**Duquesne University**
**Duquesne Scholarship Collection**

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Spring 2003

# "All hayll, all hayll, both blithe and glad": Direct Address in Early English Drama, 1400-1585

Michelle Markey Butler

Follow this and additional works at: https://dsc.duq.edu/etd

## Recommended Citation

# "All hayll, all hayll, both blithe and glad": Direct Address in Early English Drama, 1400-1585

Michelle M. Butler

A Dissertation Submitted
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Director:  Dr. Anne Brannen

Duquesne University
2003

Brian—
"I do love nothing in the world so well as you—is not that strange?"—<u>Much Ado About Nothing</u>

## Acknowledgements

**Table of Contents**

**Chapter 1: Introduction**

*"Now will I praise those godly men,*
*our ancestors, each in his own time...*
*All these were glorious in their time,*
*each illustrious in his day.*
*Some of them have left behind a name*
*and men recount their praiseworthy deeds" (Sirach 44: 1, 7-8)*

Direct address is widely acknowledged as a fundamental technique in early English, particularly medieval, drama. The observation that early English drama does not have the convention of the 'fourth wall,' and frequently speaks directly to and interacts with the audience would not be news to scholars of this drama; many have mentioned it. A.R. Braunmuller, for instance, in 1990, says that "[s]uch later-Tudor Vices as Ambidexter (<u>Cambises</u>) or Revenge (<u>Horestes</u>) continue the medieval drama's easy familiarity with the audience. Directly addressing the spectators or commenting 'aside' to them, these characters elide or obscure the differences between play and spectator" (83). Meg Twycross, in 1994, notes the preponderance of direct address in medieval plays, saying, "The true amount of direct address in these plays becomes apparent only when they are performed" (55). Suzanne Westfall, in 1997, comments that "early modern theater is full of what modern readers would consider breaches of fourth wall in the form of prologues and epilogues, verse designed to contact the audience directly with recommendation for their behavior, pleas for applause and reward, and straightforward flattery" (53). The sources in which these comments appear — <u>The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Theatre</u>, <u>A New History of Early English Drama</u>, and <u>The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama</u> — demonstrate how accepted these ideas are among scholars of early English drama; edgy or highly controversial suggestions, areas of intense scholarly debate, do not tend to make it into the introductory guidebooks that we construct for our fields. The position of direct address as a foundational, widely used technique in early English drama is

solid, perhaps as firmly in place as an assumption of our scholarship as it was in the dramaturgy in which it figures so prominently.

Since the understanding that direct address is a fundamental technique in early English dramaturgy is widely held, it is therefore surprising that almost no scholarship exists that focuses upon direct address. Doris Fenton's 1930 study, The Extra-Dramatic Moment in Elizabethan Plays Before 1616, is the sole full-length consideration of this issue. Even if this study were thoroughly brilliant and preternaturally insightful about the uses of direct address, given how much we have learned about early drama since its publication, the time would assuredly be ripe for a reconsideration of its conclusions. As it is, Fenton's consideration of direct address is disappointing in several ways. It focuses largely upon Elizabethan plays, providing only a cursory examination of medieval and Tudor plays, while nearly all contemporary scholars would agree that direct address is far more common in the earlier drama. In addition, Fenton's analysis is solely formalistic. She describes and categorizes the purposes for which direct address can be used, but provides no further analysis. Moreover, the conceptual understanding of direct address underlying her study — that direct address is by definition 'extra-dramatic' — is problematic; as we now know, there is no reason to assume that early English drama conceived of direct address as something that occurs 'outside' the normal drama. As David Klausner has noted, "This [characterization of direct address as extra-dramatic] can now be seen as a gross over-simplification of a device which both implies and provokes a considerable range of relationships between actor and audience" (2). Demonstrably problematic in concept, and analytically challenged in scope, Fenton's study nonetheless has remained the last word on direct address for over seventy years.

While Fenton's is the only study that focuses upon direct address, other scholars consider direct address in some detail as a secondary focus, because their central topic of study is closely related to direct address; discