (See Greene, R, ed., 2012; Spuler, B, 1975; Naikar, B, 2005; Turner, R.L. 1999; Datta, A, 1988; Savithri, S.R., 2009)

communication; part of this non-verbal communication is accomplished by the use of puppets and masks.²³ According to a Globe Theatre press release, the production “offers a visual poetry that transcends language in its passion and conviction” (Globe Theatre 2013). Footsbarn’s own website reports that in this production “only thirty per cent of communication passes through the spoken word” (<http://footsbarn.com/en/show.php?showid=33> Accessed 04.07.13).

I found the use of language in this production to be very effective. The Indian languages seem to have a haunting quality, the intonation appears more level than in the English and French, and the pace faster. The intoned character of these languages, punctuated by explosive consonants, is well suited to the magical atmosphere of parts of Ariel’s and Prospero’s dialogue. The choice of French for Ferdinand’s dialogue when he woos Miranda gives his speech an air of romanticism and chivalry. Caliban is played in a ‘working-class’ accent, which sets him apart from the others but is perhaps not as effective as a ‘foreign’ accent might have been. The actor playing Stephano speaks English with a French accent, which includes a strong rhotic ‘r’. This has the effect of creating a very powerful sense of character and an instantly recognisable style of speech. This illustrates the way the rhotic ‘r’ can texture the language and one can easily imagine how other distinctive elements of

²³ I saw this production at Shakespeare’s Globe in August 2013.

pronunciation might be used to similar effect. However, the effectiveness of this style of speech in aiding character recognition is undone by the fact that this actor is doubling and appears unable to moderate his 'r' colouring on the doubled part.

These experiments with language and pronunciation enhance our understanding of the manifold possibilities inherent in the interpretation of Shakespeare's work. It appears to be the case that any such experiment will receive a mixed reception. This is exemplified by the way audiences can feel included by hearing their own accent spoken well on stage or excluded by hearing a different regional accent, or their own spoken inaccurately. There remains the problem of the cultural and class 'baggage' associated with regional accents, largely fuelled by the historic use of RP and the use of highly stylised regional accents in film and television. This may strengthen the argument in favour of OP performances, where the resonances are familiar and the RP dominance is broken but there is no 'baggage' attached. Moreover, there is a clear link between pronunciation and interpretation which is apparent to both actors and audiences and which may be used to establish character, location or culture.

An African *Julius Caesar*

The question of accent, culture and interpretation was explored by Gregory Doran in his highly innovative production of *Julius Caesar* (2012) at the Royal Shakespeare Company. Doran set his production in Africa and hired an all-black cast, speaking in East African accents. The African setting is reinforced by powerful rhythmic musical accompaniment and the appearance of a shaman (the Soothsayer) in white body paint. The musical score includes African, jazz and Caribbean elements. The political aspects of the play are very relevant to the new setting, which has had more than its fair share of despots and dictators. At one point a statue of Caesar's head is toppled, bringing to mind the destruction of communist statues and that of Saddam Hussein.²⁴

Critics' assessment of the African accents is somewhat mixed. Writing in *The Stage*, Michael Coveney mentions that the delivery of the verse is stilted and reports that "only Fearon [playing Mark Antony], Adjoah Andoh as a lovely Portia, and Joseph Mydell as a wonderfully calm and authoritative Casca, are natural verse-speakers..." (Coveney, M. 2012). However, Coveney does not see this as a negative point, as it "works strangely in its [the verse's] favour, as if the characters are grasping the

²⁴ Iraqis tied a noose around Saddam's statue and toppled it in April 2003, signifying the overthrow of the regime. This statement mirrored the end of communist regimes in Hungary, Romania and elsewhere in the late twentieth century.

tools of their trade along with their liberty” (Coveney, M. 2012). Frank Scheck, writing in *The New York Post* remarks that “[t]he superb cast performs with uncommon lucidity, even if their accents combined with Shakespeare’s verse sometimes make the listening difficult” (Scheck, F. 2013).

In contrast, Teju Cole, in a review for *The New Yorker* (22 April 2013), is impressed by the quality of the ensemble. He praises the clear diction of Cyril Nri (Cassius) and Joseph Mydell (Casca) and admits that he found himself “wishing for more of Shakespeare’s plays to be done in African-accented English” (Cole, T. 2013). He does go on to say that some of the accents drift at times into singsong.

The reasons for choosing East African accents over West African are to do with the rhythm and tonal quality of the speech.²⁵ Doran explains that West African accents have a “tonal kind of accent which can be almost too

²⁵ All African accents are syllable-timed, which wipes out vowel length distinction and results in few unstressed forms. West African accents are predominantly tonal. This means that pitch fluctuations encode information relating to grammar, inflections and lexical meaning (as stress can in English). This pitch variation may cause the richness mentioned by Doran. East African languages are predominantly non-tonal, syllable-timed and with stress generated by higher pitches. There may be a greater number of pitches in the East African languages (up to seven), which may account for the musicality mentioned by Doran. Moreover, the fact that pitch differences are reserved for stress indication may enable the East African accent to conform more easily to the demands of iambic pentameter as the mother tongue pronunciation has a significant effect on the way the speaker pronounces English.

rich for the text to bear. The East African accent,” he says, “has a precision to it, and a musicality to it, that lends itself to the iambic pentameter...” (Brown, E. 2013).

Unsurprisingly, when asked for a favourite line from the play Doran responded with:

CASSIUS: Stoop, then, and wash. How many ages hence
Shall this our lofty scene be acted over
In states unborn and accents yet unknown!

Julius Caesar, III, 1

This production demonstrates the way in which a pronunciation style might help to reinforce a location and culture. The reviews show that critics and audiences are happy to accept this style of production, even though it challenges their preconceptions of the play and causes them to rethink the established view of how the play should be performed. The production certainly provoked debate and produced strong reactions in favour of or against the interpretation. In general, there was a great deal of support.

Accent and Cultural Baggage

The 'cultural baggage' inherent in the English language, particularly in an accent, is recognised by Brian Gibbons in *Shakespeare Without Boundaries*, who states that "the borders between the different accents and dialects of English, in Britain, have always involved tension: they are easily, indeed instantly, recognizable by the inhabitants, but their implications are complex" (Gibbons, B. 2011, 76). The audience's reaction on hearing an accent other than their own is instinctive, ingrained; it requires no conscious analysis. The accent may be socially inclusive, as Gibbons says, "sharing an accent or dialect contributes to solidarity, it is a bond..." (2011, 76): or it may be exclusive; he also says, "difference in accents may be divisive, may mark, and provoke hostility" (2011, 76). Significantly, Gibbons refers to another kind of border exposed by accent and dialect; that is between the printed word of the play text and the spoken word of the performance. That border is evident even when reading in one's head as one imagines the speech in one's own dialect.

Writing about the decline of RP on the modern British stage, Gibbons mentions that RP was unquestionably the accent required for major Shakespearean roles in the 1950s but points out the effect this had on the audience's perception of power and class structures in the play. The audience would subconsciously accept that the accent reflected modern

values of social class and culture (Gibbons, 2011, 80). Gibbons reminds us that the early 1960s were landmark years, as regional accents were beginning to be heard in the theatre and on screen, with Donald Pleasance in *The Caretaker* (1960) and Tom Courtenay in *Billy Liar* (1961). This era was the start of a long slow process of evolution, where regional accents slowly gained acceptance and the social stigma associated with their use gradually diminished. The process continues today; some theatre-goers still frown at Shakespeare in dialect.

On the subject of language and culture, Claire Kramsch defines a discourse accent as “a speaking or writing style that bears the mark of a discourse community’s ways of using language” (Kramsch, C. 1998, 127). She explains that “[t]he way in which people use the spoken, written or visual medium itself creates meanings that are understandable to the group they belong to” (1998, 127). She lists tone of voice, accent and conversational style as examples. Kramsch explains, “[b]y their accent, their vocabulary, their discourse patterns, speakers identify themselves as members of this or that speech and discourse community.” This linguistic recognition carries with it a cultural recognition and all the expectations which are associated with it.

Blommaert and Varis, in a consumer-culture related paper concerning urban language and literacies, titled *Culture as an Accent* (Blommaert, J.

and Varis, P. 2012, 2), point out that “in a world which otherwise revolves around strong tendencies towards uniformity, ...very small differences acquire the status of fundamental aspects of being. Identities and senses of ‘being oneself’ are based on and grounded in miniscule deviations from standard formats and scripts that organize most of what this ‘being oneself’ is actually about” (2012, 2). Referring to the great sense of conformity that is evident in our everyday lives, the authors have determined that the process leaves room for a “small space for ‘uniqueness’...” in which we “place some accents, small deviations we call characteristics of our own uniqueness. These deviations can be, and usually are, extremely small...” (2012, 9–10).

In theatre, the playwright, director or actor may focus on these small deviations and capitalise on their ability to signify meaning to the audience. This meaning may relate to social status, geographical location, ethnic origin or historical period. Furthermore, variation in the detail of the small differences may serve to differentiate between cultural subsets within the production. An obvious indicator present in this space is the language, given that it can be a powerful social and cultural indicator. Slight deviations in speech, in accent, for example, could indicate to the audience a social hierarchy within a given historical period.

In an interview for *The Daily Telegraph* (Walker, T. 2009), Trevor Nunn declares an interest in performing Shakespeare in American accents, as he believes this would bring the production closer to the accents of Shakespeare's day. Although rather a simplistic view, there is some truth in this. Nunn got the idea when working with Kevin Spacey, whom he was directing at the Old Vic. Realising there is always opposition to people taking new linguistic initiatives, Nunn says, "[s]ome people mock this idea, but it is almost certainly true that today's American accent is closer to the sounds that Shakespeare heard when he was writing" (Walker, T., 2009). Nunn appears to be advocating the use of the sounds of the language to establish a culture, in this case a chronological separation.

Stanley Wells, apparently not convinced by Nunn's argument, points out that there is no such thing as a universal American accent, perhaps implying that Nunn would simply have to select one style of American speech for convenience, without justification. Wells goes on to say: "Some American accents may not be very suited to the verse. I saw a production of *A Winter's Tale* recently and Perdita spoke with an Irish accent. I could barely understand her. The main issue is intelligibility" (Walker, T. 2009).

Nunn, however, reveals a deeper understanding of the effect of the language when he says, "I very much want to do Shakespeare with American actors using their own accents because there is a different

energy and a different use of language" (Walker, T, 2009). This is the crux of the matter: Nunn is clearly wishing to explore the full range of the voice and the effects of a variety of vowel and consonant sounds on Shakespeare's language. There is a direct parallel here to the use of OP in Shakespeare – the way the speech is centred differently in the body and the differences in vowel positioning within the mouth. In OP, the energy may also stem from the effect of the accent on the pace and delivery of the verse or prose. There should always be a place in the modern theatre for initiatives designed to explore the effect of accent in the performance of Shakespeare and it is to be hoped that Nunn, and other influential directors, will stage accent-coloured productions in the near future.

Chapter 3

3.1 Shakespearean Original Pronunciation in Performance in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries

The First Interest in OP

An awakening of Interest in the mechanics of Elizabethan speech was first seen in a nineteenth century essay by Richard Grant White, an American lawyer and literary critic who produced the first *Riverside Edition* of a Shakespeare play. In his *Memorandum on English Pronunciation in the Elizabethan Era* (White, 1861, cited in Ellis, A.J. 1871, 973), he reconstructs a few lines of *Hamlet* thus (Crystal, D. 2013):

A baste that wants discoorse of rayson

Would haive moorn'd longer!

O, me prophetic sowl! me ooncle!

A broken voice, and his whole foonction shooting

Wit forms to his consayt, and all for noting!

White examines spellings, puns and rhymes in order to substantiate his reconstructions. Revealingly, he anticipates people's reaction to the pronunciation by saying that "overcome by the astonishing effect of the passages thus spoken, they will refuse to believe that they were ever thus pronounced out of Ireland" (Ellis, 1871, 973). White's attempts to

represent the language by the use of unorthodox spellings were the result of a lack of a phonetic orthography; this all changed in 1888 with the development of the IPA. A number of scholars subsequently showed interest in studying the relevant sound changes in order to establish a possible model for Elizabethan pronunciation. This important ground work paved the way for practitioners who would later begin to use the reconstructed language in a performance context. On this subject, Alexander Ellis, whose contribution towards the study of Middle English and Early Modern English phonology was seminal, had this to say about the sounds of Shakespeare:

I have tried the effect of reading some of these passages to many persons, including well-known elocutionists, and the general result has been an expression of satisfaction, shewing that the poetry was not burlesqued or in any way impaired by this change, but, on the contrary, seemed to gain in power and impressiveness (Ellis, A.J. 1871, 982–3).

Foreshadowing the stance of later phonologists, however, Ellis is cautious about the possibility of adopting the pronunciation in practice, recommending: “[i]t is, of course, not to be thought of that Shakspeare’s [sic] plays should now be publicly read or performed in this pronunciation...” (1871, 983).

In justification of this stance he states:

Shakspeare will, and must, in each age of the English language, be read and spoken in the current pronunciation of the time, and any marked departure from it... would withdraw the attention of a mixed audience or of the habitual reader from the thought to the word, would cross old associations, would jar upon cherished memories, and would be therefore generally unacceptable (1871, 984).

This anticipation of a poor reception by the general public, voiced by Ellis but shared by others, notably critics (and which later proved to be erroneous), would be a major setback to the adoption of OP in performance practice in the twentieth century. Possibly as a result of this attitude, the twentieth century saw but a handful of Shakespeare productions in original pronunciation in England and America. Every one of these productions, however, was of the utmost importance in establishing OP as a viable performance medium.

A production which tested the public's reaction, and which may have been the earliest production in Elizabethan English in modern times, took place in New York in 1894.²⁶ This was a production of Ben Jonson's *Silent Woman*, or *Epicoene*, given by the American Academy of Dramatic Arts in New York and directed by Franklin Sargent. In this production, the prologue was spoken in Elizabethan pronunciation. The reaction to this experiment is unknown as there is no documentary evidence. In

²⁶ This production is given only a passing reference in the literature and the month of the production is unclear.

Constructed Places: Shakespeare's American Playhouses (2011, 179–80), Christopher Scully discusses the invitation given to the American Academy of Dramatic Arts by Baker and Kitteridge of Harvard University the following year, to perform *The Silent Woman* in their reconstructed Elizabethan theatre; this performance was given on 20 March 1895 in the Sanders Theatre. Scully says, “[t]hey also considered, but ultimately rejected, the use of Elizabethan pronunciation for the prologue to the play, a technique that had been used in the original New York performances.” In the Harvard production, the students played the role of the Elizabethan audience in character and costume. No reason is given for the rejection of OP.

Daniel Jones's First Experiments in OP Performance

The first experiment with OP in London was initiated by an academic department, who presumably judged that the climate was right in the capital for such a venture. This historic performance of scenes from *The Tempest* and *Twelfth Night* in OP took place at The Botanic Theatre in the grounds of University College, London, on 3 July 1909 and was the brain-child of Daniel Jones. A reviewer in *The Observer* declares that “[h]is [Jones's] labours were crowned last evening with a large amount of success; the audience [was] much interested in this novel rendering of the familiar scenes” (*Observer*, 1909). The writer likens the accent to that

heard in the West of England and Lancashire. He goes on to give approximate examples of the speech in the misleading way of many reviewers who struggle to notate the OP sounds in the normal alphabet. He then declares that “the performers acquitted themselves very creditably in the unfamiliar dialect, speaking their parts so that everyone in the crowded hall could hear them, and at the conclusion they received a well-deserved call” (*Observer*, 1909). The cast list is revealing as it includes Jones himself, playing Prospero and Andrew Aguecheek; other cast members were colleagues of Jones at UCL.

In a letter to *The Manchester Guardian* (13 June 1909) Daniel Jones complains that the sounds of Elizabethan speech have been misrepresented in an article (26 June 1909) about the forthcoming production. According to Jones, “representations of Shakspeare’s pronunciation by means of our current spelling, such as those quoted in the ‘Manchester Guardian’ of June 26th, only give the very roughest idea of what the pronunciation was. For the purpose of the forthcoming performance the scenes to be presented have been phonetically transcribed” (JONES, D. *The Guardian*, 2 July 1909, 10). He goes on to explain that the phonetic transcriptions are available to the public through the Phonetic Association. This response from Jones is significant in the respect that he appears concerned that the academic rigor he has applied to the process will be belittled by the critics’ ‘dumbing down’ of

the pronunciation as they attempt to find modern points of reference for their readers. This is a natural response on behalf of the critics and one that I encountered amongst students who had no experience of historical language study. In a practical situation, this can lead to hypercorrection if not dealt with sensitively.²⁷

G Noel-Armfield, who later became Jones's assistant at UCL, wrote in *Le Maître Phonétique* (1909b, 118): "Saturday, 3rd July 1909, marks an epoch in the history of Elizabethan representations of Shakespeare. On that date, people living in the twentieth century heard some of Shakespeare's work in the pronunciation which may be safely accepted as that used by the poet himself and his fellow actors." Noel-Armfield goes on to report that Jones was responsible for both the transcription and the coaching of the actors and he mentions that there were "very few deviations from the printed transcription." This review is testimony to the skill of Jones and the cast; Noel Armfield was an expert critic who would not have missed a single slip.

Blandford and Gray – Twelfth Night at Cambridge Festival Theatre

The theatrical world showed little interest in OP until the early thirties, when Blandford's name appears in the context of a production of *Twelfth*

²⁷ The subject of hypercorrection is dealt with in Chapter 6.

Night, Act I, Scene 5. This scene was given in OP at the Festival Theatre in Cambridge, 17 May 1933, transcribed by Blandford and directed by Terence Gray. The remainder of the production was presented in modern English. The same scene featured in a BBC Radio Broadcast, which aired on Monday 6 December 1937.

Gray, known as a maverick and innovative theatre director, founded the Cambridge Festival Theatre after purchasing the building, which was historically known as the Barnwell Theatre. He was a rich racehorse owner who bought the theatre in order to experiment with his progressive ideas on staging. He wanted the audience to “come to the theatre as to a party, and act there in their imaginations according to the pattern of the play” (source: The Marlowe 2003). Gray demolished the proscenium arch and brought the front of the stage down in steps to the front of house space. The curtain was removed and, instead of scenery, gobo images were projected onto a cyclorama. It was Gray’s vision which allowed the production of *Twelfth Night*, including Act I, Scene 5 in original pronunciation (source: The Marlowe 2003).

A correspondent writing in *The Guardian* the day after Gray’s 1933 production opened believed that critical opinion would be divided on Gray’s treatment of the play, which was in the style of Commedia dell’Arte. Much of the article is concerned with the unusual production,

which included elements of masquerade and an entrance by Sir Toby Belch on roller skates. According to the article, the reconstructed Elizabethan pronunciation “sounded to our modern ears rather like an impossible mixture of Scottish, Irish, Welsh, and a Lancashire dialect” (source: The Marlowe 2003). The writer believed the experiment to be “interesting, if not entirely justified.” This quote exemplifies the inability of early theatre critics to assess the value of OP on the stage without a yardstick by which to measure it.

Blandford Published his transcription of the scene performed in OP in Gray’s production in the book *Shakespeare’s Pronunciation: A Transcription of Twelfth Night, Act I, Scene V* (Blandford, 1927). In a note to the reader, Blandford claims his transcription is intended to give “the general impression of the pronunciation in use on the stage in Shakespeare’s time.” He goes on to make the disclaimer that “[i]t is not a contribution carrying any weight in the controversy on those details of Shakespearean pronunciation that are still under discussion.” The use of the phrase “general impression” seems to imply that Blandford was nervous of academic criticism and was not keen to have his pronunciation choices scrutinised.²⁸

²⁸ I reviewed Blandford’s transcription when considering the options for my own workshop transcription policy. Blandford’s style of transcription is very similar to that of Jones and Gimson; he has been selective and conservative in his pronunciation choices. The style of speech is highly articulated and would seem to favour the articulation of unstressed syllables.²⁸ The lack of weak forms is a strong indicator of this. I would

F.G. Blandford, London Calling

In 1936 the public heard OP on the wireless for the first time. An initiative on the part of the BBC allowed the broadcast of *London Calling – 1600*, on 15 April 1936 (repeated 25 February 1937). This was an hour-long radio broadcast where the audience was invited to imagine that they were listening to the radio in Elizabethan times. “Suppose an Elizabethan citizen in his gabled cottage revolved the dial of his five-valve receiver, what would he have heard?” asks the BBC (*New York Times*, 21 February 1937). According to the BBC, “a Cambridge professor has schooled the cast in the correct Elizabethan pronunciation, which to us today seems very strange – something like a mixture of Yorkshire dialect and Irish brogue.” This broadcast was written by Herbert Farjeon. An article in the *Radio Times* by Gordon Stowell, titled “Listening in the Year 1600”, accompanied the programme. The Cambridge professor who advised this production was likely to have been Frank Blandford, who appears in the cast list and was active around this time in the field of transcription and performance of Shakespeare in OP.

suggest that Blandford is sacrificing historical accuracy in this respect in favour of an OP equivalent of the contemporary declamatory RP pronunciation. Some of the diphthongs may be viewed as archaic. In terms of characterisation, however, this style of speech, antiquated and exaggerated, may have a place in an OP transcription. For example, it would perfectly suit a pedantic character, such as Malvolio.

Blandford's Twelfth Night Broadcast

The British Library holds a recording of a different scene from *Twelfth Night*, Act II, Scene 4, performed in OP, with the transcription attributed to Blandford. This recording is made in front of a live audience but there appears to be no record of it ever having been broadcast. However, this material is an important resource when studied together with Blandford's transcriptions and is helpful in establishing a policy for Blandford's style of OP. Elements of his style are present in my conservative strand of OP, used in transcriptions to help characterise older parts and rustics. There is evidence of the 'Cambridge' scene, Act V, Scene 1, being broadcast on the radio on at least one occasion, Monday 6 December 1937. *The Guardian*, lists the programme at 10.00 – 10.30 as part of *Experimental Drama Hour*, which was broadcast nationally ("Wireless Notes and Programmes", 6 December 1937). There is an appetiser titled "As Shakespeare Heard It", which explains that the scene would be acted first in modern pronunciation and then in "the speech of Shakespeare's day." The article explains briefly what happens in the scene and goes on to mention the names of the actors, Lilian Harrison, Nancy Hornsby, Carleton Hobbs and Dorothy Tetley. Confirmation is also given that "[t]he performance in Elizabethan English has been arranged by Mr. F.G. Blandford, a lecturer at Cambridge University, who produced the full play

in this manner at Cambridge Festival Theatre some years ago.”²⁹ It is significant to note that Blandford is now including professional actors in his OP experiments.

Daniel Jones and the Elizabethan Tongue – a Radio Broadcast

A further radio broadcast signalled Daniel Jones’s continued interest in OP in the middle years of the century, when his desire to educate the public spread to the medium of Radio and again brought professional actors into the field. It was in 1949, at the BBC, that Jones, like Blandford before him, started to work on broadcasts of OP with actors, rather than relying on phoneticians. An example is *The Elizabethan Tongue*, broadcast on 28 December 1949 on The Third Programme. According to the British Universities Film and Video Council (2012), in the programme:

Passages from the plays of Shakespeare are delivered in what was thought to be their original Elizabethan pronunciation. The programme is introduced by Daniel Jones, Professor Emeritus of Phonetics, University of London, who was also the phonetic advisor for this production. The passages are spoken by radio actors Raf de la Torre, Andrew Foulds, and Laidman Browne. Excerpts comprised *Henry V*, *Julius Caesar*, *Twelfth Night*, *King John*, *Romeo and Juliet*, and *The Tempest*.

²⁹ This statement is misleading as it implies that the production was in Elizabethan pronunciation in its entirety, rather than just the one scene, which was in fact the case.

It would be easy to dismiss the radio broadcasts as mere novelties or ‘niche listening’ but in fact they did prove to a section of the public that phonologists possessed enough historical linguistic information to recreate an Elizabethan accent with some accuracy.

These pioneering experiments illustrate features of OP performance which continue to the present day and relate to the motivation for the production. Some productions are purely language-centred and focus on the reconstruction of the pronunciation as an accent and as a means of restoring rhymes and metrical patterns. Others employ the reconstructed language as just one element of a broader historically informed production.

Shakespeare in OP on the Mid Twentieth Century Stage

Whatever their motivation, the early British experiments with OP in theatre and radio paved the way for more ambitious projects involving university departments and professional theatre. Three influential figures were responsible for a significant period of activity in the early 1950s, which saw full-scale OP productions of *Julius Caesar*, *Macbeth* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*.

The Three Influential Practitioners of the Mid Twentieth-Century

Bernard Miles, a respected actor, owned a property in St John's Wood, London, which included a disused schoolroom in the garden. This was converted into an Elizabethan-style theatre in which Miles was able to experiment with a range of Elizabethan dramatic practices ranging from architecture to costume, acting style and pronunciation. Miles's interest in OP was, therefore, part of the wider topic of the exploration of Elizabethan theatre practice. As a non-specialist, it was necessary for Miles to enlist help from the world of academia to indulge his interest. John Barton, then an English research fellow at Cambridge University (later co-founder of the Royal Shakespeare Company) was, like Miles, interested in Elizabethan theatre. He set about constructing an Elizabethan-style theatre for a production, which included period costume and reconstructed language. As he was not a phonologist, Barton enlisted professional help with the pronunciation from his university. Helge Kökeritz, Professor of English at Yale University and a specialist in phonology, was keen to stage an OP production from a linguistic point of view, particularly as he had recently published a successful book (*Shakespeare's Pronunciation*, 1953) which outlined what he believed to be a definitive Shakespearean pronunciation. Regardless of the *raison d'être* for these productions, whether it be linguistic reconstruction and repair, or part of a larger HIP experiment, all three of

the plays helped to raise the public's awareness of the value of performing in original pronunciation.³⁰

Bernard Miles

Miles led the way in this early fifties surge of interest in OP with the century's second professional OP production of a scene from Shakespeare. This was given in his newly constructed Mermaid Theatre in September 1951 and consisted of just the first scene of *Hamlet*. It seems as though Miles may have been testing the waters prior to a full OP production of *Macbeth* the following year. The *Hamlet* performance is mentioned in *The Mermaid Theatre, the First Ten Years* (Glow G, 1969), where Glow writes, "[i]n addition to *Dido and Aeneas*, the first season included twenty performances of *The Tempest*, fifteen recitals and a special performance of the opening scene from *Hamlet* performed in Elizabethan speech" (1969, 3). In September and October 1952, Miles gave a production of *Macbeth* at The Mermaid Theatre, St John's Wood, which was entirely forgotten until I discovered references to it in the national newspaper archives during the course of researching the present thesis. For the purposes of this project, the production was significant as there is in existence an almost complete set of recordings of the script. This provides the researcher with a clear picture of Gimson's

³⁰ John Barton included demonstrations of OP in his RSC workshop series *Playing Shakespeare* (2009)

transcription policy which is not available elsewhere. When considered in conjunction with the transcriptions of Blandford and Jones, this policy provides a working model for a conservative style of pronunciation, which I drew on when preparing my workshop material. This *Macbeth* production is discussed in full later in this chapter.

John Barton

Barton's *Julius Caesar*, given by the Marlowe Society at the *Arts Theatre*, Cambridge in March 1952, was the first-known complete performance of a Shakespeare play in OP in modern times. Barton, aged 23, reconstructed a floating theatre in accordance with a reference in the diary of a tourist, Thomas Platter who saw a performance at *The Globe* in 1599 (*The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, 2013). Barton's costume was Elizabethan, with Roman props and embellishments. He wanted the pronunciation to sound Elizabethan and so he employed a linguist from the English department at Cambridge University to voice-coach the actors. In order for the speech to sound novel, he deliberately went for unusual choices, such as voicing the initial 'k' in 'knight'. Barton admitted that "[w]henver there was a dispute when a sound changed, I went for the tougher, rougher alternative. I thickened it to the full sound and I found it gave an extraordinary extra texture to the language"

(Greenwald 1985, 28). Both the audience and cast were said to prefer the original pronunciation.

When transcribing material for the actors' workshops, I kept Barton's policy of choosing the 'tougher, rougher' sound in mind when choosing a style of pronunciation for the mechanicals in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, whilst always ensuring that there was an historical justification for the pronunciation choice. I felt that there was an association between the rough fabric of their 'hempen homespun', the roughness of their hands from the manual work and the probable roughness of their language when contrasted with the refined speech of the court. Barton was the first practitioner to mention the 'texture' of the pronunciation. Voicing of initial 'k' is problematic. One might question why the 'k' in 'knight' should be voiced and not the medial 'gh'; and if the latter is voiced should the vowel be a short 'i' or a diphthong? Both are possible but not necessarily equally 'readable' by the audience. These represent the type of policy choices one needs to consider, having made the decision to use what was by Shakespeare's time already an archaism. This illustrates the importance of having a sound overall transcription policy, which gives an overview of the pronunciations chosen and can place the pronunciations in an historical time-frame.

Commenting on the actors' mastery of the pronunciation, *The Guardian* (1952) reports, "the play is spoken throughout in what is surmised to have been Elizabethan English. The actors have had to learn a new language, and in a three hours' stretch never once lapsed into modern Cambridge English. It is a feat of endurance." This comment indicates the attention given to consistency in the pronunciation by the voice coach. The article goes on to say that most of the vowels receive new values. It describes how "the actors k–now each other for k–naves and go down on their k–nees" (*The Guardian* 1952). Significantly, the author states that "after five minutes the audience takes it in its stride." The idea of a very short period of acclimatisation was to be echoed in later performances.

Ivor Brown, writing for *The Observer* (16 March 1952), seems at a loss to interpret the pronunciation, just as he would be a few months later when reviewing the Mermaid Theatre's production of *Macbeth*. Describing the "brave attempt" to reproduce by the Cam the 1599 performance which Platter described in his diary, Brown states that "I was glad the experiment was made, and will be glad to hear no more of the 'Ades of March'." Showing a startling lack of faith in academia he adds, "[t]he experts may, as usual, be wrong" (Brown, 1952). He also mentions the "quaint Irishness" of the speech and represents 'I fight' approximately as 'aye fate'. He says, attaching the wrong description, that "the 'ea' *diphthong* also becomes 'a' so that 'meat' is 'mate' and 'beast' 'baste'.

“Those accents,” says Brown, “if the scholars have got them right, are far less attractive than our own” (Brown, 1952). Brown’s attempts to represent the sounds of Elizabethan pronunciation by using modern spellings and analogies is understandable but would have angered Daniel Jones, a great supporter of the phonetic alphabet. This negative stance is complemented by that of the *Manchester Guardian’s* correspondent, who says that there is “so much out of the ordinary that it ought to be repeated elsewhere... the play seems more plausible than usual” (13 March 1952). As one might expect with so innovative a venture, opinion was clearly divided.

The production appeared to be very popular as all 600 seats were sold out for the week’s run. However, despite Barton’s academic interest in the pronunciation, the production process was not documented in a scholarly way, or even at all, and there was no attempt made to record any part of the rehearsal or performance.

Helge Kökeritz

Kökeritz was responsible for voice-coaching the first known OP production of a Shakespeare play in America, *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (February 1954, directed by Frank McMullan), which was produced for the Yale Shakespeare Festival by the university’s English department. Charles

Tyler Prouty, in his *Yale Shakespeare Festival Lecture* (Prouty, CT, Ed. 1954, 3) recalls how the festival was conceived over lunch in May 1953 after the publication of Kökeritz's book, *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* (1953). He goes on to say that "[a] logical next step would be to hear a whole play as originally spoken." Prouty explains that "the Department of Drama would have to be persuaded to approve and we could envision many objects" (1954, 3). The production did go ahead and attracted media attention in the form of a segment on the *Omnibus* programme (Omnibus II 1954).

Kökeritz used early editions of Shakespeare as well as works by the spelling reformers and orthoepists to reconstruct the original pronunciation. He also looked at modern regional dialects for extant usage which might date back to the sixteenth century. He claimed to have discovered a hundred lost puns in Shakespeare's plays and cites the homophones 'carnal' and 'cardinal' as an example (1953, 29). This homophone is the source of a pun in Act III, Scene 1 of *Henry VIII*, which works owing to the syncopation of the medial syllable in 'cardinal' (Source: Kökeritz, 1953, 63). This leaves a consonant cluster 'rdn' in which the 'd' was often omitted colloquially. Evidence for this change was to be found in the metre of verse and in early spellings. Kökeritz found "twenty-two other unambiguous cases of a disyllabic pronunciation of 'cardinal'" (Holger, L, 1954, 22). This theory seems to be confirmed by

Henslowe's spellings of 'cardinal' as 'carnal' and, "by a hypercorrect pronunciation, 'cardinally' for 'carnally' by Elbow in *Measure for Measure*" (Kökeritz 1953, 63).

According to Kökeritz, "[w]hen he [Shakespeare] came up to London and became a player and playwright, he had to adopt the type of speech then used in polite circles, a speech free from objectionable provincialisms" (Holger, L. 1954, 22). Thus, Shakespeare came to abandon the Warwickshire dialect that had coloured his speech in the first twenty years of his life in favour of the cosmopolitan London brogue, although he would continue to draw on regional pronunciations when looking for particular rhymes.

Unfortunately, Kökeritz left behind no documentation in connection with this production and the *Omnibus* programme was soon forgotten. Indeed, most Americans were unaware that there had ever been an OP Shakespeare production in the US until Paul Meier began planning his production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (2010). The Yale University Yearbook for 1954 records:

The Yale Shakespeare Festival centered around plays, exhibits, and lectures, and was featured by a production of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* over nation-wide television. The play, which was presented on *Omnibus*, was spoken in what Professor Helge

Kökeritz, after intensive study, claimed to be the original Shakespearean pronunciation.
(Yale University, 2013)

In his lecture for the Yale Shakespeare Festival, Kökeritz made the assertion: “I am convinced that there is little likelihood of any major phonological discoveries in the future that would seriously affect the sound system as reconstructed in my recently published *Shakespeare’s Pronunciation*” (Prouty, C.T., Ed. 1954, 40). However, he does admit that “future research in fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth-century phonology may well make it possible to determine more precisely the pronunciation of individual words which at present seem to allow of more than one phonological interpretation” (1954, 40).

Kökeritz was influential in demonstrating the informality, even casualness, of the pronunciation on the Elizabethan stage. This contrasts starkly with the perception that Shakespeare has to be declaimed in a highly formal way. In my transcriptions for the workshops I have followed Kökeritz’s model and employed many weak and unstressed forms. Having assessed the evidence, I believe that this is representative of the informal style of speech prevalent on stage. However, in terms of vowel choice, I believe Kökeritz’s model is too advanced for Shakespeare’s day and I have chosen not to follow his example in some respects.³¹ Kökeritz begins with the premise that the vowels of OP are very much like today.

³¹ See the transcription policy for details, Chapter 5.

However, other phoneticians, notably E.J. Dobson, C. Barber and F. Cercignani disagree and put forward alternative, less advanced models for the vowel system. The fact that Kökeritz's transcriptions are heavily annotated, giving many alternative forms, reveals that the actual reading is open to interpretation, depending upon where one places the stress in the line and on the level of casualness desired.

The Twenty-First Century Renaissance of OP on the Stage

Following the mid-twentieth century surge of interest, the original pronunciation scene fell silent for fifty years. Inspiration for an OP revival occurred as a direct result of the 'original practices' being investigated at Shakespeare's Globe. The catalyst was director Tim Carroll who had the idea for an OP production and vigorously pursued it until given the go-ahead for a few performances of *Romeo and Juliet* (2004), which was followed by a complete run of *Troilus and Cressida* (2005), directed by Giles Block. The whole process of these Globe productions in turn inspired Paul Meier, British born actor, director and voice coach, who is currently a professor in the department of theatre at Kansas University. Meier spent a sabbatical year researching OP, returning to stage his own production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (2010) at Kansas University, the first OP production in the US since Kökeritz's *Merry Wives of Windsor* (1954). This was followed by a production of *Hamlet*, directed by Rob

Gander at the University of Nevada (2011). All three of these productions had a common denominator: David Crystal. Crystal was heavily involved in the transcribing and coaching process and all three productions bear the hallmarks of his interpretation of OP. Crystal has been instrumental in defining an acceptable standard of OP for the twenty-first century.

***Romeo and Juliet* and *Troilus and Cressida* at Shakespeare's Globe**

David Crystal became involved in the OP movement in the theatre when Shakespeare's Globe invited him to advise on pronunciation for the three performances of *Romeo and Juliet* over one weekend in 2004.³² This was an 'original practices' production in terms of music and clothing.

However, the casting did not follow 'original practices' as the roles of Lady Capulet, Juliet and Lady Montague were played by women. The role of the nurse was taken by a male, but not a youth. Although one might ask why certain practices were adopted and not others, this decision did not affect the effectiveness of the OP as the accent is the same regardless of gender.³³ The cast had a variety of regional accents, including

³² The production process is documented in Crystal's book *Pronouncing Shakespeare* (2005).

³³ There is nothing in the works of the orthoepists or of modern commentators to suggest that any pronunciation features were gender specific. My policy is to keep the pronunciation gender-neutral. However, there is nothing recorded about the use of pitch inflections in this period.

Northern Irish, Scots and Cockney.³⁴ In the additional programme notes for the OP performances of *Romeo and Juliet*,³⁵ Tim Carroll explains his motivation for using OP: “[f]or me, original pronunciation is the final frontier. I have always longed to hear the texts as they would have sounded.”

For this production, like Kökeritz’s, Gimson’s and Jones’s before it, there was a clear rationale and policy for the pronunciation, although this time there was a marked difference. Crystal was not aiming for a definitive, pure accent. He reveals: “I did not want phonetic uniformity in the OP production. There would not have been such uniformity on the Elizabethan stage” (Crystal 2005, 25). He was, therefore, happy for the cast to allow their native accents to influence their interpretation of OP. This stance is indicative of a totally fresh approach to performing in OP and one which brings it closer to what the audience would have heard in Shakespeare’s day.³⁶

When viewing the archive footage of this production I found the variety of vowel sounds used was beneficial to the overall effectiveness of the

³⁴ The regional accents enrich the OP and demonstrate the sort of variety which would have been heard on Shakespeare’s stage.

³⁵ Available to view in The Globe library.

³⁶ I have pursued a similar policy in the actors’ workshops, where the OP has been enriched by a variety of British and commonwealth accents. Within the parameters set by the transcription policy, provided the rhythm and rhyme are not compromised, the actors may employ their own regional accent.

production. For example, the different sounds chosen to highlight the generation gap were effective. The older characters, such as Capulet, clearly used an archaic [e:] vowel in words such as ‘she’ (1, 2) while the younger characters used the more advanced [i:]. Furthermore, the natural colouring afforded by the regional accents, such as a northern Irish Peter, lent variety to the overall tapestry and represented what may be the true sound canvas of Shakespeare’s stage. Each member of the cast seemed to emphasise different aspects of the pronunciation, with some giving weight to the northern-sounding vowels and some to the two major diphthongs in ‘my’ and ‘house’. Sometimes the OP vowels were emphasised, especially in the expanded word endings, and sometimes syllables were skipped over lightly, such as the unstressed syllables, which the cast managed very well. At times, the OP faltered, particularly in fast-paced sections, but in general the underlying OP ‘sound map’ was an omnipresent framework underpinning the whole performance.

Crystal mentions his concerns about ‘hypercorrection’, the phenomenon where actors seize on a feature (or even a perceived feature) in an accent and exaggerate it beyond that of a native speaker. This effect was noticed by one of the cast of *Romeo and Juliet* (2004), Jimmy Garnon (playing Mercutio), who said that “[d]ue to the number of vowel sounds in the OP that we recognise from regional accents around us today, it was incredibly easy to disappear down blind alleys. I found myself in Cork far

more often than I should like, and at times felt I was just riffing along generalised Mummerset lines” (2005, 23). When planning the actors’ workshops, I noted Crystal’s warnings about hypercorrection and devised some exercises to help avoid the situation arising. These appeared to be successful and certainly helped to raise the actors’ awareness of the possibility of hypercorrection occurring. The exercises are discussed in Chapter 6.

Crystal initially decided against audio recordings as these might influence the actors’ interpretation of their lines. He wanted them to use their own interpretation and characterisation to bring the text to life. He did later produce a recording, which was intended as an “aide memoire” for the voice coach and as a point of reference in order to clarify any points for the actors after they had learned their parts with the aid of the transcription (2005, 99). This was a ‘flat’ recording, devoid of interpretation.

When preparing the script, Crystal had three transcription options open to him: a full phonetic transcription; a part-phonetic transcription; and the highlighting of differences (by underlining) with a companion phonetic dictionary. Given only a short rehearsal period and the lack of training in phonetics of some of the actors, a complete phonetic transcription was not a realistic option. Crystal was not happy about

using audio recordings, partly because he was concerned about the possible boredom associated with rote-learning from a CD. He mentions how John Barton found Daniel Jones's OP recordings "flat and uninspiring" (Crystal, 2005, 34). Ultimately, he decided on a part-phonetic transcription, where only those words, or parts of words, which differed from RP would be transcribed.³⁷

The actors' individual parts were printed out, in the manner of Elizabethan cue-scripts, so that each one saw only his/her own lines. Apart from the convenience, this was also so that actors did not become confused when they saw a word transcribed in a different way in a different context. Crystal's transcription policy included a conservative style of pronunciation on certain sounds for characters of an older generation and a more advanced pronunciation for younger characters. Confusion may have arisen if actors had caught sight of one another's lines.

In order for this production to work it had to be 'sold' effectively to the actors. Crystal records that there was a great deal of trepidation, and even negativity, on the part of the actors, for whom this was a new and uncharted experience. His method of working involved letting the cast in

³⁷ This was one of the transcription methods I used in the workshops. I also experimented with the use of colour-coding and with unmarked scripts (see Chapter 6 for details).

gently with a ‘mini-lecture’ on Elizabethan speech and introducing the sounds before the actors got to see the transcription. Unfortunately, a member of the theatre staff issued the scripts before Crystal arrived at the first rehearsal.

Where there was a choice of conservative or advanced pronunciations, Tim Carroll expressed a preference for the conservative. Like John Barton, Carroll’s view was that “[a]udiences will come to an OP performance expecting the accent to be different, so where there is a choice, let’s go for the more distinctive sound” (Crystal. 2005, 113). Carroll’s comment seems to imply a disorganised approach. In fact, Crystal was very methodical in his pronunciation choices, giving conservative pronunciations to the older generation and more advanced ones to the younger characters. I experimented with this type of transcription in my workshops, not only making a distinction between generations but also giving more conservative pronunciations to ‘rustic’ characters. This proved successful, especially where comedic value could be found in archaisms.

Crystal noted a number of problems encountered in the first rehearsal. For example, actors had difficulty with the long [o:] and [æɪ] was a

particular problem.³⁸ The cast tended to make the onset too rounded so that it had an Irish quality. The peculiar pronunciations of words like ‘fortune’, ‘torture’ and ‘measure’ tended to be forgotten and some of the expanded endings, such as ‘affection’ and ‘salutation’, were omitted. However, the unstressed forms were readily adopted and the (hw) caused no problem.³⁹

The voice coach, Charmian Hoare, mentions that one tendency in rehearsal was for the actors to “generalise into a sort of West Country sound”⁴⁰ (2005, 117). Any one of the OP sounds might encourage this effect but the rhotic ‘r’ may easily be the cause. There is a danger that actors who do not normally use a rhotic ‘r’ will subconsciously associate this with a rural accent, such as Devon or Cornwall. They might then begin to slip in other sounds which they know belong to that accent. This effect may be heightened in the rehearsal room where the actors are listening carefully and accommodating their speech to one another. In fact, Meredith describes how there was a tendency for the cast to influence one another in a negative fashion by exaggerating the Northern,

³⁸ This same diphthong was consistently a problem in my actors’ workshops for the reason mentioned above. Actors are able to pronounce the diphthong in isolation but it takes a great deal of practice before it becomes second nature in context.

³⁹ In the workshop setting, I found that the actors’ experience of PDE forms enabled them to adopt the unstressed forms with ease and their familiarity with the Scots pronunciation of words such as ‘white’ allowed them to substitute the initial ‘hw’ for their regular ‘w’.

⁴⁰ This is an example of hypercorrection.

West Country or Irish sounds in a way which could colour the whole speech. The way in which Charmian Hoare dealt with the tendency to regionalise the accent was described by Rhys Meredith, who played Benvolio: “Charmian would use each of us as examples to the others on how to produce certain sounds, and so try to bring about more of a convergence. After a couple of sessions going away practising our weaker sounds and not overemphasizing our strengths, there was more of a uniformity without losing our own voice” (2005, 118). This technique of modelling good practice is well known in education and works extremely well in the OP workshop.

Crystal states that “[e]ach [actor] found some sounds to be harder than others, but not everyone had trouble with the same sounds.” He mentions “a degree of inconsistency”⁴¹ in the [e:] vowel in the conservative pronunciations of ‘even’ and ‘please’ (2005, 118–9). These problems, according to Crystal, tended to occur in scenes of “high emotion” or “great action”, not in “quiet, reflective passages” (2005, 119). This is possibly a symptom of insufficient rehearsal time. With a longer rehearsal period, the pronunciation should become second nature and would not require a conscious effort.

⁴¹ I too noticed this when viewing the DVD of the show. It appears that in moments of high drama the actors tended to revert to PDE pronunciation and in more relaxed moments were able to focus with greater effectiveness on the OP.

It is one thing for actors to work on their own lines at home but quite another when they come together and begin to interact with one another. Crystal noticed in the final rehearsals the way the actors were influencing one another in their pronunciation as they played scenes together. He mentions particularly the way Benvolio and Mercutio matched one another in pace, articulation and accuracy. In linguistic terms their accents began to ‘accommodate’, which was the ideal scenario.⁴²

Crystal comments on the fact that the actors noticed a greater sense of attention amongst the school children in the audience of the OP production when compared with regular performances. This prompted Crystal to speak informally with some children during the interval. Responses such as “cool” and “wicked” were accompanied by the suggestion that “they’re talking like us” (Crystal 2005, 137). This would seem to imply that OP was accepted by the children as a type of accent, and one which is free from the sort of stigma which might be linked (in a child’s mind) to RP. Moreover, rather than being viewed as historic speech, OP is an accent with which the school children could identify. This is reinforced by the fact that both young people and adults said that they felt closer to the characters, or in Crystal’s words, “OP reduced the psychological distance between speaker and listener” (2005, 142).

⁴² One of the most rewarding aspects of my workshop process was the way the actors accommodated their pronunciation to one another, generally with a resultant increase in proficiency. This effect was first heard after around ten hours of rehearsal.

Informal responses received by Crystal from the audience suggested that after the first scene their ears were accustomed to the OP (Crystal 2011, 10).

Actors' responses to the pronunciation are significant as there are few other examples of this type of feedback. James Garnon, who played Mercutio, mentioned that the OP "has so many rural associations in the vowels that a courtly bearing starts to feel strange. I felt myself coarsening in facial expression too" (2005, 142). There is an association here between the actor's bearing or body language and the expectations engendered in the accent. RP may more readily suggest nobility of stance and gesture; OP may suggest the type of movement and bearing associated with middle or lower class characters. This notion, if it is shared by other actors (and more research needs to be done in this area) may suggest one way in which OP might be used to differentiate between characters of different status. The 'coarsening in facial expression' may be a result of the tenser OP vowels causing the jaw to thrust forward. The Master of Movement⁴³ at *The Globe*, Glynn MacDonald, reported that "the actors' movement became more fluent during the OP performances"

⁴³ "The 'Master' of Movement title changed in 2006 when Dominic Dromgoole took over the artistic directorship. Mark Rylance used the 'Master' titles in order to remove connotations with modern theatre practices that seemed anachronistic. Dominic Dromgoole was more interested in how modern theatre practitioners worked with an early modern reconstruction" (Karim-Cooper, F. 2014, private correspondence).

(2005, 144). Workshop experiments for this project showed that when an actor is proficient in OP their pace is significantly faster than in RP.⁴⁴ This is largely due to the proliferation of unstressed forms and syllable reductions in OP, which have the effect of speeding up any accompanying movement. The lower point of resonance in the chest of OP also appears to free up the actors' gestures, allowing greater fluidity.

An example of the way the use of OP can affect the acting process is evident in the case of Bette Bourne, who played the nurse (in drag). Crystal reports that the accent in which Bourne usually played the nurse, "a noticeably London accent with glottal stops and a generally slower articulation," was absent in OP performances, where his delivery became, "distinctly more northern." The accent made the character appear tougher (2005, 145).

Kananu Kirimi, who played Juliet, remarked that her character became "bolder, more muscular, and that seemed to give her greater freedom" (146). The effect of the accent on the word-play was dramatic. According to Kirimi, "Juliet's word-play came to seem less intellectual and thought-based, more about pleasure than intelligence. It was more about enjoying

⁴⁴ This effect was apparent in the 2004 OP production of *Romeo and Juliet* where cuts had to be made to the musical underscore, which matched the RP text but proved to be too long for OP version. The effect is documented by D. Crystal in 2005e and 2011b.

making sounds – sounds that complicated one another, echoed one another, matched one another” (2005, 146). Possibly as a result of this phenomenon, Kirimi noted that she discovered a greater awareness of the humour in the part. This sort of realism was noticed by Jimmy Garnon, Mercutio, who confided that the ‘Queen Mab’ speech felt real in OP, whereas in RP it feels like poetry. He also mentioned that when departing from the rustic theme the “rural sounds jarred against the modern people I looked at [in the audience]” (147–148).

In a reference to productions which attempt to “bring the plays closer to the people” by using modern, regional accents, Crystal explains that the result is “to get rid of one kind of baggage and replace it with another” (149), as people who do not use the chosen dialect will still be outsiders. This does not happen with OP as it “occupies a unique dialect space, resonating with several modern accents and yet at a distance from all of them.”

Crystal believes it is a mistake to think of OP as a single accent. He says, “[t]he actors were told not to lose their natural accents, but to speak the OP speech as trippingly as they could in their natural voices” (Meier, 2011, 212). He goes on to say, “we had a Juliet who sounded Scottish, a Nurse from the East End of London, a Peter from Northern Ireland, as well as some RP speakers. But they all modified their accents to rhyme one

with alone, and so on. Some of these accents were closer to OP than others, of course. Those who already had a postvocalic /-r/ in their accents found OP easier to acquire than those who didn't" (Meier, 2011, 213).

The season after Shakespeare's Globe's successful *Romeo and Juliet* weekend in OP, the theatre decided to stage an entire run of *Troilus and Cressida* in OP (August–September, 2005). This production employed gender-blind casting, included a woman in the role of Agamemnon and was the only example of a 'modern dress' original pronunciation production to date. This production received some criticism. Writing in *The Sunday Telegraph* (2005) Miranda Sawyer describes the accent as one "that combines country bumpkin, northern English and southern Irish" and goes on to say "[i]t takes a good twenty minutes for your ears to adjust." Sawyer suggests that a well-known play, such as *Romeo and Juliet*, would have "helped the audience along". She seems unaware that *Romeo and Juliet* had already been performed in OP at Shakespeare's Globe. Experiments with original pronunciation at Shakespeare's Globe ceased after this production, which did not sell very well.⁴⁵ It might be that *Troilus and Cressida* is not the best choice for an OP production at

⁴⁵ Audience statistics from Shakespeare's Globe show an attendance of 1,571 for the run (figure supplied by Doug Buist, Marketing Manager at Shakespeare's Globe).

this time. In 2006, when Dominic Dromgoole became artistic director, the employment of ‘original practices’ was discontinued.⁴⁶

In the programme notes for the production, Crystal makes a significant statement with regard to defining an original pronunciation:

The pronunciation represented is [my interpretation of] an underlying system for Early Modern English. Its aim is to show the major differences between then and now. ... Any one of the sounds shown could have been articulated in a variety of subtly different ways—just as today, the sound in, say, two can be said with slightly more or slightly less lip rounding, slightly higher or slightly lower in the mouth, and so on.⁴⁷

This statement is of importance to anyone attempting a reconstruction of Elizabethan pronunciation. Crystal is referring to the ‘sound map’, within which framework there is a certain amount of tolerance of variation in the pronunciation. It is this variation which enables actors to define their own unique voice. This system helps to keep the policy of any production in perspective and to avoid any possible scenario where a director or voice coach might be struggling to impose a regimented, uniform pronunciation on the cast as a whole. This would be an unnatural undertaking which would divert energy and focus away from the

⁴⁶ Elizabethan English was not to be heard at Shakespeare’s Globe again until 20th July 2014, as part of the opening season of the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse. This staged reading was presented in candle-light and with the actors reading from cue scripts. The transcript was prepared by David Crystal.

⁴⁷ See programme notes for *Troilus and Cressida*, *The Globe Theatre Archives*

important aspects, such as characterisation, repair of metre and rhyme and the discovery of new puns and word-play.

Crystal mentions a line in *Troilus* which would have provoked a significant audience reaction in Shakespeare's day but which is lost on modern audiences. Thersites' line reads, "[f]or whomsoever he be, he is Ajax." Crystal points out that "in Shakespeare's time, the name was pronounced like 'a jakes' – and a 'jakes' was the word for a pisshouse" (Crystal 2005C).

An observation regarding the placing of the voice when acting in OP is made in an article in *The Observer* by Colin Hurley, who played Thersites: "[t]he joy of OP is that it relocates the emotion of the text from the head to somewhere between the legs" (McCrum R, *Observer*, 21 August 2005). This reinforces comments made by actors in other productions about OP having the effect of lowering the focal point of the voice. In the rehearsed readings for this project, the actors noted that this 'lowering' effect gave them a sense of freedom of movement. Their gestures became more fluid and their bodies more relaxed. The abstract concept of the emotion becoming less intellectual and more instinctive (the quote implies even sexual) may account for the way that the actors felt as though they were able to communicate with the audience more directly and effectively.

The archive footage of this production shows a certain anachronistic conflict between what is seen (modern dress) and what is heard (historical speech). This effect may have been more pronounced when viewing the show on screen than in a live performance. While this might feel uncomfortable at first, after the initial few scenes, during which the listener becomes accustomed to the sounds of OP, the conflict becomes less noticeable. Some of the cast appeared to be more comfortable with the accent than others and some of the more senior cast members appeared not to engage fully with the pronunciation. Nevertheless, there was a great deal of variety in the delivery of the OP which was successful overall and may well enhance the viewer's enjoyment of the performance.

This entry, by J Benterman, Stage Manager, appears in the show reports for the opening night, 24 August 2005: “[a] really drizzly, wet evening but that did not stop the amazing reaction from a very, very supportive audience. A really amazing response to our OP production. A very tired but pleased company”.⁴⁸

In the future, research needs to be done on the correlation between modes of speech – whether OP, RP or regional accents – and dress. It may be that the audience have certain expectations when they see characters dressed in a particular costume and problems might occur when these

⁴⁸ See show report for *Troilus and Cressida*, *The Globe Theatre Archives*

expectations are not met. This production was not popular and the use of OP may have been a contributory factor.

A Midsummer Night's Dream, University of Kansas

The successful experiment in OP at Shakespeare's Globe inspired Paul Meier to direct an OP production of his own at Kansas University. He first discovered about Shakespeare's Globe's OP *Romeo and Juliet* (2004) when he read *Pronouncing Shakespeare*, (Crystal 2005). Inspired by what he read, Meier arranged an OP workshop at Stratford in June 2007 for a group of his students and asked Crystal to lead it. Meier, and the students, were impressed by Crystal's demonstrations of OP and by his lecture on how it could be used to restore lost rhymes and metrical patterns. According to Meier: "When I heard David Crystal speaking the lines in that dialect in a little room next door to the Birthplace, Shakespeare became the people's poet, sounding more real than I could have imagined" (Meier, P. 2011b, 48). Meier decided there and then to stage a production on campus during his next sabbatical and, after consultation with Crystal, decided on *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (2010).

Meier met with initial scepticism from his university colleagues, who agreed to the project largely on the strength of Crystal's research. They

did, however, become “intrigued” by the basis of the evidence for OP. The production was videoed and an edited radio recording was made. Crystal himself coached the actors for two weeks prior to rehearsal in order to ensure the pronunciation was accurate. Crystal also recorded himself speaking the entire play on CD as an aid for the actors.

Meier states that “as soon as rehearsals began it became clear that OP would be no barrier to understanding. Indeed, I have coached extant dialects that present far greater challenges” (Meier, P. 2011b, 49). OP triggered reminiscences of familiar accents in the cast which helped them to reproduce the sounds of the pronunciation. The fact that OP strikes a chord of familiarity in many English speakers (due to many of the sounds being extant in regional dialects) appears to have been a point in its favour both in the UK and in the USA. Those new to speaking or hearing OP will always find familiar elements to latch onto.

The size of the audience was three times that which was expected. Feedback suggested that the audience “quickly became used to the dialect and found it no barrier to understanding. In fact, they told us that it textured the language in a thoroughly delightful way” (Meier 2011b, 49). It is significant that the word ‘textured’ should be used here to describe the sound of the language. This same word was used by Barton back in the 1950s. To close his article, Meier encourages others to tackle

the performance of Shakespeare in OP, citing his own audience's "enthusiastic and intensely curious response" (Meier 2011b)

Speaking about the Elizabethan accent in an interview with Meier in connection with the *Midsummer Night's Dream* production (November, 2011), David Crystal remarks that, "[p]eople generally find it exhilarating, especially when (as routinely happened in the Globe productions) the OP made the actors re-interpret their relationship with their characters" (Meier 2011, 212). He goes on to say that "the tongue-tripping rate of OP also affects the actors' movement, and that too is likely to be important in this play." The fact that there is a connection between speech and action in OP is a significant observation, which merits a separate study of its own.

On the subject of the mix of different accents which would have been heard on the London stage, Crystal informs Meier that "London would have contained dozens of accents, with its multicultural population, and a huge inward movement of people from the Midlands and East Anglia. So there never would have been phonetic uniformity on the Globe stage, and we would have heard many shades of OP" (Meier, 2011, 212). This statement is important to voice coaches and actors intending to stage productions in OP. Crystal is referring here to his concept of a generalised 'sound map' rather than a fixed accent. This means that

actors do not have to ignore their own regional or national accent but may use it to colour their OP. Moreover, every actor does not have to aim for the same nuances in their accent but they may each emphasise different elements of the speech according to their interpretation of their character. Workshops for this project have shown that the sounds of OP are greatly enriched by the use of regional accents. Moreover, the process of teaching OP is greatly enhanced by the presence of actors with a wide variety of vowel sounds which may be targeted and modelled to achieve accuracy in the OP. Further clarification is given by Crystal:

One has first to appreciate the difference between phonetics (the study of human-produced sound) and phonology (the study of the sound system of a language). OP is (my attempt to establish) the phonological system of Early Modern English, and it allows the same kind of phonetic variations as happen in Modern English... (Meier 2011, 212)

In the post-production interview with Meier, Crystal explains the value of an initial talk and explanation about how OP works, and how we know what it would have sounded like. He was able to get the cast speaking in OP in the first lecture session and the explanations given then saved time in the first rehearsal. It also whetted the appetite of the cast from whom

Crystal “got the impression that they couldn’t wait to get started” (Meier 2011, 217).⁴⁹

Crystal makes an important point about the structure of rehearsals when he says that it was good to see the production moving in parallel with the OP learning. “It was important that they started to develop some of their blocking and characterisation while still getting to grips with the accent. This is certainly what I would recommend, for future productions. Otherwise... when they have to add emotion and pace... they revert to their native accents” (Meier 2011, 218). In praising the achievements of the cast, Crystal mentions that they had begun to prepare the lines before his arrival, using the transcript and recordings he provided. Meier mentions that the accent was very popular amongst the cast who “quickly fell in love with the dialect’s swiftness, its earthiness, its lower point of resonance in the body, its way of guiding metrical considerations, its restoration of rhymes and puns” (Meier 2011, 218). There is a reference here to the location of the accent in physical terms, a point which actors seem quick to pick up on and which I suggest could be the focus of future research.

⁴⁹ I followed Crystal’s guidance here in my own workshops, where the actors were encouraged to use OP right from the start. This proved successful in giving them confidence.

This production helped to focus on the idea of using OP with a non-British cast. This highlighted the need for a different sort of transcription to reflect the Mid-West base accent. In a brief analysis of some of the OP sounds, Meier and Crystal discuss the way the cast hypercorrected some of their regular vowels which should not have been altered for OP. An example was given of the vowel [ɑ] in 'thought', 'fall' and 'daughter'. These sounds were already present in the Mid-West accent and so were not transcribed. It is important to note that most of the problems encountered in rehearsal were the same as those that would have been experienced by a British cast. The same tendency to hypercorrect has been observed in the workshopping of OP material for this project and has been partially remedied through the use of warm-up techniques discussed in Chapter 6. There was also discussion of a common tendency to make the two diphthongs [əɪ] and əʊ] sound Irish, particularly with erroneous lip-rounding on the former.

This production highlighted some of the ways in which the pronunciation can be used to emphasise character. An example is the use of 'h' dropping. Crystal refers to the fact that an effective twist in the transcription has Puck, when mimicking Lysander and Demetrius, restoring the 'h's he generally drops, as all the fairies do. This strengthens the impression of mimicry. 'H' is also restored in the Greek play by the mechanicals, who normally drop them, to reflect the

heightened language. Summing up the whole experience, Meier reports that audiences were “genuinely intrigued” by their experience of OP. “So many expressed delight with how the dialect enriched their listening experience and surprise at its clarity” (Meier 2011, 220).

Hamlet, University of Nevada

Hard on the heels of Meier’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* came a production of *Hamlet* in November 2011 by Nevada Repertory Company, of the University of Nevada at Reno. This was a student production but included professional guest actors, one of whom was Ben Crystal (Hamlet). David Crystal advised the production and Paul Meier acted as voice coach.

This production, at the *Redfield Theatre*, according to a University of Nevada Media Newsroom release (Wainwright, N. 2011), aroused a great deal of media interest with visitors from the UK and the Hollywood film industry. The production’s director, Rob Gander, chair of the university’s theatre and dance department, says, “OP is really like a dialect grounded not in geography, but through time” (University of Nevada Press Release 2011).

Ben Crystal states⁵⁰ that, in auditions, actors were chosen primarily for their acting ability. OP first featured in the recalls where actors worked in groups on one of Horatio's speeches. Some choric work was done as a warm-up exercise prior to individual work on some of the lines. With regard to the rehearsal process, Crystal reported that the actors did not use any special warm-ups prior to rehearsing in OP but simply used regular actors' voice warm-ups. The rehearsal period was six weeks long, typically twenty-eight hours a week. Each actor also received an hour's individual coaching per week, via Skype, from Paul Meier. Several OP workshops of three hours duration were given during the first few weeks of rehearsal; significantly, these utilised scripts other than the production script. A rehearsal period of six weeks is a generous allowance, perhaps designed to accommodate a largely student cast. In professional theatre an allowance of four weeks would probably be adequate.⁵¹

In a correlation with the results of the research conducted for this project, members of the *Hamlet* cast each showed their own strengths and weaknesses in their OP delivery. There was never any intention of aiming for an overall uniformity of style and any variations were seen as a positive feature; the sort of variety which one finds in a PDE production was quite acceptable, although more extreme variation was not. As Crystal explains, "[a]n accent from the outskirts of the village is

⁵⁰ In a private conversation on 25.07.12.

⁵¹ This is the rehearsal period suggested by Mark Rylance (Crystal 2005, 100).

acceptable but not one from the next village.”⁵² The grave diggers were encouraged to drop their ‘h’s as a means of characterisation.

Regarding the production script, Crystal himself prefers to pick up the OP aurally, although he points out that his OP experience enables him to read in OP from an unmarked script. Some members of the cast would use the part-IPA transcript, with or without audio, and others would just use the audio, which consisted of flat readings by David Crystal. Members of the cast became so confident in their use of OP that they would improvise everyday conversations in it. Crystal believes that the cast’s experience would enable them to stage another OP show in just three weeks. Research findings for this project confirm that, after three days of workshopping, and time for private study, actors are confident enough with the pronunciation to be able to tackle lines independently.

Crystal maintains that performing in OP helped the actor to “engage the emotional core more strongly” and that it “encouraged re-examination of base truths.” He also mentions that RP tends to have its focus in the actors head and can restrict movement, but OP has a lower centre of focus which gives the actor a greater sense of freedom of movement. This abstract notion of the way that OP enables actors to be freer and more natural confirms the views of actors in other productions and in the

⁵² In a private conversation on 25.07.12.

workshopping of material for this project. Crystal points out that the actors' movements are speeded up as a result of the faster pace of the dialogue. This introduces the important consideration of the way in which OP can impact on the actors' movement and the blocking of the scene. There is justification here, perhaps, for the Mermaid Theatre *Macbeth* (1952) production's joint focus on historically informed movement and pronunciation.

These three early twenty-first century productions have suggested that contemporary audiences are receptive to the use of accented Shakespeare in performance, whether this be a regional accent or OP. Those who feel that Shakespeare should 'properly' be performed in RP appear to be in the minority, although that belief is still held by some. Now that the dominance of RP is diminishing, other directors are showing interest in OP as a performance medium.⁵³

New York has been a focus with a student production of *Twelfth Night* (Circle in the Square Theatre School, 2010), two professional productions (*Twelfth Night* and *Macbeth* at The American Theatre of Actors, off Broadway) and a rehearsed reading of scenes from Shakespeare (The

⁵³ The Kansas production was filmed and a radio broadcast produced. Both of these are available on the internet. The Nevada production was also filmed and is on sale.

Playwright Tavern, New York, 2007).⁵⁴ Together with a small number of other productions in the US, this may indicate growing interest in the subject.

***Twelfth Night*, Shakespeare OP**

New York again experienced the sounds of OP when, in February 2012, an OP production of *Twelfth Night*, which owed its inspiration to the research interest of its director, Hamilton Meadows, was staged at The American Theatre of Actors. Meadows is a film director who had never directed Shakespeare and had previously directed only one play, in a studio theatre. The performances were given by *I Can Do That* Theatre Company, now re-named *Shakespeare OP*, who, according to their website, produce and stage Shakespeare's plays "as faithfully as possible in Original Pronunciation" (Shakespeare OP Company 2013). The company web page explains that, for *Twelfth Night*, "John Windsor-Cunningham,

⁵⁴ Director Alex Torra's *As I pronounced it to You*, given at the *Playwright Tavern* in New York in August 2007, was the first indication of renewed interest in OP. Torra is associate artistic director of *Pig Iron Theatre Company* and resident director of *Team Sunshine Performance Corporation*. His production contained extracts from Shakespeare's plays, performed in OP. Torra reports, "[w]e presented thirteen scenes from eleven different plays, performed by seven actors. The most popular responses of the evening were: how the sound changes allowed the language to move faster and how incredibly enjoyable that was; how the OP actually clarifies rhetoric and word play; how many particularly enjoyed the comedies." The company played to a small audience of around sixty and the evening consisted of rehearsed readings, rather than a staged production. A scene from *The Taming of the Shrew* was particularly successful, even though the players "were sitting at music stands" (Crystal, D 2011).

[the] company's Voice Master, coached the actors using an OP transcription of the play and recordings by Professor David Crystal."

Although there was a voice coach for this production, Windsor-Cunningham⁵⁵ (the only paid member of the team) had no experience of OP and relied on the transcription and audio recording prepared by David Crystal. Each actor was given a copy of these at the beginning of the process. The rehearsal period was not preceded by OP workshops.⁵⁶ In fact, there was no voice coach present at the first rehearsal, at which the actors were on their feet, rather than participating in a close reading.⁵⁷ Once rehearsals were under way the voice coaching took place in private, at Windsor-Cunningham's home and in workshop sessions. One might have expected a pre-production introduction to OP with a presentation of the rationale for using OP as well as a briefing or workshop on the main differences between PDE and OP and perhaps a look at some of the pitfalls or common traps.⁵⁸

Meadows' interest in OP performance stems from his study of an archaic-sounding regional accent, found only in the isolated community of

⁵⁵ A previous voice coach, a graduate from the University of Kansas, had quit the production.

⁵⁶ Most of the original cast and the co-producer left the production early on and were replaced.

⁵⁷ Source: Fromson 2013

⁵⁸ Owing to disillusionment amongst the cast, Meadows had to make a fresh start with a largely new cast after a few week's rehearsal.

Tangier Island in Chesapeake Bay. It occurred to Meadows that some of the sounds of this accent might derive from the Elizabethan English brought by the first settlers. His documentary film about the island accent, 'Speak the Speech, I Pray Thee...', is currently in the editing stage but extracts are available on the internet. Meadows has led a colourful life and his recently-published biography⁵⁹ follows his OP journey from researching the Tangiers accent to staging Shakespeare in OP. Although Crystal agreed to support Meadows in this project, mainly due to Meadows' persistence and enthusiasm, he could not agree with Meadows' view that OP may still be heard today in Tangier Island.⁶⁰ Crystal, in common with other linguists, dismisses the notion as pure myth. Due to the nature of language change, even in an isolated community speech will develop and progress over time and it is inconceivable that a sixteenth century form of English will still be spoken today.

This production received mixed reviews, not solely for its use of OP. The extract below is taken from a review of the show, titled *Oh for a Muse of... Anything*, by Meteo Moreno on the website *The Arts Wire* (Moreno, M. 2012). Moreno's negative view may partly stem from the fact that he had no experience of reviewing an 'accented' Shakespeare production. He admits to being very familiar with the play but appears bemused by this

⁵⁹ Meadows' biography details his visits to Tangier Island, his efforts to record the islanders reading Shakespeare in their accent, and ultimately staging his own off-Broadway OP productions (Fromson, D., 2013).

⁶⁰ Source: Fromson 2013

linguistic interpretation. It may be that his perception of this as a badly-prepared production may have coloured his view of the whole.

Director, Hamilton Meadows... has presented a production that seems to be put up at the last minute with actors who have barely read the script. Most of the comedy in the piece is lost due to the language being spoken in its original incarnation (many, many words are now pronounced differently). There's also the puzzling question of why everyone seems to be going for an Irish accent. Even though I've seen this classic comedy countless times, I felt lost to this production.

Moreno was quick to notice the short-comings of what was a production with a chaotic rehearsal period and insufficient time to do justice to the ambitious language element. Fromson, in his biography of Meadows, documents actors, voice coach and co-producer quitting the production and Meadows being forced to re-audition, eventually working with a cast of volunteers. Referring to his lack of experience at directing Shakespeare, Meadows stated, "I don't know what I'm doing, but I know that I'm gonna do it" (Fromson, Location 506, Kindle Edition). The fact that "most of the comedy... is lost" is possibly due to the inexperience of the actors, who could have made the language work for them in the same way that a regional accent might.

A review on Steve Capra's blog for *NewYorkCritic.org* (Capra, S. 2013) gives the show a more favourable reception and Capra is prepared to give the actors credit for taking on the extra challenge of an unfamiliar accent:

“The American Theatre of Actors recently mounted a very admirable production of *Twelfth Night*. The accomplishment was all the more appreciated because the actors [were] speaking Shakespeare’s English...” He goes on to say that “[t]he OP gave the production a delicious distance. What’s more, it made us *listen* harder than we might, engrossing us all the more” (Capra, S. 2013). Capra implies that OP adds an extra dimension to the production, distancing itself (perhaps chronologically) from PDE and encouraging greater focus from the audience.

Concerning the practicalities of staging an OP production, Meadows admits that he had concerns about the actors’ ability to read the IPA in the audition process but in the end “went with the best talent I could find, regardless of the IPA.”⁶¹ He maintains that the cast had no problems picking up the OP and his voice coach “did an outstanding job with the actors,” even though he had no previous experience of OP. The fact that the voice coach was present for all the rehearsals would have been of great benefit to the cast. Meadows’ assessment of the effectiveness of the OP, however, is problematic. His own experience of the language is limited and he was acting in the production himself. This sort of assessment needs to be carried out by an expert who is not affiliated with the production. Referring to the effect that the lack of rehearsal time had on the quality of the production, Meadows admitted that “many of the

⁶¹ The source of Meadows’ comments in this section is private email correspondence, August 2012.

cast were nervous with the extra work and were hesitant to explore other creative ideas, considering our short rehearsal time. The actors used the OP,” according to Meadows, “to help them find their characters to a degree. This skill, which was noticed by a reviewer of the Macbeth production below, may not be limited to OP but might demonstrate how OP may function in the same way as a regional accent.

Regarding the inspiration he finds in the Tangier accent and the way he feels this relates to Shakespearean pronunciation, Meadows points out that “the Tangier Island pronunciation system often expands a one syllable word used in modern English into a two syllable word.” He believes that features such as this may “hold a clue as to how Shakespeare was hearing and writing his verse and prose in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth Century.” Expansion was certainly a feature of Elizabethan English and one favoured by poets seeking an extra syllable in the scansion. Sound samples of the voices of inhabitants of Tangier on the web reveal the use of the EME diphthong [əʊ] in words like ‘now’ and a very weak or even missing post-vocalic ‘r’. The latter is infrequent in American accents and may reflect the sort of weakening process which Elizabethan English underwent prior to losing the rhotic ‘r’ before consonants and in word-final position.

The Shakespeare OP Players' second production in original pronunciation, *Macbeth* (February 2013),⁶² is warmly received by Ron Cohen in "Macbeth OP is Both Fair and Foul, The Broadway Review" in *Backstage*. This production, as revealed in a programme note, intends to restore the wordplay and rhymes which are no longer present in PDE. Cohen notices that "the sound is not always consistent throughout this large cast" (Cohen, R. 2013). Realistically, the pronunciation in the production may have been no less consistent than the speech which would have been heard around 1600 on the London stage. Cohen (2013) describes the language's "seductive expressiveness" and reports that it is no more or less comprehensible than a PDE production.

Broadway World, in an article titled *The Shakespeare OP Players Will Present Macbeth* (Broadway World Newsdesk, 2013), mentions "subtleties, intimacy" and, most importantly, "characterisations" amongst the list of linguistic and dramatic elements enhanced by the use of OP. It is significant to note that the reviewer felt that OP was used as a character-enhancing device, supporting Meadows' claim that OP helps the actor to find their character. The article suggests that "[t]he modern presentation of Shakespeare's plays in period pronunciation is gaining momentum..." (Broadway World Newsdesk, 2013).⁶³

⁶² Presented by the Shakespeare OP Players at the American Theatre of Actors, 54th Street, New York, February 7–24, 2013.

⁶³ Outside New York, there is an awakening interest which is demonstrated by two recent productions in Oregon and Texas, one professional and one in an academic

British Library OP Recordings

A milestone in the revival of OP is the 2012 *British Library* recording, *Shakespeare's Original Pronunciation*, curated by B Crystal, advised by D Crystal, and performed by professional actors. This recording was made to commemorate the year of Shakespeare in 2012. In the programme notes for this recording (Crystals 2012) Ben Crystal makes an enlightening comment when referring to the shades of many modern accents present in OP, which may perhaps explain the reason for its sudden growth in popularity. He says, "it is a sound that often reminds English speakers of the accent of their home. It is, then, a more universal sound than we are perhaps used to hearing Shakespeare spoken in. It is an Everyman sound..." Here, Crystal is referring to sounds such as the 'hw' (for example in 'where'), which sounds Scottish, the rhotic 'r', which is reminiscent of the West Country and Ireland, and the broad, northern monophthongs in words like 'lady'. Although sometimes juxtaposed in an

institution. *Shakespeare's Amazing Cymbeline*, was presented at *Portland Centre Stage*, Oregon from January to April 2012. Other accents were also heard in this production, although it is unclear what the rationale for these was. According to Mary MacDonald, the production's voice coach, referring to a clip of this production on youtube, "only 5 actors play all the roles, and along with the OP you'll hear a little Welsh, some RP, and a bit of Italian. In general, I'm well and truly satisfied with our first outing using OP."⁶³ The clip⁶³ reveals that many of the sounds are indeed OP, although some of the speech veers rather towards RP and Irish. Unfortunately, although there are several reviews of this production, none of these refer to the use of OP. *Julius Caesar* received its second OP production in 2013, when The University of Houston–Downtown presented an abridged performance. The production was directed by Kate Pogue, lecturer and writer on Shakespeare, who prepared the transcript and adapted the play for seven actors with a running time of one and a half hours.

extraordinary way, these sounds are instantly recognisable to the regional speakers who use them.

According to David Crystal's programme note, "[t]he texts have been chosen to illustrate OP in a variety of different settings, and in a range of different voices – male and female, old and young. Different genres are represented by sonnets, prose and dramatic poetry." The extracts have been well chosen to demonstrate the point reached at this moment in the history of Shakespearean language reconstruction and will doubtless be an inspiration to actors and directors wishing to explore the genre further and perhaps take the study in new directions.

The recording demonstrates the way OP can make Shakespeare sound more accessible and repair the anomalies in the language which have arisen through centuries of pronunciation change. The polished theatrical performances on the CD aptly define for posterity the interpretation of Elizabethan pronunciation put forward by the Crystals. There are, however, other varieties possible within the general Shakespearean spectrum and it is to be hoped that others will experiment with these alternative subtle shades of sound in the near future.

This survey of past OP performances would seem to confirm that original pronunciation is beginning to gain popularity and acceptance as a serious

branch of HIP study (informing current practice) as well as an effective performance medium for dramatic exploration and discovery (for example in the wider field of accented Shakespeare). Each new production adds to our knowledge and expertise on the subject and it is to be hoped that a way will be found to capitalise on that shared resource.

3.2 *Macbeth* at the Mermaid Theatre (1952)

(An Original Contribution to the Study of OP History)

In the same year as John Barton's landmark, student production of *Julius Caesar* at Cambridge, in the London suburbs the Mermaid Theatre were rehearsing an OP production of *Macbeth*. The press were aware of the production but the language element appears to have been largely overshadowed by the fact that the show was staged in a reconstructed Elizabethan theatre in an unusual location.

An article titled "The Mermaid" (*The Guardian*, 1952b), announces a forthcoming production of *Macbeth* in an Elizabethan-style theatre at the bottom of the actor Bernard Miles's garden in St John's Wood; this was the same Mermaid Theatre which was later re-sited in Blackfriars. The real significance of the article to this project is revealed in the statement that "[t]he *Macbeth* is to combine both the pronunciation and the acting style of Shakespeare's own stage." The article goes on to explain that the *Macbeth* production would be part of a six week festival at the Mermaid Theatre in St John's Wood, to be staged from the end of August (1952). As well as *Macbeth*, the performances would include Thomas Middleton's *A Trick to Catch the Old One* and Purcell's *Dido and Aeneas*, starring Kirsten Flagstad. It gives the names of the producer, Joan Swinstead, and the designer, C. Walter Hodges. Significantly, it goes on to name the directors of pronunciation as A.C. Gimson and gesture as Bertram L.

Joseph, and the theatre's founder and mentor is named as Bernard Miles. The article states that it is Miles's aim to establish a permanent Elizabethan theatre in London. The mention of AC Gimson as director of pronunciation confirms that this project was indeed a serious and very significant one. Gimson was an eminent professor of phonetics at University College, London, and a respected author of works on the English language, notably *An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English* (1962), which became a seminal work on RP.⁶⁴ Further references in *The Guardian* confirm that this production did indeed take place, even though there are no references to it in any books, articles or papers on OP.

A short article in *The Guardian* (1952d), titled "Macbeth at the Mermaid", describes the *Macbeth* production as "now showing" and explains that the performance has a "double interest", the twin focus being the Elizabethan staging, which "makes a virtue of the nearness of the audience and the fact that they can see all around the players," and, "an attempt to recapture the supposed broad vowels of the Elizabethans." The writer compares the *Macbeth* production with Barton's *Julius Caesar*, which had been given only a few months previously. The author of this piece, when speaking about the pronunciation, mentions that "the danger is that it not only slows the pace but also makes the speaking of verse perhaps even more difficult for the lesser fry" (*The Guardian* 1952d). This is revealing

⁶⁴ He was also David Crystal's phonetics teacher.

and unexpectedly contradicts the findings of the 2004 Globe production of *Romeo and Juliet*, where the pace of the OP was measurably faster than in the PDE performances. This statement appears to reveal something about the style of transcription and delivery favoured by Gimson, which was carefully articulated and contained few weak and unstressed forms. It is also perfectly possible that the actors were deliberately over articulating and slowing down their lines in order that the audience and press reviewers were not able to report that they found the language incomprehensible.

Another reference in the press archives points to a new line of enquiry. In *The Guardian* (1952c), a piece titled “The Mermaid” describes the preparations for the forthcoming season, due to commence at the end of August. A ‘roof hut’ was being constructed, for the lowering of apparitions onto the stage and costumes were being prepared. The following sentence holds great significance: “*Macbeth* is being done in a contemporary accent, and the phonetics department of London University has recorded the play, as a model for the actors, in Elizabethan speech...” In the absence of any extant transcriptions, recordings, if still in existence, would reveal the model of OP chosen by Gimson for the production, a model which would have been chosen not only for its historical accuracy, but also for the consistency and uniformity required by the actors learning OP for the first time under time constraints.

The article of 1 April 1952 (*Guardian* 1952b) states that “Bernard Miles had opened the Mermaid for the festival last year...” There is no mention here of what the programme was in 1951. If there had been a previous OP experiment this would have pre-dated Barton’s *Julius Caesar* (1952). The same article also mentions that “plans are being made for a replica of the theatre to be toured so that the productions can have a wider public.” In fact, other references revealed that the following season took place on a temporary stage at the Royal Exchange in the city, but the *Macbeth* production of 1953 was in modern English pronunciation.

In another review of the 1952 *Macbeth* production titled “Thrones for Two”, this time in *The Observer* (14 September 1952), the critic, Ivor Brown, seemed unsure of how to react to this unusual style of speech. He was not impressed by the pronunciation, which he describes as “Mummerset plus some Scottish... and some Cockney too.” He goes on to say, “it seems, to my ear, an ugly mess, but even those who find it pleasing must admit that it impedes the acting. The whole production... has an air of affectation thrust upon it” (Brown 1952). This is the second reference to the fact that the OP might inhibit the flow of the drama and there is a hint here that the pronunciation might have been over articulated. Brown mentions that “treason” is pronounced “tr-rayson” but draws attention to an apparent oversight when he points out that “pleasant seat” is pronounced normally.

News of the production featured in *Shakespeare Quarterly* (1953, IV, 1), which reported thus:

Interesting experiments have continued at the Mermaid Theatre, in London, where the effort is made to re-create, as far as possible, an Elizabethan performance. The plays are given on an Elizabethan stage, the speeches delivered in Elizabethan accents, and the acting modelled on Elizabethan gestures. The production attempted to reproduce both the pronunciation and acting style of Shakespeare's own lifetime.

Gimson and Joseph are credited as directors of Elizabethan pronunciation and gesture, Swinstead is recorded as the director, Bernard Miles as Macbeth and Josephine Wilson (Miles's wife) as Lady Macbeth. The performance dates are given as September 11th, 12th, 13th and 30th and October 2nd and 3rd (twice nightly).

After making enquiries, I tracked down Gimson's cast recordings to the vaults of the British Library.⁶⁵ There are nineteen references to *Macbeth* in the index but the name Gimson appears neither in the index nor on any of the record sleeves, and Elizabethan pronunciation does not appear in the descriptions.⁶⁶ The record sleeves do not reveal any further

⁶⁵ I am grateful to Dr Michael Ashby of the Phonetics Department at University College, London, for his help in locating the *Macbeth* recordings in the on-line library index of the British Library, which holds all the UCL archive material. The discs may be heard by appointment with the Listening and Viewing Service at the British Library.

⁶⁶ I am grateful to David Crystal for confirming that the voices on the recording are UCL staff, including Gimson.

information about the recordings but a close examination of the recorded material revealed that these are OP recordings. There are several speakers, both male and female, 'playing' the roles. Rather than giving a 'flat' reading as Daniel Jones had done in his Linguaphone recordings, the roles are acted, as if in a radio drama. The style of pronunciation closely resembles the example given in Gimson's book, *An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English*, although Act II, Scene 1, which contains the passage he transcribed phonetically into OP, appears to be missing from the recordings. The presence of a certain diphthong [ɛi] and the treatment of 'er', 'ir' and 'ur' are fingerprints of Gimson's style which are in evidence here.

Despite the current lack of concrete evidence linking these recordings with the 1952 Mermaid *Macbeth*, the fact that the cast are all UCL staff may be enough to conclude that these are indeed the same recordings. As there are no recordings of Barton's *Julius Caesar* and only short extracts of Kökeritz's *Merry Wives of Windsor*, these recordings represent an invaluable resource for anyone studying OP. They give an insight into a type of reconstruction which is different from that of Crystal and Kökeritz, and which was presumably deemed acceptable for the English public in 1952.

It is significant that there is also much common ground between the *Mermaid Macbeth* transcription and the Crystal and Kökeritz style of OP. I discuss this in Chapter 5.2, where I compare and contrast the different styles of OP transcription. It is important to note, however, that the style of speech here is quite formal, clearly articulated, with few letter-droppings and weak forms, and the choice of vowel sounds is sometimes conservative (for example a long vowel in words like ‘look’ and an archaic pronunciation in words like ‘could’ [ku:ld]). This alternative approach can serve to broaden the possibilities of using OP on the modern stage and to give the director a wider choice of pronunciations. The presentation on the recording is, as one would expect, completely fluent, professional and convincing. Although the pace may not be quite as fast as the less formal style of Crystal, it is difficult to imagine how the pace of the production could actually be slowed down by this style of OP. It may be the case that the actors had insufficient preparation time or that they were simply too cautious or overemphatic with their articulation.

The Mermaid Theatre archives contain a book titled *The Mermaid Theatre, The First Ten Years*⁶⁷ (Glow, G, 1969). References in this book filled in some of the gaps in the Mermaid Theatre story. For example, there is a

⁶⁷ This book was discovered by Carol Anderson, PR officer at The Mermaid Theatre, after I made enquiries about the theatre’s early years. I am grateful to her for supplying this information.

very significant reference in the book, not seen elsewhere, to the content of the first season of the Mermaid in 1951:

On Sunday 9th September 1951, the theatre opened with a performance of Purcell's opera *Dido and Aeneas* with, of course, Kirsten Flagstad. In addition to *Dido and Aeneas* the first season included twenty performances of *The Tempest*, fifteen recitals and a special performance of the opening scene of *Hamlet* performed in Elizabethan speech (1969, 3).

Although only consisting of a single scene, this performance of *Hamlet* in the inaugural season, September 1951, is the earliest known professional performance of Shakespeare in OP in modern times and it pre-dates Barton's student production of *Julius Caesar*.

The programme notes for the production include a page titled, *A Few Words About Style*, containing several paragraphs by A.C. Gimson and B.L. Joseph. In these notes, Gimson states, "it is reasonably certain that [the pronunciation] will bear a close resemblance to what the play must have sounded like at its first performance." Specifically, he confirms that the target pronunciation is that of "educated Londoners at the beginning of the seventeenth century."⁶⁸

⁶⁸ This comment gives a very clear indication of the target pronunciation, which may be cross-referenced against the descriptions given by the orthoepists.

The following acknowledgement appears prominently in the programme: “[v]ery special thanks are due to Mr A.C. Gimson and his colleagues for preparing the phonetic transcript⁶⁹ and for giving the Company so many hours of individual tuition.” Summing up, Gimson declares that, “we believe that to hear Shakespeare spoken in sounds which he himself had in mind and ear cannot fail to be interesting and revealing and that it may even prove to be exciting and beautiful.” The recordings in the British Library made for this production provide a wealth of material which researchers may use to analyse Gimson’s style of transcription, and which are sufficient to recreate the sounds of this historical production, should a director ever wish to do so.

In conclusion, the twentieth-century OP productions, from Jones’s early experiments, through Blandford, Gimson, Kökeritz and Barton, and culminating in Crystal and Meier’s more modern twenty-first century interpretations, have paved the way for further experimentation in the medium. Precedents have been set and significant objections have been negated. It has been demonstrated that, far from being an unintelligible ‘foreign’ pronunciation, OP contains many points of reference to which modern audiences can relate; it is easily understandable and modern ears are able to ‘tune into it’ within a few minutes. Audiences find the sound of the pronunciation agreeable and it enhances, rather than detracts from, the performance.

⁶⁹ Enquiries have failed to locate an extant transcript.

Actors, despite possible initial apprehension or scepticism, have discovered that the pronunciation is beneficial to their work. It enables them to create 'real', believable characters; it lowers the focus of the voice, freeing movement; It speeds up the pace of delivery and movement; and it is a useful tool in differentiating between characters, according to their age, geographical setting and possibly status.

These successful productions have shown that performance in OP is both practical and desirable, and the reconstructed speech not only repairs the language but also informs and enhances other areas of Shakespearean performance. Actors have demonstrated that they are able to cope with the demands of OP performances in the same way as they would a modern dialect performance. Indeed, coaching the pronunciation as a dialect has proved to be beneficial.

Furthermore, there is not only a strong precedent for OP performance *per se* but also there has emerged a discernible historical context, traceable through past productions. A line of development may be drawn between the early twentieth-century productions and the most recent performances of *Hamlet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in the US. This development appears to show a correlation with the accepted style of pronunciation in mainstream performances; in parallel with the acceptance of regional and less formal speech in Shakespearean

productions, the Elizabethan reconstructions have become less formal, more conversational and more inclusive of unstressed forms and syncopations. As a result, the current style is more representative of what is thought to be a true Shakespearean pronunciation. I suggest that there is scope for further research in this area.

The fledgling tradition of OP performance, additionally, has highlighted the differences in approach by a series of practitioners who have proved that it is neither necessary nor historically accurate to narrow Shakespearean pronunciation down to one definitive set of sounds. Experiments have also shown that, just as there are various strands of OP, there are different ways of integrating OP into a modern production. David Crystal, in his *Romeo and Juliet* transcription, uses conservative and advanced pronunciations side by side to contrast characters of different generations, and in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* uses letter-dropping to signal character and heightened language. For example, Puck, who generally drops his initial 'h's in Crystal's transcription, pronounces them when he is mimicking Lysander and Demetrius (who do not drop 'h'); the mechanicals, who also drop initial 'h' in their prose, restore it when they are attempting the heightened language in the verse of the Greek play. Some of the differences in pronunciation between Crystal's and Blandford's transcriptions are so marked that they might

easily be used side-by-side to signify different ethnic groups, differing generations, or even social classes, within a single production.

Moreover, these past OP productions have provided invaluable practical demonstrations of the power of the reconstructed language to reverse the damage of generations of sound changes (mainly owing to the Great Vowel Shift) and years of misguided editing, which has attempted to rectify many of the apparent anomalies. The restoration of rhymes in Meier's *Midsummer Night's Dream* (2010) and the repair to the metre of *Romeo and Juliet* (2004) and *Troilus and Cressida* (2005) are testimony to this power. Hearing the reconstructed speech from the mouths of actors on the modern stage, it is difficult to deny its worth. On this subject, David Crystal notes that “[s]tylistic decisions are always hypotheses, and in the theatre the evidence which validates them lies in the minds and mouths of the director and actors...” (Crystal 2005, 112).

The sound changes undoubtedly constitute the core of the matter. The following chapters examine the linguistic context, explain the methods involved in determining what the changes are and how they work, and give the subject of Shakespearean pronunciation an historical perspective.

Chapter 4, The Linguistic Context, Phonological Research and Reference

Any project involving the use of historical language study will include a review of the state of the language in the target period. With regard to this project, I found an understanding of Middle English was very helpful when interpreting the theoretical writings on Elizabethan English and some knowledge of Old English was useful when examining the etymology of words. This was absolutely necessary in this project as there is often a direct correlation between etymology and pronunciation. The Elizabethan and Jacobean periods are significant in terms of language change as they occur in the middle of the Great Vowel Shift (GVS). This was an event with far-reaching consequences which affected only English, leaving other European languages untouched. The GVS had a more profound effect on the English language than any of the other pressures and influences at the time, such as migration from rural to urban areas, and is the biggest cause of pronunciation change. It is, therefore, unsurprising that the GVS looms large in the background of any research into the language of the period. This phenomenon largely affected the long vowels and diphthongs. The differing pronunciations of 'ea' words such as 'meat', 'bear' and 'great' today are a direct result of the GVS. In fact, 'great' is one of only a handful of words which preserve the original 'ea' pronunciation. A similar duality of pronunciation is found in some words ending in 'ear'; compare, for example, 'dear' and 'bear'. In

Shakespeare's day, both pronunciations were possible in many of these words.

The literature available on the history of English pronunciation is sparse and falls into three types: the work of the spelling reformers and orthoepists of Shakespeare's day; the work of later authors who evaluated this early writing and formulated their own theories; and the work of modern phonologists and linguists. Potentially, there are problems with all three:

- Spelling reformers were often biased towards a particular 'spelling pronunciation' and tended to be conservative or to make compromises to ensure their ideas were more likely to be adopted. Some of the authors were from the regions and advocated their own native pronunciations.
- Orthoepists were not always accomplished phonologists and did not have the benefit of standardised phonetic symbols with which to transcribe pronunciations. Consequently, in the absence of a universal system of notation, it is not always an easy matter to compare their suggestions.
- Later writers, such as Ellis (1871) and Vietor (1906) had their own theories and transcription methods, some of which are now out of date. However, their indispensable pioneering studies laid the foundations for today's work in this field.

- Modern writers tend to be very knowledgeable and accurate with their phonetic descriptions but there is variation in their interpretation of the evidence. This is not necessarily problematic. There is certainly room for more than one style of interpretation of OP and the different types of pronunciation open up a variety of possibilities in performance and serve to enrich the language. This theme is explored further in Chapter 6.

Set out below is a brief review of the major works on Shakespearean pronunciation. The review is not exhaustive but sets out the key studies which enable anyone specialising in OP to identify the best practice in order to define a workable transcription policy.

Pioneers in Elizabethan Pronunciation

Alexander Ellis

One of the pioneers of the evaluation of Shakespeare's pronunciation was Alexander Ellis. In the third part of his study of early pronunciation *On Early English Pronunciation* (1871), Ellis includes many pertinent observations and a thorough assessment of the work of the orthoepists. Although it may take the student a while to master the peculiarities of the phonetic symbols used by the various writers quoted, there are some insights into EME pronunciation. Ellis provides many examples of the work of earlier authors, such as Mulcaster and Spenser and his sixteenth

century pronunciation dictionary outlines the pronunciation styles of some of these authors. In the dictionary, Ellis attempts to standardise the various phonetic systems used, as he acknowledges in the preface: “[t]he various phonetic orthographies of the ... writers have been translated into palaeotype to the best of my ability.” This results in spellings such as ‘kouht’ for ‘caught’ and ‘voutshsaaf’ for ‘vouchsafe’. The sections on puns, metre and rhyme are full of pertinent observations, some of which are not to be found elsewhere. For example, in a section on ‘noteworthy uses and corruptions’ Ellis cites the use of ‘rushling’ for ‘rustling’ and points out that this same linguistic phenomenon may be found in colloquial German. This type of linguistic development is important to this project as these quirks of pronunciation may sometimes be the source of puns or word-play in Shakespeare.⁷⁰

Wilhelm Vietor

After Ellis, the torch was carried by the German linguist, Wilhelm Vietor. Even though some of his ideas are out-of-date and the phonetic system is not always easy to follow, Vietor presents some very useful material in his book, *A Shakespeare Phonology* (1906), which is full of examples of Shakespearean pronunciation and includes a comprehensive rhyming dictionary. Vietor clearly states that he is concerned with the

⁷⁰ For example, a pun on ‘knack (deceitful trick) and ‘neck’ in *Titus Andronicus* (IV, 4) relies on a homonym.

Shakespearean pronunciation of the London stage, rather than Elizabethan pronunciation. Despite receiving criticism of some of his ideas from later writers, Viator made a huge contribution to our understanding of early pronunciation. An example of the sort of archaism to be found in Viator's work is his transcription of 'who' as [hwu:]. I would suggest this is inaccurate as the 'w' in OE 'hwo' became silent after the raising of the vowel to [u:]. He makes some pertinent observations regarding Shakespeare's pronunciations of 'ai' and 'a-e' (as in 'fairy' and 'make'), which also appear somewhat archaic for his day. Viator advocates the use of a diphthong in 'ai', which he maintains is substantiated by the rhyme evidence. Even a cursory concordance exercise shows that there is apparent evidence for this assumption; this may be seen in Shakespeare's choice of words to rhyme with 'maid' and 'made'. The two words form distinct groups which never appear to rhyme with one another. This idea is not accepted by most modern practitioners who tend to use the same monophthong in both cases rather than using the diphthong for 'ai' and monophthong for 'a-e'. When assessing evidence of this kind, however, one must keep an open mind as there is a distinct possibility that Shakespeare was following poetic tradition in keeping these two word classes distinct. Indeed, this situation exemplifies the sort of difficult decision which the transcriber needs to make when preparing the text for reading or performance. Viator's book

is full of pertinent observations which need to be borne in mind when considering Shakespearean rhyme and metrical patterns.

The following extract, from *Twelfth Night*, gives a flavour of Vietor's transcription style:

if miuzik bi ðe fu:d ov luv, plæi on;
giv mi ekkses ov it, ðæt, surfetiŋ,
ðe æpetijt mæi sik'n, ænd so: dij.
ðæt stræin ægæin ! it hæd æ dijiŋ fa:l :
o:, it kæ:m o:r mij e:r lijk ðe swi:t suwnd,
daet bre:ðz upon æ bæŋk ov vijolets,
ste:liŋ ænd giviŋ o:dor! inuf; no mo:r:
tiz not so swi:t nuw æz it wæz bifo:r. (Vietor, 1906, 82–3)

Although Vietor expressly states that unstressed vowels lose their definition (“[a]ll the vowels, when unstressed, are more or less obscured, verging on [ə]” [Vietor 1906]), he does not show any unstressed vowels in this transcription and shows no dropped letters, such as final ‘g’ (despite the fact that one would expect instances of both in this passage). This is problematic. Despite claiming to reveal the pronunciation of the Elizabethan stage, Vietor is in effect offering an idealised, text–book representation of the speech rather than showing everyday pronunciation in practice. Unstressed vowels are very much a feature of the English

language and were certainly rife in Elizabethan English. I will show below how the same overelaborate approach to transcription was adopted by later writers. Overall, this transcription has a conservative sound owing to the use of [æ:] in ‘came’ and the diphthong [æi] in ‘play’. For the purposes of this project, I have consulted Vietor’s conservative pronunciations when examining Shakespeare’s rhyming practice as Shakespeare was always ready to employ conservative pronunciations for rhyming purposes.⁷¹

F.G. Blandford

FG Blandford In his *Shakespeare’s Pronunciation* (1927), presents an accurate OP transcription of *Twelfth Night*, Act I, Scene 5, together with a key to the pronunciation of the phonetic symbols used. Unlike Ellis, Blandford had the new IPA phonetic symbols at his disposal. The style evident in this transcription is reminiscent of the BBC recording, directed by Blandford, of *Twelfth Night*, Act II, Scene 4 (BBC Archive Recording at British Library 1006–1007). Blandford admits in a ‘note’ that his transcription is intended to give “a general impression of the pronunciation used on the stage in Shakespeare’s time” (Blandford, FG 1927, 2). He thus attempts to distance himself from the contemporary phonological debate on Shakespeare’s pronunciation. However, his

⁷¹ For example, the use of a conservative pronunciation of ‘babe’ to rhyme with ‘drab’ and ‘slab’ (*Macbeth* IV, 1).

transcription is detailed and is representative of a well-articulated and slightly archaic pronunciation. The preciseness of the speech is shown by the absence of weak forms and unstressed syllables, a style of speech which feels academic when compared with the more fluent and casual style adopted by later experts, such as Kökeritz and Crystal. Blandford follows Vietor in the use of diphthongs in words such as 'day' and 'know'. 'Doth' and 'should' are both given a long [u:]; the 'l' is pronounced in 'should' (probably out of date in Shakespeare's day), and the same conservative long vowel is used in 'good'. The latter was also used by Daniel Jones. In my study, I have used elements of Blandford's transcription, together with Jones's as inspiration for a conservative style of speech.

Evidence of OP in Shorthand Manuals

One unusual but useful source of information on Early Modern English pronunciation is the work of early shorthand writers. W Matthew's *English Pronunciation and Shorthand* (1943) presents a useful assessment of the shorthand used by EME writers, which sheds some light on the pronunciations used in the period. His premise is that shorthand constitutes a form of phonetic script and, therefore, the shorthand used by writers in the past should give an indication of their style of pronunciation. Matthews observes that, on account of the arbitrary

treatment of vowels in shorthand, this sort of analysis has much greater benefit with regard to consonants. Indeed his account of the shorthand writers' treatment of consonants is revealing. A case in point is the syncopation of medial 'v', which apparently could occur in words such as 'river', 'marvel' and 'silver' as well as in the commoner ones such as 'evil', 'devil' and 'heaven'. This work lends weight to many of pronunciations favoured by writers on OP who point to syncopated pronunciations such as [i:l] (evil) and [di:l] (devil), a technique which I used extensively in my transcriptions and workshops. Very clear examples are given for the use of medial 't', rather than 'th' in 'apothecary', 'authority' and 'nothing' and the use of the alternative 'd' in 'farthing' and 'fathom' (Matthews, W, 1943, 187).

Daniel Jones

In his *The Pronunciation of English* (Jones, D, 1909, rev. 1956), a seminal work on the English language, Daniel Jones presents a series of phonetic transcriptions, which includes a speech from *Julius Caesar* in Elizabethan pronunciation. Significantly, Jones thoroughly revised his ideas regarding some of the pronunciations following the publication of Dobson and Kökeritz's books (discussed below), where he was the subject of some criticism. The transcription of Julius Caesar's speech in the fourth edition of 1956 is significantly updated as a result. This revision is taken to be

Jones's preferred style of transcription. Ultimately, it would become apparent that perhaps Kökeritz had been too hasty in his assumptions, in some cases bending the evidence to fit his theory, and some of the criticisms of Jones may have been without foundation, or simply a difference of opinion.

The best account of the criticisms levelled by Kökeritz and Dobson may be discovered in Jones's own words in his preface to the revised edition of *The Pronunciation of English* (1956). In a remarkable change of heart, Jones admits to several misjudgments in his earlier transcriptions. The sounds in question are common ones, occurring frequently in Shakespeare's works and Jones sought advice from AC Gimson and R Quirke before redrafting his transcriptions. He states, "I have made several rectifications in the Shakespeare text in accordance with Kökeritz's findings" (Jones 1909, preface). He goes on to accept that the archaic diphthongs in 'day' and 'know' had coalesced with the monophthongs in 'make' and 'bone'. He adds an important caveat, however, that "the coalescence might have been in favour of the diphthongs" (Jones, 1909). In parenthesis he adds that this might explain the PDE diphthongs in these words. Jones then explains that he has followed Kökeritz in transcribing 'you' and 'funeral' with an advanced ju:, rather than the falling diphthong iu. Again, there is a caveat, that iu may have been preserved in words where it follows 'r' such as 'Brutus' and

'brutish'. Jones concludes the section by stating that he cannot agree with Kökeritz's assumption that words such as 'speak' and 'meat' were pronounced with the same vowel as 'take' and 'make'. He announces that he is "adhering to my previous mode of rendering such words with e: in speak, etc. and ε: in make, etc." (Jones, D, 1909). Kökeritz is now thought to have been mistaken in his assumption that Shakespearean pronunciation was very like today's. In the light of this, Jones's early transcriptions may well still have some currency.

Other transcriptions by Jones of extracts from *The Tempest* and *Twelfth Night* are printed in *Selected Works, Volume 7* (Jones, D, 2003). These were the versions used by Jones in early public performances in 1909 and, therefore, do not reflect his later phonological re-thinking. However, they are useful in that comparisons between early and late transcriptions show the development in the approach to the interpretation of OP throughout the twentieth century.

It is sometimes beneficial to consult the writings of more than one phonologist side by side in order to see the full picture. For example, I studied the works by the two phonologists H. Kökeritz and E.J. Dobson together in order to obtain a balanced view of the different approaches made to EME language study in the middle of the twentieth century. There is much agreement between the two but some differences of

interpretation of vowel quality, which can have a significant effect on the transcription process.

H. Kökeritz

Kökeritz begins his analysis of OP with the somewhat mistaken premise that Elizabethan English pronunciation was very close to modern English. From this starting point he tends to bend the evidence to suit his own aims. In this respect he has been heavily criticised by later writers such as Cercignani (discussed below). I have, therefore, chosen to follow Kökeritz with caution in some respects. In his work, *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* (1953), Kökeritz discusses the evidence for reconstructing Shakespeare's pronunciation, including orthoepistic, orthographic, rhyme and metrical evidence. He explains in great detail the phonology of the language of Shakespeare's day and lists a great number of puns and examples of word-play, some of which are newly discovered. A very useful rhyme index is included as well as a short list of common syncopations and a section on accentuation. There are invaluable observations in chapters on weak forms and stress, elements overlooked by some earlier writers. Phonetic transcriptions of excerpts from Shakespeare serve to illustrate Kökeritz's transcription policies. As he was of the opinion that EME (Early Modern English) was very much like PDE (Present Day English) and his transcription policy reflects this belief, the style is quite informal, with an

abundance of letter droppings and weak forms. Some of the vowel sounds are kept deliberately close to their PDE equivalents, such as the 'a' in 'call' and 'all' (transcribed as [ɔ:]) and the 'o' in 'work' (given as [ɜ:]). Kökeritz's theories may have been formulated as a reaction to Daniel Jones's well-articulated, and in some respects over-conservative, version of OP and in some ways veer too far in the opposite direction. A companion volume, *Shakespeare's Names, A Pronouncing Dictionary* (1959), serves as a useful reference when transcribing names in Shakespeare's plays. Kökeritz gives the 'modern' (1959) and, where different, Elizabethan pronunciations.

E.J. Dobson

EJ Dobson expresses an alternative view in his *English Pronunciation 1500–1700* (1957), which provides the reader with a most comprehensive analysis of EME pronunciation. I have drawn heavily on the ideas of Dobson in my own transcriptions, tempered with the suggestions of other authors, such as Crystal and Barber. *Volume 1* discusses the spelling reformers, orthoepists and phoneticians as well as assessing various homophone lists and rhyming dictionaries. *Volume 2* represents a rigorous phonological analysis of all the elements of EME pronunciation. Many of the sounds used in workshops and transcriptions for this project are based on the theories of Dobson. Of particular interest to anyone

studying the use of OP in the theatre are chapters on sentence phonetics (strong and weak forms), shortening, stress, syncope and the development of glide vowels, all of which may profoundly affect metre and rhyme. Dobson includes extensive footnotes, linking his own research with that of previous phonologists. His arguments for the vowel and consonant sounds he proposes are thoroughly convincing and supported by a wealth of examples from the literature. Read in conjunction with Kökeritz, very few stones are left unturned in these rigorous analyses.

A.C. Gimson

In his technical manual *An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English* (1962), AC Gimson includes a very useful chapter on the historical background and a paragraph on 'redundancy' which explains our ability to interpret a variety of accents. This section proved useful in the preparation of workshop material for this project. He discusses the theory of language reconstruction and the sources from which evidence might be uncovered and lists the various phonemes found in the early Modern English sound system. Elizabethan English is illustrated by a short transcription from *Macbeth*, which gives a clear indication of a style reminiscent of Daniel Jones. This demonstrates very few weak forms, some long vowels where later writers use short ones, such as in 'look',

and the use of a diphthong in words such as 'way'. Further discussion of the different interpretations of OP is found in Appendix 1.

Charles Barber

The student may find a general overview of pronunciation presented in Barber's *Early Modern English* (1976), which is very useful in putting the theories of Kökeritz and Dobson into perspective. Included is some very useful discussion of EME morphology and syntax as well as a summary of the main features of the pronunciation. Elements of the transcription policy adopted for this project follow Barber, such as his description of the EME development of ME 'au' and certain other aspects such as the merger of 'ir' and 'er' but independence of 'ur' in the educated English of Shakespeare's day. In a useful chapter titled *Changes of Meaning*, Barber discusses the way the meanings of words can change over time. He cites examples such as 'brave', which in EME could mean 'courageous' but also 'excellent' and even 'finely dressed'. This book presents an overview of the various aspects of EME, rather than detailed references, and is not specifically aimed at Shakespearean pronunciation. As such it is valuable for putting the various elements of the language into a broad perspective.

F Cercignani

The most rigorous study to date of Shakespearean pronunciation, which puts into perspective all the previous work on the subject, is F Cercignani's *Shakespeare's Works and Elizabethan Pronunciation* (1981). In this work, he devotes some energy to denouncing the theories of other writers, notably Kökeritz. His main criticism of Kökeritz centres on his assumption that English pronunciation in Shakespeare's day was sufficiently advanced to be very similar to today's. Other scholars, such as Dobson, have already disproved this assumption. Indeed, Cercignani endorses much of the work of Dobson and gives prolific examples of standard EME pronunciations and variants, as they occur in Shakespeare's works. I have used Cercignani as a point of reference when other writers were at odds or had little to say on a specific subject. This book is difficult to use for quick reference, owing to the extreme length of sentences listing examples of pronunciations, which makes it a challenge to scan for particular words or usage. The index, however, is very comprehensive. The useful introductory section cites a great deal of linguistic evidence for Shakespearean pronunciation and there are important chapters on accentuation and syllable reduction (syncopation), which afford a direct comparison with Kökeritz's work.

Etymology

In order to determine the Shakespearean pronunciation of some words I have found it is sometimes helpful to look at the etymology of the word. A respected expert in the field of Old English (OE), Stephen Pollington's OE dictionary, *Wordcraft* (1993), is very useful in this respect. This PDE to OE dictionary enables the reader to determine at a glance the exact vowels used in the ancestors of modern words. Pollington focuses on early West Saxon pronunciations. Unfortunately, doublets from the other dialects are generally excluded which means that the sources of some possible EME variants are not evident.

I have used this dictionary when searching for patterns in pronunciation change which are significant in the Elizabethan era. One example is the way words with an 'er' spelling sometimes adopted an 'ar' pronunciation. This is important when identifying rhymes such as 'carve'–'serve' in *Love's Labour's Lost* (IV, 1). This same pronunciation change may be seen in the word 'dark'. 'Deorc' is one of the eight OE manifestations of this word in Pollington's dictionary. This word could still be spelled 'derk' in middle English, which shows the expected pronunciation, with 'er'. The present-day pronunciation and spelling may have come about as a result of the same dialectal influence which gave us 'star' (from OE 'steorra') and 'hart' (from OE 'heorot'). A similar effect may be heard today (despite

the continued 'er' spelling) in the pronunciations of 'sergeant' and 'Derby', which are two of a handful of words still exhibiting the EME trend of pronouncing 'er' as 'ar'. This was once widespread and may be seen frequently in the spellings of the period.

As a further source of etymological information, *The Oxford English Dictionary, 11th Edition* (Soanes, S., Stevenson, A. Ed., 2008) is indispensable. It is valuable in determining the history of words and their dates of adoption or first use. This is particularly important in the case of words where the OP pronunciation can differ according to its origins. For this project, I frequently consulted this dictionary when attempting to pinpoint the pronunciation of words beginning 'qu'. This would generally be pronounced 'qw' in words of OE origin, such as 'quick', but might be pronounced as 'k' in Latin or French borrowings, such as 'banquet'. This results in 'quote' and 'coat' being a homonym, which enabled Shakespeare to use a pun in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (II, 4).⁷²

The grammar, lexis and pronunciation of Old English are explained in Mitchell and Robinson's *A Guide to Old English* (1964). There are also some useful readings and a dictionary of the words used in the given readings. Study of this work provides a good basic grounding in OE pronunciations and grammar, and is particularly helpful if one takes the

⁷² THURIO: And how quote you my folly?
VALENTINE: I quote it in your jerkin.

time to read the OE texts aloud. The prose readings are very much more approachable than the poetry as the vocabulary is easier to understand; the technique of using kennings in the poetry presents more of a challenge to the reader. Many features of OE are still evident in our spellings, such as the now-silent ‘gh’ (formerly ‘h’). I have used this feature in my conservative style of OP. The initial aspiration of ‘h’ (‘hw’) in words like ‘white’ was very much in use in EME and should be a prominent feature of any transcription.

Historical Linguistics

Academic writing relating to the history of pronunciation refers to EME vowels in relation to their ME origins. Furthermore, in philology, symbols relating to the vowel sounds differ from those used in phonetics. For example, the vowels in ‘see’ and ‘sea’, respectively [si:] and [se:], would be described by referring to their history as ME ē ([e:]) and ME ē̄ ([ɛ:]). Both of these vowels were raised in the GVS to their EME values. Similarly the EME sounds [u:] and [o:] would be described as ME ō and ō̄ (the close and open long ME ‘o’). The ME long ‘i’ found in words such as ‘time’ is described as ME ī, which became diphthongised by the time of EME to [əɪ]. For this project, it has been essential to understand the contexts in which these sounds were used in ME in order to determine their places in the EME sound system.

I have found Horobin and Smith's *An Introduction to Middle English* (2002) helpful in establishing this context. It is a well-presented instruction manual covering all aspects of the orthography, grammar and pronunciation of Middle English. The orthographic system is described in detail and phonetic symbols adequately describe the vowel system of ME. An understanding of this vowel system is important when assessing the effects of the GVS on Elizabethan English.⁷³ There are some important observations on language change, such as the change in the pronoun to PDE 'she' from OE 'heo' with its falling diphthong, via 'hjo' with its Norse-influenced rising diphthong and the assimilation of 'hj' to [ʃ]. The PDE 'she' originates in the southern form of the pronoun, the northern form being 'scho'.

A fuller understanding of the pronunciation of middle English and a demonstration of the use of the ME vowels in context may be gained from the phonetic readings transcribed by Kökeritz in *A Guide to Chaucer's Pronunciation* (1978/1995) The transcripts complement very well the readings in the original orthography presented by other writers and allow the reader to reproduce accurately what Kökeritz believes to be the original sounds of ME. A general introduction clearly sets out guidelines on the pronunciation of ME, which relates directly to the theoretical studies of EME.

⁷³ A striking example is the dual pronunciation of the word 'Rome' in Shakespeare's day, to rhyme with both 'doom' and 'home'.

HC Wyld's *A History of Modern Colloquial English* (1920) contains a chapter examining the English language between Henry VIII and James I, which includes many significant observations by Wyld. Importantly, this volume includes some case studies of the features of pronunciation of prominent Elizabethans, as far as may be inferred from their writing. This culminates in a detailed study of the pronunciation of Queen Elizabeth. In this connection, Wyld shows that 'ai' was, in Queen Elizabeth's pronunciation, a monophthong. This is significant for this project as many authors, such as Viator and Blandford, transcribe this sound as a diphthong, which may well have been out of fashion by 1600. Wyld also argues that there was some unrounding of short o, shown by the spelling 'stap' for 'stop' (a trait I have followed in my transcriptions) and that ME long 'e' had already raised to [i:]. Many other examples help to reinforce the reconstruction of an Elizabethan accent.

The Spelling Reformers and Orthoepists

As representative of the Elizabethan spelling reformers, we may look at the work of John Hart, which is full of clues to the contemporary pronunciation. Jespersen's *John Hart's Pronunciation of English* (Jespersen, O. 1907) is a comprehensive account of Hart's theory of pronunciation, including material from his *Orthographie* (1569), his *Methode* (1570) and an autographed manuscript of the *Orthographie*

(1551). It contains Hart's original material, reprinted, together with editorial comment and useful comparisons with the work of Bullokar, Gill and Ellis. Although a little early for the target period of this project, this volume gives an insight into the practice of a writer who was instrumental in formulating an approach to the study of phonetics and spelling. Hart's word-lists are important reference material for anyone transcribing EME as they give many examples of the common pronunciations of the day. Importantly, Hart confirms that the long vowel in 'meet' was already raised to [i:] in this period, a practice I have adopted in transcription except where I wished to represent an archaic sound for the purposes of characterisation. The many variant pronunciations and doublets demonstrated here make this a valuable resource for the researcher when checking for possible rhymes and metrical patterns.

The orthoepistic writings, such as those of E. Coote (1596), W. Bullokar (1580), R. Hodges (1644) and P. Levins (1597) often reveal evidence of unusual pronunciations. Coote includes a dictionary and Hodges groups words into lexical sets of alike pronunciation. Hodges describes the pronunciation (force) of the various letters and throws up some useful variants such as 'devil' with a long [i:]. He also observes that there is a diphthong in 'day' and he makes a distinction between the diphthongs in 'boy' and 'boil', a feature which has been exploited in this project's transcription policy.

This project has made use of a number of primary sources, such as *Henslowe's Diary* (Ed. Greg, W. 1907), *The Diary of Henry Machyn* (Ed. Nichols, J.G. 1968) and *The Letters of Queen Elizabeth and James VI of Scotland* (Bruce, J. 1849), which are invaluable in providing occasional spellings and rhyme evidence. Queen Elizabeth's letters, for example, confirm what the orthoepists have written about fashions in pronunciation and give some insight into what her own pronunciation might have been. This evidence is discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

Elizabethan and Jacobean poetry collections similarly are useful resources, especially when the spelling is unmodernised as original spellings in these collections give important clues about pronunciation. These sources have proved very useful in determining instances of rhyme and metrical usage. For example when I consulted Brydges' *The Poems of Sir Walter Raleigh* (1814) it became evident that Raleigh's pronunciation included usage which may well have become unfashionable in everyday speech but was still common in poetry such as shortened forms of the words 'placed', 'most', waste, pierce and been; and original, stressed forms of 'have' and 'were'. Similar forms occur frequently in Shakespeare's verse.

The Value of Concordance

Concordance programs have been indispensable to this project, such as the online concordance program at www.opensourceshakespeare.org. This program, and others like it, is of enormous value when cross-referencing pronunciations. The database allows a fast search of the entire Shakespeare canon in order to compare instances of a particular word. In this way one can ascertain the number of syllables given to a word or instances of the word in rhymes. I used a concordance program to establish the most commonly used metrical form of the word 'whether'. My searches revealed that the number of instances of a monosyllabic pronunciation [hwɛ:ɹ] more or less balance the disyllabic form [hwɛðɹ]. An investigation into the pronunciation of 'thither' reveals that the word is rhymed with both 'together' and 'whether'. Both the latter words could be pronounced with an 'i' vowel and were sometimes spelled so.

The above review exposes the variations possible in the interpretation of the linguistic situation prevailing in Shakespeare's England. It would be surprising if this variation were not present, given the external pressures on the London accent caused by immigration, fashion, education and the latter stages of the GVS. Such variation should be seen as an asset when assessing the options for OP performance as the richness of the language

may be exploited for dramatic effect. However, the great number of possible linguistic nuances creates a need for a consistent transcription policy which covers the needs of the production. A possible policy is discussed in the following chapter.

Evidence in Contemporary Spellings for Elizabethan Pronunciation

In order to discover how occasional spellings might inform our understanding of the Elizabethan literature one might study the letters of Queen Elizabeth I and the contents of Henslowe's Diaries and compare the findings with Shakespeare's usage.⁷⁴

Occasional spellings may betray the actual pronunciation of the writer. However, such evidence should be treated with care. The evidence needs to be examined in the context of the normal pronunciation of the author concerned. An author such as Shakespeare, for example, may spell a word such as 'could' as 'coold'. This does not signify [u:] in this case but [ʊ]. Shakespeare uses this spelling to differentiate this vowel from the short 'o' in a word such as 'cold', which to him was written 'ou'. A similar spelling may be found in Queen Elizabeth's letters to King James

⁷⁴ The printed sources consulted here were largely transcribed from Henslowe's and the Queen's own hands (using their own spellings). Sources are: Bruce, J. (1849), Greg, W. (1904 and 1907). The choice of Queen Elizabeth and Henslowe allows for possible class variations in pronunciation.

VI of Scotland, where, in a letter dated April 1585, she spells 'would' 'woold'. Similarly, the digraph 'ea', as well as standing for short ě could in one writer represent a vowel raised to [i:] and in another a conservative [e:].

Elizabeth's letters to King James VI of Scotland (Bruce, J. 1849) show strong evidence of her use of the variant pronunciation of 'er' as 'ar' in 'servant'. From the Fourteenth Century, Middle English (ME) ě before r had a tendency to become ǣ in certain types of speech. This change began in the North and by the fifteenth century was spreading southwards. The original ě was retained in some words as a variant in certain types of speech. In a letter to King James dated October 1582 Elizabeth used the conservative spelling 'servaunt', a form which can also be seen in a letter written in May 1584. The 'au' simply represents short 'a' before 'n'. However, in September 1592 we find the spelling 'sarvant' which is repeated in a letter to James in 1601. The evidence for this type of pronunciation is strengthened by the spellings 'desarve' and 'desart' (in a letter of June or July 1585), 'sarved' and 'desart' (March 1585) and 'swarve' (February 1586). An entry in Philip Henslowe's diary (Greg 1904) in November 1595 reads thus: "consaning a bargen of the beargarden." This unusual spelling of 'concerning' may betray his [a] pronunciation [cənsʌrɪn(g)]; the 'r' may have been very weak or not sounded. This may also be seen in the spelling of 'purgery' in the

following entry from 5th May, 1593: “for drawinge my bell in the stare chamb(er) a genste cowcheman & kedder & phillipes vpon pargery.”

Another trait of Elizabeth’s speech is the raising of short ‘ĕ’ to ‘ī’, a frequent pronunciation in certain words in her day in polite speech. This was often found in words where the ‘ĕ’ vowel followed a particular consonant such as ‘y’, ‘g’ and ‘r’, whose phonetic shape was more easily followed by a higher vowel. Most commonly this was found in ‘yet’ [jɪt], ‘yes’ [jɪs] and ‘yesterday’ [jɪstəjdæ:]. This raising in Elizabeth’s speech is evident in ‘together’ (January 1585–6 and May 1586; this also occurs twice in Henlowe’s Papers), ‘frindeship’ (February 1584–5, March 1585–6), ‘frind’ (October 1586, May 1588, July 1588) (once in Henlowe’s papers), and a lengthened form is implied in ‘freends’ (April 1586). There is also evidence of this raising in ‘whither,’ which is used interchangeably with ‘whether’ (January 1586–7, June 1596, July 1596). In Shakespeare this raised vowel can be found in a number of rhymes such as ‘amiss’–‘redress’, ‘pretty’–‘ditty’, ‘together’–‘thither’ and ‘yet’–‘sit’ and in the spellings ‘disperate’ (*Henry V*) and ‘divell’ (‘devil’, a very frequent occurrence).

In Queen Elizabeth’s day there were two possible pronunciations for words with ea such as sea. The regular pronunciation [e:] began to be ousted by a variant [i:] (our modern pronunciation) which may have

originated in East Anglian dialects and exerted an influence on London English. Thus, in Elizabeth's day the word *meat* could be pronounced either [me:t] or [mi:t]. The only PDE words which preserve the older pronunciation are 'great', 'steak', 'break', 'drain' (originally 'drear') and 'yea'.

Elizabeth's pronunciation of *ea* as in *sea* was undoubtedly a conservative [e:] rather than the advanced [i:]. Her use of the digraph *ea* in words like *sincere* is ambiguous in terms of pronunciation as in some writers this could represent the advanced pronunciation [i:]. However proof can be seen in her spelling the word '*reason*' as '*rayson*' (August 1585). Shakespeare uses this form when he puns on '*reason*' and '*raison*' in *Henry IV, Part 1*.

The fact that Elizabeth spells 'sake' as 'seake', where [ɛ:] is represented by the digraph 'ea' suggests that elsewhere the same digraph may be used to show the slightly closer vowel [e:] in 'receaved' (January 1584–5), 'receaved' and 'perceave' (January or February 1584 or 5), 'beleaved' (June or July 1585), and 'conceave' (April 1586). Weight is given to this assumption by the appearance of the spelling 'weare' for 'were', representing the old, stressed form [wɛ:ɹ].

The words 'either' and 'neither', which even today have two alternative pronunciations, could be given a short vowel ([ɪ] or [ĕ]) or a diphthong ([əɪ]) in Elizabethan speech. Elizabeth's spellings 'ether' (October 1582, March 1585, May 1586) and 'nether' (March 1585, May 1586) signify a short vowel in both words. A similar shortening of the vowel can be found in the spellings 'lest' ('least') (May 1586), 'bin' ('been') (May 1586), 'ben' ('been') (April 1586), 'yeld' ('yield') (October 1582), 'yelded' ('yielded') (November 1585), 'yelding' ('yielding') (March 1585), and possibly in 'profe' ([prɪf]) (May 1586), 'hast' ('haste') (November 1585) and 'erles' ('earls') (January or February 1584–5), all these being well attested elsewhere in Elizabethan writing.

Evidence of the nature of the Elizabethan short 'ă' may be found in Elizabeth's letters in occasional spellings such as 'rencq' for 'rank' (June or July 1585), 'ecept' for 'accept' (1590) and 'embassador' for 'ambassador' (September 1589). This attests to the probable fronting and raising of the letter 'ă' which may well have been pronounced [æ] in some types of speech, rather like the 'a' in 'hat' or 'cat' in 1950s RP. This possible similarity between the reflexes of Middle English (ME) 'ă' and 'ĕ' may account for some otherwise unexplained rhymes in Shakespeare such as 'back'–'neck', 'man'–'again', and 'matter'–'letter' as well as the pun on 'marry' and 'merry' in Henry VI, Part 2. In his diary, Henslowe writes the name 'Elexander', which seems to show the same

fronted vowel: “R at elexsander & ladwicke the 14 of Janewarye the fyrst tyme yt wasse playde 1597 in pte.” Henslowe also uses the spelling ‘Jenewary’ for ‘January’ (alongside ‘Janewary’, Greg 1904, 68).

In Shakespeare, some words which normally took the short ě vowel had an ă variant. This may be seen in Shakespeare’s spellings ‘malancholy’ and ‘wrastler’. Queen Elizabeth was probably influenced by this usage, as can be seen in her use of ‘whan’ (when) (August 1585, November 1585, May 1586, October 1585) and ‘then’ (than) (October 1582, November 1592, April 1601), a variant which may also be found in Henslowe’s papers.

Elizabeth’s treatment of the ‘tion’ suffix hints at a possible tendency to give this two syllables. This pronunciation is very common in poetry of the period, is very significant with regard to Shakespeare’s verse, and may possibly be signified by the following spellings in Elizabeth’s letters: ‘expectaçon’, ‘examinaçon’, ‘convençon’. ‘construccions’, ‘execuçon’ (October 1582) ‘persuacion’, ‘expectacion’ (July 1586) and ‘persuacion’ (June 1594). One also finds this usage in Henslowe’s diary in adycyons (additions) and ‘consideracon’. The spelling ‘oraions’ for ‘orations’ (1590) may imply a similar pronunciation. Elizabeth’s spelling of ‘conspiracy’, ‘conspiratie’ (1590 and January 1586–7), is an inverted

spelling (possibly showing the ending [səɪ]) which may give a clue to her normal treatment of 'tion'.

There is an implication in the spellings 'tortur' ('torture') and 'treasor' ('treasure') that Elizabeth used a weak second syllable in these types of words, [to:ɹtəɹ] and [trɛzəɹ], which did not use the PDE [tʃ] and [ʒ].

It is well attested that the word 'murder' was often given a dental fricative in Elizabethan pronunciation. This can be seen in Elizabeth's spellings 'murtherar' (January or February 1584-5), 'murther' (January 1585-6, April 1586) and the inverted spelling 'furdar' ('further') (January 1585-6), which seems to imply that in her orthography the 'd' can stand for 'th'.

ME 'ě' occurs occasionally in words which normally have PDE 'y'. This can be seen in Elizabeth's use of 'sence' for 'since' (in a letter of October 1586), 'geven' for 'given' (May 1584 and an undated letter) and 'geve' for 'give' (August 1585, April 1586), which could alternatively indicate a long [i:] vowel here. Henslowe, in his diary, shows similar variation between 'ă' and 'ě' in 'bell' for 'bill', 'henges' for 'hinges'.

As early as the fifteenth century there is evidence that initial 'h' was dropped, especially in Germanic enfranchised words, even when stressed. The tendency was commonplace in unstressed words,

especially personal pronouns such as 'his' and 'hers'. In tandem with this feature is found the tendency to insert an excrescent 'h' before a vowel at the beginning of a word. The dropped 'h' is evidenced in the orthography, just as it is today, when 'an' is used for the indefinite article as in 'an hotel'. Queen Elizabeth uses this in "such an horrible fact" (April 1586). The excrescent 'h' is common in Elizabeth's letters on the word 'it'. This is, in fact, an historical form, originating in the OE 'hit'. It is, indeed, her normal practice to write 'hit', as in this phrase from a letter to King James, dated October 1586: "I protest hit before God". Henslowe, in his diary, sometimes uses 'his' for 'is'. A significant slip of the pen in a letter of July 1588 sees Elizabeth use the very 'Cockney' spelling 'leaful' for 'lethal'.

While this evidence is not conclusive on its own, it may be examined together with other forms of evidence to determine the most likely pronunciations of the period.

Chapter 5

5.1 Transcription Policy

The preparation of a transcription in original pronunciation brings with it certain problems. I have dealt with the most obvious one, the choice of orthography to represent the phonetic sounds, in Chapter 6. There is also the question of what gives the transcription its authority. This question may be answered in three ways.

Firstly, we have the evidence of the orthoepists, those whose interest was in writing about the mechanics of their own pronunciation. This is problematic. There was no standard pronunciation in Shakespeare's day and there is known to have been marked variation between the regions. Even today, regional dialects share a phonological system but there can be distinct differences in the detail of the pronunciation. Does the transcriber, therefore, choose one particular pronunciation over another or try to find common ground between them? Where there are marked differences in pronunciation, I have chosen to favour the writings of those orthoepists from the south of England, such as Charles Butler, whose pronunciation would have been near to that found in London, and those, such as Alexander Gil, who had lived for a considerable time in the capital before publishing.

But what about Shakespeare's own pronunciation? At least in his younger years he would have been influenced by the Warwickshire accent, even if he felt obliged to conform to the London regional form of speech later in life (as well as to the hyper-correctness of the grammar school pedagogues). Evidence of Shakespeare's pronunciation is embodied in the texts in the form of word-play, rhymes and rhythm, which may shed some light on his vowel sounds and syllable patterns. These, also, are open to interpretation, but when usage is compared over a range of texts and is viewed in conjunction with the orthoepists' comments, certain patterns begin to emerge, such as frequent examples of the vacillation between different vowel sounds on the word 'fear'. This project is concerned not solely with Shakespeare's own pronunciation but with that of the London stage in his era.

Possibly least helpful to the transcriber, there is evidence embedded in the occasional spelling peculiarities of contemporary writers. Stephen Orgel reminds his reader that it is a mistake to assume that "the authority of a text derives from the author." He states that "in the case of dramatic texts it is almost never true" (Orgel, S. 2002, 2). I would argue that, in terms of what we can discover about pronunciation, it is not relevant whether the spelling derives from the author or a scribe. The authority it carries with it is of the age. A

scribe may reveal through a spelling pronunciation the pronunciation of the day, however incorrect the actual spelling might be.

The authority of the transcription, then, derives from the combination of these sources as interpreted by the transcriber. Although not infallible, it may be as much as eighty percent accurate, in the view of David Crystal (2005, 20). Crystal points out that we cannot be certain now whether Shakespeare heard something as a full rhyme or perhaps a half-rhyme (2005, 52). As transcriber, I have chosen to place more weight on the evidence of Shakespearean texts than on the orthoepists or any vagaries of contemporary spelling.

This transcription policy guides the reader through the main features of the vowel and consonant systems of Shakespeare's English, looking at unusual features of the language, such as syllable expansion and reduction, unfamiliar stress patterns and some variant pronunciations, often caused by lengthening, shortening, restressing or secondary stress. Examples are given from Shakespeare's plays and poems in order to clarify the explanations and footnotes guide the reader to further examples, presented in the workshop material. I will show in this guide that it is perfectly

possible to rationalise the possibilities into a workable set of norms which may be applied universally to Shakespearean texts.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide directors and actors with a transcription policy which takes account of the possible language variations of Shakespearean English and puts forward a standard of transcription which is appropriate to the modern stage, accessible to actors and intelligible to today's audiences. In order to achieve this, there may be circumstances where I have made compromises, such as one pronunciation being preferred over another for the sake of audience-readability or actor-friendliness.

The overriding objective when transcribing is to keep the script actor-friendly. This immediately poses a problem: how does one accurately represent the pronunciation of the spoken word orthographically without using overcomplicated phonetic symbols? A precedent was set by David Crystal, who presents his text in a part broad-phonetic transcript. This has several advantages over a full phonetic script. The actor is able to see at a glance where the common ground is with PDE pronunciation and is able to focus on the differences. There seems little point in asking actors to interpret phonetics where the pronunciation is identical to today's. In this type of transcript there is scope for variation in the actor's accent, provided it is kept within the parameters of OP as defined by the phonetic

symbols. Although the transcript might look strange to the actor at first sight, reading it will become fluent as soon as a small number of phonetic symbols is mastered, as well as a few rules of interpretation. These mainly relate to secondary stress and the pronunciation of words under weak stress.

The disadvantage of using a part-phonetic transcription in this way is that a common base accent is used as a point of departure. This project has taken the base accent to be RP, but productions in America have used transcriptions designed for the local accent. Any deviation from this base accent is notated phonetically and anything which conforms to the standard is left unaltered. It follows then that an American company would not be able to use a transcription prepared for a British production unless the actors were skilled enough to use British RP as their base accent, which may sometimes be the case. The only alternatives are to make a complete phonetic transcription, which would be less actor-friendly and more labour-intensive for the performers, or to train the cast to the level at which they are able to work from a regular script (perhaps with some footnotes), which is infinitely preferable, and achievable, given enough workshop and rehearsal time.

Transcriptions made for this project follow Paul Meier's example (in his student production of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in 2011) of

highlighting in red the parts of words where the pronunciation is unlike the base accent, which in Meier's case was a Mid-West USA accent. This immediately draws the actor's eye to the parts of the text which require interpretation. My chosen font is Lucida Sans Unicode; a Unicode font is necessary for the typing of phonetic symbols.

The number of phonetic symbols I have used is really quite small and some of these are only used rarely. The symbol 'ʊ', for example, which represents the short 'u' in 'pull' is only used in two situations: as the second element in the falling diphthong 'əʊ', which is heard in words like 'house' and 'our', and in certain words which now have a long 'ɜ:' such as 'work' and 'world'. The transcriptions follow the standard practice in phonetics of representing the long vowel with a colon. Where a colon follows in the punctuation, a space is left after the length mark. 'ɛ' is only used to show the vowel in 'er' words such as 'Derby', where the 'ar' sound was used in EME (also 'mercy', 'serve', 'heart' and 'heard'). 'ɑ' is used as a short vowel in only two words, 'was' (or 'wast') and 'what' ('hwat') which were, in this period, showing signs of lip-rounding but had not yet reached 'o' (ɒ). The 'ɣ' symbol is only used to represent the short 'u' in words like 'love' and represents a more central, slightly darker and less rounded vowel which in Shakespeare's day was on the move between 'ʊ' and 'ʌ'. The use of 'ɹ' is designed to prompt a rhotic 'r' in positions in a word where it is unfamiliar to most British speakers, that is post-vocalic

and word-final positions. ‘ɔ:’ represents the long vowel found in words like ‘all’ and is another sound which is rather like a GA vowel.

The following three symbols are the most common: ‘əɪ’ shows the falling diphthong found in words like ‘eye’ and ‘fire’, with a neutral first element; ε: represents the open ‘e’ heard in ‘face’, ‘fair’ and ‘name’; ‘e:’ is the closer ‘e’ heard often in ‘ea’ words and in ‘ee’ words in conservative OP.

Some symbols are used to steer the actor away from PDE pronunciations. For example, ‘i:’, ‘o:’ and ‘u:’ all represent pure vowels and serve to remind the actor not to diphthongise the long vowels as we do in PDE. Likewise, the breve over ‘ă’ is a reminder to keep a short ‘a’ vowel before ‘r’ (and not to use the long ‘a’ found in PDE ‘father’), and ‘ö’ represents the un-rounded General American ‘o’ in ‘hot’.

The philology of the reconstruction of EME in this transcription policy has been well documented by phoneticians such as Daniel Jones (1909), Helge Kokeritz (1953), E.J. Dobson (1957), A.C. Gimson (1962), Fausto Cercignani (1981), Charles Barber (1997), Terttu Nevalainen (2006) and David Crystal (2005). Provided that there are two points of reference, the changes undergone by a language between these two points may be hypothesised. As our two points of reference, we have present day

English (PDE) and Old English (OE), or to be precise, Late West Saxon, which is the best orthographically represented of the four OE dialects. Although Late West Saxon (900–1100) is historically remote from our time, we can be fairly sure of the pronunciation by studying the orthography. The Latin alphabet had recently become accepted as a replacement for the runes and the pronunciation of the Latin letters was standard. In addition to the analysis of phonological developments we have the benefit of the writings of spelling reformers, orthoepists and grammarians of the period in question; this has been covered in Chapter 4. We also have internal evidence in the rhymes, puns and metre of the texts.

What follows is an outline of the transcription policy I devised for this project's OP workshops. The choices are inevitably influenced by the sentence phonetics (or the context) and in numerous cases variant pronunciations are adopted in the transcriptions which are appropriate to the context in respect of metre, rhyme, assonance or sometimes comedic value. These may affect vowels and consonants, stress patterns and elisions or syncopations. The following song from *As You Like It* (II, 5) illustrates the value of variant pronunciations:

JACQUES

Who doth ambition shun
And loves to live i' the sun
Seekin' the food he eats
And pleased with what he gets,
Come hither, come hither, come hither:
Here shall he see no enemy
But winter and rough weather.

In what is clearly rhyming verse there is an obvious problem with two of the couplets. At first glance 'eats' does not rhyme with gets. However, in *Macbeth* Shakespeare rhymes 'eaten' with 'sweaten' (sweated) and there is known to be vacillation between a long and short vowel in words of this type; therefore, the short vowel [ɛ] should be chosen here. The rhyme between 'hither' and 'weather' is explained by a common lowering of the [ɪ] in 'hither' to [ɛ]. This also creates a sense of unity in the assonance of the four lines. The internal rhyme in the penultimate line dictates the use of [i:] in both 'see' and 'enemy' (the latter might otherwise take a diphthong [əɪ] under secondary stress).

The main choices for the sounds of Shakespearean pronunciation are explained below. In order to guide the reader through the transcription, I have grouped the sounds by type (vowels/consonants, long/short) and

shown a keyword for each subsection in order to identify the precise sound under examination.

Section 1: The Short Vowels

Short ‘a’, as in ‘trap’,⁷⁵ short ‘e’, as in ‘dress’, short ‘o’, as in ‘lot’, short ‘u’, as in ‘strut’, short ‘i’, as in ‘kit’.

- Short ‘a’, as in the words ‘trap’ and ‘master’ (ME ǎ)

As well as in words such as ‘trap’, the short ‘a’ was also found in ‘master’, where a long sound is often found today, and before ‘r’. The [a] in German *Mann* and French *Paris* and *salle*, a low front vowel, has been taken as a model. This is used in the following extract from *As You Like It* (I, 1):

ADAM

Yöndeɹ cymes mɪ mǎsteɹ,⁷⁶ yəɹ brɪtheɹ.

ORLANDO

Go: apǎɪt, Adam, an’ thəʊ shə:t hi:ɹ həʊw ‘e will shɛ:ke mɪ ɹp.

The word ‘shalt’ here does not use the expected phoneme; the treatment of short ‘a’ before ‘l’ is discussed below. The use of a diacritic on the [a] is not a regular phonetic practice; this is adopted here as a reminder to

⁷⁵ The keywords used are taken from Wells, J.C. (1986) and are universally recognised in linguistics as representative of lexical sets.

⁷⁶ The symbol ‘ǎ’ is used to remind actors to give this the short vowel found in German ‘Mann’ or northern English ‘hat’.

actors not to use the long [ɑ:] phoneme, which was not used in this position in EME. The short [a] before 'r' is used on the word apart as lengthening in this position was not yet widespread in this period. This did not occur until about the middle of the seventeenth century with the loss of 'r' and the adoption of the [ɑ:] phoneme.⁷⁷

- Lengthening of 'a' before 'l', as in 'call'

Before a 'back l' as in words like call and tall the vowel developed in late ME to *au*. This followed the same subsequent path of development as the diphthong *au* in 'law', becoming [ɔ:] (or the less rounded [ɑ:]). This transcription policy follows Dobson and Barber and uses the former, although it is very similar to the latter, but with greater lip rounding. In intervocalic position, such as in words like 'dally', 'salary' and 'shallow' the diphthongisation fails and the short [a] is preserved. Before single 'l' followed by a bilabial consonant as in 'always' and 'almost' there is variation between the long and short phonemes [a] and [ɔ:] and short [ɒ] is also possible. The policy is to use [ɒ], except where the verse might suggest a long vowel. This situation is complicated by the existence of weak and strong forms of some words. For example 'shall' had a strong form 'shɔ:ll' as well as a weak form which was restressed to give the PDE form. Before the nasal consonants 'n' and 'm' ME *a* became *au* [ɔ:] in some, but not all, types of speech. This usage can be seen in spelling

⁷⁷ Examples of rhymes with short 'a' may be found in Appendix 1, *An Introduction to Shakespearean Pronunciation*.

trends in Queen Elizabeth's letters to King James of Scotland, (Bruce, J, 1849), where she uses spellings like 'daungerous', 'graunt', 'slaunder and chaumber'. The extract below, part of one of her tortuous sentences, illustrates some noteworthy spellings employed by Queen Elizabeth:

"which manner of proceeding, besides that yt will **faule** out greatlie to the generall satisfaction of the world, in a matter subiect to so many dyverse iudgementes and **construccions**, youe shall also therebie shewe yourselfe not to inclyne to make yourself a partye of any faction within your- owne realme (an inconvenience most **daungerous ether** for yourself or for any other prince to faule into), but to have a care, as prince and soueraigne among your subiects, to minister iustice indifferentlye unto them, and to punishe thos that shal be found to have forgotten themselues in duty towards you." (18 October 1582) (1849, 2)

The successor of ME *au*, that is [ɒ:], is implied by the spelling 'faule' for 'fall' and 'daungerous' for 'dangerous'. Her pronunciation of 'either' appears to be 'ether', just one of the possibilities in her day. The word 'construccions' may imply the pronunciation [kɒnstrʌksɪɒnz] or [kɒnstrʌksjɒnz].

- Lengthening of 'a' before 'm', 'n' and 'r', as in 'chamber', 'angel' and 'art'

A pronunciation of 'a' before 'm' and 'n' with [ɛ:] was present in the seventeenth century. In the transcriptions, [ɛ:] is used for regular OP in words like 'chamber' and 'angel' but [ɒ:] when a more archaic version is

required. Some words such as ‘dance’, ‘grant’ and ‘slander’ had pronunciations with the short [æ] vowel, which is extant in a number of regional accents today. This short variant is used in the regular OP in contrast to the long [ɜ:] in the more conservative version. The PDE [ɑ:] phoneme was not used in this situation until the eighteenth century.

Lengthening of [a] before ‘r’ probably did not occur until the later part of the seventeenth century. The policy is to use the short vowel in words such as ‘apărt’ in the above extract, as well as in ‘Chărlēs’, ‘ărt’, ‘bărn’, ‘ăre’ and ‘hărd’. A similar short ‘a’ vowel is also used in ‘făther’, ‘răther’ and ‘păss’.

- Lip rounding (to ‘o’) of the short ‘a’, as in PDE ‘swan’

The common PDE phenomenon of lip-rounding, producing ‘o’ in words such as ‘swan’, ‘want’, ‘wasp’ and ‘waddle’ and [ɜ:] in ‘war’ did not take hold until the end of the EME period. The possible exception to this is the two words ‘what’ and ‘was’ (also ‘wast’) in which lip rounding first occurred in the early seventeenth century. Robinson (1617) shows rounding in ‘what’, ‘was’ and ‘wast’. These three words are, therefore, transcribed as [hwat] and [was] and [wast], showing an early stage in the process. Other orthoepists, notably Hart (1551), Bullokar (1580) and Hodges (1644) do not show any lip rounding. Short [a] is preserved in other words such as ‘swăn, wăsp’, ‘wăr’ and so on.

Evidence for this lack of lip-rounding may be seen in the following Shakespearean rhymes:

Let the priest in surplice white,
That defunctive music can,
Be the death-divining swan,
Lest the requiem lack his right. (*Phoenix and the Turtle*, line 13)

PUCK

Thou coward, art thou bragging to the stars,
Telling the bushes that thou look'st for wars,
(*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, III,2)

As in PDE, 'l' was sometimes lost after [a] and before a consonant, as in 'walk'. This could occur as early as the fifteenth century in words like walk, talk and shalt, alms,⁷⁸ calf and half, where 'a' is followed by 'l' and a consonant. In many of these words 'l' is still silent today. Alexander Gill (1619, 15) stated that "many learned men pronounced this 'l' in reading and sometimes in speaking". The dialectal pronunciation, without the 'l', was, however, more widespread. These words followed ME *au* [ɔ:]. An example is the word 'shalt' in *As You Like It* (I, 1):

⁷⁸ 'Alms' could also be disyllabic, 'almes' (although this is not found in Shakespeare).

ORLANDO

Go: apǣt, Adam, an' thəʊ shə:t hi:ɹ hæʊw 'e will shɛ:ke mɪ ɹp.

This shows use of the development of the ME 'au' diphthong and loss of 'l' in 'shalt'.

- Short e, as in 'dress' (ME ě)

This vowel is close to the PDE sound and is not normally transcribed. The Orthoepists Robinson (1617) and Cooper (1685, ed. Jones J.D. 1911, 40) equate this with a short ME ā, which makes it [ɛ]. This symbol is used as clarification, for example in unstressed 'thɛ:y', which is shown as 'they'. Occasionally, variants exist with a raised vowel ([ɪ]) so we can find 'divil', 'together', 'yis', 'yisterday', 'yit' and even 'pibble'. As explained below, before 'r' this vowel can become 'a' in words like 'servant', 'Derby' and 'sergeant'.⁷⁹

- Short o, as in 'lot' (and an American form) (ME ǒ)

During the first half of the seventeenth century the short 'o' was gradually being lowered from [ɔ] to [ɒ] and unrounded. In some types of speech the unrounding is quite pronounced and the orthoepist Cooper (1685 ed. Jones 1911, 40) goes so far as to equate this with German 'a' in Mann. The spellings 'Gad' for 'God' and 'strap' for 'strop' attest to the severity of this. It was certainly used in London speech. This transcription

⁷⁹ Examples of 'e' raised to 'i' may be found in Appendix 1, *An Introduction to Shakespearean Pronunciation*.

policy does not transcribe ‘o’ as ‘a’ (or [a]) but marks short ‘o’ with a diacritic (ǒ) as a reminder to actors to give the vowel the quality of the ‘o’ in General American (GA) ‘top’. The following rhyme supports this usage (*A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, II, 1):

PUCK

In very likeness of a roasted crab,
And when she drinks, against her lips I bob

Sometimes one finds ŭ variants, originating in OE, such as ‘front’ and ‘stomach’. There are also some instances of raising to ‘ǔ’ such as ‘among’ and ‘mongrel’. In these cases the vowel has been treated in the same way as the ‘ǔ’ in ‘love’, transcribed as ‘γ’ (see below).

- Short ‘u’, as in ‘strut’ and ‘foot’ (ME ŭ)

In ME short ‘ǔ’ was a high back vowel with pronounced lip-rounding. This can still be heard in PDE where labials have preserved the lip-rounding such as ‘wool’, ‘bull’ and ‘push’. As a general rule, this vowel has become unrounded and lowered to the neutral [ʌ] sound. During the EME period this process of lowering and unrounding was taking place but evidence first appears around 1640 in the later orthoepists. Earlier writers such as Hart (Hart 1569, cited in Jespersen 1907, 32), Robinson and Butler describe ‘ǔ’ as the short equivalent of ME \bar{o} , which is [ʊ]. This transcription policy follows Gimson (1962) and Crystal (2005) in

assuming that around 1600 the process was not yet complete and ‘ǔ’ is treated as a partially unrounded vowel between [ʊ] and [ʌ], which is shown as [ɣ]. This vowel was not only used in ‘love’ but possibly also in ‘move’ and ‘prove’. In the seventeenth century, we sometimes find identity of ‘ǔ’ with ‘ǒ’; this can be seen in Shakespeare’s rhyming of ‘tongue’ with ‘wrong’ in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (II, 2):

The Fairies Sing:

You spotted snakes with double tongue,
Thorny hedgehogs, be not seen;
Newts and blind-worms, do no wrong,
Come not near our fairy queen.

This ‘o’ pronunciation of ‘tongue’ is by far the commonest usage in Shakespeare, although he does rarely rhyme with ‘ǔ’ words.⁸⁰

- Short ‘i’, as in ‘kit’ (ME ĭ)

This vowel is the same as in PDE and is not, therefore, transcribed. Sometimes a lowering of ‘ĭ’ words can be found which results in ‘hether’ for ‘hither’. This is dialectal but did affect London speech. Henslowe wrote ‘henge’ for ‘hinge’ (Greg, 1904, e.g. 10). Queen Elizabeth, in her letters (Bruce, J, 1849), spelled ‘wishing’ as ‘weshing’ (18 October 1582), ‘given’ as ‘geven’ (18 May 1584), ‘wither’ as ‘whether’ (January 1586–7)

⁸⁰ A further example may be found in Appendix 1, *An Introduction to Shakespearean Pronunciation*.

and 'yielding' as 'yelding' (March 1585). This lowered vowel is transcribed only when necessary to facilitate a rhyme or pun.

- Short 'e', 'i' and 'u' before 'r', ěr, ĭr, ůr, in words such as 'herd', 'bird' and 'nurse'

Around 1600 'ěr' gained identity with 'ĭr' when both vowels became retracted to [ə]. Thus 'bird' and 'herd' were pronounced alike. The vowel, however, was short, as the long vowel [ɜ:] (or [ə:]) (used today) did not arise until after the loss of 'r' (when the 'r' was vocalised to [ə], thus doubling the length of the vowel in 'bird' to [əə] or [ɜ:]). At this time, the vowel in 'ůr' was still rounded (or partially rounded) and a vowel similar to [ʊ] (or possibly [ɣ]) persisted until the latter half of the seventeenth century in words such as 'burn' and 'lurch'. In my transcriptions, therefore, 'ěr' and 'ĭr' are given the value [əɪ] whilst [ʊɪ] is used for 'ůr' when stressed (although this may more properly be pronounced as [ɣɪ]). The exact nature of this vowel is difficult to determine from the evidence but Gimson transcribed 'world' as [wɤrld] (Gimson, 1962).

- 'er' becomes 'ar', as in 'Derby' and 'sergeant'

Due to variation arising in late ME 'er' could often become 'ar' in words such as in 'clerk' and 'Derby'. This usage with 'ar' was common in the seventeenth century and is found frequently in spellings and rhymes of the period. Shakespeare rhymes 'art' with 'convert' and 'part' with 'desert' (spelled 'desart'). Queen Elizabeth used spellings such as

‘desarve’, desart’ and ‘sarved’ (Bruce, J, 1849). This transcription allows for [aɪ] when rhymes or common usage dictate. This is generally shown as [ɛɪ], which denotes a low central vowel, following Crystal (2005). In some of the workshops, ‘ar’ was written as an alternative.

For stones dissolved to water do convert

O, if no harder than a stone thou art, (*Rape of Lucrece* 643–4)⁸¹

- ME ʊ, as in ‘love’

This short vowel was moving from [ʊ] towards [ʌ] in Shakespeare’s day but it is difficult to ascertain how far it had lowered by then. This transcription follows Gimson’s (1962) example by assuming it was approximately [ɪ]. This sound resembles a short, unrounded version of [o:]. I have observed Ben Jonson’s comments in *The English Grammar* (1640) concerning the identical pronunciations of ‘love’ and ‘prove’ as a short, flat vowel. I have used this vowel in ‘move’, which is rhymed with these two words. In the transcription this is shown as [ɪ]. The lengthened variant of ‘love’, [lu:v] is kept as a possibility where rhyme dictates.

⁸¹ Further examples of ‘er’ sounded as ‘ar’ may be found in Appendix 1, 154

Section 2: The Long Vowels

These are present in words such as PDE 'fleece', 'face', 'thought', 'north', 'goat' and 'goose'.

- ME ā, Long 'a', as in 'face', 'faith', 'veil' and 'change' [ɛ:]

In the seventeenth century there were three possible pronunciations of ME long ā. [æ:] was the conservative vowel which became [ɛ:] in the first half of the century, and later [e:]. [ɛ:] is used in the transcriptions, although [æ:] may still have been heard in 1600, particularly amongst the older generation. The ME diphthong *ai* had probably by this time become the monophthong [ɛ:] and achieved identity with ME ā so that 'fame' and 'faith' would contain the same vowel. Before 'm' and n' some of the ME *au* words developed into [ɛ:] and assumed identity with ME ā. These include 'change', 'danger', 'chamber', 'range' and 'ancient'. The [ɒ:] vowel could also still be found in these as a variant so that 'change' may have the same vowel as either 'all' or 'fame'. The former, is used in conservative speech in the transcriptions. This variation caused a number of unusual pronunciations such as 'calf', 'calm' and 'half' with [ɛ:], although it is unlikely that Shakespeare used these. Bullokar (1580) even rhymes 'talk' with 'spake'. This feature gave rise to the modern variant pronunciation of 'Ralph', [rɛ:f] as well as the vowel used in the abbreviation 'ha'penny'.

- ME ē, Long 'e' as in 'Sea' [ē], pronounced like the 'ea' in 'steak'

ME ē is shown as [e:] in the transcriptions as this was the vowel to which it had moved by the early seventeenth century. This is in keeping with the decision to use [ɛ:] for ME a:, which pre-supposes that [ɛ:] for ME ē would have been raised to [e:]. In the conservative form, this vowel is used to represent unraised ME ē. There were already in Shakespeare's day variant pronunciations with [i:], which may have arisen through OE dialectal differences between the Saxon and Anglian regions. The [i:] form was later to become the dominant form as [e:] pronunciations died out in standard English in all but a handful of words, such as 'break' and 'steak' and in some proper nouns, such as 'Deakin' and 'Deaton'. Shakespeare sometimes drew on these [i:] variants when he was looking for rhymes, for example 'cheere' and 'near'.

There is abundant evidence in Shakespeare to support the use of [e:] for ME ē. This pun from *Henry IV Part 1* (IV, 2) serves to illustrate the point:

FALSTAFF

Tut, never fear me, I am as vigilant as a cat, to steale creame.

PRINCE

I think to steal cream indeed, for thy theft hath already made thee butter.

The word-play only works if 'stale' and 'steal' are homophones. The vowel is not identical but it is near enough for the pun to be appreciated

by the audience ([stɛ:l] and [ste:l]). And in *Richard II* (I,3) we find the following word-play:

GAUNT

All places that the eye of heaven visits,
Are to a wise man ports and happy havens.

Here, the word 'heaven' appears in its original long form and is a near-homophone with 'haven'.⁸²

- Variants of 'ea', 'fear' rhymes with both 'bear' and 'deer'

Some words, such as 'dear', 'year' and 'read' had common [i:] variants in Shakespeare's day. The transcription policy favours the pronunciation commonly shown in Shakespeare but in the conservative form the older [e:] forms are used. Some words can vacillate in Shakespeare for the purpose of rhymes. The word 'fear', for example, is rhymed with both [i:] and [e:] words.

- Lengthening of 'ea', 'dead' rhymes with 'made'

The quantity of this [e:] vowel was very unstable and, therefore, in places shortenings are used where the word is now long in PDE and vice-versa. For example, in rhymes, 'feast', 'least' and 'beast' are often short and in

⁸² Further examples of the 'ea' pronunciation may be found in Appendix 1

these lines from *Hamlet* (V,1) a long vowel on 'dead' and 'head' generates a triple rhyme:

LAERTES

Now pile your dust upon the quick and dead

Till of this flat a mountain you have made

T' o'ertop old Pelion or the skyish head

Of blue Olympus.⁸³

In Shakespeare's day there was some variation in the pronunciation of Latin. The unreformed pronunciation used [e:] or [ɛ:] for 'e' but the reformed style used [i:]. PDE tends to show the unreformed version but in Shakespeare's day this would vary. The unreformed version tended to follow the spelling and was more natural for uneducated speakers. The orthoepists were in favour of the reformed Latin.

- ME ē, Long [i:] as in 'Meet'

ME ē had been [i:] since the fifteenth century and so was well established in Shakespeare's day. This pronunciation is the same as PDE.

- Shortening of long 'ee' as in 'sheep'

The words in this group were not so subject to shortening as ME ē words but in the seventeenth century there were short variants of words such as 'yield', 'shield', 'field', 'teeth', 'sleep' and 'sheep'. There are a number of

⁸³ Further examples of vowel lengthening may be found in Appendix 1.

puns using the shortened variants of ‘sleep’ and ‘sheep’. In *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (I,1) we find the following play on words:

SPEED

Twenty to one then he is shipp'd already,
And I have play'd the sheep in losing him.

In *Sonnet 2*, ‘field’ is shortened and is rhymed with ‘held’. The [ɪ] vowel is the most likely one here as Shakespeare rhymes ‘held’ with ‘killed’ and ‘fulfilled’ elsewhere. This raising of ě to ĭ was common and can be found in ‘devil’ and ‘evil’.

- ME au, as in ‘Law’ or [ɒ:]

This sound is represented as [ɒ:]. This monophthong is supported by the orthoepists Robinson (1617), Hodges (1664) and Coles (1674) and is the sound proposed by Dobson (1956), Barber (1997) and Gimson (1962).

In words like ‘dance’ and ‘demand’ where PDE uses [ɑ:] ă is used in the regular OP: in words like ‘chamber’, and ‘range’ [ɛ:] is used. In the conservative form the variant [ɒ:] vowel is used in all these words.

The coalescence of the vowels ‘au’ and ‘ou’ is assumed in ME *au* and *ou* words before [x] (gh) in words like ‘daughter’, ‘sought’, ‘thought’ and ‘bought’ and [ɒ:] has been used in both these cases.

- ME ai or [ɛ:], as in 'fairy'

Hart (1551) and Robinson give this the value [ɛ:] and this has been adopted in this policy (As in Dobson, 1956, 774). There is evidence in Shakespeare of the monophthongisation of 'ai' and identity with ME ā ([ɛ:]). The double meaning of 'tale:tail' in *As You Like It* (II,7) appears to show this identity:

JACQUES

And so, from hour to hour, we ripe and ripe,
 And then, from hour to hour, we rot and rot;
 And thereby hangs a tale.'

Use of a diphthong would have been a conservative pronunciation for the day. The fact that Shakespeare often groups 'ai' words in rhymes may well show his observance of rhyming tradition, rather than a phonological difference.⁸⁴

- ME ō or [u:] as in Moon

This vowel was raised long before Shakespeare's day, probably by 1500, and there is no question that 'moon' would be pronounced with [u:].

There is a possibility of a long vowel where PDE has a short one, such as 'cook' and 'book' and even 'could' and 'should'. Some early practitioners

⁸⁴ The monophthongisation to [ɛ:] may have occurred as a result of the assimilation of the two elements of the diphthong.

of OP in the twentieth century, such as Blandford and Jones, use the long vowel in the latter two words (with a pronounced 'l').

- 'Rome' pronounced as 'room', 'done' rhyming with 'moon'

The well-attested variant of 'Rome', [ru:m] is found in the following pun from *Julius Caesar*, II,1, (Hodges, 1664, Butler, 1634 and Kökeritz, 1959, 141):

CASSIUS

When could they say till now, that talk'd of Rome,

That her wide walls encompass'd but one man?

Now is it **Rome** indeed and **room** enough,

When there is in it but one only man.

This pronunciation may also be used in the adjective 'Roman'.

The word 'done' also has variant pronunciations. The original, lengthened form of the vowel would have been raised in the same way as 'moon' and is rhymed with it in *Hamlet* (III, 2, 171):

GERTRUDE

So many journeys may the sun and moon

Make us again count o'er ere love be done!

In *Venus and Adonis*, Shakespeare uses the PDE pronunciation, which is the product of early shortening and lowering on the pattern of 'love':

And were I not immortal, life were done
Between this heavenly and earthly sun.

(*Venus and Adonis*, 217)

- ME \bar{o} or [o:], as in 'goat' and 'throne'

By Shakespeare's day ME \bar{o} had raised to [o:] and this value is the norm in the transcription. As [o:] and [ɔ:] are allophones of the same phoneme, if actors use the lowered [ɔ:] (rather like PDE in 'nor') before 'r' this is acceptable as it was a pronunciation not far removed from Shakespeare's time and was possibly in use then. Variants were possible which have since died out and may be found in rhymes. For example, before 'r' this vowel could be raised to [u:] in 'sworn' and 'worn'. The transcription policy has also allowed for the fact that there could be raising to [u:] in words like 'throne', 'none', 'ghost' and 'one'. There could also be raising after 'w', which is found in PDE 'womb' and 'who' (OE 'hwo'). In EME this could also occur in words like 'woe'. A different scenario may be seen in woman, which in PDE is raised and shortened. The word 'woman' is rhymed with 'no man' in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (III, 1), although this may be a 'tongue in cheek' exaggerated rhyme:

VALENTINE:

That man that hath a tongue, I say, is no man,
If with his tongue he cannot win a woman.

Section 3: The Diphthongs, as in 'price', 'mouth', 'choice' and 'duty'

The diphthong consists of two vowels, joined by a glide. The stress may be on the first element (a falling diphthong) or the second (rising) as in 'duty'.

- ME ī or [əɪ], such as 'price' and in the final 'y' on 'courtesy'

This diphthong is very common and not dissimilar to the one used in PDE. The first element, however, is the central vowel [ə] (as at the start of 'about') followed by a lax [ɪ] (as in 'kit'). It may be heard in a word like hide [həɪd]. A further use of this diphthong, unfamiliar to speakers of PDE, occurs under secondary stress in final -y. A word such as a remedy will often be given a secondary stress which will be pronounced [əɪ]. This was perhaps the most common source of rhymes in EME poetry and explains many rhymes in Shakespeare such as this, from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (II, 2) :

PUCK

Pretty soul! she durst not lie
Near this lack-love, this kill-courtesy.

However, there is vacillation between [əɪ], [i:] and [ɪ] in endings, depending upon stress, so the context needs to be considered. In prose, and when unstressed in verse, the diphthong is not necessary.

This diphthong is also used for many words which today are pronounced 'oi' such as 'join', 'point' and 'toil'. In Shakespeare's day many words with [əɪ] had variants with 'oi' [ɔɪ]. Eventually the 'oi' pronunciation, and spelling, dominated and ousted the other pronunciation, even though in EME some of the [əɪ] variants were the dominant ones. In Shakespeare's day it is possible that all the words could be pronounced 'oi'. The transcription policy, as far as possible, adheres to the pronunciation which may have been used by Shakespeare and, when he gives no clues in rhyme or pun, the comments of the orthoepists are taken into consideration. The following extracts show the possible use of [əɪ] in 'oi' words:

QUEEN ELIZABETH

Airy succeders of intestate joys,
Poor breathing orators of miseries!

Richard III (IV, 4)

PROLOGUE

From forth the fatall loynes of these two foes,
A paire of starre-crost lovers, take their life.

Romeo and Juliet

Kokeritz (1953, 125) points out that the two words ‘loins’ and ‘lines’ were identical in pronunciation and so there appears to be a play on words in the above extract from *Romeo and Juliet*.

- ME ū or [əʊ], as in ‘mouth’

The other major diphthong is [əʊ], which is used in words like ‘house’ and ‘cow’, formerly ME [u:] words. There were variants in existence, however, some as a result of the failure of the diphthongisation. In the transcriptions, [u:] has been used in ‘your’ (note the difference in PDE between ‘your’ and ‘our’), but [o:] in ‘hour’ and ‘flower’.⁸⁵

- ME eu and iu, as in ‘cure’ and ‘dew’

These two diphthongs (originally distinct) are assumed to have coalesced in Shakespeare’s day and the advanced pronunciation ‘ju’ is used for both, as in ‘dew’ and ‘duty’. ‘ju’ is also used in words like ‘lute’ where PDE generally has a monophthong (from French [y:]). In certain cases where this is difficult to pronounce, such as following ‘r’ it is possible to use the falling diphthong [ɪu] (a possibility admitted by Jones in his preface to the fourth edition of *The Pronunciation of English*, 1956) or to use the monophthong [u:], as today. Working with a base British accent, it

⁸⁵ A diphthong [əʊ] is also possible in ‘hour’ and ‘flower’ and gives two syllables. I have used this in some places for emphasis or where the metre dictates.

is not necessary to transcribe 'ju' except in words where PDE tends to use [u:].

Section 4: Consonants

- Letter dropping, such as initial 'h' and final 'g'

Some of the practices involving pronunciation of the consonants are easily perceived by today's audience. In Shakespeare's day there was no stigma attached to dropping initial 'h', for example, and this was still the custom in most French words, spreading to native words as well, even when stressed. Rather than universally dropping 'h', the transcriptions have used this as a means of characterisation, allowing the possibility for low-born or uneducated characters to drop 'h' in every circumstance and high-born characters only to drop unstressed 'h'. Although this is not necessarily the way the pronunciation would originally have functioned, as even royalty would drop their 'h's, it may be used to exploit the modern audience's sensibilities as a means of defining status through language. This letter-dropping is evident in word-play in *Henry IV, Part I* (I, 2), when Falstaff says: "Yea, and so us'd it, that were it **here** apparent that you are **heir** apparent."

Final 'g' may frequently have been dropped and this is applied as a general rule. There is a possibility, however, that the final 'g' could be articulated, as some Northerners still do, in words like 'sing', and

particularly before a vowel, as in 'singer'. This was common practice in the sixteenth century but probably died out in standard English by the end of the century, although some speakers may still have used this pronunciation into the early seventeenth century. This feature could be used to set apart a particular set of characters, such as the forest-dwellers in *As You Like It*.

- 'Th' pronounced as 't'

Medial 'th' was often pronounced as 't' and the transcription uses this in other positions as well in words where it was known to occur, such as in the word 'Goth'. This pronunciation enables Touchstone to play on the words 'Goth' and 'Goat' in *As You Like It* (III, 3):

I am here with thee and thy goats, as the most
capricious poet, honest Ovid, was among the Goths.

- 'Hw' pronounced as 'hw'

It is well attested that the consonant group 'wh' was still pronounced 'hw' as it had been since Old English, except in 'who', 'whom' and 'whose', where the 'w' had been lost with the raising of 'o'. Accordingly, this pronunciation is used here. Loss of 'w' is also evident in other words such as in PDE 'sword' and 'two' but this effect was more widespread in EME, where such words as 'swore', 'swollen' and 'swoon' were sometimes pronounced without 'w'. Words of French and Latin origin often lost the

‘w’ after ‘q’. This may be seen in the pun on ‘coat’ and ‘quote’ in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* (II, 4), which works if the two words are homonyms:

THURIO

And how quote you my folly?

VALENTINE

I quote it in your jerkin.

- Silent ‘gh’ in ‘light’

‘Gh’ was generally silent, although some older speakers or those from the regions may still have sounded it lightly, perhaps with the original ME short vowel in some cases or even with the new diphthong. As a means of characterisation, the transcription sometimes has low-born characters preserve the sounded ‘gh’ (transcribed gh with underscore rather than less actor-friendly [ç] or [x]) but with a diphthong, in words like ‘light’. There is evidence for this pronunciation and it is possibly more easily understood by the audience than the short vowel.

- The effects of ‘r’

A rhotic ‘r’ is used universally in all situations. This may be strongly sounded in the places where it is still used in British English (in initial position, intervocalically and after a consonant) but may be more weakly sounded between a vowel and consonant and in word-final position. This final ‘r’ had a lowering effect which prevented ME ē from raising in words

like 'bear' and 'there'. These words are given the long vowel [ɛ:] in the transcriptions.

Before 'r', 'o' is lengthened in words like 'horn' and 'corn', following Crystal (2005), even though this may be a slightly advanced pronunciation for the time. Dobson (1957) and Butler's example is followed in not lengthening 'a' before 'r' in words like 'hard' as this feature probably only became common in the later seventeenth century.

- A glide vowel before 'r' and 'l' in 'fire' and 'cold'

During the EME period a glide vowel [ə] developed before 'r' and this can be heard today in words like 'fear' and 'fire' even though the rhotic 'r' is no longer pronounced. In the transcriptions the glide vowel is generally not shown, unless it is given an extra syllable in the metre. The vowel is transcribed, however, when it is shown by the spelling. Compare the words 'fire' and 'briar' in this extract:

PUCK

ə'll follə you, ə'll le:d you abəʊt a rəʊnd,

Through bog, through bush, through brɛ:ke, through brɛiə:l

Sɪmetəɪme a ho:ʊse ə'll be: , sɪmetəɪme a hæʊnd,

As hɔ̃g, a headless bɛ:ɹ, sɪmetəɪme a fɛɪre;

A Midsummer Night's Dream, III, 1

Here, the vowel [ə] is given in 'briar' as it is shown in the spelling; the glide is not given in 'fire'. When stressed, the glide [ə] could become syllabic, thus rendering the word 'fire' as two syllables. This line shows both mono- and disyllabic usage side by side:

BRUTUS

And pity to the general wrong of Rome—

As fire drives out fire, so pity pity— *Julius Caesar*, III,1

A similar glide could occur before 'l', providing an extra syllable. In Shakespeare this is possible on the word 'cold' in the following example:

3RD WATCHMAN

O, is it so? But why commands the king

That his chief foll'wers lodge in towns about him,

While he himself keeps in the cold field?

Henry VI Pt 3, IV,3

Section 5, Stress Patterns and Secondary Stress

Regarding accentuation, where stress patterns occur in verse which appear to be unlike today, the concordance program at *Open Source Shakespeare* (<http://www.opensourceshakespeare.org/concordance> 2003–2011, last accessed 24.06.14) has been used to establish Shakespeare's normal practice. Results have been cross-referenced with Kökeritz's Index of Shakespearean accentuation in *Shakespeare's*

Pronunciation (1953, 392). Unusual stress patterns in the transcriptions are shown by underlining:

HENRY

Upŏn the enrɛ:ged so:ldjəʊs in thəʊ spəɪl

əs send prɪcepts to the levəɪathan *Henry V, III,3*

An important feature in EME, particularly in verse, was the existence of competing stress systems. Secondary stress, which was widely used in the ME period but was dying out during the early seventeenth century, was still very much favoured by poets and was also used in blank verse. In everyday language this was being dispossessed by the more modern single stress-pattern. This feature is particularly important in the respect that on syllables which were formerly affected by secondary stress, the vowel functioned as it did on stressed syllables. This resulted in pronunciations like [ɪndiɛ:] for India and [hɪpɒlɪte:] for Hippolita. In the transcriptions, the secondary stress is most noticeable on certain suffixes. The endings ‘-y’ and ‘ion’ (and ‘ian’) are frequently of importance as the former often results in a diphthong which is not present in PDE and the latter often yields an extra metrical syllable. In this extract from *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (III, 2), secondary stress on the final syllable of ‘archery’, ‘gloriously’ and ‘remedy’ cause diphthongisation and perfect rhymes:

OBERON

Flower of this purple dye,

Hit with Cupid's archery,

Sink in apple of his eye.

When his love he doth espy,

Let her shine as gloriously

As the Venus of the sky.

When thou wakest, if she be by,

Beg of her for remedy.

And in these extracts from *Henry V*, secondary stress realises an extra syllable through the process known as 'resolution' or 'expansion':

CHORUS

O for a Muse of fire, that would ascend

The brightest heaven of invention, (in-ven-si-on) (Prologue)

HENRY V

What is it then to me, if impious war,

Array'd in flames like to the prince of fiends,

Do, with his smirch'd complexion, all fell feats

Enlink'd to waste and desolation? (de-so-la-si-on) (III, 3)

In the above, the extra syllable appears in 'desolation', with its secondary end stress but not in 'complexion'. The word 'impious' is disyllabic with a

stress on the first syllable. The identical stress pattern can be seen in all eight instances of the word in Shakespeare's plays and poems, such as here:

And York and impious Beaufort, that false priest,

Have all limed bushes to betray thy wings,

Henry IV, Part 2, II, 4:

Where the suffix 'ion' is given two syllables it is shown as 'iɔn' when stressed and as 'iən' when unstressed; 'jən' is used when it is given one syllable or in prose.

- Unstressed Vowels

In unstressed syllables, a vowel was commonly either [ə] or [ɪ] and probably generally followed the pattern of PDE. Except where the vowel would have been different from today, it is not transcribed. So, 'remembrance' is unaltered, even though the vowel in the first syllable would be [ɪ] and in the last syllable [ə], as today. In 'todɛ:y' the first vowel would [ə] as in PDE and, therefore, is not transcribed. A similar policy applies to commonly unstressed words such as 'but', 'and', 'of', 'her', 'to' 'as'. Except where letters are dropped, as in 'an' (and)' and 'er' (her), these words are not transcribed, as their weak forms are the same as today. Other weak variants, such as 'mɪ' for 'my', 'jəɪ' for 'your' and 'θɪ' for 'thy' are shown in the transcription.

- Simplification of Consonant Clusters

In Shakespeare's time there was a general tendency to simplify consonant clusters and omit final and initial ones. This practice was fully accepted, even in educated and courtly speech. Occasionally, excrescent consonants were inserted to facilitate articulation, such as an initial 'h' before a word beginning with a vowel. Where consonant groups are simplified by the omission of a consonant this is shown in the transcription by an apostrophe as in 'wrăs'le' (wrestle); this is not necessarily shown where the practice is common in PDE, such as in 'contempt'. Elsewhere, loss of consonants is shown either phonetically, as in [to:ɹd] for 'toward' or by the use of an apostrophe, as in 'tɛ:'ən' for 'taken' and 'han'' for 'hand'.

- Syncopation (Syllable Reduction) in prose and verse

Syncopation (syllable reduction) was far more common than is the case today. In verse, syncopations which are evident in the metre are shown by the use of apostrophes (as in honourable below):

DUKE FREDERICK

ə wʊld θəʊ 'adst bɪn sɪn to sɪme mæn else:

The wʊld esteem'd θɪ fäθəɹ 'ɔ̃n'rabl̩,

As You Like It, I,2

In a passage such as the following, the tri-syllabic word 'perilous' would be replaced with disyllabic 'parlous', the common syncopation with which the actor would be familiar:

HENRY

Suppose within the girdle of these walls

Are now confined two mighty monarchies,

Whose high upreared and abutting fronts

The perilous narrow ocean parts asunder: *Henry V*, III, 3

As it is not possible to cover every contextual eventuality in this outline of the transcription policy, individual instances are justified in the foot-notes or end-notes.

Shakespeare and Variant Pronunciations

During the transcription process, I took into account the numerous variant pronunciations that existed in Shakespeare's time. Some of these originated in the four Old English dialects, where their differing pronunciations gave rise to doublets. These alternative pronunciations are significant as Shakespeare would sometimes draw on them to make a rhyme work or to create a more appropriate metrical effect. There are times in a modern production when a variant pronunciation or a doublet might be chosen even when metre or rhyme do not dictate it, for example

for comic effect. However, it is necessary to bear in mind that the 'readability' of the lines should not be compromised; the audience must be able to understand the lines with no difficulty.

Shakespeare was as versatile in his use of pronunciation as he was colourful in his imagery and inventive in his lexis. He was fortunate to live in an age when the English language was changing rapidly, with the result that older and newer forms of pronunciation were concurrently in common use. London was a melting pot for linguistic diversity, drawing in speakers from various regions with their variant pronunciations. Many words that are current today were adopted into the mainstream language from regional speech or were non-educated variants. This accounts for a lack of logic in some pronunciations. Some examples are given below of the types of variant pronunciations the transcription policy allows for, where appropriate. As well as in rhyming verse, one might sometimes consider variant pronunciations in prose and blank verse, particularly if the choice serves to heighten the comedy or to underline the fastidiousness of a character such as Malvolio.

The spelling of 'ache' is a good example of the way in which an alternative pronunciation might have been intended by the author. In Shakespeare's day the verb was pronounced as today, [ɛ:k]. However, the

noun was pronounced as the spelling might suggest, [ɛ:tʃ], and could be disyllabic in the plural. This usage may be seen in *The Tempest* (I, 2):

PROSPERO:

Fill all thy bones with aches, make thee roar
That beasts shall tremble at thy din.

Shakespeare also puns on the monosyllabic singular form in *Anthony and Cleopatra*:

ANTONY

Thou Bleed'st apace.

SCARUS

I had a wound here that was like a 'T',
But now 'tis made an 'H'. (IV, 7)

By the eighteenth century the pronunciation of the noun had conformed to that of the verb. To the poet looking for rhymes, this lack of stability in pronunciation was a gift.

The modern pronunciation of the words 'were', 'are' and 'have' is not the original one. These are re-stressed versions of an unstressed form. The original pronunciation of these words was [wɛ:ɹ] (occasionally heard in PDE), [ɛ:ɹ] and [hɛ:v]. Shakespeare does not hesitate to use these pronunciations when he needs a rhyme, as the examples show:

Sonnet 13, 5

So should that beauty which you hold in lease
Find no determination: then you **were**
Yourself again after yourself's decease,
When your sweet issue your sweet form should **bear**.

Sonnet 35, 5

All men make faults, and even I in this,
Authorizing thy trespass with **compare**,
Myself corrupting, salving thy amiss,
Excusing thy sins more than thy sins **are**;

Sonnet 81, 4

Your name from hence immortal life shall **have**,
Though I, once gone, to all the world must die:
The earth can yield me but a common **grave**,
When you entombed in men's eyes shall lie.

A variant of 'key' may be found here, where Shakespeare uses the conservative pronunciation [kɛ:]:

So am I as the rich, whose blessed **key**,
Can bring him to his sweet up-locked treasure,
The which he will not every hour **survey**,
For blunting the fine point of seldom pleasure.

Sonnet 52

In *The Merchant of Venice* (II, 7) the same pronunciation is found:

PRINCE OF MORROCO:

Lies all within. Deliver me the **key**:

Here do I choose, and thrive I as I **may**!

When Laertes addresses Ophelia in the following words, he may actually be speaking in rhyme (*Hamlet*, IV,5):

Till our scale turn the beam. O rose of May!

Dear maid, kind sister, sweet Ophelia!

Ophelia may be pronounced [O:fi:lɪɛ:], under the influence of secondary stress, as well as [O:fi:ljə] or [O:fi:lɪə] with a single stress.

In *The Rape of Lucrece* the word 'Rome' is given its variant pronunciation [Ru:m]:

So fares it with this faultful lord of Rome,

Who this accomplishment so hotly chased;

For now against himself he sounds this doom, (line 766)

And:

And never be forgot in mighty Rome

Th' adulterate death of Lucrece and her groom. (line 1695)

Henslowe, in his Diary (Greg 1904), significantly uses an inverted spelling when he writes 'room' as 'rome', which betrays his pronunciation.

The undiphthongised northern [u:] variant of 'ow' or 'ou' may be seen in the expression 'school of night', which is a well-known crux found in *Love's Labour's Lost*, (IV,3):

FERDINAND

O paradox! Black is the badge of hell,

The hue of dungeons and the school of night;

And beauty's crest becomes the heavens well.

This passage makes perfect sense if one reads 'school' as 'scowl', which may have been Shakespeare's intention. Others have interpreted this, rather fancifully, as a reference to Raleigh's atheistic group of thinking men, which included Christopher Marlowe. In some editions the word is amended to 'suit'.

- Vowel Shortening

In Shakespeare's day there was a tendency to shorten long vowels and in many cases both the long and short variants existed side by side. A good example is the word 'love' which is traditionally rhymed with [u:] words.

The commonest pronunciation of 'gone' was with the long vowel and words such as 'dead' and 'breath' could also still take a long vowel. Words that in ME had [o:] had the vowel raised to [u:] in EME. If this vowel was shortened early it followed the path of other words with ME ŭ and eventually became [ʌ], as in PDE 'blood', if shortened late it became [ʊ] as in 'good'. Charles Barber (1997, 123) maintains that there is evidence that in the late seventeenth century all three forms could be found in the word 'foot'.

The following shows a case of shortening on the word 'beast', which may have been Shakespeare's regular pronunciation of the word (*Comedy of Errors*, V, 1):

EMILIA:

In food, in sport and life-preserving rest

To be disturb'd, would mad or man or beast:

A similar shortening is also found in *Venus and Adonis*, lines 1019–1021.

A few lines later, Shakespeare rhymes 'confess' with a shortened 'decease'.

Babe, which has a known short form, is rhymed with 'drab' and 'slab' in *Macbeth* (IV,1):

THIRD WITCH

Finger of birth–strangled babe

Ditch–deliver'd by a drab,

Make the gruel thick and slab:

Bequeath also had a short form, which can be seen in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (III,2):

LYSANDER

And yours of Helena to me bequeath,

Whom I do love and will do till my death.

HELENA

Never did mockers waste more idle breath.

Likewise, 'achieve' could also be short:

Sonnet 67, 1

Ah! wherefore with infection should he live,

And with his presence grace impiety,

That sin by him advantage should achieve

And lace itself with his society?

As could 'greater':

Sonnet 119, 10

O benefit of ill! now I find true
That better is by evil still made better;
And ruin'd love, when it is built anew,
Grows fairer than at first, more strong, far greater.

And 'fiend', which could rhyme with 'friend':

Sonnet 144

And whether that my angel be turn'd fiend
Suspect I may, but not directly tell;
But being both from me, both to each friend,
I guess one angel in another's hell:

'Fiend' is rhymed with 'end' in *The Phoenix and the Turtle* (lines 5–6).

- Vowel Lengthening

In the same way that we find unfamiliar shortenings, we also find lengthening of words which are short in PDE. This extract shows lengthening of 'head;' and 'dead' in *Hamlet* (V, 1):

LAERTES

Now pile your dust upon the quick and dead
Till of this flat a mountain you have made

T' o'ertop old Pelion or the skyish head

Of blue Olympus.

The spelling betrays a long first vowel in 'headland' in this extract from *Henry IV, Part 2*, (V, 1):

DAVY

Marry, sir, thus: those precepts cannot be served; and,
again, sir—shall we sow the hadeland with wheat?⁸⁶

- Raising and Lowering of the Short Vowels 'e' and 'i', as in 'whether'

Some common variants were caused by the raising of [ɛ] to [ɪ] and the reverse lowering. For example, the vowel in 'whether' may be raised and that in 'whither' may be lowered. This is sometimes shown by the spelling and can sometimes be deduced by rhymes. In these lines from *Venus and Adonis*, 'together' and 'whither' are clearly intended to rhyme. There is no way of telling whether the intended vowel is [ɛ] or [ɪ] in this case as Shakespeare uses both vowels in both words but [ɪ] may be the more common option:

Whose frothy mouth, bepainted all with red,
Like milk and blood being mingled both together,
A second fear through all her sinews spread,
Which madly hurries her she knows not whither:

⁸⁶ Further examples of vowel lengthening may found be in Appendix 1.

In *Pericles* (V,1) 'thither' is intended to rhyme with 'together':

My temple stands in Ephesus: hie thee thither,

And do upon mine altar sacrifice.

There, when my maiden priests are met together,

In this case it is likely that 'together' would have the raised vowel, [ɪ], which was common in this word.

- Syllable Structures

Sometimes the syllable structure of a word may not be evident from our PDE usage. For example, in *Titus Andronicus* (I,1), Shakespeare appears to show the etymology of the word 'brethren' by giving it an extra syllable:

Make way to lay them by their brethren.

'Film' also could be given two syllables, the second one being a syllabic 'm'. This is a result of the development of a glide vowel, [ə] between final 'l' and 'm'. This could occur in 'elm' and even words like 'shelf'. This disyllabic variant is possibly shown by the spelling 'philome' in *Romeo and Juliet* (I, 4):

MERCUTIO

Her whip of cricket's bone, the lash of 'philome',

Her wagoner a small grey-coated gnat,

Henslowe, in his diary (Greg 1904), shows a similar trait in his spelling of 'monethe' and 'hundered' which seem to imply two and three syllables.

In *Coriolanus*, the same trend may be at work in this passage:

VALERIA

In troth, there's wondrous things spoke of him.

Here, 'wondrous' shows its etymology, from fifteenth century 'wonders' (now obsolete) by the addition of a third syllable.

The opposite effect, that of a reduction in syllables in the environment of a PDE syllabic 'n' or 'm', a form of syncope, can be seen in Shakespeare and others in mono-syllabic words like 'stol'n' and 'fall'n' (shown in some editions in the spelling but otherwise evident from the scansion).

PUCK

Because that she as her attendant hath

A lovely boy, stolen from an Indian king;

A Midsummer Night's Dream, II,1

WIDOW

Though my estate be fallen, I was well born,

Nothing acquainted with these businesses;

All's Well That Ends Well, III, 7

It is essential that any transcription policy be adaptable to every linguistic situation. However, it cannot realistically present every possible scenario and will inevitably sometimes generalise. This policy includes the main linguistic features which the actor will encounter when reconstructing Shakespeare's pronunciation. It is hoped that the examples will enable the actor to apply the principles set out here to any passage of text they may encounter. The style of transcription is fairly informal and advanced for Shakespeare's day. It forms a contrast with those of Blandford and Jones, which are more conservative and formal. The policy was tested and refined in actors' workshops, which are the subject of the next chapter.

5.2 A Comparison of Different Types of OP Transcription Style

Once the decision has been made to stage a production in OP, the voice coach and director have a number of pronunciation choices available.

Previous productions have pointed the way to the various styles of pronunciation and how they might be used. There were a number of styles of pronunciation in use in Shakespeare's day among older or

younger generations and people from London or from the provinces.

Shakespeare would vary his own pronunciation in order to make a rhyme work or to add or subtract a syllable in his verse.

John Barton made a deliberate decision to adopt some conservative, even archaic, pronunciations in his 1952 *Julius Caesar*. He admits that some of the pronunciation he used was probably archaic in Shakespeare's day, like pronouncing the 'k' in words with 'kn'. He wished to emphasise those elements of the language which are 'foreign' to the modern ear. His audiences heard the 'kn' pronounced in 'knight' and 'knave' and the rhotic 'r' was given emphasis, causing 'lord' to sound like 'lowered'.⁸⁷

⁸⁷ Although my impression is that Barton's 'kn' was perhaps exaggerated, there is a possibility that his pronunciation is one that was still heard in the seventeenth century, although it would have been weakening and becoming unvoiced prior to being omitted altogether. E.J. Dobson (1957) and C. Barber (1976) both support the view that 'kn' was still pronounced in the seventeenth century. Kökeritz (1953) holds a different view and cites some convincing evidence in Shakespeare's word-play to support the early reduction of 'kn' to 'n'. Examples of word play which relies on the pairs of words being homophones are given by Kökeritz (1953, 120–121) in pairs such as knack-neck (which could share the same vowel), knave-nave and night-knight. The following word-play from *All's Well That Ends Well*, (III, 2), relying on 'not' and 'knot' being homophones, would seem to prove the point:

Countess:

I have wedded her, not bedded her, and sworn to make the not eternal.

This issue demonstrates the complexities of attempting to reconstruct pronunciation. Even the greatest minds cannot agree. One should also consider the treatment of 'gh'. If 'kn' is pronounced then why not 'gh'? And if 'gh' is pronounced, a decision needs to be made about sounds which precede it in

In contrast, Gimson (1962) seems to have favoured a less robust and more gentle style of OP, although his version was also conservative in several respects. The rhotic element and diphthongs were given little emphasis but articulation of the consonants is precise. He was perhaps attempting to create a style of OP which was palatable to a London audience accustomed to the highly-articulated and precise declamatory style of the Shakespeare productions of the 1950s. Unlike Barton's, his was not a student production to be given to a sympathetic university audience; his was destined for a subscription-paying, discerning London audience and this may have tempered his interpretation. Gimson's transcription of *Macbeth* contains very few letter-droppings (for instance, initial 'h', final 'g' in 'ing' or final 'd' in 'and') and few of the weak forms which proliferate in the transcriptions of Kökeritz and Crystal. It is understandable that, as a pioneer in the field, he proceeded with caution for fear of alienating his audience.

The use of the diphthong [ɛi] on words like 'say', 'fair' and 'traitor' is a small but significant feature of Gimson's transcription. Kökeritz and Crystal both transcribe this as the monophthong [ɛ:]. It is a matter of phonological debate whether this sound was still a diphthong in 1600; it may have been part of the speech of the older generation and in regional

words such as 'light' and 'bright'. Should this be a diphthong or an archaic short vowel, which really belongs to ME?

accents. A look at Shakespeare's rhymes reveals that, in general, he seems to avoid rhyming words of the class of 'maid', 'fair' and 'pain' with words which would have taken the [ɛ:] monophthong, such as 'fade' and 'care', but in so doing he may simply be following tradition. Kökeritz is confident that ME *ā* and *ai* had coalesced early in the fifteenth century (Kökeritz 1953, 173), and he cites instances of spelling and rhyme to support this.

The pun on the words 'tail' and 'tale' in *Othello*, Act III, Scene 1 reinforces Kökeritz's view, although Shakespeare may have been relying on the audiences tolerance of alike pronunciations to allow the pun:

CLOWN: Are these I pray you, winde instruments?

MUSICIAN: I marry are they sir.

CLOWN: Oh, thereby hangs a tale.

MUSICAN: Whereby hangs a tale, sir?

CLOWN: Marry sir, by many a winde instrument that I know.

Gimson uses unstressed [əv] (for 'of') rather than [ə] and [mɪ] (for 'my') rather than [mɪ] when unstressed. Curiously, he chooses [e:] as the vowel in 'fear' and 'hear', where others would choose [ɛ:] (owing to the lowering effect of the 'r') but uses [ɛ:] in 'whereabout'. In some words where the vowel would today be short, and is so in Crystal and Kökeritz, Gimson uses a long vowel. [u:] is used in 'could' and 'should' as well as 'look' and

‘good’. [ju:] is used not only in ‘absolute’ but also in ‘truth’ and ‘suit’ (although in the latter [ʃ] and [ʃj] are given as alternatives). Sometimes, strongly articulated syllables appear where other transcribers might use weak forms, such as the endings of ‘leisure’, ‘nature’, ‘fortune’ and ‘torture’. His approach to ‘er’, ‘ir’ and ‘ur’ is conservative, with ‘firm’, ‘certain’ and ‘earth’ taking [ɛ] and ‘worst’ and ‘world’ taking [ɹ].

Gimson’s style is closer to that of Daniel Jones than to Kökeritz.⁸⁸ Jones also uses a long vowel [u:] on words like ‘good’ and ‘bosom’ and uses the [ɛi] diphthong on words such as ‘they’, ‘their’ and ‘players’ (in early work). Some of the above features are evident in this transcription from *Macbeth* Act II, Scene 1 by Gimson (1962, 79):

nəu o:ər ðə wɹn ha:f wɹld 1
 nə:tər si:mz dɛd, ənd wɪkɪd dre:mz əbjuz
 ðə kyrteɪnd sli:p : wɪtʃkraft sɛɪbrɛ:ts 3
 pɛ:l hɛkəts ɒfəriŋz : ənd wɪðərd myrdər,
 əlarəmd bæi hɪz sɛntɪnəl, ðə wɹlf, 5
 hu:z həulz hɪz wɑtʃ, ðɹs wɪθ hɪz stɛɪθɪ pɛ:s,
 wɪθ tɑrkwɪnz rævɪʃɪŋ strəɪdz, tu:ərdz hɪz dɪzəɪn 7
 mu:vz læɪk a go:st.

⁸⁸ Jones was Gimson’s teacher, who, in turn, was Crystal’s.

The lack of weak forms is very evident here; 'nature' in line 2 is the only word which has a weak ending. The final 'd' in 'and' is preserved, as is the initial 'h' on 'his'. The word 'ravishing' in line 7 is not syncopated and its ending is fully pronounced (as opposed to 'in', with a dropped 'g'). The word 'curtained' in line 3 demonstrates the 'ei' diphthong for 'ai' and shows a strong second syllable (unlike today). Gimson's approach to 'ur' in 'world', 'curtained' and 'murder' shows that he has kept this sound distinct from 'ir' and 'er', choosing [ʏr], where the vowel represents a stage in the transition from EME [ʊ] to PDE [ʌ]. Later in the seventeenth century, 'ur' coalesced with 'ir' and 'er' as [ər].

It is worth noting that Gimson uses the short vowel 'ɪ' on 'stealthy' in line 6, rather than the diphthong 'əɪ' employed by Crystal and Meier. Later in the passage Gimson uses 'ɛ' as the vowel in 'earth' and 'firm' (the latter was originally an 'er' spelling). He has chosen not to use the 'ɚ' variant, which had been adopted into the language from a colloquialism by this time and was popular in many 'er' words, even in courtly speech. He could also have chosen the more advanced 'ə' vowel which represents a form used in the merged 'ir' and 'er' sounds. It is worth noting that Gimson uses the raised [i:] vowel in words such as 'seems' and uses [e:] not only in 'dreams', but also in 'hear' and 'fear' (instead of expected [ɛ:]).

The style of OP favoured by Crystal (*in Romeo and Juliet*, 2004) and Meier (*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, 2010) is perhaps closer to the less-formal, conversational speech which would have been heard on Shakespeare's stage. Crystal uses many weak forms in his transcriptions, particularly in the unstressed syllables of verse, and frequently drops initial and final letters. This informal style may be seen in this extract from Crystal's transcription of *Twelfth Night* (unpublished extract, supplied by Crystal D):

If music be: the food ə lʏve, plɛ:y on; 1
 Give me: ɪxcess əv it, thət, sɛɪfətin,
 The appetəɪte mɛ:y sicken, ən so: dəɪ 3
 That strɛ:n əgɛ:n! It had a dəɪn fə:ll.
 o: it kɛ:me o:ɹ mɪ ləɪke the swe:t səʊnd, 5
 Ste:lɪn ən gɪvɪn o:deɪ, ɪnəʊgh, nə mo:ɹel
 Tɪs not sə swe:t nəʊw as it wəz bɪfo:ɹe 7

Line 1 shows the unstressed form of 'of' (ə) which is common in colloquial speech today, but not generally heard on the modern Shakespearean stage. Line 3 shows a dropped 'd' on the word 'and', and there are similar dropped endings on 'dying' in line 4 and 'stealing' in line 6. Line 6 also contains the unstressed form of 'no' (nə) and 'so' is similarly unstressed in line 7. Crystal chooses [ɑ:] for the vowel in 'fall', which is very similar to Gimson's [ɒ:], but with less lip-rounding. Instead

of Gimson's conservative diphthong [ɛi] in 'play' and 'strain', Crystal uses the more advanced monophthong [ɛ:].

The effect of Crystal's use of unstressed forms is to increase the pace of the dialogue and it helps to emphasise the natural strong and weak stresses of the verse. This style of speech, which seems to flow 'trippingly on the tongue' (*Hamlet*, III, 2)⁸⁹ may be a more accurate representation of that heard on the Elizabethan stage.

In *Romeo and Juliet*, Crystal juxtaposes two contrasting forms of OP in order to emphasise the different modes of speech of the older and younger characters. Capulet can be heard using the conservative pronunciation of [ma:k] for 'make', a vowel which had largely been replaced by the vowel [ɛ:] in Shakespeare's day. The older generation use the unraised vowel [e:] in words like 'see' and 'me', again a conservative pronunciation at the time.

Romeo and Juliet Act I, Scene 2 (Crystal 2005):

CAPULET: Shɪ ath nat se:n the che:nge ə fo:ɪte:n ye:rs...

⁸⁹ All text references refer to Clark, W.G. and Wright, W.A. (1865) *The Works of William Shakespeare (Globe Edition)*, Cambridge and London: Macmillan except where otherwise stated.

In the above line, the more usual pronunciation for Shakespeare's day would be [i:] in 'seen' and 'fourteen' (and generally also in 'years'). The conservative vowel used here is a useful aid in characterising the role.

The informal, conversational style of transcription is also evident in Kökeritz (1953), who advocates the use of 'h' dropping and consonant simplification, as well as syncopation:

JACQUES:

ɔ:l ðə wɜ:ldz ə ste:dʒ, 1

ən(d) ɔ:l ðə mɛn ən wɪmɪn mi:ɹlɪ plɛ:əɹz.

ðɛ: hɛ:v ðə ɛksɪts ən ðə ɛntrənsɪz, 3

ən(d) o:n mæn ɪn ɪz təɪm plɛ:z mɛnɪ pɑ:ɹts,

(h)ɪz æk(t)s bi:n sɛvn ɛ:dʒɪz. ət fɜ:ɹst ðɪ ɪnfənt, 5

mju:lɪn ən pju:kɪn ɪn ðə nɜ:ɹsɪz a:ɹmz.

As You Like It, II, 7

This short transcript contains many fingerprints of Kökeritz's transcription style. Letter dropping proliferates, such as the 'd' in 'and' in lines 2 and 3, the initial 'h' on 'his' in line 4 and the final 'g' in 'mewling' and 'puking' in line 6. There is a syncopation to one syllable on the word 'being' ([bi:n]) in line 5 (common in Shakespeare), and simplification of the consonant cluster 'kts' on the word 'acts' in line 5. The word 'have',

which is stressed in line 3 shows the original strong form, which is implicit in the spelling.

Some direct comparisons may be made with Daniel Jones' earlier interpretation; he recorded this speech in OP for Linguaphone (Jones, 1939). Significant differences include the use of the conservative diphthong [ɛi], where Kökeritz uses the monophthong [ɛ:] on 'players', 'they' and 'their'; the conservative diphthong [ɛu] on 'mewling', where Kökeritz uses the more advanced [ju:]; a short vowel [ʊ], or possibly [ɣ], on 'ur' in 'nurse' and 'world' in Jones where Kökeritz uses the more advanced (and less accurate) [ɜ:], a more conservative vowel [a:] on 'have' in Jones; and the vowel [ɒ:] in 'all' where Kökeritz uses the more advanced [ɔ:]. The fast pace and fluency achieved in Kökeritz's transcriptions may be heard in his own recordings (Kökeritz 1953b) of the above extract and others printed in his book, *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* (Kökeritz 1953).

A direct comparison between the modern approach of Crystal and the articulated style adopted in the 1920s by F Blandford (1927) is exemplified in the following speech from *Twelfth Night*:

Crystal 2010

Blandford 1927

<p>1 Mæ:ke me: a willə cabin at yəu gɛ:tɛ, 2 ən cɑ:l ʊpən mi: sɔ:l wiθin ðə hæusɛ; 3 Wrɛɪtɛ lɛɪəl kɑntəns ɒf cəntɛmnd lɪvɛ 4 ən sɪŋ əm læʊd e:n in ðə dɛd ə nɛɪɪt; 5 Həlɔ: yəu nɛ:me to ðə rɪvɛɪbrɛtɛ hɪlz 6 ən mɛ:ke ðə bɑblɪn ɡɒsɪp ɒf ðə ɛ:ɹ 7 Crɛɪ ʌʊt 'O:lɪvɪə!' ɔ:, yəʊ ʃʊld nɒt rɛst 8 Bɪtwɛ:n ðə <u>ɛɪmɛnts</u> əv ɛ:ɹ ənd ɛ:θ, 9 Bət yu: ʃʊld pɪtɪ mi: .</p>	<p>mæ:k mi: æ wɪləʊ kæbɪn æt iʊr gæ:t, ænd kɑ:l ʊpən məɪ sɔʊl wɪθɪn ðɛ hæʊs; wrɛɪt lɔɪjəl kæntəns ɔv kɔntɛmnd lɪv ænd sɪŋ ðɛm læʊd ɛ:vɪn ɪn ðɛ dɛ:d ɔv nɛɪɪt; 'hæl'lu: iʊr næ:me tʊ ðɛ rɛ'vɛ:rberæt hɪlz ænd mæ:k ðɛ bæblɪŋ 'ɡɒsɪp ɔv ðɛ æɪr krɛɪ ʌʊt 'ɔ'li:vɪæ!' ɔ:, iʊ ʃʊ:ld nɒt rɛst bɪtwɪ:n ðɛ 'ɛɪmɛnts əv æɪr ænd ɛ:rθ, bʊt iʊ 'ʃʊ:ld pɪtɪ mi: !</p>
--	---

A number of significant differences are evident in this short extract.

Although both are valid interpretations of Shakespearean speech,

Blandford's style is more antiquated and highly articulated. His transcription is a full phonetic one, whereas Crystal's is part-phonetic.

The vowel in 'make' and 'gate' is given a more conservative [æ:] by

Blandford, compared with Crystal's advanced [ɛ:]. Similar conservatism is

also shown by Blandford's choice of a long vowel in 'dead' and 'earth',

and the aspirated 'gh' in 'night' (notated as 'ç'), which by Shakespeare's

time was becoming rare. The long vowel (and articulated 'l') Blandford

uses in 'should' may have been used by Shakespeare, although the short

vowel (and omitted 'l') would have been common. Conservative

diphthongs are used in ‘air’ (compare this [æɪr] with Crystal’s more advanced monophthong [ɛ:ɪ]), ‘you’ and ‘your’ (archaic falling diphthongs in Blandford’s case). Crystal’s less-formal style shows letter dropping on the words ‘and’, ‘of’ and ‘them’, and unstressed forms on, ‘willow’, ‘your’, ‘you’, ‘my’ and ‘but’. Crystal, however, chooses to use the conservative [e:] vowel on words such as ‘me’ and ‘between’, where Blandford uses the more advanced [i:], which was current in Shakespeare’s day.

The informal style is exemplified by Paul Meier’s 2010 OP production of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. Meier and two students prepared the transcription under the guidance of David Crystal.⁹⁰ The fast pace here is enabled by close attention to the sentence phonetics and a fine balance of weak and strong word forms, carefully chosen to support the verse structure. The transcript successfully restores many of the original rhymes and broken metrical patterns. It is important to note that it has been shown that this style of delivery does not impair the ‘readability’ of the pronunciation for a modern audience. Moreover, it encourages a more natural flow of language than is heard in some modern productions.

The student-actors on the production DVD demonstrated a high degree of fluency and accuracy in Elizabethan pronunciation and it is satisfying

⁹⁰ The complete transcript is available on-line at www.paulmeier.com (Meier, 2010b), and it contains links to recordings, spoken by David Crystal.

to hear metre and rhyme restored and functioning as it is believed Shakespeare intended it to. There is nothing in this production that would hinder the audience's understanding of the play and it may be argued that the accent helps to define characters⁹¹ in a similar way to modern regional accents.

In explaining his transcription policy, Meier states, "You will see some differences in transcription style for high and low characters, and for formal versus informal speech. For example, h-dropping was variable in Shakespeare's time, as was the reduction of unstressed -ing endings. So *rehearsing* might be spoken by one character in one context as *rehersing* and *re'ersin'* in another. In *Pyramus and Thisbe*, the mechanicals' speech reflects their attempt to adopt a high style of diction" (Meier, 2010b).

It is important to note that the phonological differences evident in these different types of transcription are relatively small and that there is substantial agreement evident in the bulk of the material. Differences in sentence phonetics (weak and strong stress) are sometimes a matter of

⁹¹ In connection with the OP *Romeo and Juliet* (at Shakespeare's Globe, 2004) David Crystal reports that "every actor I interviewed said that the OP changed their perception of their character. Juliet felt she could stand up more to the Nurse and her parents in OP. Mercutio felt that he could, for the first time, do justice to the 'earthy' quality of the Queen Mab speech, which he always found uncomfortable when spoken in the cerebral tones of RP" (Crystal 2011, *Empson Memorial Lecture*).

interpretation and are particularly important when transcribing verse.

Differences in vowel quality and quantity represent the various sounds of the era, both conservative and advanced, which may well have been heard in London in the time of Shakespeare.

To a voice coach or director who is preparing for an OP production, the option of using subtle variations of pronunciation opens up the possibility of using speech to emphasise contrasts in character, age, status or geographical origin. For example, the mechanical or 'country bumpkin' could be characterised by a conservative type of speech, perhaps following Barton's lead and voicing initial 'k' in words like 'knight' and medial 'gh' in words such as 'light'. Crystal's practice of using unraised [e:] in 'meet' could also be used, possibly in conjunction with the dropping of initial 'h', even under stress.

A transcription policy must allow for flexibility as well as individual actor's interpretations in its application. It is not possible to state that a particular word is always spoken in a certain way as the pronunciation will always be influenced by the context and the demands of character, rhyme, metre or word-play. Verse scansion is open to interpretation and the actor must be allowed a free choice. It is important, therefore, that the actor is educated in the possibilities of the pronunciation so that an informed decision might be made.

Chapter 6, Testing the Transcription Policy/ Developing a Method through Workshopping

This chapter is largely concerned with the development of an efficient pedagogy for the teaching of original pronunciation in the context of actors' workshops. The summary of the workshop process and discussion of resources used may be of interest to the drama teacher and voice coach⁹² whose brief is to give a grounding in OP to a group of actors with little or no experience of the subject. I prepared all the materials used in the workshops myself.⁹³ The impact of using Shakespeare's pronunciation is discussed throughout this chapter. It is not the aim of this chapter to discuss the historical period and conditions as these factors are dealt with elsewhere. Putting the transcription policy into practice in the workshop context constitutes a pedagogical exercise. However, in order to formulate a transcription policy which is adaptable in the performance situation, I have included alternative pronunciations. The presence of these alternatives enables the voice coach or director to make stylistic decisions regarding the pronunciation. In order to be thorough in the formulation of a pedagogy, I created opportunities in the workshops for actors to experiment with different styles of pronunciation.

⁹² And possibly the director with an interest in, but no experience of OP.

⁹³ Unless otherwise stated, all Shakespearean extracts were taken from Clark, W.G. and Wright, W.A. (1864)

The Transcriptions

When transcribing material for these workshops I followed my transcription policy, outlined in the previous chapter. The system was applied with rigor but the policy is designed to allow flexibility in pronunciation choices within certain, clearly-defined boundaries.⁹⁴ Moreover, the actors were encouraged to colour the OP with their own regional accents. As the policy allows for slight variation in the vowel sounds to represent a conservative and an advanced pronunciation, I had to make some decisions relating to performance style, which in a production context would be made by the director.

The Rationale for Workshopping Original Pronunciation

The workshopping of original pronunciation is a key process which must precede any performance. At present, there are no resources available to a director who wishes to stage an OP production and little advice or information about how to proceed. I aim to address this in this study by demonstrating the sort of resources and pedagogy which should be under consideration. The resources required include a transcription of the scene to be studied, warm-up exercises and material for teaching the

⁹⁴ The OP sound map.

context of the pronunciation.⁹⁵ I will show that there is a logical procedure for teaching the pronunciation and I suggest that this sort of procedure should be followed in any workshop. The procedure refers not only to a logical sequence of teaching OP sounds, but also a logical approach to tackling the sounds within the context of a scene and to the structure of each workshop session. Teaching methods are a key factor in the success of the workshops and I shall explore several different didactic techniques. For the purposes of these workshops, I made the assumption that none of the actors had any experience of OP. Refinement of OP teaching techniques and materials can most effectively be made in a workshop context. I would argue that in rehearsals for a production, other pressures and demands on time will compromise the process of discovery and development. This chapter will document my workshop process.

Assessment of Progress

I suggest that the success of the workshop should be measured by reference to success criteria designed for the purpose. I set out below a set of criteria which were helpful in determining the progress of the students and actors who attended my workshop sessions. These criteria are more appropriate for workshops which take place over several days

⁹⁵ The context might include both the historical usage and the context of particular sounds within a word, or words within a sentence.

rather than one-off sessions. In a short session, the success criteria will inevitably focus on small scale issues such as vowel and diphthong sounds and fluency of delivery. My policy in the workshops was to use positive reinforcement and always to praise the students for their achievements.

Workshop Informal Assessment

Assessment Strands for Actors' OP Skills

- pronunciation of diphthongs and vowels
- general pronunciation skill and fluency
- recall and use of unusual pronunciations (such as 't' for 'th')
- recognition and use of weak forms in the appropriate context (sentence phonetics)
- recognition and use of syncopation, elision and expansion, especially where the metre is enhanced by their use
- reading of phonetics
- sight-reading from an annotated/phonetic script
- sight-reading from an unmarked (regular) script
- transferable skills (recognising patterns and rules and applying them in other contexts)

Skills Success Criteria

- almost always correct
- often correct
- sometimes correct

Assessment Strands for Pedagogy

- teaching sequence (of vowels, diphthongs and consonants)
- chorus work
- antiphonal work
- peer coaching
- warm-up exercises
- use of lexical sets
- hypercorrection avoidance
- accommodation awareness
- teaching of historical context – decision-making
- teaching of transferable skills
- Success of different types of script
- format of workshop sessions

Pedagogy Success Criteria

- The students are:
- quick to understand a point
- accurate in their pronunciation

- fluent and confident in reading the script
- fluent and confident in their delivery
- able to correct themselves and others
- able to analyse and discuss pronunciation
- able to transfer their skills
- independent thinkers, learners and decision-makers
- well motivated

General Workshop Success Criteria

- The actor has made sufficient progress with the pronunciation to enable them, *in general*, to focus on other skills such as movement, gesture, blocking, general acting and voice work. They are using OP as a tool to inform and enhance their regular Shakespearean acting process (in terms of metre, rhyme, character).
- The actor has made sufficient progress to enable them, *at times*, to focus on other areas of such as movement, gesture, blocking, general acting and voice work.
- The actor is largely focused on the OP pronunciation and *not yet able* to apply OP skills to other areas of their acting and voice work.

An Overview of the Workshops

The first workshops inevitably focused on voice work rather than acting. Despite my experience of English and foreign language teaching, I struggled to find the best way to teach (and orthographically represent) the new sounds, some of which were close to PDE and some quite far removed. Nevertheless, the first few workshops were crucial in helping to shape the methodology I would eventually use in the final workshop for professional actors. The summary of the workshops below documents the processes involved and highlights the successful elements of the pedagogy.

Teaching Materials

I devised a number of resources (written materials and audio) to help the actors learn OP. Part way through the workshop process, I took the decision to supply reading material so the actors could prepare privately prior to the workshop. This made a significant difference in the final workshop, where the actors had perused the two booklets described below and came to the first session with questions and comments to share. The warm-ups are generally linked to particular scenes and target the pronunciations for the scene to be studied in that session. In addition to using Paul Meier's style of colour-highlighted, part-phonetic

transcription, I decided to try something completely new and experimented with a non-phonetic type of script, which is designed to be accessible to everyone. All these materials are discussed below in the context of the workshop sessions.

The Rhythm of Macbeth and an Introduction to Shakespearean

Pronunciation⁹⁶

I wrote these two booklets for actors to read prior to the workshops. They are both designed to be accessible to all and demand no prior knowledge of OP. They are phonetics-free and describe the pronunciation in familiar terms. *The Rhythm of Macbeth* deals with the way the syllable count is altered by syncope, elision and expansion (or resolution) and gives numerous examples from the play where the metre might be read differently in the light of OP. The object of this booklet is to introduce the actor to the sort of reconstruction which is possible with OP and which will be pursued in the workshop. *An Introduction to Shakespearean Pronunciation* is a lay person's guide which uses examples of rhythm and rhyme to explain how OP differs from PDE. The rhymes are explained in straight-forward terms in a way which forms a starting point for our study later in the workshops. The benefit of these booklets was evident in workshop 5 where the actors came to the first session primed with some

⁹⁶ In Appendix 1

impressive OP knowledge and even some questions about the pronunciation. This preparation saved time in the workshop which would have been spent explaining some of the basics. I would advocate the practice of forwarding some sort of pre-reading material in order to awaken a critical interest in OP prior to any workshop.

Workshop 1

My first practical workshop lasted for three hours and took place on one afternoon in April 2011 at the University of Glamorgan. In this workshop I focused on pedagogy and involved a group of three drama students working on several short readings from Shakespeare's plays. I introduced the actors to two varieties of Elizabethan pronunciation, one more conservative than the other for the period. The reason for this was to demonstrate that, even within the field of OP, contrasting accents may be used to differentiate between characters.⁹⁷

My primary focus in this voice workshop was on teaching the pronunciation. I employed a method here where the pronunciation was dealt with in stages, each stage building towards a final version fully in OP. Instead of presenting a full phonetic transcription, I only transcribed those words or parts of words which differ from PDE and I retained some redundant and silent letters to act as visual clues to the word's identity

⁹⁷ With hindsight, it probably would have been better to study one type of OP in this initial workshop.

(see Appendix Part 1, actor's booklet). This type of transcript was used by David Crystal for the Globe productions (2004–2005) and by Paul Meier in his *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (November, 2010), but I added a few refinements as an aid to the actor. In this type of transcription, 'house' appears as 'həʊse' rather than 'həʊs' and 'may' appears as 'mɛ:y' rather than 'mɛ:'. A word like 'any', which the actor may tend to give the modern pronunciation is marked 'ǎny' as a clue to the short 'a' vowel sound, and a word like 'nŏt' was similarly marked (to signify unrounding). Length markings are shown in the traditional way, by use of the colon. The word 'farm' is marked 'fǎɪm' to prompt the correct short vowel sound and rhotic 'r' (rather than the present day English [PDE] [ɑ:]). The intention was to emphasise the similarities with PDE, enabling the actor to feel confident with familiar sounds while focusing on the unfamiliar.

In addition to the transcription, I gave the actors a 'lexical set' chart (see Appendix 1) which identified groups of words pronounced alike in order that logic may be applied to the learning process. I also wrote out a short pronunciation dictionary transcribing the most common words. Where stress patterns differ from PDE these were shown by underlining the stressed syllables, such as 'record' (noun). Expanded patterns or resolutions were marked with accents, thus: [resolusìóns]⁹⁸. Where

⁹⁸ The acute accent represents a secondary stress and the grave a separate, unstressed syllable.

clarification was required or where there were alternative pronunciations for the actor to choose between, I explained this in footnotes.

The lexical set chart is inspired by the system devised by JC Wells and used in his *Accents of English* (Wells, JC, 1982). This system is employed by dialect coaches teaching modern English accents and, with modifications, it works well with OP. I narrowed down the number of lexical groups used in this study to those required for the style of OP set out in the Transcription Policy (Chapter 5), and I amalgamated several of the groups where the words were pronounced alike in EME. The inclusion of a keyword and signature pronunciation on the chart enables the reader easily to find the required lexical set and to determine the appropriate pronunciation. It is intended that this will be a useful aid in the early stages of rehearsal, after which it may only be needed as an aide memoire. Owing to the existence of doublets and variant pronunciations, upon which Shakespeare was able to draw when rhyming and punning, the chart cannot show every possible pronunciation; variants are explained in footnotes to the text.

The workshop process revealed one possible disadvantage of working with a pre-prepared transcription. When transcribing rhyming or blank verse, the transcriber makes decisions about where stresses should occur. Where there are a number of interpretations of the metrical

patterns, the choice of which one to use should be the responsibility of the actor, who will no doubt favour one rhythm over another or may wish to experiment with alternative readings. For this reason, the actor needs to be fully informed of the variations between stressed and unstressed pronunciations so that they may edit the transcription should they wish to do so.

I broke the rehearsal process down into several stages, the first stage involving repetition and rote-learning. This involved a ‘crash-course’ on the pronunciation, a brief history of language change and a discussion on the justification for using OP. During this stage, I gave sample readings of the modes of speech which the workshop would target. A warm-up session explored the sounds of the diphthongs and involved the actors in some detective work relating to the restoration of original rhyming couplets (see Appendix 1). I presented the following sentences as a light-hearted guide to the approximate sounds of the language:

‘The say is very grain today; it must bay the say wade in the sun late.’
(The sea is very green today; it must be the seaweed in the sunlight.)

‘Way could say floors an’ wades through the winda as well as pays an’
banes an’ some grain trays.’
(We could see flowers and weeds through the window as well as peas and
beans and some green trees.)

I used names to aid recollection of the sounds of the long vowels: Sarah, May, Peter, Audrey, Lucy (sɛ:rah, me:y, pi:ter, ɒ:drey, lu:cy). The learning process was then broken down into manageable sections. Several transcripts of the text each addressed different aspects of the language so that the process was built up in layers, the final layer being a complete OP reading.

In order to show the practical applications of the language, I chose several extracts from Shakespeare's plays through which the benefits of OP may be explored. The first extract, from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Act III, Scene I), shows how OP functions in prose and focuses on a conservative form of pronunciation. The second reading (Act II, Scene I) demonstrates how lost rhymes may be repaired and introduces an advanced pronunciation of 'e', after the raising had occurred of ME ē to [i:]. The third reading, from *Henry V*, demonstrates a more formal style with fewer droppings of 'h' and 'g'.

I gave the actors a resource booklet, specially prepared for the workshop (Appendix 1, page 2), which contains the workshop extracts and supplementary material. The introduction gives examples of short extracts in OP, a brief explanation of the sound-changes involved and the rationale for performing Shakespeare in OP.

The first reading, from *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act III, Scene I, consists mostly of prose. The text is well known and Shakespeare's use of the mechanicals provides a perfect opportunity to demonstrate one possible use of OP: to represent the down-to-earth accent of common folk in an otherwise PDE production. The readings built up the OP pronunciation in layers and after each stage the actors were given a chance to practise their lines privately, coached on a one-to-one basis, before bringing their work back to a plenary session.

Phase 1 (Appendix 1) clarified the phonetic symbols which would be used in the workshop and dealt with the important aspect of diphthongs, which give OP some of its character and texture. The diphthongs were dealt with first as these involved only three lexical sets: the 'house', 'time' and 'choice' groups. This phase also covered the 'dropped' consonants g, t and h. Apostrophes replaced the dropped consonants in order to avoid ambiguity between words such as 'an' and 'and'. Initial 'wh' was treated as 'hw' except in words like 'who' and 'whom'. The actors were given a vocabulary list, arranged into the lexical sets, in order to practise the pronunciation.

Phase 2 (Appendix 1) introduced the long vowels, including those which have become diphthongs in PDE, and the rhotic r. This involved a greater number of words and a number of new lexical sets. The transcription of

this scene used a conservative pronunciation, which was probably archaic by 1600, but it is possible that some older speakers may have continued to use the unraised vowel, [e:], in see and meet at this time. The open vowel, [ɛ:r], was used in many ‘-ear’ words (such as ‘fear’ and ‘hear’), following the usage of Shakespeare in many of his rhymes. Puck’s speech provides a contrast by using the more advanced pronunciation and by not dropping ‘h’ and final ‘g’. Again, I gave the actors a list of words arranged into lexical groups for pronunciation practice prior to the reading.

In phase 3 (Appendix 1) I dealt with the short vowels and other differences in pronunciation (such as elision, syncopation and resolution) as well as consonants. The [ɚ] sound, used by Shakespeare and found in the letters of Queen Elizabeth and other sixteenth and seventeenth century writers in words such as ‘mercy’ and ‘person’, was introduced at this point in the workshop. This phase also presented the pronunciations of unstressed syllables and there was a discussion of the rhythm of the language. I supplied a complete list of the unstressed words found in the text for practice purposes (Appendix 1). I incorporated sounds and symbols introduced in phases 1 and 2 here, contributing to the full range of pronunciations.

A summary of this part of the workshop included a discussion of ways in which OP can be used to signal the status of the characters and to heighten comedy. OP might easily occupy a niche in a Shakespeare production, even where the remainder is delivered in standard pronunciation. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, with its 'play within a play' presents an ideal opportunity for this. In a complete OP production, contrasts in generations (or possibly social status) could easily be signalled by using conservative and advanced OP pronunciations side by side.

I selected the second reading, an extract from *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act II Scene 1, to show how lost rhymes might be repaired through the use of OP, and the third reading, Act II, Scene 2B, was chosen to explore further the usefulness of OP in repairing lost rhymes and metrical patterns. In the third reading, I employed the more advanced vowel system, which was common in Shakespeare's lifetime. Again, I presented the work in stages, which may be seen in the transcript (see Appendix 1). The reading was followed by a discussion of the value of restoring lost devices in a PDE production by drawing on the knowledge gained from the study of the original pronunciation.

The fourth reading, from *Henry V* (see Appendix 1), enabled the actors to experience the use of OP in a passage of blank verse. In this reading the

more advanced vowel system is again used. I presented the work in two stages, dealing with metrical considerations of syncopations, resolutions and weak stress first, followed by a complete transcription. I took the opportunity here to deal with the subject of secondary stress. A greater number of phonetic symbols will be found in this transcription; these serve to clarify the pronunciation of unstressed syllables, which is largely the same as in PDE.

This workshop was successful in the respect that the students achieved an acceptable degree of accuracy in their pronunciation as well as a reasonable understanding of how it might be used in a modern production. In terms of the material, there were problems with the demands made on the actors, particularly with regard to reading the phonetic symbols; none of the participants had any significant previous experience of reading phonetics. A colour version of the workshop booklet would be better so that the phonetic symbols could be highlighted in red.

The GVS diagram with sound changes moving up the chain was of interest and this might be extended to include a grid containing more examples of before and after the shift. Throughout the workshop, it was evident that visual aids were very helpful, especially when explaining

vowel sounds or phonetic symbols. The use of visual aids requires further testing in the workshop setting.

The idea of highlighting in red on the text the point of focus for each extract was very useful, although in phases two and three the pronunciations from phase one were sometimes overlooked as they were no longer highlighted. This is not necessarily a problem when focusing on new sounds but it needs to be addressed when the aim is to prepare a complete extract for performance.

It was useful for the students to be able to practise pronunciations at each stage, alone or in a pair, with the vocabulary lists. However, this practice needs to be monitored to ensure the correct vowel or diphthong pronunciations are used and one-to-one coaching here is beneficial. In this short workshop there was insufficient time to enable the actors to practise effectively in private. In a longer workshop, they could be given a speech to prepare over the lunch break or during the days between sessions.

The initial handout, of sentences spoken in PDE which produce an approximation of OP, was an effective ice-breaker; this provided an early opportunity to try out OP. The sentence demonstrating the positions of the rhotic 'r' ('Rosie trained every third hour') was useful in

demonstrating where to place the post-vocalic 'r'. The 'rhyming couplets' warm-up was a good talking point and enabled the students to focus on the repair of rhymes at the outset. The experience of analysing the rhymes and attempting to determine which pronunciation to be guided by as the model for the couplet was valuable. This exercise might be improved by the inclusion of a greater amount of detective work, which could be achieved by cross-referencing several couplets in order to discover recurring patterns.

The introduction of the diphthongs without the rhotic 'r' proved counterproductive as the 'r' sound would have aided the actor in the diphthongal pronunciation and it is perhaps not good practice to separate the two. This would be addressed in future workshops.

One aspect that deserves consideration is that of the regional accents of workshop participants; the transcription assumes an RP base accent as the point of departure. In this workshop one actor had a strong South Wales accent, one had a mild Norfolk accent and one was an RP speaker. It was significant that the Norfolk accent seemed to increase in strength when OP was being used as the actor concerned searched for familiar sounds in her own accent on which to draw when pronouncing OP. The Welsh accent caused a flapped 'r' occasionally to replace the rhotic 'r', which is an acceptable sound in OP. In all three accents there occurred

inappropriate diphthongisation at times. This might be remedied by reinforcing the vowel pronunciations at every stage of the process and refreshing them frequently in warm-ups. Longer workshops might explore the use of constant revision of pronunciations already covered, an element which was absent in this short workshop.

The readings and demonstrations given by me were found to be very helpful to the actors, especially as they had no previous knowledge of phonetics. A point to note is that prior knowledge of language should not be assumed; one actor asked what a diphthong was. In this workshop, only one of the participants had any prior knowledge of phonetics and that was limited. Ultimately, the reading of phonetics was quite successful.

I felt that the subject of syncopations and resolutions should be given more workshop time, especially as both of these features can affect the metre. In future workshops, a whole extract should be devoted to these alone. For the purposes of clarity, both archaic and advanced forms of OP should be linked more closely to the JC Wells classification of vowel sounds. By using this method, OP might be taught as an accent (or dialect) in the same way that actors are coached in regional accents.

The two common diphthongs seemed to present the most obvious obstacle. Although the actors made a reasonable attempt at these in isolation, in practice the diphthongs tended to mutate into PDE forms when the actors were not totally focused on them. The neutral onset, 'shwa', of the diphthong [əɪ] quickly became the lip-rounded 'oi' or the PDE version [aɪ]. More time needs to be allowed for the short vowels, the correct pronunciation of which is essential in achieving the overall spectrum of OP. ǣ and o:ɹ need more practice in isolation before attempting to use them in a scene. This is particularly true with ǣr, which can easily sound 'piratical' or West Country when exaggerated. Weak stress should occupy an extract of its own. When this is tackled with the short vowels there is too much information to absorb at once. This would be more easy to deal with in a series of workshops, where the material could be introduced more slowly.

This workshop was important in the respect that it demonstrated the limitations of students with no experience of phonetics or dialect coaching. It also helped to highlight the problems of teaching a new style of pronunciation, effectively a new accent, and expecting students to use it immediately in reciting Shakespearean verse and prose. The resources used proved to be quite effective, although more time is needed to assess their value. The pedagogy worked well, especially the echoing and pair work and these aspects are well worth developing further. Even after such

a short workshop the students OP skills were “often correct”, although, unsurprisingly, they were “not yet able to apply OP skills to other areas of their acting and voice work.”

Workshop 2

I decided to experiment further with the pedagogy in the second workshop, which would be for a larger group of drama school undergraduates and graduates. In this workshop, I aimed to develop a more effective teaching style, experimenting further with antiphonal and pair work. This would again need to be a voice workshop and, as a control, scripts, warm-ups and exercises would be similar to the first workshop. This would enable me to focus on the teaching and compare the results with the previous workshop.

The workshop took place in London in October 2011. There were eight participants in this predominantly student workshop, six undergraduate acting students from Italia Conti Drama School, one graduate from Bristol Old Vic and one graduate from the Drama Studio. All had done some work on phonetics, although some were weaker than others at reading the symbols. One was particularly strong in this respect and made more rapid progress than the others.

The long vowels seemed to present no problems and the rhotic 'r' was handled well. Following the pattern of the first workshop, the first subject I tackled was the two diphthongs [əɪ] and [əʊ] and it took some practice before the pronunciation of these was acceptable. I achieved this by splitting the diphthongs into their separate elements, which were practised in isolation before they were joined with a glide. There was a tendency in the first one to start with [ɒ] so the students practised finding the physical position of the jaw and the placing of 'shwa'. In the second one there tended to be a lack of emphasis on the first element, with the rounding coming too early. Throughout the workshop, the most common errors occurred in the pronunciation of these two diphthongs and these needed to be refreshed constantly. They were managed quite well in the phase 1 reading but became problematic as a greater variety of sounds was introduced later on.

The warm-up activities (as for workshop 1) were successful but a well-designed structure is now needed in this type of session, together with clear instructions. In particular, the method of determining the rhymes in the couplet exercise needs to be more specific. The actors were used to the concept of lexical sets from their accent studies and the application of this organisation proved to be good discipline in the study of OP.

A Midsummer Night's Dream Readings

I addressed the issue of introducing the rhotic 'r' (identified as a problem in workshop 1) in this workshop, where I included it in phase 1 with the diphthongs. This was an improvement, as it made it easier for the actors to pronounce the diphthongs, which are often associated with the 'r'. In general, the diphthongs were satisfactorily pronounced at this stage, although there would have been benefit in a greater amount of individual practice on this. One student suggested that the diphthongs on 'lion' and 'wild fowl' could be exaggerated, and possibly drawn out, for comic effect. The 'hw' was executed with ease by all the participants.

Phase 2, which introduced the long vowels, was very successful. There was awareness of the dangers of diphthongising these and this was largely avoided. However, at this stage the diphthongs were beginning to lose their integrity while the focus was on the long vowels.⁹⁹ Given more time to practise, this could have been avoided. The two sounds for 'e', close [e:] and open [ɛ:], were managed well and kept distinct.

Surprisingly, the [ɒ:] sound in 'wall' needed a fair amount of practice.

More time to deal with short vowels, and especially weak stress (phase 3), would have been beneficial and longer could have been spent discussing

⁹⁹ This demonstrated the necessity for constant revision of sounds already covered.

the custom of pronouncing 'er' as 'ar' and examining 'ir', 'er' and 'ur'. The use of the symbol [ɐ] in 'servant' and 'mercy' may not be necessary and avoiding its use may save confusion; 'ǎr' is a possible alternative. I suggested the possibility of voicing the now silent 'gh' in 'eight' and this was adopted by some who wished to emphasise the rustic character of the mechanicals. In this connection, I explained that prestige accents did not really exist in the seventeenth century. The [ɣ] in words like 'such' did not cause a problem, except that it was sometimes overlooked.

My reading of the prologue from *Henry V* was a revelation to many of the students, who were familiar with the play and had studied the speech in detail the previous year. They explained that the practice of syncopation and resolution had not been covered in their lessons when they were attempting to make the lines scan. There was a view that we may be reading more into irregular lines than Shakespeare actually intended as some lines may be irregular as a result of pronunciation change. The most common reason for this is Shakespeare's possible use of syncopation and expansion. The following extract, which may appear irregular, would have conformed to the iambic pentameter when spoken by an Elizabethan actor familiar with these techniques:

O for a Muse of fire, that would ascend

The brightest heaven of invention, *Henry V*, Prologue

'Tion and 'sion' endings were frequently expanded as a result of a secondary stress, which is now lost.

Suppose within the girdle of these walls
Are now confined two mighty monarchies,
Whose high upreared and abutting fronts
The perilous narrow ocean parts asunder: *Henry V, Prologue*

'Perilous' may be pronounced 'parlous' and was often spelled that way.

Group sessions enabled the actors to practise vowel and consonant sounds informally and to help one another improve their pronunciation. One actress had a particularly good feel for the pronunciation. She had studied and performed in a Southern Irish accent and was drawing on sounds that she was familiar with in order to achieve the OP sounds. Although this led to occasional inaccuracies in the diphthongs, overall, the ability to relate some OP sounds to a familiar model was beneficial.

My *Romeo and Juliet* reading (Appendix 1) prompted a lengthy discussion. Comments suggested that the OP made the characters seem more real, rather than the stereo-types that they can easily become in RP. The adoption of OP in tragedy, contrasting with the comic extracts we had focused on, was accepted without question. This may show that the

use of the pronunciation is not limited in the minds of the participants to the sort of speech one might use to characterise rustics or comedic roles.

The support for teaching OP in drama school was unanimous and vigorous, even if it were to take the form of a one-off workshop session. Several of the students confided that as a result of this workshop they are now in a better position to interpret Shakespeare's rhyme and metre and regretted that they had not done the workshop prior to their first-year Shakespeare module. A student (from Italia Conti) asked, "would OP work with other authors and for later works?" My response was that this style holds for anything up to around 1650 (and the more conservative version perhaps from 1550) but vowel sounds were continuing to change and variant or regional pronunciations were being adopted. Therefore, although this approach may be relevant to later periods, such as the Restoration, adjustments would need to be made for the more advanced sound system.

This workshop revealed that a model system is required, which should include visual aids, warm-ups, exercises to develop differing aspects of the pronunciation, short extracts to work on in groups (or pairs) and fuller texts to develop pronunciation and characterisation. Owing to the difficulty of covering everything in a workshop, a self-study follow-up course would be beneficial, with audio examples, vowel and consonant

exercises and short extracts from plays and poems. The success of the lexical sets and warm-up exercises in this workshop appeared to confirm the viability of teaching OP in the same way as a modern regional accent. This workshop was more successful than the first one in terms of the fluency and accuracy achieved after three hours. Much of this was due to the use of antiphonal techniques¹⁰⁰, pair work (peer coaching) and the use of lexical sets for warm-ups and demonstration of specific sounds. OP skills were in general “often correct”, although one participant was “almost always correct”. General progress enabled the actors “at times, to focus on other areas such as movement, gesture, blocking, general acting and voice work.”

Workshop 3

The third workshop was a two-day acting workshop, which took place on 24th and 25th November, 2011, in the drama department at the University of Glamorgan. In this workshop, the good practice developed in the last workshop would be carried forward and problems addressed. The practice of dealing with the rhotic ‘r’ with the diphthongs was continued as it provided a link between these two sounds which would continue later. The use of lexical sets in the warm-up would be extended and given more of a structure as this appeared to increase the accuracy

¹⁰⁰ ‘Parroting’

of the pronunciation. More time would be allowed to introduce the short vowels, and weak stress would be dealt with in greater detail.

A new development for this workshop was the use of audio. Prior to the workshop the actors were sent a download link to access the audio. It became apparent during the workshop that a number of students had accessed the material and some of them had downloaded the examples onto their phones to listen to during the day. The audio took the students, line by line, through the target scenes.

As the first OP acting workshop, it presented a challenge: most of the students had no prior knowledge of OP and were unfamiliar with the phonetic symbols used in the transcriptions, and as their experience of Shakespeare was limited, they were not well-practised at reading or performing blank verse. I had discovered in previous workshops that the best way to tackle these challenges was to get the students speaking in OP, albeit fragmented at first, as early as possible in the first session.

The overall objectives of the workshop were to give the students a general introduction to the use of OP in prose and verse, to achieve as much accuracy as possible in the pronunciation and to allow them to explore the dramatic possibilities presented by OP. In a workshop of this nature it is important to achieve the right balance between accuracy of

speech and meaningful dramatic exploration, to unite the spoken word with the action. To achieve this, inevitably some compromises have to be made with regard to both the pronunciation and the acting. This workshop presented the first opportunity to test the material in a dramatic context, rather than in a voice workshop.

I designed a website for this workshop and this was made available to the students prior to the first session. All the written materials used in the workshop, such as the original play scripts, OP transcripts and warm-up exercises, were available on the website. There were also audio samples in MP3 format which could be downloaded onto handheld devices for listening prior to the first workshop and between sessions.

I had discovered that warm-ups are an essential part of the workshop, as they give the students confidence and enable them to focus on the sounds (and symbols) which they will need to master. The 'greetings', 'quotes' and 'swearing' activities (see Appendix 1) were designed to encourage the students to listen to and to imitate the sounds of OP. By moving around the room on the 'greetings' and 'swearing' exercises the students were able to hear a range of attempts at the pronunciation and this enabled them to 'tune in' to the accent at an early stage in the learning process. These warm-up exercises necessitated speaking only one or two words at a time.

After having practised a few of the sounds of OP and some individual words, the opening speech of *Richard III* was read to the students without their having sight of either the original script or a transcription.¹⁰¹ After the initial reading there was a short discussion about the intelligibility of the pronunciation for a modern audience. The students were asked to compare the speech with a pronunciation they had experience of. The reading was performed a second time while the students followed the original text (not a transcription). Experience has shown that it is beneficial for the actors to analyse the language for themselves, discovering patterns and rules which might make the learning process more logical and meaningful. Therefore, they were asked to look for any recurring patterns in the speech or anything which struck them as a particularly unusual pronunciation. After the reading, they were given an opportunity to make comments and share their discoveries.

The first practical activity, *The Tempest*, Act II, Scene 2, was designed to give the students a chance to assess the value of OP without having to pronounce it themselves. Only Caliban's lines were in OP so the students had a chance to absorb the sounds of the language and to begin to assess how OP might help to define a character. I gave the students the original script rather than a transcript.

¹⁰¹ The sight of a phonetic transcript at this stage may well have proved daunting for many of the students.

As a physical warm-up to this scene, I asked the students to participate in a 'rock-throwing' activity. In pairs, the students threw imaginary rocks at one another, each one accompanied by an insult in OP; the recipient threw the 'rock' back with a different insult. Forming groups of three, with Caliban situated in the centre, the outer two pushed him from one to the other, voicing an insult as they did so, which gradually increased in volume and speed. Caliban winced and reacted with a sound as if physically hurt by each insult. This activity may also be done with the whole group forming a circle around Caliban and pushing him from one to the other.

This warm-up was followed by a discussion about how to play the scene. The themes discussed here were: misunderstandings (the four-legged monster and the man in the moon); drunkenness; the mistreatment and exploitation bullying of Caliban; and the 'monster' idea (because he is ethnically 'different' or deformed). After playing the scene, the group discussed whether the use of OP was effective as a means of characterising Caliban and ways in which the drama might be heightened by the contrast between OP and PDE. One of the students expressed the view that the language helped to characterise Caliban as a non-native English speaker and it showed his social status. This last comment may suggest that OP might fulfil the role of an accent which might be perceived as a class signifier, in the way that a modern Cockney dialect

might. This feature may be employed within a regular, RP production, where a sub-set of the cast might signal their status through language, such as the shepherds and other forest-dwellers in *As You Like It*. Within an OP production, the lower status may be signalled by letter-dropping and perhaps the use of conservative forms (see the transcription policy, Chapter 5). With regard to non-nativeness, the OP accent may be sufficiently remote from modern English dialects to function as a foreign accent within an RP production. As the accent cannot easily be identified with a modern-day geographical location, it may serve well to represent the speech of characters from outside the central location of the play. The deliberate misuse of stress in the verse is an additional tool which might strengthen the notion of Caliban's speaking a foreign language.

The second practical activity featured *Romeo and Juliet*, Act II, Scene 2. As a warm-up, the students performed a 'pentameter walk'.¹⁰² The object of this was to heighten awareness of the structure of the verse-line with its five iambic feet, and focused initially on regular iambic lines, moving on to irregular ones. The students were asked to take steps in a variety of ways such as on the accents or on every second beat, whether stressed or not. This exercise proved to be a useful warm-up to the *Romeo and Juliet* reading; it helped the students who were less confident with iambic

¹⁰² Literally, a walk around the studio, stepping on each stressed syllable.

pentameter and drew attention to the sort of irregular rhythm one would encounter in the text.

The scene was repeated in choric fashion with several Romeos and Juliets attempting each line, echoing the model pronunciation. I asked the students observing to look for recurring patterns in the pronunciation. Care was needed at this point in pronouncing the diphthongs accurately and keeping the long vowels pure. Students then had a chance to practise in pairs, moving around the room and changing partners at regular intervals so they were able to hear a number of different interpretations. Some students chose to refer to the downloaded files on their handheld devices at this stage. The students read this scene from a PDE script initially and learned the pronunciation aurally, although a part-phonetic script was available for those students able to read it.¹⁰³

In the feedback session, one student felt strongly that this type of pronunciation was not appropriate for the *Romeo and Juliet* scene. It was explained to her that the lack of fluency in the language at this early stage and a certain amount of over-emphasis of the features of the pronunciation possibly caused the language to sound rougher. With more experience of the pronunciation, the delivery would be more effective

¹⁰³ Several students chose to use the phonetic script.

The second day consisted of a four-hour voluntary workshop in extra-curricular time. A number of the students had prior commitments but there were six in attendance. I gave them a practical which involved reading the phonetic symbols in an extract from *Macbeth*, Act IV, Scene 1 (see Appendix 1). The witches and apparitions in the *Macbeth* extract used OP but Macbeth himself, in contrast, spoke in a modern accent (not necessarily RP, as one student played the role very effectively in broad Scots). The object here was to determine how the use of OP by the supernaturals might help to highlight the differences in character between them and Macbeth. Hearing the two forms of speech juxtaposed heightened the contrasts in pronunciation and appeared to emphasise the other-worldly characters of the witches, or, at the very least, differentiated their brogue from the noble speech of Macbeth.

A challenge here was for the three witches to use the language to create some individuality or quirk of character for themselves. This involved emphasizing the diphthongs in words such as 'round', 'about' and 'thou', emphasizing the sibilants in 'snake', 'sting' and 'lizards' or exaggerating the final consonants in 'dark', 'shark', 'drab' and 'babe' (the latter also being pronounced short). The second workshop had proved the benefit of practising individual words from the scene in isolation before the reading of each phase; I used this method to a greater extent in this workshop as

it also provided an opportunity to introduce the phonetic symbols which were used in the transcription.

The students progressed through the three phases of the *Macbeth* script without any major pronunciation problems. However, several of them found it increasingly difficult to read the lines as the number of phonetic symbols increased. The diphthongs fluctuated somewhat and frequent reminders were required of the need to use the neutral 'shwa' vowel at the onset. There was a tendency for [əɪ] to become 'oi' and [əʊ] to become 'au' or some sort of monophthong akin to [u:]. The short, unrounded vowel on 'hot' was not always executed but this was not crucial as the modern-day vowel is acceptable in OP. The group 'ǎr' was not always recognised. Perhaps more time should have been spent on the short vowels, which were left until the third stage.

The attempt at improvising some blocking on this scene during the initial reading of the phonetics was unsuccessful. However, later in the workshop, with the benefit of more practice, the scene was effectively rehearsed in OP, directed by a student, and run in segments, alternating between PDE and OP. This was beneficial in the respect that the blocking could be worked out in the RP reading and then rehearsed in the OP reading. The role of Macbeth was played in a Scots accent, giving an effective contrast to the witches' and apparitions' OP.

The final practical activity focused on *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act II, Scene 2, and was the most ambitious scene, being in OP throughout. One objective was to discover whether it was possible to use OP pronunciations to differentiate between the characters. For example, there was the option here of using a more archaic style, where 'gh' and 'kn' are sounded. One character might choose to exaggerate the rhotic 'r' and another might exaggerate the 'əʊ' diphthong. Further important variations might manifest themselves in rehearsal, especially where the actor has a native accent other than RP.

I began rehearsals on this scene with a warm-up exercise to discover whether some of the words might have comic potential when exaggerated or mispronounced. Could one or more of the characters be given a quirky style of pronunciation to exaggerate their role? The use of language was paramount here and the blocking was considered secondary. In order to give some structure to the scene, a director was chosen from amongst the group.

The students found the *Midsummer Night's Dream* script difficult to interpret as all the phonetics were presented at once. However, they began to discover the comic possibilities inherent in the OP pronunciations on words such as 'lion', 'lover', 'tyrant', 'ladies' and 'roar'. The OP sounds were gradually absorbed as parts of the scene were

developed. They began to discover that even the names such as ‘Snug the Joiner’ have a completely different ring to them in OP. This exercise demonstrated that, even after a number of hours of focus on OP, presenting a new phonetic script without adequate preparation may cause significant difficulty. The ‘vocabulary taster’ (a list of OP words used in the script) proved very valuable as a warm-up exercise for this scene.

Overall, the workshop was successful in that the students made good progress in their study of the pronunciation and were able to use OP, albeit to a limited extent, in their acting and directing. The idea of working without reference to phonetics but relying on picking up the pronunciation by ear was modestly successful and, had the workshop been spread over a longer time-frame, may have been more so. It is clear, however, that this type of learning process needs to be re-enforced by one-to-one coaching if it is to be truly successful. The students benefited from the warm-up activities, which enabled them to use the pronunciation on individual words and short phrases right from the outset. The exercises provided a focus for the target scenes and helped the students get into character.

My observations of the students’ annotating of scripts shed some light on the methods of individual actors towards learning the accent. Some of them continued to annotate on the second day when we were using the

phonetics. In the initial stages, the annotations, although approximate, were helpful. However, when greater accuracy was needed the approximations could be misleading if taken too literally. This is inevitable when actors use familiar PDE words as a point of reference; for example, annotating 'fear' with 'fair' as an aide memoire. When performing the *Macbeth* scene from phase 3 scripts, two students chose to use the more 'actor-friendly' phase 1 script, committing to memory the sounds covered in stages 2 and 3.

Crucially, the idea of acting out scenes whilst tackling the phonetic script was unsuccessful. Even in the relatively straight-forward first phase, the improvised blocking was not at all meaningful. This may suggest that, when working with an inexperienced student group, it may be preferable to establish the pronunciation before embarking on the dramatic action. This is contrary to David Crystal's findings with experienced actors.

Right from the outset, it was evident that the students were attempting to relate the new OP sounds they were hearing to sounds they already had experience of. A phonetic symbol on the page held little significance but a simple reference to a modern phoneme, such as the diphthong in the word 'go', was frequently the trigger to a successful OP pronunciation, such as in the word 'now'. This phenomenon strengthened my belief that any productive teaching method must include reference to lexical family

groupings, each with their own keyword, which serves to trigger an accurate pronunciation. In rehearsal, I was able to correct pronunciation errors with little interruption to the flow of the lines by simply calling out a key word (such as 'Sarah') which would generally prompt the appropriate correction. For a working methodology, the use of lexical sets and keyword triggers should be a central feature.

One advantage of using regular scripts on the first day was that the students were able to look and listen for recurring patterns in the pronunciation and could begin to formulate a set of rules, rather than simply following a text without regard to how the pronunciation works in context. This develops the important skill of listening, which is essential when developing pronunciation skills. The vocal warm-up on vowels and diphthongs was essential as most of the students had no experience of thinking about where in the mouth they placed their vowels or even what the distinction is between a vowel and a diphthong. The use of signature names to demonstrate the vowel sounds was central to these exercises.

An annotated, rather than phonetic script might encourage actors to think about the recurring patterns and word groups involved in OP, as well as the stress system. This should enable them to be able to read from a regular script (possibly with footnotes) quite soon, given sufficient time for private study.

In general, progress on the pronunciation was slower in these workshops than in previous ones. Factors affecting this were the group size, the experiments with the use of regular, rather than phonetic scripts, the emphasis on acting and directing, and the frequent feedback and discussion sessions built into the workshop (which were very informative and will be instrumental in forming an effective method of coaching).

Despite the slower progress, the students appeared to be using their ears effectively and this is emphasised by the way some of them chose to read from phase 1 scripts on the second day, when rehearsing scenes in phase 3. Their memory of the sounds was largely accurate and it was noteworthy that they preferred to commit the sounds to memory rather than read the phonetics (which some students found rather confusing). A study of the phonetic symbols could be undertaken privately prior to the workshop as all the symbols and sounds were on the website and perhaps more encouragement might have been given to the students to look at and listen to these.

The main points I needed to explore further in the next workshop concern both the type of script and the pedagogy. A method of signalling the OP sounds without using phonetics needs to be pursued, perhaps using colour coding. The idea of my giving an OP reading while the students follow an unmarked script encourages them to listen and

analyse the OP sounds, looking for recurring patterns, and is a beneficial warm-up exercise. The use of lexical groupings with key trigger words may now be extended, both in the warm-ups and in the coaching of texts. I consider the use of audio samples (available prior to the workshop) as an essential part of the process now.

Given that the students were acting in OP in this workshop, I felt that the fact that in general their OP skills were “often correct” was acceptable. Similarly, the ability to focus “at times” on other areas such as movement, gesture, blocking, general acting and voice work was acceptable. In terms of pedagogy, there was still a need to test this in the context of a longer workshop (or series of workshops).

Workshop 4

The fourth workshop took the form of a radio project, which took place on Thursday 1st and Friday 2nd March 2012. The previous workshop, in November 2011, clarified the fact that, in order to achieve a higher standard of accuracy in the pronunciation, what was required was a longer rehearsal period, working towards a particular goal with a small group of actors. The goal was provided by the radio department at the University of Glamorgan, who generously agreed to record part of a play in OP.

I took into consideration here discoveries made in earlier workshops. Extensive audio samples were recorded to accompany the written material, I developed a new type of transcript, which did not rely on the use of phonetic symbols, and I wrote a guide, *An Introduction to Shakespearean Pronunciation*. This includes examples from the plays and poems, explaining how OP might be used to reconstruct the original metrical and rhyming patterns.¹⁰⁴

In this booklet, I have explained some of the ways in which Shakespeare's pronunciation might easily be restored. The book avoids linguistic explanations which might alienate the reader and is filled with line readings explaining the reconstruction. It does not try to persuade the reader to recreate the pronunciation in its entirety and it does not systematically explain how all the vowels should be pronounced. It simply gives a number of representative examples of pronunciations which, if adopted, would go a long way towards repairing the anomalies inherent in modern performances. It is hoped that this will gently point the reader in the right direction, encourage them to approach Shakespearean texts in a new way, and perhaps explore the subject of OP in greater detail. My choice of script was crucial to the success of this project. An ideal script would run for around 40 to 45 minutes and contain prose, blank verse and rhyme. It was important for me to choose scenes where the OP

¹⁰⁴ *An Introduction to Shakespearean Pronunciation* may be found in Appendix 1

would not only repair rhyme and metre but also contribute to the characterisation of the parts, very beneficial to a radio recording. The extracts from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* had proved popular in previous workshops and so I adapted the 'mechanicals' scenes to make a self-contained piece. This would not be effective without some interaction with the fairies so parts of Oberon's, Puck's and Titania's dialogue are included.

The inclusion of two casts, humans and fairies, allowed me to test the two varieties of OP detailed in my transcription policy. A more conservative form was assigned to the mechanicals and an advanced form to the fairies. The fairies' mode of speech is also given a more carefully articulated sound by retaining initial 'h' in stressed words. The mechanicals drop their 'h' in prose but pronounce it (perhaps exaggeratedly) in the 'Pyramus and Thisbe' episodes, where they are attempting heightened language. The details of the two forms of OP are explained in detail in the 'Transcription Policy' (Chapter 5).

During the third workshop it became apparent that it would be highly beneficial to develop a method of teaching OP which does not involve the reading of phonetic symbols. I decided to explore a way of extending the idea of using highlighting, but at the same time avoiding phonetics. During the third workshop, the students had successfully identified

recurring patterns in groups of alike words and so the grouping of words into lexical sets seemed a good way forward.

The idea of extending the use of coloured fonts as a means of identifying vowel sounds seemed attractive, but there was a danger that overuse of coloured text might be confusing and might render the script unreadable. As an alternative, I placed a border around the occurrence of the vowel sound in a word and filled the box with an appropriate colour (see Appendix 1); this type of script appears to be more easily readable. After observing the way actors mark up their scripts with personal reminders to help recall a pronunciation, I decided to capitalise on this by including footnotes with pronunciation prompts and other information where it would be helpful. In some cases the prompt might simply be the key-word for the lexical set. To support the transcription, I gave the actors a complete vocabulary list with all the words from the play grouped according to their lexical sets (and colours). This facilitated pronunciation practice and served as a resource in which the words could be looked up to check the pronunciation.

Dropped letters, such as initial 'h' and final 'g' appear in the transcript in 25% grey. This does not affect the readability of the original word and it enables the actor to re-instate the dropped letter if they wish.

Syncopations are shown in the same way or by using apostrophes to

replace omitted letters. Less-frequently-used lexical sets do not employ colour, but a simple box around the letter, together with a footnote, which serves as a prompt.

I met a few challenges in the transcription process. The first involved variant pronunciations which do not fit the general pattern. Examples of this are the words 'measure' and 'discretion'. For the purposes of the radio workshop, a box was put around the entire word and a 'friendly' spelling, using letters of the regular alphabet, was given in a footnote. For example, 'measure' is spelled 'meazer' and 'discretion' is 'discesion'. This enables the text to remain as close to the original as possible. The second challenge involved the use of weak forms such as 'yə' for 'you' and 'yəɪ' for 'your'. For the radio workshop I spelled these in the way they might appear in regional dialect in a novel. Sometimes dropped letters are involved, such as in 'them' and 'of', which were greyed. In other cases I used a yellow border with a shadow to prompt the unstressed pronunciation. If the weak form was the same as in PDE this was not shown in the transcript.

I have shown the rhotic 'r' by a bold 'r', which is more actor-friendly than the phonetic 'ɹ' symbol used in previous workshops. The rising diphthong in 'Cupid' is shown by 'yu' when necessary (rather than 'ju'). The 'a' in

'what' is shown by the phonetic 'a' as this is close enough to the regular letter to be recognisable, yet sufficiently unusual to act as a prompt.

There are several advantages of using this type of orthographical system rather than a part-phonetic transcript. The different elements of the pronunciation can be taught in layers or stages without the need to produce a series of different scripts. The colour coding easily enables the reader to scan the text for families of words with identical pronunciations. The origins of syncope or elided words can easily be seen and the greying of letters allows the redundant syllables to be omitted when reading, or re-instated according to the actor's preference. The supporting material allows cross-referencing when checking pronunciations and the target sounds can be checked with the audio samples. Preparatory work on the vocabulary can be undertaken prior to reading the text, taking the words of each lexical set in isolation to practise the pronunciation. This proved very beneficial in the warm-up sessions.

One great advantage is that the system encourages the actor to recognise recurring patterns in the sounds of the language and to apply logic to their interpretation. This contrasts with the use of phonetics, where the actor may blindly follow the orthography, taking longer to recognise the underlying structure of the pronunciation. Another benefit of the colour

annotated script (CAS) is that the text looks close to the original. In order to achieve this, I had to make compromises, especially when showing unusual pronunciations in words such as 'measure' and 'nature', and in expanded endings such as 'discretion'.

Looking at JC Wells' lexical sets (Wells, 1986), it became apparent that a little adaptation would be necessary to represent the sounds of OP. For example, group 7, the BATH set, can be merged with group 3, the TRAP set, and set 8, CLOTH, may be merged with set 4, the LOT set. Set 9, the NURSE set, needs to be subdivided to account for OP sounds not represented in PDE; this would differentiate between the [əʊ], used in 'term' and 'bird' and the [ʊɹ], used in 'nurse', and would also allow for the variant [ɹɹ], sometimes used in [əʊ] words. Set 11 needs to be subdivided to include the open and close 'e' sounds, [ɛ:] and [e:].

I assigned a suitable signature name to each lexical set, which defined the pronunciation for the word group. Many of the names, such as 'Lucy' and 'Peter', contain the target vowel sound when pronounced in PDE. However, some, such as 'Snug' and 'Austen', represent sounds which have no equivalent in RP. The signature sounds were established through the use of audio samples and demonstrations and the students were expected to commit these to memory. I recorded each keyword for ease of reference and, in order to practise the vocabulary, the complete lexical

set associated with each key-word was presented in the audio recordings. I made these available to students on a website, which was set up to support the workshop.

During the transcription process for the radio workshop (workshop 4), some unusual pronunciations came to light, some of which affected the metre and some the rhyme scheme. In order to clarify the implications evident in the text, I justified my transcription choices by referencing a precedent for each one, either in the works of Shakespeare or of other poets and playwrights of his era. These pronunciations are discussed in detail and supporting examples are given in Appendix 1.

On the workshop web space, the actors were able to listen to my recording of every line in the play and hear the pronunciation of every significant word in the context of its lexical set. The *Radio Project Home Page* gave access to the phonetic transcription, the CAS, the lexical sets with audio and the original play script (Figure 7.1, below).

7.1, 'Radio Project Home Page'

Original Pronunciation Workshop

University of Glamorgan OP Radio Project

Welcome to the Radio Project pages. You will find here all the resources you need to enable you to read the play in Original Pronunciation. There is a choice of three scripts: the original version, a part-phonetic version (as used in the directors' workshop) and a new colour-annotated transcription which does not require a knowledge of phonetics. The latter has been prepared in response to suggestions by students on the directors' workshop. There are also audio files for every line in the play which you can use to help refine your pronunciation. The links in the menu on the left take you to the text in regular English with demonstration audio.

Use the menu buttons on the left to navigate to any particular scene.

The Transcriptions

This abridged version of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* focuses on the antics of the mechanicals in Athens and in the forest. Some of the action involving Puck, Oberon and Titania is also included as their interaction with the mechanicals is central to the plot. The inclusion of these two diverse sets of characters presented an opportunity to use different modes of speech to differentiate between them. The mechanicals use an older style of pronunciation which would still have been used by some in Shakespeare's day and there is evidence of it in his rhymes. The fairies use a more advanced type of speech. The mechanicals drop their initial 'h', a very common practice in Shakespeare's day, even amongst the nobility and royalty. The exception to this is in the 'play within the play' where the mechanicals strive to attain the heightened language of the play form. 'H' is preserved for the fairies throughout, when stressed, although other letters are often dropped.

The Phonetic Script

In order to interpret the Phonetic Script you need to know only a small number of phonetic symbols. These do not really take long to master. The complete list may be found by clicking the menu button on the left. Download the Phonetic Script here:
[Phonetic Script](#)

The Colour-Annotated Script

This project sees the trial of this new type of script, which has been developed as a result of suggestions by students. In the C.A.S. blocks of colour have been placed around each individual vowel where it differs from present day English so that the vowel sound is easily identified and groups of related words may be distinguished. As an aide-memoire, every vowel has been assigned a signature sound in the form of a name. Other sounds which differ from present day English are placed in a box. Sometimes a footnote explains the reason for the box and sometimes the spelling is altered slightly to show how the word should be pronounced. Taken in conjunction with the audio files, the CAS should be sufficient for students who prefer not to use phonetics.
[Click here to download the Colour-Annotated Script \(CAS\)](#)

Click here to download the key to the colour symbols and the signature names (see also lexical sets with audio below for further explanation):
[Colour Code used in Colour-Annotated Script](#)

The complete lists of all the OP words in the script can be seen and heard by following the link below.

It is important to note that some of the sounds do not occur naturally in present day British English (PDF) and in those cases the OP form is the signature pronunciation (as per the audio examples). In many cases the PDF pronunciation easily gives away the OP sound.

The play script is divided into segments, each of which is followed by a link to the audio recording. The segments follow the lines of each character so that it is possible for the actor to click on their own lines without having to listen to the intervening dialogue (figure 7.2, below):

Figure 7.2, Text Sample with Audio: Act II, Scene 1

The screenshot shows a web browser window with the title "Original Pronunciation Workshop". On the left is a vertical navigation menu with tabs for "Home", "Radio Project 2012", "Act I, Scene 2", "Act II, Scene 1", "Act II, Scene 2", "Act III, Scene 1", "Act IV, Scene 1", "Act IV, Scene 2", "Act V, Scene 1", "Phonetic Symbols", "Vowel Chart", "Vowel Sounds Demo", and "Contact". The "Act II, Scene 1" tab is selected and highlighted in blue. The main content area displays the text of Act II, Scene 1, [A wood near Athens], including the dialogue between Oberon and Puck. The text is as follows:

Act II, Scene 1. [A wood near Athens]

OBERON: My gentle Puck, come hither. Thou rememberest since once I sat upon a promontory, And heard a mermaid on a dolphin's back, Uttering such dulcet and harmonious breath, That the rude sea grew civil at her song, And certain stars shot madly from their spheres, To hear the sea-maid's music.

PUCK: I remember.

OBERON: That very time I saw, but thou couldst not, Flying between the cold moon and the earth, Cupid all arm'd: a certain aim he took At a fair vestal throned by the west, And loosed his love-shaft smartly from his bow, As it should pierce a hundred thousand hearts; But I might see young Cupid's fiery shaft Quenched in the chaste beams of the watery moon, And the imperial votaress passed on, In maiden meditation, fancy-free.

Yet mark'd I where the bolt of Cupid fell: It fell upon a little western flower, Before milk-white, now purple with love's wound, And maiden call it love-in-idleness. Fetch me that flower; the herb I shew'd thee once: The juice of it on sleeping eye-balls laid Will make or man or woman madly dote Upon the next live creature that it sees. Fetch me this herb; and be thou here again Ere the leviathan can swim a league.

The browser's address bar shows "Internet" and the page number "11196".

The page below (figure 7.3) contains all the major words in the play grouped into their lexical sets, each under its own tab. Each lexical set has a signature word which serves as a reminder of the pronunciation. For example, in the view below, *Ida* is the signature word for the ‘aɪ’ diphthong and all the words in the list contain that diphthong. At the foot of each list is a link to an audio recording of the complete list.

Figure 7.3, 'Lexical Sets' Page

You will find below all the words in OE which differ from modern English, grouped in lexical sets (each group contains words pronounced alike). The audio files demonstrate the pronunciation of all the words in each set. Each set has a signature word (in name) which will help you to recall the pronunciations. Please note that some of the names are not pronounced like modern English.

You will also find here examples of words with unusual pronunciations (Special Words) as well as the weak forms of common words.

Click a tab to see the lexical set and hear the words.

The link to the AUDIO file is at the end of each word list.

[Click here to download a colour-coded WORD file of the lexical sets which corresponds to the colours on the annotated script.](#)

[Click here to listen to the Berlin Project Interview](#)

[Ida](#) | [Snot](#) | [Sera](#) | [Amy](#) | [Oberon](#) | [Ang](#) | [Ole](#) | [Arabela](#) | [Austen](#) | [Lorraine](#) | [Demid](#) | [Tom](#) | [Larry](#) | [Bart](#) | [Other Vowels](#) | [Special Words](#) | [Iiv](#) | [Strong and Weak Forms](#)

Ida

wfright
wila
af
bind
boiling
bright
by
child
cry
delight
desire
die
dined
dry
dried
egentine
eye
eyes
eyne
fantasies
fery
finds
five
flight
fly
fying
fright
hide
vow

Done Internet 9,110%

Summary of Workshop 4, Radio Workshop, Thursday 1st March and Friday 2nd March 2012

All but one actress, who had completed a phonetics course as well as a previous OP workshop, chose to work from the Colour Annotated Script. This actress also referred to the CAS for clarification where words contained multiple phonetic symbols. The CAS proved very beneficial as an aid to understanding the sounds of OP and it was also used in an initial read-through in PDE. It was very useful to be able to see at a glance the frequency of words in each lexical set. The means of highlighting special cases of pronunciation (with a box and foot-note) was less effective as the pronunciation was not immediately obvious and was sometimes overlooked. There is room for development in the way that 'special words' are described; perhaps a phonetic description in a footnote may be useful. The designation of the weak forms of the vowels found in 'Ida', 'Arabella' and 'Orla' (such as unstressed 'i', 'are' and 'for') was only partially effective as in some places the actors failed to notice the yellow border. It may be that the 'shwa' vowel in unstressed words might be represented by using letters from the PDE alphabet.

The lexical sets were an invaluable aid when practising the pronunciation, as well as acting as reference material. In this workshop, insufficient time was allocated to the reading of the vocabulary in the lexical sets, which

also needs to be revisited frequently during the rehearsal process. In particular, more practice could have been done on the 'special words' list; this would have enabled the cast to identify less-obvious patterns in those words which do not belong to a lexical set.

It was problematic that each actress showed variation in her delivery of key vowel sounds, not always within the acceptable parameters of OP. This reveals either a marked inconsistency in the actresses' perceptions of the OP vowel sounds, or an inability to recall with accuracy a sound which has been modelled for them, or a lack of understanding of the physical process required to produce a sound. Some actors are more discerning than others in their attempts to intellectualise the mechanisms involved in the physical process of placing the sounds and some are more able to attune their ear. The problematic wide variations beyond tolerance are also influenced by the actresses' base accents, which may contain greater or fewer of the OP target vowels. If the target vowel is in the actresses repertoire, albeit in a different context, she is more likely to hear it and reproduce it accurately; it is a matter of reproducing a familiar physical process in an unfamiliar context. This may be exemplified by using the PDE diphthong found in 'go' and reproducing it in the context of the OP diphthong in 'now'. It is an advantage to have a variety of base accents. For example, one actress's (Southern Irish) short 'o' and 'a' sounds were very appropriate for OP, an RP speaker had a very pure long

'o' (Oberon), and a Mancunian had pure long 'e' vowels (both open and closed) and was able to accommodate her short 'u' to the 'Snug' vowel in 'love'. These vowels were used as models for the group. The aim was never to achieve a single uniform accent but to allow each actor to colour the OP with their own regional accent, which reflects the likely situation in Shakespearean England.

Warm-up exercises helped to create awareness in the actors of where in the mouth to place the OP vowels and how this placing differs from PDE. The greatest difficulty was experienced with the two falling diphthongs [əɪ] and [əʊ]. Although these were managed with accuracy in the warm-up, when met in context or at speed they were frequently less accurate. With more practice, greater accuracy and fluency might be achieved with these and other sounds; a longer break between rehearsals would provide the necessary time to practise.¹⁰⁵ A systematic approach might now be applied to the voice exercises, perhaps using methods which have proved efficient in dialect coaching. As part of this, warm-up and revision exercises should be built into the rehearsal process at regular intervals. It is desirable that the actors ultimately think in OP so that the pronunciation becomes second nature.

¹⁰⁵ This would be tested in the next workshop.

As in previous workshops, OP pronunciations were initially exaggerated. This may be inevitable, and even beneficial in the early stages of learning OP, but it becomes problematic if allowed to continue. This exaggeration was certainly evident in the rhotic 'r', especially when preceded by [o:] and short 'a'. It was discovered, however, that exaggerated sounds might be useful for the purposes of characterisation or for comic effect in the mechanicals' scenes. The time-frame of this workshop did not allow full exploration of the different forms of 'r'. A flapped or trilled initial 'r' was not used and the one used in pre-consonantal and final positions was perhaps too strong for the period, as 'r' was beginning to weaken in these positions.

The pace of the dialogue was a slight issue here. In the introduction to the workshop I mentioned that OP has a faster pace than PDE. Unfortunately, this encouraged some of the actresses to attempt a quicker pace of delivery than was desirable in the early stages of learning. On several occasions the pace had to be slowed down in order to achieve greater accuracy. David Crystal describes the stage speech of Shakespeare's day as "very casual. Sounds were left out and words run together." With the cumulative effects of all these shortenings, he reveals that the running time of the OP *Romeo and Juliet* at Shakespeare's Globe "turned out to be ten minutes shorter than the modern one" (Crystal 2005e). This effect was problematic in places where the dialogue was

integrated with fight choreography or dancing, such as in the banquet scene “(where the speaking and the dancing was carefully choreographed in Modern English, but in OP the speaking finished well before the dancing did)” (Crystal 2011b).

Even in a short rehearsal period, such as this, successful methods began to present themselves for effective coaching of the pronunciation. For example, when it became apparent that the various base accents were providing some excellent exemplar vowel sounds it was possible for me to capitalise on this. I applied labels to certain pronunciations, which the actresses could easily recognise, such as the ‘Henley vowel’ for the pure long ‘o’ sound and the ‘Dublin’ ‘o’ and ‘a’ for the short vowel sounds. This labelling evolved as a result of the cast’s listening to one another’s delivery, and my pointing out sounds which were ideal for OP. This situation was beneficial in that individuals felt that they had a head-start in the process and were contributing something of their own speech to the target sounds. It also helped to create a sense of identity amongst the cast as unique ways of describing the sounds were developed which were only appropriate to this group.

As the workshop progressed, results seemed to confirm that pronunciation practice should be built into the rehearsal process. Without being constantly refreshed, there was a tendency for some of the vowel

sounds to revert to PDE. This was especially true of the diphthongs. Furthermore, hypercorrection¹⁰⁶ would sometimes be in evidence, resulting in undesirable or exaggerated sounds.

Parroting proved to be productive. This took the forms of both choric repetition of lines spoken by me and copying by individuals. Right from the start of the workshop, the actresses were very keen to copy sounds and this was very helpful in eventually achieving accuracy in the placement and delivery of the vowels. Once some accuracy had been achieved, the idea of introducing peer coaching became possible. By breaking into pairs or small groups the actors were able to listen to and correct each other's pronunciation. This idea of 'peer coaching' is one which I would explore in more detail in the next workshop, when working with a group of actors over an extended time period.

Sight-reading undertaken in this workshop was only modestly successful. Although the colour annotated script enabled actresses to read at sight in a way that may not have been possible for them with a phonetic script, only some of the elements of the pronunciation were accurate in sight-reading and these varied from person to person. In most cases, the

¹⁰⁶ "The use of an incorrect form by a speaker trying to avoid ones that are stigmatized. '[D]ropping an h' is and was stigmatized so, in trying to avoid the stigma, they might use [h] even when it is not there in the prestige form..." Matthews, P.H. (2007). In OP terms, this might describe the overemphasis of a linguistic feature (such as a rhotic 'r'), perhaps applying it in inappropriate places.

sounds which drifted most noticeably towards RP were the diphthongs. For example, some actresses began to use a sound approaching [ʊ] for the initial vowel in the [əɪ] diphthong. More time to practise sight-reading would be beneficial, given more rehearsal time.

At the point in the recording when the focus shifted from pronunciation to acting, errors began to appear in the OP and the actors' regional accents began to assert themselves (not in itself an adverse effect). In Paul Meier's *Midsummer Night's Dream* rehearsals, David Crystal's preferred method of working was to use OP in parallel with the blocking, so that the actors were used to acting, moving and thinking in OP. This avoids the danger of reverting to PDE if movement is introduced at a later stage in the rehearsal process.

A few general points were evident in rehearsal. The [ɛ:] in 'Sarah' had a tendency to diphthongise, especially when used in final position and sometimes this vowel was too close, becoming [e:]. In general this fault was recognised by the actors, who corrected themselves. The [e:] in 'Amy' was also sometimes diphthongised in open syllables. The 'Snug' vowel had a tendency in some actors to become a PDE Northern vowel – too high and too rounded. The first element of the diphthongs [əɪ] and [əʊ] would sometimes revert to PDE sounds when the cast was focused on acting or when sight-reading. The long [o:] vowel, when followed by 'r',

had a tendency to become [ɔ:], not the target vowel but nevertheless an acceptable alternative. A problem occurred where one actress began to develop an excrescent 'r' after the vowel in words like 'ought'. This is a form of 'hypercorrection'. A more efficient warm-up routine may well solve these problems and this would be tested in the next workshop.

An analysis of the radio recordings revealed some recurring errors in the pronunciation, the most common of which were as follows:

In general, RP speakers tended to pronounce the long vowels with a fair degree of accuracy but the diphthongs were less well executed, especially [əɪ]. A student with a Scots accent consistently pronounced the [əʊ] and [əɪ] diphthongs very accurately but did not always distinguish between the open and close 'e' sounds [ɛ:] and [e:]. Others did not achieve an open 'e' in words like 'rate' and tended to use the PDE diphthong. An Irish student failed to reproduce the [əɪ] diphthong with any degree of accuracy as the first element tended to be [ɒ]; her open 'e' also tended to become [e:].

I allocated lines for the scene at the start of the workshop and this enabled the actresses to focus on the pronunciations they required for their own role. The majority of students made good progress in this workshop so that their pronunciation was "often correct". Two students

were “almost always correct” and one was “sometimes correct”. All the students made sufficient progress to enable them “at times, to focus on other areas such as gesture, and general acting and voice work.”

Workshop 5

It was in the fifth workshop that real progress was made, both with the method of teaching and the accuracy of the pronunciation. I developed techniques further here which had been gradually introduced in previous workshops, such as an annotated script, scene-specific warm-up exercises and peer coaching. Moreover, the actors were given the opportunity to discover ways in which the use of OP might enhance or inform their practice. A major difference between this and previous workshops was that the actors were all professionally trained.

The structure of this workshop allowed me to determine how much progress actors are able to make with the pronunciation over a period of several rehearsals, given time to practise in between. I hired a small studio in central south London and advertised the project as a rehearsed reading in original pronunciation, focusing on *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. There were three one-day rehearsals, stretching over three weekends in May 2012, each rehearsal lasting from 10.00 am to 5.00 pm. The final day culminated in the rehearsed reading.

In order to recruit the cast, I placed a casting call on the *Casting Call Pro* website,¹⁰⁷ inviting actors with an interest in exploring the performance of Shakespeare in OP to apply. The advert made it clear that this was an educational project. Despite the prospect of no pay, within a couple of days a team of twelve professional actors was assembled, one of whom was also a voice coach.

About one month prior to the first rehearsal the cast were emailed some preparatory material so that they might come prepared on the first day of the workshop. This included copies of the booklets *The Rhythm of Macbeth* and *An Introduction to Shakespearean Pronunciation*, written for actors participating in these workshops. The cast was also sent a link to the workshop website, which contained all the scripts used in rehearsal, together with audio recordings of the lines and some other supporting material such as vowel charts.

I wrote *An Introduction to Shakespearean Pronunciation* as a lay person's guide to the reconstruction of Shakespeare's language, which is made possible by the use of OP. It is designed for actors with no knowledge of language history or phonetics and includes many line-readings from Shakespeare's plays. The actors were asked to read this prior to the first workshop session and the intention was that this would cover some of

¹⁰⁷ www.castingcallpro.com/uk

the groundwork, saving time in the rehearsal. An important feature of this booklet is that the elements of pronunciation are explained in the context of the evidence in Shakespeare's works. My intention was that the actors should understand the value of questioning that evidence and looking for alternative readings. As there are no phonetic symbols in this booklet, it presents no obstacles to the beginner and is appropriate for self-study.

I designed *The Rhythm of Macbeth* (Appendix 1), for the purpose of introducing actors with no previous experience of OP to the sort of repairs that the language reconstruction can make to the scansion of Shakespeare's verse. The main object of this booklet is to draw attention to certain irregularities in the metre and to suggest that these irregularities were not necessarily present when the verse was written. Over time, language change can cause changes in the syllable structure of words which may have a significant effect on the scansion. My intention was that the actors would consider this aspect of OP prior to the first workshop and that it would encourage them to think about, and hopefully challenge, the idea of reconstructing historic pronunciation. Feedback from the actors at the end of the sessions showed that they found reading this material prior to the workshop very worthwhile as it gave a succinct introduction to the value of OP in a way that an untrained person could easily understand. The booklet stimulated interest in what

was for all the participants a new area of study. As no knowledge of OP is required in order to understand the concepts introduced, it formed an ideal self-study module.

In order to make a direct comparison with the work done in the shorter workshops, I used some of the same texts, in particular the extracts from *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. The actors had the choice of using the part-phonetic transcript, Colour Annotated Script (CAS) or the two side by side. In addition to the *Midsummer Night's Dream* CAS, I prepared a CAS for *Romeo and Juliet* Act II, Scene 2.

My personal preparation for this workshop included many hours of listening back to the recordings made in workshop 4 (The Radio Project) in order to identify possible problem areas. In particular, it was important to discover which OP sounds were easily managed and which caused the most difficulty, how sounds occurring in particular combinations were dealt with and what effect the base accent had on the delivery. Recurring patterns in mispronunciations were noted in order to inform the teaching process. It was hoped that careful coaching would lessen the frequency of these errors.

I devised a methodical approach to the introduction of the OP sounds and created various new warm-ups, using lexical sets and signature sounds in

conjunction with lines from Shakespeare's plays.¹⁰⁸ In the workshop, I introduced phonetic symbols at all stages as a visual stimulus so all the actors would become familiar with them, even if they had chosen not to use the phonetic script. Warm-ups were designed to be repeated throughout the rehearsals in order to keep the sounds of OP in the actors' minds and, importantly, in their mouths. It was important to avoid the possibility of actors adopting the nearest modern dialectal pronunciation for OP sounds where there is no equivalent today.

For this workshop, I prepared a warm-up booklet (see Appendix 1), which was designed to introduce the actors to each of the individual OP sounds and to practise them, both in isolation and in the context of lines taken from three Shakespeare plays. In the booklet I present the vocabulary of each scene, arranged in lexical sets so that the teaching can focus on each sound in turn. To complement these warm-ups, I designed some 'substitution exercises' (to increase accuracy and avoid hypercorrection), based on Shakespeare's sonnets. (Appendix 1) Some reconstruction activities were also given, which show how rhymes and metre might be restored through the use of OP (Appendix 1). These are discussed in greater detail below.

¹⁰⁸ See Appendix 1 for the printed material given to the actors, including the lexical sets and signature sounds.

A Brief Outline of the Workshop Programme

In the rehearsals, my warm-ups inevitably focused on voice. These were not so much concerned with the everyday actors' warm-ups for relaxation, breathing, diction and projection, but with the correct placing of the vowels in the mouth, use of lips, tongue and teeth in the consonants and accurate pronunciation of weak and strong syllables. Interpretation of the given orthography was an important feature and I spent some time explaining how the CAS and phonetic scripts work.

I devised the Sonnet substitution exercises as a means of introducing the OP vowel and consonant sounds individually in the context of Shakespeare's verse. The colours I assigned to each sound and the IPA phonetic symbols were both reinforced through these exercises. The idea was that actors would become familiar with both terms of reference so that they were able to work from either type of script later in the rehearsal period. The substitution exercise uses a CAS (see Appendix 1), which enables the actors to read the text in PDE, and it targets words for substitution which use particular OP sounds. Each sonnet focuses on just a few lexical groups so the script is clear and uncluttered, and the target colours may easily be identified. These exercises serve to replace the original concept, used in earlier workshops, of presenting the pronunciation in stages, each stage with its own dedicated level of

transcription. The substitution exercise is more adaptable as the ground-rules are not predetermined by a fixed transcription (and the choices which go with it), but may be tailored to the actors needs on the day, switching focus from one sound to another where necessary or blending a variety of sounds to create contrasts. As a warm-up for the substitution exercise, I targeted some of the lexical word lists in one of the play extracts; I read the list out, while the actors echoed the pronunciation.

A new technique introduced here was vowel tracking. This exercise is very effective once the actors are sufficiently familiar with the sounds of OP. This is a technique sometimes used in teaching choral singing, which involves vocalising all the vowels in a sentence and omitting the consonants. In OP rehearsals this can work on two levels: the basic version involves reading the vowels in turn from a colour-annotated or phonetic script; the more advanced form requires the actors to read a PDE script, inserting the target OP vowels as they go. On the basic level this involves quick thinking and the voicing of the correct vowel sound; the advanced exercise serves as preparation for working in OP from unmarked PDE scripts.

Warm-ups

The warm-up for *A Midsummer Night's Dream* involved a group reading of some of the vocabulary from the play, arranged in lexical sets. This enabled the cast to practise each of the vowel and consonant sounds in turn, after which the actors used the PDE version of the script to attempt a substitution exercise. The principal was already familiar to them through our work on the sonnets. The object here was gradually to replace PDE sounds in a scene from the play with the OP sounds until confidence was gained in using the words in context. This exercise was repeated with different scenes throughout the duration of the three days in order to reinforce the correct pronunciation at every stage. Although this works well with regular lexical groups, it does not help to establish the irregular pronunciations, which do not easily fit a pattern. I drew attention to these pronunciations as and when they were met and constant reinforcement was needed. Practising the pronunciation of each lexical set prior to the substitution enabled the actors to focus on achieving the correct vowel and consonant sounds. The fact that alike vowel sounds are highlighted in the same colour in the CAS proved very beneficial when searching for recurrent vowel sounds.

The *As You Like It* and *Macbeth* warm-ups present brief lexical sets of sample words used in the exercises. Once the pronunciation for each

lexical set has been established, the actors can move on to reading individual lines or phrases from the play. These are presented in PDE with the target word highlighted. The object is to read the extract in PDE except for the target word, which is pronounced in OP. It was hoped that exercises of this nature might help to prevent 'hypercorrection', which was the cause of inaccurate pronunciations in previous workshops, particularly workshop 4. The warm-ups include examples of weak stress and secondary stress, which suffered from a lack of attention in previous workshops. Importantly, the actors were given a copy of the lexical sets but not the extracts from the plays. The idea is to encourage them to really listen and perfect their OP pronunciation.

It is important that actors understand the basic principles of OP and are able to apply them to their own work. This sort of transferable skill is important if the actor is to be able to work independently and prepare their own lines for performance. In order to practise this skill, some reconstruction exercises were attempted as part of the warm-up work. Passages from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* were analysed for redundant rhymes, which were then repaired by means of OP. Syncopation and expansion were also discussed to see how these can affect the scansion.

Actors' ears are attuned to a variety of modern accents. However, fluency in OP is not about finding PDE sounds to use which *approximate* OP ones,

but accurately reproducing a genuine sound within the OP spectrum. The workshops have shown how easily actors can fall back on an Irish or West Country sound when they are unsure how to produce an OP one.

Achieving the correct balance between OP warm-ups, voice coaching, and the normal rehearsal business of blocking and character work is not easy and may involve compromises.

Summary of Workshop 5, London

Day 1

The first day of workshops began with a brief discussion of shortcomings in the metre and rhyme of Shakespeare's verse and I showed the actors how careful reconstruction of the pronunciation would repair many of these deficiencies. In order to illustrate this point, I asked the actors to attempt some rhyme and metre reconstruction exercises (see Appendix 1) to see how the lines would have worked in Shakespeare's day. There was some discussion about the Great Vowel Shift and its effect on English pronunciation and spelling.

Throughout this workshop I established a policy of frequently revisiting sounds previously introduced in order to reinforce the pronunciation. Flash cards were used to introduce the phonetic symbols for each lexical set and a variety of warm-up activities was used to practise vowel sounds

at regular intervals throughout the rehearsal. On the first day of workshops the target text was *Romeo and Juliet*. The cast were each assigned part of Act II, Scene 2 to prepare during the week for a read-through at the start of day two. I used this text, rather than *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, so that any erroneous pronunciations and bad habits could be dealt with in this, rather than our main text.

The placing of vowels and diphthongs was a major focus on the first day. The actors were very interested in the mechanics of producing the correct OP sounds and, with the aid of a vowel chart and reference to common PDE sounds, we were able to locate the vowels fairly accurately in the mouth. I followed a logical sequence in the teaching of the vowels, beginning with the open and close 'e' sounds [ɛ:] and [e:]. With a little practice, the actors were easily able to differentiate between the open and close 'e' vowels, which were known by the signature names 'Sarah' and 'Amy', and were able to apply these accurately to the words in the appropriate lexical sets. The idea of signature names was enthusiastically taken up by the cast, who found these a great help.

I then devoted some time to the two falling diphthongs [əɪ] and [əʊ], ensuring the first element was 'shwa', gliding to a short and relatively lax second element. These sounds presented a little difficulty and some of the cast needed to practise them for a while before achieving a

respectable result.¹⁰⁹ The short ‘a’ and ‘o’ did not pose any real problems, although it took a little practice to ensure that ‘a’ was not too ‘fronted’ and that ‘o’ was partially unrounded.¹¹⁰

The ‘Snug’ vowel, [ɣ], was a little elusive at first but when it was approached by unrounding and shortening the [o:] sound everyone managed to place the vowel correctly. It was also helpful to vocalise the journey from [ʊ] to [ʌ], gliding through the spectrum and halting mid-way at the required height and degree of rounding for [ɣ]. [ɒ:], which was given the signature name Austen, presented no problems as it was described as a long ‘hot’ vowel. The long [o:] took some practice and continued to be a problem vowel as there was a great tendency to diphthongise this, as in PDE. The other major problems dealt with early on were the not-unexpected Irishness of [əɪ] (with an ‘o’ or [ɔ] onset) and a slight tendency to monophthongise [əʊ] to [u:].

Long ‘o’ before ‘r’ proved to be elusive as more often than not [ɔ:] was heard. However, this was not a problem as both sounds belonged to the same phoneme and there is some justification for using the lowered value. With a little practice ‘ar’, or ‘Arabella’, was reproduced fairly accurately, once the tendency to push the ‘a’ too far forward had been countered.

¹⁰⁹ The two elements were practised separately before joining with the glide.

¹¹⁰ A practice which was possibly becoming less fashionable after 1600.

Rather than teaching irregular pronunciations systematically, I dealt with these in context, as they arose. For example, a word like 'nature' or 'toward' would be explained when it occurred in the script. However, it soon became apparent that, for those actors using the CAS, much repetition and reinforcement of this teaching was necessary before the irregular pronunciations became second nature. In respect of these irregular pronunciations, the CAS was not as effective as the phonetic script.

In rehearsal, actors picked up elements of the pronunciation from each other and the workshop process was able to benefit from this.

Throughout the rehearsal, examples of good pronunciation were highlighted for others to follow. Conversely, care was taken to correct any errors which crept into an actor's lines before others had a chance to accommodate to them. Breaking into groups proved useful as this enabled the cast to listen to their own pronunciations and to practise them on each other in a relaxed manner. During group work it was possible for me to hear the actors' progress and to encourage good practice.

The sonnet substitution exercise (see Appendix 1) proved to be a valuable tool for practising vowel sounds alone or in pairs and the actors confirmed that they found this helpful. Some ground-rules about how

this should be approached were needed. Only the target vowels were to be spoken in OP and the rest of the sentences were to be in PDE or in the actor's natural accent. An exception to this was made in the case of the rhotic 'r', as once this had been introduced the cast found it difficult to omit it, and there was no benefit in my enforcing this. Apart from this, the rule of adhering to PDE (or regional accent) was enforced as other sounds began to creep in on the non-highlighted words. Some of these were accurate OP sounds but some were instinctive additions, the product of hypercorrection, which were sometimes inaccurate, leaning towards modern dialects. This phenomenon was a natural result of the psychological process the actors were experiencing as their brains attempted to 'latch on' to OP and sought terms of reference in their experience of a variety of modern-day accents. A fair amount of guidance was needed regarding where the repertoire of familiar sounds could and could not be exploited.

The names I assigned to the signature sounds were beneficial once the correct pronunciation for them was established. These enabled the cast to refer easily to lexical sets by name throughout the rehearsals. The colours assigned to each signature sound were also useful for identification. These allowed the scanning of lines for particular sounds and identifying of target vowels in substitution exercises.

It was helpful for me to observe actors searching for points of reference to help them recognise and reproduce speech sounds. There was constant reference to a sound being like one found in a Yorkshire, Irish, West Country or Scots accent, which was not surprising, given the heterogeneous nature of OP. These points of reference can be useful when the comparison is fully accurate but less so where the actor has identified the nearest approximate sound to the one in question, in the absence of a PDE equivalent. In such cases, I found it generally best to steer the actor away from the comparison and instead to reproduce the sound by its physical placing in the mouth or by simply memorising the quality and quantity of the sound in context.

Some of the actors taking part in this workshop were reasonably comfortable with phonetics, although some symbols (such as γ) were unfamiliar. The colour annotation was universally welcomed in the warm-up exercises and lexical set charts, where it enabled actors quickly to find the appropriate set and where it served to flag up a particular sound. For some of the cast, the CAS was the script of preference when reading, and especially on initial reading. Some chose to use both scripts side by side, one supplying information which was felt to be missing in the other (or in a more accessible form). On a practical note, some actors complained that the printing in some of the exercises was too small; as a result, the blocks of colour were insufficient in some cases to allow differentiation

between two similar colours. This became less important when familiarity with the sounds had been achieved.

Day 2

On day two, the rehearsal structure followed the pattern established on the first day, where work on lines alternated with warm-ups and pronunciation exercises. I found this to be the most effective method of working. One of the warm-ups was an antiphonal choric reading of a scene from *Macbeth* (where individuals and groups would echo my pronunciation), using phonetics, and another was designed to practise the *Midsummer Night's Dream* lexical sets. Two of the four sessions in the day were set aside for rehearsed read-throughs of *Romeo and Juliet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, which were recorded in audio and video format. I later analysed these recordings and brief notes were sent to the actors by email.¹¹¹

The day began with informal performances of the prepared *Romeo and Juliet* exercise. The actors had had a week to prepare around two pages of dialogue each, from the balcony scene in OP. In the first session, following a warm-up which used lexical sets from the target play, each pair of actors performed their prepared scene to the remainder. A great deal of hard work had been put into this and the cast had made use of

¹¹¹ Described in Appendix 1

the audio on the website. There was a reasonable degree of accuracy in the pronunciation here, although the pace was not always very natural and some performances were faltering. The verse suffered a little as the actors' main focus was still on the pronunciation of individual words; pauses and run-ons were not always observed. A balcony in the rehearsal space was used for this scene and there was some success at getting into character, despite the difficulties of the text. This proved to be a very productive exercise in the respect that it encouraged the cast to focus on performing OP in 'public' at an early stage in the workshops.

Some of the cast chose to use the colour-annotated scripts for this exercise and a high degree of accuracy was achieved in the pronunciation by paying attention to the lexical groups flagged up by the colours, combined with careful reading of the pronunciation hints in the footnotes.¹¹² A slight technical problem arose in that two actors had printed the CAS themselves on a Mac and some of the detail in the script had not been reproduced. This should not have occurred when printing from a PDF, but it demonstrated how important quality control is in the

¹¹² As a group, the OP skills were either 'almost always correct' or 'often correct'. Several actors were "using OP as a tool to inform and enhance their regular Shakespearean acting process", while the majority "made sufficient progress to enable them, at times, to focus on other areas such as movement, gesture, blocking, general acting and voice work."

preparation of materials, as the error was not discovered until the second day.

In this workshop, antiphonal reading proved to be a popular way of working. The leader-chorus variation allowed actors to find their voice, through imitation, without the fear of mispronouncing OP publically. The leader-solo variety was to become more useful at a later stage once actors' lines were assigned. One actress remarked that she felt her pronunciation was good when speaking in chorus but she realised her own short-comings when performing solo.

In the second session of the morning an antiphonal reading of the *A Midsummer Night's Dream* extract was attempted, following the leader-solo pattern, so that the cast could familiarise themselves with the sounds of their own lines. They had already warmed up with the lexical sets and so there was familiarity with the groups of sounds. The reading was the first occasion in rehearsal where the cast began to deliver the lines in character and with meaning. The work undertaken on day one had been absorbed very well and the major elements of pronunciation were attempted without too many errors.

After lunch, the cast broke into groups to rehearse individual scenes from *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. During this session I gave some individual

coaching, which was particularly useful with regard to special pronunciations and variants which did not fit into the lexical sets. Working in smaller groups seemed to free the actors from their inhibitions and they were able to help one another work towards the target pronunciations. Actors frequently asked for clarification during this session and by the end it was clear that all the cast had a good idea of what they were aiming for. At this stage in the process, each actor began to demonstrate their strengths and weaknesses, which I was largely able to address in the short individual coaching sessions.

The first unsupported reading of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* was very successful and there was an appreciative response from the actors to one another's lines. Importantly, there was a fair degree of accuracy in the pronunciation and the cast at this stage frequently corrected their own mistakes. I allowed the reading to run without interruption and it was in this read-through that some of the cast really started to use the OP to help define their characters and to discover its comedic value. For example, one actor would lengthen the long 'ɛ' vowel, causing the character to sound distinctly northern. Another chose to emphasise the 'əɪ' diphthong as he felt it added humour to the role (in words such as lion). The pace now was fairly close to that of a normal PDE reading. This resulted in some stumbles and uncorrected errors, including some unwanted PDE pronunciations, but overall the reading showed real

promise. The OP was beginning to sound fluent and quite natural, and the tendency to exaggerate the sounds (except for the reasons mentioned above), which was evident in early exploration, was largely resisted.¹¹³

Peer learning was an important feature of day two. It was significant to note that, when the cast was broken down into smaller groups to rehearse in OP, they immediately began to use their listening skills, accommodating their own pronunciations to those of others whom they believed were achieving the target pronunciations. They also felt free to experiment, repeating and polishing the sounds until they were happy with the result, encouraging one another in the process. This peer-learning is a powerful force and one which was encouraged in rehearsal. However, in the interests of 'quality control', this type of group work needs to be closely monitored to ensure accuracy.

Notes on Day 2

Following the second day of rehearsal, the audio and video footage was analysed and notes given to each actor by email to help them focus their individual preparation (See Appendix 1 for notes). The object of this was to address the weaknesses which had become apparent in the read-

¹¹³ The majority of the actors were now able "in general, to focus on other skills such as movement, gesture, blocking, general acting and voice work." The OP skills of about half the group were "almost always correct", the remainder being "often correct".

throughs of *Romeo and Juliet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Although there were some common problems, each actor showed their own particular set of strengths and weaknesses. In this email feedback, the system of lexical sets and signature sounds (or, in this case, names) came into play. Areas of weakness were described in terms of names, such as 'Austen' or 'Snout', which were clear and unambiguous to the actors. During rehearsal, the OP sounds were frequently referred to in this way and the actors had already become familiar with this way of working. This obviated the necessity of using phonetics, which not all the cast were comfortable with and which, via email, may not have displayed correctly on the actors' computers.

The common problems, evident on the recordings, were as follows:

The first element of the two falling diphthongs [əɪ] and [əʊ] was sometimes inaccurate and not close enough to the neutral 'shwa' vowel. In particular, the former was sometimes pronounced [ɒ], resulting in an uncharacteristic 'Irish' sound. The open and close long 'e' vowels [ɛ:] and [e:] sometimes became slightly diphthongised by the addition of a second element [ɪ] if the actors altered their mouth shape before ending the syllable. This was particularly noticeable in open syllables, where the vowel was not followed by a consonant. There was an occasional

tendency to lengthen ‘a’ and ‘o’ where they should be short in OP. This is possibly a case of hypercorrection.

The notes given to the cast by email were limited to the most common weaknesses of each actor, in some cases citing examples from their lines. Possibly as a result of the notes, a distinct improvement was subsequently heard in the accuracy of many, but not all, of the actors. The greatest improvement was in the diphthongs, which from the start had caused some difficulty. Although there was a lack of uniformity in the diphthongal pronunciations, this was generally within the acceptable boundaries for OP. All the actors were able to pronounce the diphthongs by this stage; some were just more consistent in their accuracy than others.

Day 3

The third and final day of workshops started with a number of warm-ups, a cold-reading¹¹⁴ and some peer coaching. There was also a run-through of the lexical sets from *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, where every vowel and diphthong was tested and the irregular pronunciations were refreshed. This was followed by a slow read-through of the script, during which I coached the pronunciation to improve accuracy. Unfortunately, this tended to interrupt the actor’s train of thought and inhibited the

¹¹⁴ The reading of a script without phonetics or annotations to give the reader hints to the OP pronunciation.

drama. At this stage, I promised the cast an uninterrupted read-through in the afternoon, after which notes would be given. The focus of the afternoon was to be on continuity and bringing out the drama of the piece. This would test the actors to see how much of the pronunciation was retained when they were focusing on acting rather than reading.

The sonnet substitution exercises served a useful purpose at this stage in eradicating hypercorrection, which had begun to manifest itself as fluency increased. For example, one actress, who relied very much on her ear, began to slip into pronunciations from PDE accents with which she is familiar. Her notes mention the tendency to lengthen vowels which should be short, such as 'o' and 'a', a feature of some modern regional accents, such as the West Country, where she was brought up. She also tended to produce a lip-rounded, 'northern' version of the Snug vowel, where it occurred in proximity to the northern-sounding 'Sarah'. This type of effect could be heard in an extreme form when her 'Ida' diphthong became a very northern [a:] monophthong, a phoneme which is outside our target range for OP. In the sonnet substitution, the actors were required to deliver lines in PDE (or their own regional accent) except for the words highlighted in the colour of a lexical set, which were to be spoken in OP. As the cast became more familiar with the range of OP sounds this became increasingly difficult but it was an excellent way to

focus their pronunciation on target sounds. This exercise proved useful for actors' private warm-ups as well as in rehearsal.

A peer coaching session was built into the day's rehearsals. For this session, each actor was asked to bring a short speech (from the target play) to the group to be the subject of constructive criticism by their peers. The object of the exercise was to enable the cast to fine-tune their ears to the pronunciation and to recognise faults in others which they might perhaps possess themselves. Furthermore, it was an opportunity to observe good practice amongst their peers. This activity was well received but caused a certain amount of anxiety; actors were quite reluctant to volunteer to take their turn. Most of the cast chose a challenging speech with a mixture of vowel sounds, including ones they found difficult. The outcome of this activity was very positive. Individual actors were able to focus on short specimen texts and the rest of the group displayed a fair amount of knowledge and confidence in their frank assessments of each speech. The exercise served to sharpen awareness of the pronunciations the cast were producing, and to put some pressure on them individually to improve their delivery.

The cold-reading exercise was an important research element as I wanted to discover how soon actors might be proficient enough in OP to be able to work from a regular script. The target script for this exercise was

As You Like It. The actors rose to the challenge of determining the OP sounds for themselves and some suggested that this type of exercise could be given as 'homework' after the first day to bring to a plenary session on the second day. Whilst their confidence was laudable, one day of coaching is probably insufficient grounding for this sort of independent exercise; its place is in the workshop, where guidance and constructive criticism are available. Individually, the cast achieved a fair degree of accuracy in this task. Where lines were discussed by the whole group, they collectively identified the correct pronunciation in all the words from regular lexical groups and some of the irregular ones, drawing on their experience of the workshop so far and their sense of logic. The idea of giving the actors sufficient background historical or phonological information from the start, regarding the reason for particular pronunciations, reaped rewards here, although it is important not to give too much information. Throughout the workshop, the cast were frequently asked to think about what the possible pronunciations might be in a variety of situations. The success of this session suggested that three days of workshopping is perhaps sufficient to kick-start the OP process. The level of proficiency gained by this stage was high enough to enable a cast to move on to the next stage – rehearsing a complete play – with the proviso that rehearsals would need to include individual

coaching and further plenary sessions, in order to consolidate and regularly refresh the pronunciation.¹¹⁵

To sum up the cold reading, it appears to be the case that, after only three days training, actors are able to identify the major regular lexical sets when they occur in an unmarked text and can supply the appropriate vowels. A greater amount of rehearsal time is required before all the less common patterns are recognised, and certain irregular forms will always require explanations in footnotes, together with some kind of orthographic representation. Read in conjunction with audio demonstrations, this is certainly a viable way of presenting the text, provided adequate workshop training precedes the reading and that this is reinforced by individual voice coaching.

Rehearsed Reading

The final rehearsal saw a significant increase in the pace of delivery to a regular performance pace. The read-through continued uninterrupted and, while I took notes, the actors generally corrected their own mistakes, especially with regard to words from the general lexical sets. Many of the errors either involved irregular words or were examples of hypercorrection, which the cast would probably identify themselves when

¹¹⁵ Rehearsal structure is discussed below.

they listened to the recording. At this stage, the cast were on their feet and beginning to act more. Inevitably, this meant occasional lapses in OP but it enabled them to focus on the drama and use the OP to help create their characters. A number of lines, which sound very different in OP, were delivered in a way which prompted laughter from the cast, even though we had heard them already. The mechanicals were able to use the accent to emphasise both the dim-wittedness and the pompousness of their characters (drawing out the diphthongs and emphasising the restored 'h' in the Greek play). The increased pace brought a greater frequency in the use of unstressed words, which the cast had slowly been adopting throughout the workshops. This led to a greater sense of informality in the lines, as well as improved fluency. After being given a few notes on pronunciation, mostly repeating earlier comments, the cast embarked on the final reading, which was recorded. Here, the actors felt inspired to move around more but this generally had only a slightly detrimental effect on the OP, which was, by now, becoming more natural. The recordings of the reading were very useful as a means of identifying the strengths and weaknesses of each actor. In the context of a longer rehearsal period, this recorded material would be invaluable in moving to a more polished level and would inform individual coaching sessions.

Throughout this workshop a great deal of support was expressed by the actors for the use of OP in Shakespeare and they felt that the insight it

gives into the workings of the rhyme and verse was invaluable. As the cast became more confident with the accent it became apparent that OP is also a valuable resource for an actor to use when building a character. Subtle shades of emphasis, rhythm and pace served to heighten comedy or drama in a way that is perhaps not possible in RP.¹¹⁶

Work with professional actors demonstrated that there may be a niche in the field of Shakespearean performance today for original pronunciation. This style of performance has much to offer the actor, director and audience and appears greatly to enhance the understanding of the drama. These three days of workshops showed that, even for novices, swift progress is possible in learning the pronunciation and applying it to a text, and that, given careful planning, its use in professional productions is perfectly practical.

Workshop Findings and Conclusions

Workshop Progression

I designed the workshop process to aid the development of materials and a pedagogy for teaching OP to actors. In the early workshops, where the number of student participants was small, I focused on an initial

¹¹⁶ See Appendix 1 for the rehearsal schedule and actor's notes for workshop 5.

assessment of the transcription policy, the development of warm-up material and assessing the best order in which to introduce the OP sounds. These workshops enabled me to practise the various aspects of teaching the pronunciation and to analyse the ways in which students were learning and recalling the OP sounds. I documented the strengths and weaknesses discovered in each workshop so that each subsequent workshop would build on the success of the last. As the workshops progressed and a working teaching method became established I allowed more freedom for the actors to experiment with gesture, movement and development of character. At this stage the actors began to experiment with the nuances of the language in their delivery. The final workshop, which was significantly longer than the previous ones, fully established the teaching method and allowed the actors to discover how OP might benefit their practice.

Observations on the Pedagogy

Assessing Prior Knowledge and Skills:

It is sound teaching practice when starting out with new students to assess their prior knowledge and skills in order to adopt the best teaching strategies and to move the student on from their current position. In the workshops, this process occurred in preliminary discussions, initial readings and warm-up exercises. At this point, I was

able to discover the extent of the students' knowledge of phonetics, languages and whether they had any experience of dialect coaching. This knowledge had a significant impact on group work, where their skills could be acknowledged and referenced, and influenced the type of transcription I would give them. I ensured that any expertise within the group was exploited for the benefit of all the students.

Lexical Sets

The use of lexical groupings was a key building block of the pedagogy, underpinning many of the warm-up exercises and influencing rehearsal strategy, especially in terms of terminology. For example, I frequently signalled pronunciations by the use of the signature words assigned to the sets. This enabled effective and succinct communication on matters relating to OP vowel sounds. The lexical approach was also beneficial in that it aided the recognition of patterns of assonance (or internal rhyme) in the text.

Learning Strategies and Techniques

I evaluated a variety of learning strategies during the workshop process. The most successful ones are listed below:

- use of warm-up exercises – these are invaluable throughout the whole rehearsal (and performance) period. They may take two forms: warm-

ups directly related to the rehearsal script and warm-ups with a didactic purpose. The former enabled the students to practise alike pronunciations out of context prior to using the vocabulary in the context of the script.

- antiphonal/choric speaking – a number of variations of antiphonal work are possible, such as teacher–group, teacher–student, student–group, student–student and group–group. This technique allows for the successful modelling and replication of specific pronunciation. Choric speaking is also a useful tool in this respect as it is a time–efficient way of rehearsing, and individual pronunciations can be heard, provided the group is not too large.
- peer coaching – this proved to be a very productive way of accelerating learning within the group. The leader needs to pair the students up carefully (weak–strong or strong–strong and weak–weak with support) and the process needs to be monitored for accuracy: feedback to a plenary session can take care of this.
- accommodation time – an important feature of language is the way two speakers accommodate their pronunciation to one another. This process is beneficial to the learning of OP and time must be allowed (preferably

in supervised pair work) for scene partners to accommodate their dialogue.

- independent learning – it is important to allow the actors to learn at their own pace. Warm-up exercises of an analytical nature (determining rhyme or metrical patterns) and reading from unmarked scripts are beneficial. The exercises can be differentiated. Private preparation outside the rehearsal room is crucial in order to achieve rapid progress.
- transfer of skills – rather than teaching individual pronunciations (unavoidable at times) it is best to teach general principles of pronunciation in a particular context which might be recognised and applied by the student when meeting that context in the script.
- one to one coaching – this is an essential element of any OP teaching programme. In the workshop context, this can occur during peer coaching sessions, during warm-up sessions or outside the regular rehearsal schedule. The sessions should be short, focused on only one or two features of pronunciation, and should occur regularly to facilitate progress. These sessions should be designed to reinforce the learning completed in group sessions but tailored to meet the needs of the individual.

- feedback – feeding back to the students, either individually or in a plenary session, is essential to maintain progress. Feedback should be positive but include constructive criticism, focusing on one weakness at a time.
- audio recordings – use of audio is desirable. Rehearsal sessions may be recorded for the purposes of analysis and reinforcement of good practice. Actors may use pre-recorded audio as model pronunciation.

Workshop Materials

Warm-up Material

The warm-ups I used in the workshops were very effective and may be divided into three categories: ice-breakers, those with a didactic purpose, and those designed as a precursor to line readings (pronunciation primers). The didactic material (such as rhyme discovery exercises) was instrumental in encouraging independent thinking and the development of transferable skills; the pronunciation primers appeared to have a significant effect on the quality of pronunciation in the line readings. Warm-up material which reinforces the pronunciation and counters hypercorrection (such as the sonnets) is a useful additional resource.

The Transcription Policy

I found that the transcription policy is an essential resource (and reference document) which underpins the whole system of pronunciation used in the workshops. It would be impossible for a workshop or rehearsal to proceed without this document. The policy defines the sound map within the boundaries of which shades of pronunciation may operate, including the nuances of modern regional accents. It is the responsibility of the voice coach (or pronunciation supervisor) to encourage the cast to remain within the pre-determined boundaries.

Benefits of the Colour Annotated Script

The colour annotated script is a valuable resource in the teaching of OP. It is particularly useful in the early stages of learning and for actors who struggle with the IPA symbols. There are a number of benefits of using this orthography:

- the script can be read as a regular script without any specialist knowledge,
- interpreting the script requires very little training and necessitates only a key to the colour code (with reference to the lexical sets),
- the pronunciation can be built up in stages, taking each vowel or diphthong in turn,

- patterns of assonance in the OP can easily be recognised (this is useful information for the actor to have when analysing the text).

It should be noted that this script does not represent the OP pronunciation as accurately as a phonetic script. Regular sounds are depicted with accuracy but weak forms are difficult to show. In these cases the actor needs to take the time to read the footnotes. The CAS may be used in conjunction with a phonetic script.

A Model for Rehearsal Practice

It is perfectly possible for an OP production to proceed with only a minimal extra time allowance. Given a rehearsal period of 4 to 6 weeks, one would need to allow an additional 3 to 4 days for the OP coaching. Ideally, the rehearsal period would be preceded by three days of dedicated coaching (around 18 hours) perhaps spread over three weekends. A further, refresher day (or half day) in the middle of the rehearsal period would be beneficial. In addition to this, each cast member would benefit from three or four, hour-long, individual coaching sessions on their lines,¹¹⁷ which could be built into breaks in the normal rehearsal schedule or could occur outside rehearsal time. Individual coaching should complement the learning completed in group sessions,

¹¹⁷ This sort of individual coaching was used in the productions at The Universities of Nevada and Kansas and at the Shakespeare's Globe.

focusing on the actor's own part but reinforcing the general OP skills learned in the plenary sessions. Coaching might also be done in pairs of scene-partners in order to allow actors time and space to accommodate their language to one another.

Workshop/Rehearsal Structure

The OP work which precedes the regular rehearsal should be run in a workshop format and be viewed as a process of discovery (rather than a series of lectures). I would advocate the actors speaking in OP (perhaps short fragments, such as greetings) right from the start and that movement is introduced as early as possible in the process. I suggest that the scripts used in the workshop (at least for the first two days) should not be the production script. If the production script has to be used, I would advocate actors reading parts other than their own.¹¹⁸

The Future of Original Pronunciation

This project has focused on the acquisition of language skills. During this process, discoveries have been made regarding the way that the use of OP can influence the way actors get into character and even view their

¹¹⁸ This will avoid any bad habits being carried forward into the production.

character.¹¹⁹ This can affect their stance or the way they move. This effect was mentioned by David Crystal in connection with *Romeo and Juliet* at Shakespeare's Globe (2004). According to Crystal, "[a]ll the actors found themselves re-thinking their characters. For example, Bette Bourne, playing the nurse, said she became a totally different woman, tougher and more direct" (Crystal 2005e). "I recall the actor playing Mercutio saying that he found his Queen Mab speech much more meaningful in the 'earthy' tones of OP than in the 'posh' tones of RP" (Crystal 2011).

Cicely Berry believes that OP can also influence the way an audience listens. In connection with the production of *Romeo and Juliet* at Shakespeare's Globe (2004), she said that OP "made her explore the language anew, depart from previous stereotypes, listen in a different way... The speech seemed to be coming from within the actors..." (Crystal 2005, 156).¹²⁰

A good indicator of the value of OP would be if actors who had experience of the pronunciation chose to use it, in some way, to enhance their voice work in a regular PDE production. This scenario has been put to the test. David Crystal, curious to hear whether any OP had persisted in *Romeo and Juliet* (2004) after the OP run had finished, went to a regular

¹¹⁹ This is an area which would benefit from research in the future. This area of research can only take place after the language acquisition, once the pronunciation has become second nature.

¹²⁰ Cicely Berry was in the audience.

performance three weeks later. He reports that Bill Stewart (Capulet) preserved some of the weak pronoun forms and Crystal also heard some expanded word endings, such as in 'lamentation' (Crystal 2005, 165). These features, relating to stress and scansion, are the most likely ones to be retained, although another cast member kept the [e:] in peace (pronounced rather like 'pace'), simply for the resonance.

Chapter 7, Conclusion

This is the first doctoral thesis to examine the performance of Shakespeare in Original Pronunciation. I have covered important groundwork with regard to the language which will benefit voice coaches, teachers or directors wishing to use OP in the theatre. This has resulted in the formation and testing of a practical transcription policy. I have devised and tested a novel method of orthographic representation (the Colour Annotated Script) for the early rehearsal stages, which is suited to actors with no experience of the IPA. I have explored a style of OP speaking which differs in some respects from other current practitioners. A methodology for workshopping Shakespearean pronunciation has been devised, tested and recorded, which it is hoped will be of benefit to voice coaches, drama teachers and directors involved in such productions. As an example of the ways in which two styles of OP can work together to define two sets of characters, I have included in the appendices a new transcription of *As You Like It* in OP. The project has tested, in a workshop setting, the ways in which OP might be used as an alternative to a modern regional accent in helping to define a culture or period as well as an optional tool in developing their characters.

The original transcription policy I propose in this thesis may be wholly adopted in a production, and includes an advanced and a conservative

variety of speech.¹²¹ As a result of my research into the pronunciations used in Shakespeare's day, I have used certain pronunciations here which are not adopted by other modern practitioners. In words such as 'tall' and 'law' the long rounded vowel [ɔ:] is used; 'er' and 'ir' are assumed to have coalesced and are given [əɪ], whereas 'ur' is kept distinct and notated [ʊɪ] although [ɪɪ] is a suggested guide pronunciation (the latter phonetic symbol is avoided in this position as it may be misleading, especially when sight-reading); 'see' is given [i:], except where a conservative sound is required, then [e:]; in 'chamber', the conservative version is [ɔ:]; a distinction is drawn between words like 'noise' with 'oi' and those like 'join' with [əɪ] (determined by Shakespeare's usage and the writings of the orthoepists); short 'o' in 'God' is given an unrounded vowel (as in the short American sound); 'ar' is given a short vowel and 'or' a long one [o:].

During the course of research for this study I uncovered important archive material which is of benefit to anyone researching the history of OP and the results of some of the research into historical OP

¹²¹ The conservative and advanced varieties may be characterised by highlighting a few distinctions: The most noticeable feature is the long 'e' sound in 'me' and 'see', which in the conservative variety is pronounced rather like 'may' and 'say' (but as a pure, long vowel) whereas the advanced form is like PDE. Expanded endings on words such as 'musician' may be emphasised in the conservative form but spoken as today in the advanced form (unless dictated by the metre). The vowel in 'chamber' might be pronounced as the 'aw' in 'awful' in the conservative version but with a sound like the first 'a' in 'Sarah' in the advanced form. There is also the option of dropping initial 'h' and final 'g', a feature which could work independently of the other elements.

performances of Shakespeare have been cited in two academic publications. Information relating to previously unknown early twentieth-century productions of Shakespeare in OP was incorporated into Paul Meier's article, 'Early Modern English Pronunciation and OP on the Modern Stage' for *The Cambridge On-line Shakespeare Encyclopedia* (2013). My research findings relating to the Mermaid Theatre's *Macbeth* production were acknowledged in a paper by David Crystal, "Early Interest in Shakespearean Original Pronunciation", published in Andrew Linn and William Poole (eds.), *In memory and honour of Vivian Salmon*, a special number of *Language and History*, 56 (1), (2013).

The Legacy of Past OP Productions of the Twentieth and Twenty-first Centuries

My study of past OP performances has revealed some pointers which may be of benefit to directors considering performing in OP. The question of readability by the audience is important to anyone who is considering investing in a production of this type. In this respect, OP may be viewed as simply another accent of English, albeit one that is no longer in everyday use. The phonemes, syncopations and stress patterns are not wholly unfamiliar to present-day English speakers, and the consonant system of Elizabethan English is almost the same as today's. Within the general sound map of OP there are various possibilities for interpretation

which have been used in past productions and there is scope for actors to use their present-day regional accents. It is significant that the transcriptions used in these performances have been influenced by the prevailing attitude towards an accepted Shakespearean stage accent. This may be seen in early twentieth-century transcriptions, such as those of D Jones, F Blandford and AC Gimson. These tended to exploit the Elizabethan vowel system within a formal framework with clearly pronounced consonants and few weak forms or syncopations. Later practitioners, such as D Crystal, have produced less formal transcriptions which are a truer representation of the speech heard by Elizabethan audiences.

Audiences are surprisingly tolerant of linguistic variation and are able to accept a variety of pronunciations. The OP sound map intersects in most respects with that of PDE. Many of the phonemes are identical and most OP vowel sounds may be found in some regional context in the British Isles or around the world. Actors too are very adaptable and their training in the use of different accents enables them to adopt the use of OP as they would a regional dialect.

Recent OP productions have proved that restoration of the pronunciation does not cause audience alienation. On the contrary, the audience's adaptability in terms of language recognition means that the

pronunciation is mostly still relevant and recognisable, even after four hundred years. This is largely owing to the preservation of the consonant system, during a period of significant change in the vowels. The merits of language reconstruction as it relates to rhyme, metrical patterns, word-play and puns have been well-established.

The rate of delivery is significantly speeded up in OP performances. This might enable performances of plays to achieve a running time closer to that of the Elizabethan stage. The music had to be rescored for the Globe production of *Romeo and Juliet* as the underscored passages, which fitted the PDE performance perfectly, were too long for the OP dialogue.

According to Alfred Hart (1942, 122), Elizabethan actors would speak 2,300 lines in two hours, compared with around 1,700–1,800 by the RSC. This faster pace would significantly speed up the dramatic action.

Exponents of OP will, in the future, be looking at the new discoveries which accompany performing in the reconstructed language and assessing their relevance to the theatre of the 21st century. One of the discoveries concerns the way in which OP appears to enhance the actor's physical delivery and engagement with the emotions. This appears to be related to the way OP affects the physical mechanisms of voice production employed by the actor, in particular, the way OP emanates from the core of the body, that is, very low in the breath system. The

restored pronunciation appears to give the actor empathy with this physical aspect of the Elizabethan performer's craft.

I have summarised previous work on OP in this thesis in order to place contemporary work into an historical context. It is significant to note that the choice of vowel sounds and the degree of informality of reconstructed original pronunciation have changed over the last century. Early practitioners were cautious in their representation of the accent as they no doubt wished it to gain acceptance. This parallels the early spelling reformers' conservative suggestions, which they hoped would be accepted, as they perceived that the conservative had a better chance of being adopted than the radical. Therefore, Gimson, Blandford and Jones (especially in his early work) adopted a highly articulated style with no 'h' or 'g' dropping and no Cockney-reminiscent 'yeller' or 'feller'. There was also reluctance to put these practical experiments forward as academically sound demonstrations of OP. This attitude is exemplified by Blandford's note in his *Twelfth Night* (1927) transcription (Blandford, F. 1927, 2), where he takes care to announce that his transcription is not a definitive one for academic purposes.

Observations on the Linguistic Context

Chapter 4, *The Linguistic Context*, reveals the lack of agreement on the finer details of Shakespearean pronunciation amongst the linguists and phoneticians of the last century and the lack of clarity in the works of earlier writers. While there is broad agreement on the fundamentals of the pronunciation, the details are open to interpretation. Reasons for the differences of opinion are the broad time-scale of the sound changes and the fact that the language was subjected to pressures from outside influences, such as the migration of people from the provinces (where sound changes may be in a more advanced state) into London. As there would not have been uniformity of speech on Shakespeare's stage there is no need to aim for it in a modern performance. However, as mentioned above, it is perfectly possible to draw up a generalised sound system which establishes the parameters within which the pronunciation may operate. This sound map should be defined by the production's transcription policy, which is a necessary document in an OP production.

The variations within the sound map of early seventeenth-century pronunciation are reflected in the choices Shakespeare himself made when searching for a rhyming word. In many cases it is simply not possible to postulate a particular pronunciation of a word as the one Shakespeare might generally use, as he would use in one passage an

advanced pronunciation, in another a conservative or archaic one and in another an unusual variant or doublet. Syllables might be added or subtracted in accordance with poetic tradition and colloquial usage in order to tidy up the pentameter. These metrical adjustments are often not shown in the orthography and some of this poetic tradition is unfamiliar to modern actors. In prose passages one cannot look for the clues embedded in rhyme or metre. It is sometimes possible, however, to determine the most likely pronunciation, based on the frequency of occurrence in Shakespeare's works. This may be tested by examining the occurrence of rhymes and metric patterns using concordance.

Practical applications of OP and Workshop Observations

In the twentieth century there was a stigma attached to some characteristics of informal pronunciation, such as letter dropping. As this type of informal speech was a feature of Elizabethan English, prejudice may have prevented its use on the stage. However, since the nineteen fifties a gradual tolerance of regional accents has grown and spread to the stage, eventually embracing accented Shakespeare. Recently, this has enabled the staging of Shakespeare's plays in African and Indian accents as well as in mixed-language productions. All of this has opened the eyes of actors and directors to the possibilities afforded by the use of accents in Shakespeare, for example to differentiate between character groups or

to locate the play in a particular culture. I would suggest that Elizabethan pronunciation might be viewed as another branch of accented Shakespeare.

The fact that accented Shakespeare is more acceptable in British Theatre today has been proved by Barrie Rutter's Northern Broadside productions and Gregory Doran's African *Julius Caesar* (2012). Original Pronunciation might be seen as taking this type of accented performance in a slightly different direction. The OP could be used in the same way as northern or African accents to establish a culture, location or characters. Variations within the OP could help to identify a subculture just as accents do today.

In the workshop setting, the actors became proficient in their use of OP for this purpose. For example, Caliban's foreign traits and his accented English were perfectly signalled by OP and the mechanicals' earthy, unsophisticated characters were well suited to it. In the latter case, the language unexpectedly added to the comedy of the scenes. Furthermore, a strong contrast may be achieved when certain characters speak in OP and some in RP.

It is important to consider the value of OP as an option, either to be adopted as the primary language of the play or to be used for a particular

purpose within a regular production. The latter could work in a way similar to that seen in the *Indian Tempest* by Footsbarn Theatre, which used Malayam, French and Sanskrit in addition to English. The Indian languages helped to define the cultural context of the piece and added a poetry of their own to a dialogue which was already musical and rhythmic. OP could similarly be used to help define the culture of the production, for example, a culture removed chronologically or geographically from our own.

Therefore, the use of OP as an option may be viewed in the same light as the use of period costume or candlelight, or the recreation of period acting spaces and the use of all-male casts. In this type of scenario, the pronunciation takes on a defining role, in conjunction with the other elements. Its primary function is not to do with language repair; the restoration of metre and rhyme may be viewed as a bonus. OP could be used to establish the foreign accent of a single character such as a Turk, a Moor or Ethiopian, or simply an outsider in the context of the play.

HIP at Shakespeare's Globe

The latest initiative at Shakespeare's Globe is to recreate the sort of indoor space used by Shakespeare's company in the winter from 1608 onwards. The design of the new theatre follows drawings discovered in

Worcester College, Oxford in the 1960s. These are attributed to John Webb, the nephew by marriage and assistant to Inigo Jones. Webb inherited Jones's books and drawings after his death and he, in turn, donated part of the collection to Worcester College. The Globe's Artistic Director, Dominic Dromgoole admits that "almost everything we know about early Jacobean playhouses came from those drawings. We hope the theatre will throw a spotlight on the plays" (Trueman, M. *The Guardian*, 27 November 2012). Farah Karim-Cooper, leader of The Globe's architectural research group states, "[o]ur goal is to build a theatre that Shakespeare might recognise" (Trueman, M. 2012). The recently completed, 340 seater space includes two galleries and a pit and, following a detailed research programme, is constructed of materials, in the decorative style, and using construction techniques of the Jacobean period.

Martin White is advising on the appropriate candle-lighting conditions for the new theatre. Even though there was only one source from 1636 which mentioned the number of candles in use in a commercial theatre (a mixture of wax and tallow), White is able, by careful analysis of the figures, to deduce a possible figure for an indoor theatre of 66 fragile tallow candles over the stage and 12 tougher wax candles in wall holders (source: White, M. 2013). White is a firm believer that material factors in a physical environment can be explored, such as lighting, musical

underscoring, blocking and gesture (White, M. 2008). He does not, however, believe it is achievable to recreate for today's audience the experience of an audience from a past age, as Robert Sarlos (University of California) believes he can.

Keith McGowan, musical director of a number of productions at Shakespeare's Globe, shares White's view. He reminds his reader that the musical field has led the way in the field of HIP but has left the idea long ago of re-creating the original performance. McGowan believes the process now should be "more compromising" (McGowan, K. 2008, 186). By way of an example, McGowan points out that research might enable the musicians to recreate the trumpet fanfares of war which would hold great significance for the Tudor audience but their significance is lost on the modern audience, who experience no physical response to them. Another compromise concerns the use of embellishment, which was a key feature of Elizabethan instrumental music. McGowan explains how, at the Globe, "embellishment got in the way of the impact of the music, and everything had to be much clearer and bolder" (186). The fact of the matter is, that the original Globe's musicians may have come to the same conclusions and made adaptations of the music of their era for theatrical purposes. McGowan, as a composer, employs a group of instrumentalists who can achieve a "very broad palette of musical timbres" by doubling and trebling parts. This caters for all the demands of the play.

Claire Van Kampen, composer and former Director of Theatre Music at Shakespeare's Globe, talks about the futility of attempting to be "authentic" by using Renaissance music. Van Kampen reminds her reader that "Shakespeare used modern instruments, tunes, clothing and texts. To be truly authentic," Van Kampen suggests, "we would have to recreate an entire 1590s culture, including audience, acting company, and musical band" (Van Kampen 2008, 183). This, however, would still leave the problem of Shakespeare's text, which is far removed from our time and, Van Kampen reminds us, contains references to clothing, music and customs of Shakespeare's day. Van Kampen's solution was to adopt a selective approach with the focus on "accuracy of character detail created through careful attention to the text and stage directions" (2008, 185).

One of the greatest discoveries at the Globe is the actor-audience rapport. Ralph Alan Cohen (2008, 218) believes that "original staging returns power to the audience by relying on them for collaboration," as "the early modern theatre [was] wholly dependent on a collaborative audience." The universal lighting of Shakespeare's Globe and the Blackfriars theatre reinstates the conditions for that collaboration to succeed. There is, however, a compromise here. As Van Kampen and McGowan suggest, the audience is fully grounded in the present so they will not respond to every nuance of the text as an early modern audience would but will respond in their own, forward-looking, twenty-first

century way. The collaboration, then, demonstrates the value of HIP: it brings something new to the performance. Cohen talks about the way ‘original practices’ in “early modern spaces” might be forward-looking when he says they “look forward to a theatre freed of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century developments that in many ways have fettered it to its audiences” (2008, 212).

The idea of a compromise may equally be considered in the area of pronunciation, a field where there will always be a margin of doubt about what the pronunciation actually was. One should again consider the audience in this respect; the ‘readability’ of the pronunciation for today’s audience is paramount. The fact that Shakespeare used certain variant pronunciations suggests that these variants were probably easily understood by his audiences. When using OP in a modern performance, one needs to consider how much the modern audience will understand and perhaps a compromise might have to be made.

Putting on Clothing and Putting on an OP Accent

I would suggest that, for the actor, there may be an analogy between putting on period clothing and adopting the style of pronunciation. Toby Cockerell, who played Katherine in *Henry V* (1997), explains that his costume forced him “to move in a certain way – I would just glide across

the floor” (Kiernan, 1998, 25). Paul Chahidi (Maria in *Twelfth Night* 2002) revealed how his costume helped his character: “the corset... gave you a posture – with the skirt, the shoes and the hard-shelled wig – you had to move in a certain way. Both Cockerell and Yolande Vazquez (Beatrice in *Much Ado About Nothing*, 2004) reported that their costumes restricted their breathing and Vazquez was forced to re-think how she would perform her lines (Rylance, M, Vazquez, Y. and Chahidi, P. 2008).

The use of OP can affect actors in a similar way. The *Romeo and Juliet* (2004) actors reported the way the language had an effect on their character and movement. Bette Bourne remarked that, “in OP, the nurse became a totally different woman... OP toughened her up... She’s quite ruthless to Juliet” (Crystal 2005, 145). Kananu Kiriki found that, “[i]n OP, Juliet felt less self-conscious and more front-footed. She was bolder...” (145–6), and Rees Meredith (Benvolio) reported: “I felt like I was going for my actions a lot more strongly” (146). James Garnon (Mercutio) observed that the Queen Mab speech in RP “always sounds like poetry” whereas in OP “suddenly it felt real” (147).

The Workshop

Workshopping has played a major part in this study and the documentation of the workshop process has added to the volume of material written on the subject. The research element of this thesis focuses on the practical applications of OP in a performance context so it is natural that the study would be undertaken within the framework of a drama department, where undergraduate students were available to help with and benefit from the research. Additional workshops have been conducted with professional actors in a London studio in order to develop a methodology for working in the accent and to refine the workshop methods further. Workshops have had a twin focus of enabling the actors to achieve a measure of proficiency in the use of OP in the rehearsal studio and to experiment with the sounds of the language in order to discover how it might benefit and inform their acting and directing.

The workshop is an ideal place to generate ideas, make discoveries and to experiment with new tools and techniques. In this context, many minds are better than one when it comes to problem-solving and invention. Some ideas will work and may be refined while others will be unsuccessful and may be discarded or re-worked. Importantly, the workshop is likely to generate multiple possibilities from which to select. Amongst their peers, actors are generally uninhibited and not afraid to

try new ideas and to make mistakes. Ground-rules manifest themselves and may be adopted as a method of working. Self-evaluation comes into play as well as peer support and coaching. Direction may be subtle and unnoticed.

Feedback from workshop participants was an important consideration and the views of the actors were taken into consideration when formulating methods and frameworks. The expertise of participants was often valuable, particularly in workshops for professional actors. The presence of a voice coach in one of the workshops was beneficial in respect of analysing the vocal apparatus and placing the vowel sounds in the appropriate physical context. Short of mounting a full-scale OP production, workshops provide the best possible research tool to discover the dramatic potential of OP and to establish the most efficient working practices in the rehearsal room. Indeed, the context of a production would have included consideration of audience expectations and allocation of rehearsal time for OP.

My research conducted in the workshops has clarified the possibilities for the orthographical representation of OP sounds. Three types of script were tested – part-phonetic, CAS and regular scripts with footnotes. The conclusion was reached that all three types have their place at various

stages of the rehearsal process and all three have advantages and disadvantages.

The part-phonetic script contains the most accurate representation of the sounds of OP (short of a full transcription) and is a valuable tool in the teaching process. OP requires a limited number of phonetic symbols, which can be learned without too much effort. Ideally, the script should be printed in colour so that the phonetic symbols may be highlighted, perhaps in red; words, or parts of words, which are pronounced as in PDE should be printed in black. One drawback of using this type of orthography is that currently there is only a handful of transcriptions available. Therefore, a friendly linguist or someone very familiar with OP is required to prepare the script before the rehearsals may begin. This is a time-consuming process, which requires a thorough knowledge of language history as well as sensitivity to the demands of rhyming and blank verse. Another disadvantage of this type of script is the fact that the transcription relates to a specific base accent. This means that the transcription is not transferrable, except in so far as US actors might be able to adopt a British RP accent for all the words outside those transcribed into phonetics.

The CAS (colour annotated script), devised specially for the workshops and developed as a direct result of actors' suggestions, proved effective

in rehearsal, either as the sole text for rehearsal or viewed in tandem with the part-phonetic script (see Appendix 1). This has the advantage that no specialist knowledge is required to read the text so it can be used as a working script right from the start of rehearsals. As lexical groups are highlighted in unique colours, the CAS makes it easy to find related words and to target certain pronunciations during the learning process. This enables the recognition of alike-sounding words, which is very useful for identifying the patterns of assonance, identified by Linklater (Linklater, K., 1992) as an important non-verbal source of information. Although impractical for the whole script, this type of orthography is useful for demonstration purposes and short scenes. It tends to work very well for the regular lexical sets but less well for certain consonant groups or unstressed forms. The transcription process is more time-consuming with this type of script and a colour printer or copier is required for duplicating. Nevertheless, it has proved to be a useful tool in the teaching process, especially in the early stages of learning.

The method of teaching OP I employed in this project was developed over a number of workshops in response to the needs of the participating actors, taking into consideration their comments and preferences. Actors identified the need to associate language with movement. Meaningful delivery of lines, emotion, emphasis and, importantly, stress patterns originate in the fusion of language and action and, therefore, it makes

sense to allow this partnership to occur early in the workshop. David Crystal takes the view that the language and action should be combined at an early stage in rehearsal; if the movement is introduced later, the pronunciation might flounder with the change of focus (Meier, P, 2011, 218). A benefit of using movement in some way is that it encourages the natural flow of language and recognition of stress patterns, albeit initially at a slower pace than normal. As confidence in the OP develops, the movement naturally occurs as a response to the interpretation of the lines. This could take the form of an entrance or exit, or a gesture accompanying an emotive exchange in the dialogue. In the workshops, actors showed a natural tendency to get on their feet and use movement to heighten the effect of the language, even in initial read-throughs.

In OP, attention to stress patterns assists in the differentiation between strong and weak forms and encourages the actor to practise the informal weak forms which might otherwise be neglected in prose. It also aids the recognition of the metrical patterns in rhyming and blank verse, which can easily be overlooked when the focus is on pronunciation. The identification of key words for stressing might, in a prose passage, affect the pronunciation. One weakness shown by actors in the early stages of learning was the failure to use weak forms when words were unstressed, especially in prose. This could be a result of the tendency to over articulate everything Shakespeare in RP. This needs consideration in

rehearsal; some marking up of the scripts might encourage a greater distinction between weak and strong forms.

The style of teaching I used in workshop sessions deserves consideration. If the teaching of OP were to proceed lecture-style there is a real danger that the actors would be alienated. The workshops have shown that actors want to be actively involved in the learning process right from the start. There is a natural tendency to repeat words aloud in order to experience the physical effects of the pronunciation, which are quite different from PDE. Actors will vocalise example pronunciations, sometimes several times, until they are comfortable with the physical effort involved in producing the correct sound. This is an important part of the learning process and should be encouraged right from the start of the workshop. It is to be hoped that the teaching methods used in the workshops, which are documented in Chapter 6, might be an aid to others using OP in future productions.

Actors in the workshops showed a genuine interest in why words are pronounced in a certain way in OP and, therefore, a carefully-controlled explanation of language history, fed in at various points in the workshop, is important in gaining an effective understanding of the pronunciation. Investigations involving metrical repairs and restoration of rhyme encouraged the actors to think more deeply about how the pronunciation

functions. This encouraged analytical thinking, which was increasingly in evidence later in the rehearsal process.

Work with OP should not occur exclusively in situations where directors are preparing a full OP production. The reading of lines in OP benefits regular productions as an alternative way of looking at scansion and meanings, and teasing out additional value from the text, such as assonance or word-play. A partial repair of the language, in places where it may add value, is itself an attractive option. This is certainly true of verse in places where the scansion feels unnatural and there does not seem to be an emotional or directorial justification for the irregularity. The directorial irregularity (originating from the author or editor) may signify a pause for a gesture, entrance or exit, or simply a breathless, faltering or emotional exchange. OP might be seen as another filter, through which the language may be passed in order to discover a new reading or meaning.

The study of OP as a means of informing modern stage productions is certainly lagging behind other fields of theatre such as costume, staging, architecture and make-up. One possible reason is the lack of expertise in theatrical circles. There are plenty of costume and design experts in the world of theatre as well as architects and authorities on the literature, but if a production wishes to discover what pronunciation might have to

offer, a linguistic expert must be sought. The solution to this problem seems to be to raise awareness of the benefits of experimenting with historical pronunciation through training and resources. Historical language study could be an undergraduate module in drama schools. Resources, such as text books, videos, audio recordings and transcriptions need to be published to support this training. Even the most basic course in OP would go a long way towards raising an awareness of what the language has to offer.

During the course of this project, I solved problems in respect of establishing a performance practice with actors. Very little has ever been documented about developing an effective OP rehearsal technique so this study aims to address this. Of the very few productions which have taken place over the last sixty years, only those involving Crystal and Meier have been documented. Almost nothing was written about the process involved in Barton's *Julius Caesar* or Kökeritz's *Merry Wives of Windsor*, despite the fact that these were university productions.

Preparing for an OP Production

A significant discovery I made in the workshops is that actors are able to work from unmarked scripts after only a few days' rehearsal, once they have had some basic training in OP and are able to recognise the regular

lexical groups as well as the common irregular pronunciations. This learning process is aided by a teaching method which encourages the recognition of these regular patterns. An unmarked script with footnotes (possibly including some phonetic symbols for clarification) would be a very satisfactory way of presenting the text to an established OP company with experience in the pronunciation, particularly read in conjunction with the necessary audio recordings. This method of presenting the text is not dependent on a particular base accent. The two alternative methods used in the workshops involve the part-phonetic script and the colour annotated script, both of which are base-accent dependent. These methods might be used in the early stages of rehearsal until actors are familiar with the pronunciation. It would be unhelpful to present actors with a full phonetic version as this may represent a psychological barrier and for many would be an extra layer in the learning process.

The structure of the OP workshop needs careful consideration. Workshop sessions have shown that it is not adequate to teach the pronunciation first and then attempt to follow a regular rehearsal pattern. The rehearsal period for a full production should be preceded by at least five days of voice and acting workshops dedicated to OP. It would be best if these days occurred on weekends prior to the rehearsal period. This would allow adequate time for the actors to work on their scripts alone, with the help of recorded audio tracks, and ideally to receive individual coaching

from a dialect coach. The text used for this should not be the production script or, if it must be, the actors should read lines other than their own. During the course of the workshops, there should be continual revision of the basic sounds in the form of exercises and warm-ups. Once the rehearsal period begins, individual coaching should continue to take place and time should be allowed for the actors to work alone with the audio. Regular OP warm-ups and revision should be built into the rehearsal schedule. An OP voice coach should be on hand throughout the rehearsal process in order to assist the cast with warm-ups and answer individual queries, to monitor the progress of the pronunciation, to give private coaching, to encourage the actors to accommodate their language to one another and to guard against any tendencies to hypercorrect.

A regular performance of Shakespeare might also benefit from some text study with an OP bias. Experimentation will often yield previously undiscovered patterns of assonance, examples of word-play and rhyme, and may clarify irregular metrical patterns. Peter Hall alludes to this teasing out of added value from the text when he says, “[w]hen I am preparing a Shakespeare play, I still mutter the text to myself in Elizabethan. It reveals the shapes and colours. It always makes the words wittier” (Hall, P. 1993, 76).

In the same way that history tends to repeat itself in a variety of contexts, so ideas from the performance techniques of past eras may be put into practice again. This turning full-circle represents a very valid way of rediscovering lost methods and practices as a means of revitalising current ones, and may be viewed as at once 'authentic' and novel. Language study lends OP its historical credibility while the performance practice enables novelty. It is from the novelty that new ideas, invention and creativity will spring forth. It is essential that the historical basis of the reconstruction is sound, yet the reconstruction must not restrict and inhibit the performers but should open their minds to new discoveries. It is possible, for example, that abandoning modern sound and light technology in favour of candlelight and live acoustic music may enable actors and directors to explore new methods of creativity, atmospheres and acting techniques that may be grounded in past traditions but may even appear post-modern.

Leaving aside the notion of pure OP performances, the significance of the study of OP to the wider field of performance practice is an area awaiting exploration. This project has begun to explore the correlation between OP and movement, characterisation, interpretation of text, and rhyme and metrical reconstruction. Regarding interpretation of the text, *First Folio* acting may enable the actor to get closer to the original performances and discover clues hidden in the text; OP enables deeper examination of

the metrical structure of the folio text with the possible revelation, or at least clarification, of hidden direction. Language reconstruction has significant implications for current performance practice and as work on OP proceeds it will become difficult for practitioners to ignore these implications. In a sense, performances of Shakespeare in modern pronunciation contain anomalies which are readily accepted by performers and audiences. The anomalies are, of course, not created by choice but by language progress, which has left the original pronunciation and, most significantly, the effect of the language on performers and audience behind.

The prevailing situation is largely the result of a shortage of information and a lack of education. People are not always aware that many of the metrical anomalies in Shakespeare's verse were not present at its conception; they are not aware that a far greater proportion of Shakespeare's verse rhymed when it was initially penned. The solution is to inform and educate, but not to attempt to indoctrinate. Actors and directors can make up their own minds about how much or how little of the reconstruction to adopt and in what way they use the information in their practice.

The Globe reconstruction has contributed greatly to our understanding of the way in which live performances worked in Shakespeare's day, in terms

of architecture, interaction between performers and audience and the use of natural lighting. The actual language of the play is equally deserving of attention. However, this is more problematic as the subject lacks the obvious focus of a physical manifestation in the form of a construction site, an archaeological excavation or a blueprint. It requires a focus of a different sort, one not associated with a particular building or tradition.

It is to be hoped that this project, which has involved a large number of students and actors in the process of learning about and performing Shakespeare in OP, may have made a modest contribution to the provision of information and education, and that future initiatives and performances will do the same. There is clearly a great deal of linguistic and dramatic exploration still to be done before our understanding of how OP might benefit the performance of Shakespeare's plays is complete. But, despite the difficulties involved, the rewards make the effort well worth it. If we are, as Crystal (2013) suggests, to acknowledge the centrality of the relationship between pronunciation and interpretation, that relationship needs to be explored fully before judgments can be made regarding its validity.

Works Cited:

Algeo, J. And Pyles, T. (2010), *The Origins and Development of the English Language Vol 1*, Boston: Wadsworth.

Anderson, E. (trans.) (1938), *The Letters of Mozart and His Family*, London/Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Apel, W. (1971), *Harvard Dictionary of Music*, London: Taylor and Francis.

Arber, E. (ed.) (1900), *The Surrey and Wyatt Anthology*, London: Oxford University Press.

Ashworth, P. (2009), "As You Like It, Curve, Leicester", *The Stage*, 4 March, online at:
<http://www.thestage.co.uk/reviews/review.php/23689/curve-as-you-like-it> (accessed 02.07.13).

Noel-Armfield, G. (1909), *Le Maître Phonétique*, 1909b, 118.

Barber, C. (1997), *Early Modern English*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Barnett, L. (2011), "Cicely Berry, Voice Coach to the Stars", *The Guardian*, Sunday 24 July, online at:
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2011/jul/24/cicely-berry-voice-coach> (accessed 02.07.13.)

Barton, J. (2009), *Playing Shakespeare DVD*, ITV Studios/Acorn Media UK

Basavaraj Naikar, B. (2005), *Literary Vision*, New Delhi: Sarup.

- Baumgartner, J.B. (1774), *Cello Method*, The Hague.
- Bell, R. (ed.) (1868), *The Poems of Greene, Marlowe and Jonson*, New York: Hurst.
- Berry, C. (1993), *The Actor and the Text*, London: Random House.
- Berry, C. (2011), *Voice and the Actor*, London: Random House.
- Berry, C. (2011b), *Text in Action*, London: Random House.
- Berry, C. (1994), *Your Voice and How to Use It*, London: Virgin Books.
- Bessell, J (2001) Shakespeare's Globe Research Bulletin, Issue Number 18, March,
- Bessell, J. (2012) 'The Actors' Renaissance Season at the Blackfriars Playhouse', in *Performing Early Modern Drama Today*, Aebischer, P. and Prince, K. (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Bharucha, R. (1993), *Theatre and the World: Performance and the Politics of Culture*, London: Routledge.
- Billington, M. (2006), "A Midsummer Night's Dream, Swan, Stratford", *guardian.co.uk*, 9 June, online at:
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2006/jun/09/theatre.rsc>
 (accessed 04.07.13).
- Blandford, F.G. (1927), *Shakespeare's Pronunciation*, Cambridge: W Heffer.
- Blandford, F.G. (1937), *Twelfth Night Act II, Scene 4*, BBC Archive Recording 1006-7 at British Library.

- Blommaert, J. and Varis, P. (2012), *Culture as an Accent, Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies, Paper 86*, London: King's College, online at:
<http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/groups/ldc/publications/workingpapers/the-papers/86.pdf> (accessed 13.07.13.).
- Bloom, G. (2007), *Voice in Motion, Staging Gender, Shaping Sound in Early Modern England*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bridges, E. (ed.) (1814), *The Poems of Sir Walter Raleigh*, London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown.
- British Universities Film and Video Council (2012),
 website:<http://bufvc.ac.uk/shakespeare/index.php/title/AV66921>
 (accessed 27.07.12).
- Brook, P. (1988), *The Shifting Point*, London: Methuen.
- Brooke, T. (ed) (1922), *The Marlowe Canon*, Modern Language Association of America
- Brown, E. (2013), *Interview, Shakespeare's African Play*, online at:
<http://www.interviewmagazine.com/culture/gregory-doran-julius-caesar-bam#> (accessed 17 .07.13).
- Brown, I. (1952), "At the Theatre, Riverside Nights", *The Observer*, 16 March 1952, 6.
- Bruce, J. (1849), *Letters of Queen Elizabeth and James VI of Scotland*, London: Camden Society.
- Bullen, A.H. (ed.), (1890), *Poems, Chiefly Lyrical etc.*, London: JC Nimmo.

Bullokar, W. (1580), *The Amendment of the Orthographie for English Speech*, London: Henry Denham.

Bulwer, J. (1644), *Chirologia*, London: T Harper.

Bulwer, J. (1644b), *Chironomia*, London: T Harper.

Burton, L. (2013) *Shakespeare's Globe 2012 Theatre Attenders Survey, Report On Findings, Draft 2*, Shakespeare's Globe (unpublished).

Butt, J. (2002), *Playing With History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Broadway World Newsdesk (2013), "The Shakespeare OP Players Will Present Macbeth", *Broadway World* online at:

<http://broadwayworld.com/article/The-Shakespeare-OP-Players-Will-Present-MACBETH-27-24-20130131> January 31 2013, (accessed 06.07.13).

Caccini, G. (1602), *Le Nuove Musiche*, Florence.

The Camerata of London (1983), *English Ayres and Duets Sung in Authentic Elizabethan Pronunciation*, Hyperion CDA 66003.

The Camerata of London (1990), *Shakespeare's Musicke*, Meridian Records.

Capra, S. (2013), *NewYorkCritic.org* online:

http://shakespeareop.com/SteveCapra_NewYorkCritic%2015%20March12.html (accessed 01.04.12).

- Carroll, T. (2008), 'Practising Behaviour to his own shadow', in Carson, C. and Karim-Cooper, F. (eds.) *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carson, C. and Karim-Cooper, F. (eds.) (2008), *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cercignani, F. (1981), *Shakespeare's Works and Elizabethan Pronunciation*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cooke, A. (1931), *Ten Seasons of Dramatic Experiment*, online at: <http://business.highbeam.com/articles/c/Journals> (accessed 27.07.12).
- Coote, E. (1596), *The English Schoole-Maister* (Facsimile), London: Harper-Collins/Ecco
- Cohen, R. A. (2008), 'Directing at the Globe and the Blackfriars: Six Big Rules for Contemporary Directors', in Carson, C. and Karim-Cooper, F. (eds.) *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, R. (8 February 2013), "Macbeth OP Is Both Fair and Foul", *The Broadway Review* in Backstage online at: <http://www.backstage.com/review/ny-theater/off-off-broadway/macbeth-op-shakespeare-op-players> (accessed 06.07.13).
- Cole, T. (2013), "An African Caesar", *New Yorker*, 22 April, online at: <http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/books/2013/04/julius-caesar-gregory-doran-brooklyn-academy-music.html>, (accessed 28.06.13).

- Cole, M. (1988), *Back to the Land*, *Performance Practice Review*, Volume 1, No. 1, 25–41, online at:
<http://scholarship.claremont.edu/ppr/vol1/iss1> (accessed 01.06.12).
- Collins, B., Mees, I.M. (1999), *The Real Professor Higgins, The Life and Career of Daniel Jones*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Conkie, R. (2006), *The Globe Theatre Project: Shakespeare and Authenticity*, Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Constable, H. (1896), London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co. Paternoster House.
- Coveney, M. (2012), “The Stage Reviews, Julius Caesar”, *The Stage*, Thursday 7 June, online at:
<http://www.thestage.co.uk/reviews/review.php/36405/julius-caesar>
(accessed 28.06.13).
- Crystal, D., Crystal B. (2002), *Shakespeare’s Words*, London: Penguin.
- Crystal, D. (2005), *Pronouncing Shakespeare*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2005b), *Romeo and Juliet*, Programme Notes, The Globe Archives.
- Crystal, D. (2005c), “Friends, Romans and West Countrymen”, *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 6 May, 16–17.
- Crystal, D. (2005d), “Hark, Hark, What Shout is That? “ *Around the Globe* 31, Shakespeare’s Globe, August 2005.

- Crystal, D. (2005e) "Performing the Tongue that Shakespeare Spoke", Radio Talk for *Lingua Franca*, ABC Australia, 12 July 2005.
- Crystal, D. (2011) "Interview with Paul Meier: A Midsummer Night's Dream: an original pronunciation production", In Dudley Knight (ed.), *A World of Voice; Voice and Speech Across Culture*, Voice and Speech Trainers Association, pp209–23 online at: <http://www.davidcrystal.com/?fileid=-4833> (accessed: 12.01.11).
- Crystal, D. (2011b), 'Shakespeare in Period Speech: Seven Types of Pronounceability', *William Empson Memorial Lecture*, University of Sheffield, 29 March 2011.
- Crystal, B. and D. (2012), *Shakespeare's Original Pronunciation*, Audio CD, British Library, London: The British Library Board.
- Crystal, D. (2012b), *Think On My Words*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2013), *In Memory and Honour of Vivian Salmon*, a special number of *Language and History* 56 (1) London: Maney Publishing.
- Daniel, S. (1896), *Delia*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner Paternoster House.
- Datta, A. (1988), *Encyclopaedia of Indian Literature: Devraj to Jyoti, Volume 2* New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.
- Delsarte, F. (1893), *System of Oratory*, Delaumosne, Arnaud, Delsarte, Géraldy, Giraudet, Durivage, Berlioz, New York: Edgar S. Werner.

- Alan C. Dessen (2008), 'Original Practices at the Globe: a Theatre Historian's View', in Carson, C. and Karim-Cooper, F. (eds.) *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dobson, E.J. (1957), *English Pronunciation 1500-1700, Volumes 1 and 2*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dryden, J. (1659/1808), 'Heroic Stanzas Consecrated To The Memory Of His Highness Oliver, Late Lord Protector Of This Commonwealth. Written After The Celebrating Of His Funeral.' *The Works of John Dryden*, Edinburgh: William Miller.
- Dryden, J. Davenant, W. (1667/2010), *The Enchanted Island*, London: British Library.
- Drottningholms Slottsteater (2012), '*Performing the Past in the Present*' – Drottningholms Slottsteater 16 July, online at: <http://www.mynewsdesk.com/se/drottningholmsslottsteater/news/performing-the-past-in-the-present-open-pre-performance-talk-with-t-hooft-and-tatlow-at-drottningholms-slottsteater-august-1st-43175> (accessed 01.03.13).
- Ekwall, E. (1902), *Shakspeare's Vocabulary, Its Etymological Elements*, UPSALA: University Press.
- Ellis, A.J. (1871), *On Early English Pronunciation III*, London: Trübner and Co.
- Erne, L. (2013), New York: CUP

- Flatter, R. (1948), *Shakespeare's Producing Hand*, London: William Heinemann.
- Fromson, D. (2013), *Finding Shakespeare*, online at:
<http://www.amazon.co.uk/Finding-Shakespeare-Kindle-Single-Fromson-ebook/dp/B00ET98Z8C> (accessed 15.04.13).
- Gardner, L. (2009), "Speaking Shakespeare As You Like It", *Guardian*, 5 March, online at:
<http://www.theguardian.com/stage/theatreblog/2009/mar/05/shakespeare-as-you-like-it> (accessed 06.07.13).
- Gibbons, B. (2011), "He Shifteth His Speech: Accents and Dialects in Plays by Shakespeare and his Contemporaries", in Christa Jansohn, Lena Cowen Orlin, Stanley W. Wells (eds.) *Shakespeare Without Boundaries: Essays in Honor of Dieter Mehl* (76–91) Plymouth: University of Delaware Press, Rowman and Littlefield.
- Gill, A. [1619] (1972), *Logonomia Anglica*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Gimson, A.C. (1962), *An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English*, London: Edward Arnold Publishers.
- Globe Theatre (2013), "Psst!", *Globe Theatre Press Release*, (12 June), online at:
http://www.shakespearesglobe.com/uploads/files/2013/06/final_foosbarn_release.pdf (accessed 04.07.13).

- Glow, G. (1969), *The Mermaid Theatre, The First Ten Years*, Westerham: Westerham Press.
- Green, E. (2001), *La Parole Baroque*, Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.
- Greene, R. (ed.) (2012), *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Greenwald, M.L. (1985), *Directions by Indirections, John Barton of the Royal Shakespeare Company*, London: Associated University Presses.
- Greg, W. (1904), *Henslowe's Diary*, London: AH Bullen.
- Greg, W. (1907), *Henslowe's Papers*, London: AH Bullen.
- Grenfell, J. (1938), "Burlesque at its Best", *The Observer*, 27 November, 6.
- Grierson, H. (ed.) (1912), *The Poems of John Donne*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- The Guardian (1936), "Review of Broadcasting", 18 April, 14.
- The Guardian (1933), "Twelfth Night as a Masquerade", 18 May, 5.
- The Guardian (1937), "As Shakespeare Heard It", *Wireless Notes and Programmes*, 6 December, 2.
- The Guardian (1952), "Our London Correspondence, Aye Met a Lay-on", 13 March, 6.
- The Guardian (1952b), "Our London Correspondence", *The Mermaid*, 1 April.
- The Guardian (1952c), "Our London Correspondence", 25 July, 6.
- The Guardian (1952d), "Our London Correspondence", 13 September, 6.

- The Guardian (1952e), "What News on the Rialto", 14 November, 6.
- The Guardian (1953), "Theatre in the City", 15 January, 4.
- The Guardian (1953b), "The Mermaid's Sea Change, Longer Season in the City", 11 July, 6.
- Gurr, A. (1997) 'Shakespeare's Globe, a History of Reconstructions and Some Reasons for Trying', in Mulryne, J.R. and Shewring, M. (eds.), *Shakespeare's Globe Rebuilt*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hadow, G.E. (ed.) (1917), *Sir Walter Raleigh Selections*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Halio, J.L. (2010) 'on "Authentic" versus "Living" Shakespeare' in *William Shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet*, Ed. Bloom, H. New York: Infobase Publishing
- Hall, P. (1993), *Making an Exhibition of Myself: The Autobiography of Peter Hall*, London: Oberon Books.
- Hannoncourt, N. (1984), *The Musical Dialogue*, Portland: Amadeus Press.
- Harris, F. (2006), *The Man Shakespeare*, Stockbridge: Hard Press.
- Harrison, A. (2012), *London's Globe Theatre Celebrates First Two PhDs*, 23 February, BBC News, online at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-17073302> (accessed 14.01.13).
- Hart, A. (1942), *Stolne and Surreptitious Copies: A Comparative Study of Shakespeare's Bad Quartos*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- The Harvard Crimson (1895), 'The Silent Woman', 1 March.

- Hayman, R. (1972), "John Barton", *The Times*, London, 9 September, 11.
- Hildy, Franklin, J. (2008), "'The Essence of Globeness': Authenticity, and the Search for Shakespeare's Stagecraft", in Carson, C. and Karim-Cooper, F. (eds.) *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hodges, C.W. (1999), *Enter the Whole Army*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hodges, R. [1644] (1978), *The English Primrose*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Hope, J. (2010), *Shakespeare And Language: Reason, Eloquence and Artifice in the Renaissance*, London: Methuen Drama/A and C Black.
- Horobin, S., Smith, J. (2002), *An Introduction to Middle English*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Horowitz, A. (2004), *Prospero's True Preservers*, Newark: University of Delaware Press.
- International Opera Foundation Esterházy (2013), *Goals of the International Opera Foundation Esterházy*, online at: <http://www.eszterhaza.com/index.php?p=2> (accessed 05.06.14).
- Jespersen, O. (1907), *John Hart's Pronunciation of English*, Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Jeynes, E. And Ryan, J. (May 2002), *Umabatha*, *Research Bulletin, Issue 25*, Globe Research, online at:

- <http://www.shakespearesglobe.com/uploads/ffiles/2012/03/891356.pdf> (accessed 06.01.13).
- Johnson, S. (1765), *Preface to Shakespeare* (not paginated),
online at: <http://www.bartleby.com/39/30.html> (accessed 25 July 2013).
- Jones, D. (1909), *The Pronunciation of English*, Cambridge: The University Press.
- Jones, D. (1909), *The Guardian*, 2 July, 10.
- Jones, D. (1939), *English Pronunciation Through the Centuries, Linguaphone English, EE47 A British Library, Early Spoken Word Recordings*, Shelfmark: 1CL0005051.
- Jones, D. (1939), *Pronunciation of Early Seventeenth Century English*, Linguaphone Institute Recording EE 47/8.
- Jones, D. (eds. Collins B, Mees I.M.) (2003), London: Routledge.
- Jones, J.D. (1911), *Cooper's Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae*, Halle: Niemeyer.
- Jonson, B. [1640] (1909), *The English Grammar*, New York: Sturgis and Walton.
- Joseph, B. (1969), *Acting Shakespeare*, New York: Theatre Arts Books.
- Kaufman, J. (2011), "A Matter of Voice", *The Wall Street Journal On-line, Europe Edition*, 31 August, online at:
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111904787404576534690533590346.html> (accessed 02.07.13).

- Keenan, T. (2009), "Adapting the Adaptors: Staging Davenant and Dryden's Restoration *Tempest*", *Journal of Adaptation in Film and Performance*, Vol II, No. 1, Academia, 65–77.
- Kennedy, D. (2009), *The Spectator and the Spectacle: Audiences in Modernity and Post Modernity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Kiernan, P. (1998), "Findings from the Globe Opening Season, Henry V", '*Shakespeare's Globe Research Bulletin*', Issue Number 2, March 1998
online at:
<http://www.shakespearesglobe.com/uploads/ffiles/2012/03/528787.pdf> (accessed 26.05.14).
- Kiernan, P. (1999), *Staging Shakespeare at the New Globe*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Kökeritz, H. (1953), *Shakespeare's Pronunciation*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kökeritz, H. (1978/1995), *A Guide to Chaucer's Pronunciation*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kökeritz, H. (1959), *Shakespeare's Names, A Pronouncing Dictionary*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kökeritz, H. (1953b), ILP0228589, TV19233/TV19233 Yale University Press (LP), British Library shelfmark: 1 LP0228589
- Kramsch, C. (1998), *Language and Culture*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Lahey, T.M. (2011), "Hamlet in the Original Pronunciation", *The Shakespeare Conference*, 23 September, online at:
<http://shaksper.net/archive/2011/303=september/28148=hamlet=in-the-original-pronunciation> (accessed 01.07.12).
- Lass, R. (2001), "Shakespeare's Sounds" in Adamson, S., Hunter, L., Magnusson, L., Thompson, A. and Wales, K. (eds.), *Reading Shakespeare's Language: a Guide*, 257–269, London: Thomson Learning.
- Lass, R. (2000), "Language Periodization and the Concept of 'Middle'", in Taavitsainen, I., Nevalainen, T., Pahta, P., Rissanen, M. (eds.), *Placing Middle English in Context*, 7–41, Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lawrence, W.J. (1927), *Pre-Restoration Stage Studies*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lawrence, W.J. (1913), *The Elizabethan Playhouse and Other Studies*, Stratford Upon Avon: Shakespeare Head Press.
- Lee, S. (ed.) (1904), *Elizabethan Sonnets*, London: A. Constable.
- Levins, P. (1597), *A Dictionary of English and Latin Words (Rhyming Dictionary)*, London: Nichols and Sons.
- Lindley, D. (2008), "Music, Authenticity and Audience", in Carson, C. and Karim-Cooper, F. (eds.), *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Linklater, K. (1992), *Freeing Shakespeare's Voice: The Actor's Guide to Talking the Text*, New York: Theatre Communications Group.
- Lundberg, H. (1954), "Up From Stratford", *New Yorker*, 13 February, 21–22.
- Maguire, F. (2011), "Shakespeare's Globe Announces Plans to Build an Indoor Jacobean Theatre", *Ahem, Your Attention, Please, Shakespeare's Globe Press Release*, 20 January.
- Manchester Guardian (1952), "Our London Correspondence", Tuesday 1 April, 6.
- The Marlowe (2003), *Cambridge Festival Theatre*, online at: <http://www.societies.cam.ac.uk/marlowe/showarchive/festival/fezzie.htm> (accessed 12.06.12).
- Massaro, D.W. (1989), "Testing between the TRACE Model and the Fuzzy Logical Model of Speech Perception", *Cognitive Psychology* 21 (3): 398–421, online at: <http://psych.stanford.edu/~jlm/pdfs/Massaro89.pdf> (accessed 12.05.12).
- Matthews, P.H. (2007), *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*, Oxford: OUP.
- Matthews, W. (1943), *English Pronunciation and Shorthand*, Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Mayhew, A.L., SKEAT, W. (1888), *A Concise Dictionary of Middle English From 1150 –1580*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

McGowan, K., Van Kampen, C. and Lyons, W. (2008), "Performing Early Music at Shakespeare's Globe", in Carson, C. and Karim-Cooper, F. (eds.), *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meadows, H. (2012), *The Odd Accent of Tangier (VA)* online at: www.youtube.com/watch?v=AIZgw09CC9E (accessed 24.02.12).

Meier, P. (2011), 'A World of Voice', *Voice and Speech Review*, Volume 7, Issue 1, Online at:

<http://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=paul%20meier%20crystal%20interview&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CCEQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.davidcrystal.com%2F%3Ffileid%3D-4833&ei=uSf7U4KgAYjWalvmgdgj&usg=AFQjCNGRcma9HJYMtkAqEoGI2RM3HN9bMA&bvm=bv.73612305,d.d2s> (accessed 12.06.13)

Meier, P. (2010b), *Preface to A Midsummer Night's Dream Transcription*, online at: www.paulmeier.com/DREAM/script.pdf (accessed 24.05.13).

Meier, P. (2010c), *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Radio Recording, Kansas: University of Kansas

Meier, P. (2011b), "In 1595 'Prove' rhymed with 'Love'", *American Theatre* February 2011, 48–50.

Meier, P. (2011c), *Early Modern English: Pronunciation and OP on the Modern Stage*, (unpublished article written for the next edition of *The Cambridge Online Encyclopaedia*).

Meier, P. (2012), *A Midsummer Night's Dream Transcription*,

- online at: <http://paulmeier.com/DREAM/script.pdf> (accessed 1.12.12).
- Miles, B. and Trewin, J.C. (1981), *Curtain Calls*, Guildford: Lutterworth Press.
- Miller-Schutz, C. (1988), "Findings from the Globe Opening Season, The Winter's Tale", *Shakespeare's Globe Research Bulletin*, Issue Number 3, March, online at:
<http://www.shakespearesglobe.com/uploads/ffiles/2012/03/812813.pdf> (accessed 26.05.14).
- Milroy, J. (2002), "The Legitimate Language", in Watts, R. and Trudgill, P. (eds.), *Alternative Histories of English*, 7–25, London: Routledge/Taylor and Francis,
- Mitchell, B., Robinson, F. (1964), *A Guide to Old English*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Moreno, M. (2012), "O For a Muse of... Anything", *The Arts Wire*, online at:
<http://www.theartswire.com/reviews/oh-for-a-muse-ofanything-a-review-of-twelfth-night.html> (accessed 21.02.12).
- Mozart, L. [1756] (1985), *Treatise on the Fundamental Principles of Violin Playing*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Needham, A. (2012), "Stephen Fry's Twelfth Night: this all-male affair is no one-man show", *The Guardian*, 1 October, online at:
<http://www.theguardian.com/stage/2012/oct/01/stephen-fry-twelfth-night-all-male> (accessed 30.07.13).

- Nevalainen, T. (2006), *An Introduction to Early Modern English*,
Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- New York Times (1895), 'The Silent Woman', 18 March.
- New York Times (1937), "An Elizabethan Broadcast", 21 February.
- Nichols, J.G. (1968), *The Diary of Henry Machyn*, London: AMS Press.
- Noel-Armfield, G. (1909), *Le Maître Phonétique*, 1909b, London: IPA.
- Norton Anthology of English Literature Online (2013), "Thomas Platter, a
Swiss Tourist in London", online at:
http://www.wwnorton.com/college/english/nael/16century/topic_4/tplatter.htm (accessed 25.03.13).
- Northern Broadsides (2007), *The Tempest*, online at:
<http://www.northern-broadsides.co.uk/downloads/The%20Tempest.pdf>
(accessed 22.06.13).
- Northern Broadsides (not dated), "History", online at:
<http://www.northern-broadsides.co.uk/index.php/about-us-2/history>,
(accessed 15.07.13)
- The Observer (1909), 'As Shakespeare Spoke, Elizabethan Pronunciation
on the Stage', 4 July.
- The Observer (1952), "At the Theatre, Thrones for Two", Ivor Brown, 14
September, 6.
- Omnibus II, (1954), "Alistair Cooke visits the Yale University
Shakespeare festival", Vol. 21, United States: *CBS Television Network*, 21
February.

- Orgel, S. (1996), *Impersonations: The Performance of Gender in Shakespeare's England*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Orgel, S. (2002), *The Authentic Shakespeare and Other Problems of the Early Stage*, London: Routledge.
- Open Source Shakespeare, *Concordance*, online at:
www.opensourceshakespeare.org (last accessed 21.11.13).
- Pavis, P. (1992), *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*, London: Taylor and Francis.
- Pearce, E. (2013), *Northern Voices*, online at:
<http://www.northern-broadsides.co.uk/index.php/test3/edward-pearce-on-northern-voices> (accessed 22.06.13).
- Pollington, S. (1993), *Wordcraft*, Hockwold-Cum-Wilton: Anglo-Saxon Books.
- Prouty, C.T. (ed.) (1954), *The Yale Shakespeare Festival Lectures*, North Haven: The Shoe String Press.
- Quiller Couch, A.T. (ed.) (1895), *The Golden Pomp*, London: Methuen.
- RAL (2003), *Cambridge Festival Theatre*, online at:
<http://www.societies.cam.ac.uk/marlowe/showarchive/festival/fezzie.htm> (accessed 01.06.13).
- Red Byrd and the Consort of Viols (1989), *Elizabethan Christmas Anthems*, (Amon Ra CD-SAR46).
- Rodriguez, R. (2011), "Regional accents thrive in U.S. – but is that a good thing?" *CNN*, 29 September, online at:

- <http://edition.cnn.com/2011/09/29/living/american=accents=ireport>
(accessed 13.07.13).
- Rylance, M., Vazquez, Y. and Chahidi, P. (2008), "Discoveries from the Globe Stage", in Carson, C. and Karim-Cooper, F. (eds.), *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sams, E. (1985), *The Real Shakespeare, Retrieving the Early Years*, Yale: Yale University Press.
- Savithri, S.R. (2009), 'Speech Rhythm in Indian Languages', in *Indian Speech and Hearing Association, , 41st ISHACON Pune 2009*, Dr. N. Rathna Oration, online at:
http://www.ishaindia.org.in/web_020209/Rathna_oration.pdf
(accessed 24.05.14).
- Sawyer, M. (2005), 'Troilus and Cressida', *The Telegraph*, 4 September.
- Scheck, F. (2013), "RSC's Julius Caesar roars to life", *New York Post*, 16 April, online at:
http://www.nypost.com/p/entertainment/theater/rsc_caesar_roars_to_li
[fe_Fd9leX5AqAQlg7qTYWfxCL](http://www.nypost.com/p/entertainment/theater/rsc_caesar_roars_to_li) (accessed 17.07.13).
- Schoch, R. (1998), *Shakespeare's Victorian Stage: Performing History in the Theatre of Charles Kean*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scragg, D.G. (1974), *A History of English Spelling*, (70–71)
Manchester: Manchester University Press.

- Scully, C. (2011), *Constructed Places: Shakespeare's American Playhouses*, Cambridge: Proquest, Umi Dissertation Publishing.
- Shakespeare's Globe (not dated), 'Twelfth Night, by William Shakespeare', online at:
<http://onscreen.shakespearesglobe.com/index.php#/twelfthnight>
 (accessed 30.07.13).
- Shakespeare OP Company (2013), *Reviews*, online at:
<http://shakespeareop.com> (accessed: 12.01.13).
- Shakespeare Quarterly (1953), "Current Theatre Notes", 4, 1, January.
- Sherwood, R. (1632), *A Dictionary of English and French*.
- Sidney, P. (1595), *The Defence of Poesie*, London: William Ponsonby.
- Simpson, P. (1935), *Proof-Reading in the 16th, 17th and 18th Centuries*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skeat, W. (1914), *A Glossary of Tudor and Stuart Words*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Smeaton, O. (ed.) (1906), *Poems of Spenser*, Edinburgh: T.C. and E.C. Jack
- Soans, C. and Stevenson, A. (2008), *Oxford English Dictionary, 11th Edition*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spuler, B. (1975), *Handbook of Oriental Studies, Part 2*, Leiden: Brill.
- Supple, T. (2006), *Director Talk: Tim Supple, A Midsummer Night's Dream*, online at:
http://www.rsc.org.uk/downloads/transcript_tim_supple_director_iv.pdf
 (accessed 04.07.13).

Stern, T. (2004), *Making Shakespeare: From Page to Stage*, London: Routledge

Swafford, J. (2010), "In Search of Lost Sounds", *Slate.com (Blog)* Tuesday 2 March, online at:

www.slate.com/articles/arts/music_box/2010/03/in_search_of_lost_sounds.html (accessed 04.06.12)

Taylor, P. (2006), "A Midsummer Night's Dream, Swan Theatre, Stratford-Upon-Avon", *The Independent*, 12 June, online at:

<http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/theatre-dance/reviews/a-midsummer-nights-dream-swan-theatre-stratford-upon-avon-image-srhttpwwwindependentcouktemplatevergfxfourstargif-height1-width1img-srhttpwwwindependentcouktemplatevergfxfourstargif-height10-width47-481996.html> (accessed 04.07.13).

The Royal Shakespeare Company (2006), *Tim Supple Production 2006*, online at: <http://www.rsc.org.uk/explore/shakespeare/plays/a-midsummer-nights-dream/2006.aspx> (accessed 04.07.13).

Thompson, P. (1983), *Shakespeare's Theatre*, New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

The Times (2012), "Shakespeare by Candlelight", 30 November.

Trueman, M. (2012), "Shakespeare's Indoor Globe to Glow by Candlelight", *The Guardian*, 27 November.

Turner, R.L. (1985), *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, London: Routledge/Curzon.

University of Bristol (2009), *Explore Jacobean Theatre on DVD*, Bristol: University of Bristol Press Release, 11 June, online at: <http://www.bris.ac.uk/news/2009/6398.html> (accessed 30.07.13).

University of Bristol (2012), *Bristol professor helps bring candlelit Jacobean theatre to life on Bankside*, Bristol: University of Bristol Press release, 28 November, online at: <http://www.bris.ac.uk/news/2012/8980.html> (accessed 30.07.13).

University of Nevada Press Release (2011), "Reno takes center stage as Shakespeare debate heats up", UN Media Newsroom, 25 October, online at: <http://newsroom.unr.edu/2011/10/25/university-of-nevada-reno-takes-center-stage-as-shakespeare-debate-heats-up> (accessed 01.07.12).

Van Kampen, C., McGowan, K. and Lyons, W. (2008), "Performing Early Music at Shakespeare's Globe", in Carson, C. and Karim-Cooper, F. (eds.), *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Verderosa, T. (2011), "Hamlet Succeeds with Original Pronunciation", *The Nevada Sagebrush*, 13 November, online at: <http://nevadasagebrush.com/blog/2011/11/13/%E2%80%98hamlet%E2%80%99-succeeds-with-original-pronunciation> (accessed 02.07.13).

- Vervliet, S. and Van Looy, B. (2010) "Bach's chorus revisited: historically informed performance practice as 'bounded creativity'", *Early Music* 38 (2): 205–214, Oxford Journals, Volume 38, Issue 2.
- Vietor, W. (1906), *A Shakespeare Phonology*, Marburg: N.G.Elwertsche.
- Violanti, H and Ryan, J (2002), "Kyogen of Errors", *Research Bulletin, Issue 24*, Globe Research, May, online at:
<http://www.shakespearesglobe.com/uploads/ffiles/2012/03/284169.pdf> (accessed 24.05.13).
- Wainwright, N. (2011), "Te Be Er Not Te Be?" *Nevada Today*, 26 October 2011, online at:
<http://www.unr.edu/nevada=today/news/2011/new=hamlet-production-in-old-language> (accessed 02.07.12).
- Walker, T. (2009), "Trevor Nunn Says American Actors Can Get Closer to Shakespeare", *The Daily Telegraph*, (9 October 2009) online at:
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/theatre/theatre-news/6280585/Trevor-Nunn-says-American-actors-can-get-closer-to-Shakespeare.html> (accessed 02.07.13).
- Warwick Bond, R. (ed.) (1892), *The Complete Works of John Lyly*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Webb, C. (1995), "Performance Practice: Issues of Authentic Performance", *Undergraduate Review*: Vol. 8: Iss. 1, Article 10, online at:
<http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/rev/vol8/iss1/10> (accessed 06.03.13).

- Weingust, D. (2006), *Acting from Shakespeare's First Folio: Theory, Text and Performance*, New York: Routledge.
- Wells, J.C. (1986), *Accents of English*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, M. (2008), 'Research and the Globe', in Carson, C. and Karim-Cooper, F. (eds.), *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, M. (2012), *The Chamber of Demonstrations DVD*, University of Bristol.
- White, M. (2013), "When Torchlight Made an Artificial Noon", *ShaLT Lecture*, 14 July).
- Williams, S. (ed.) (1861), *John Chamberlain Letters*, Camden Society.
- Williams, W. (1905), *Elizabethan Drama from Lyly to Shirley*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Woods, P. (2011), *Globe audiences: Spectatorship and reconstruction at Shakespeare's Globe*. Unpublished thesis, available to view in the library at Shakespeare's Globe.
- Worthen, W.B. (1997), *Shakespeare and the Authority of Performance*, Cambridge: CUP
- Wyld, H.C. (1920), *A History of Modern Colloquial English*, London: Fisher Unwin.
- Yale University (2013), "Class of 1954", online at:

www.e-yearbook.com/sp/eybb?school=69&year=1954 (accessed 01.06.13).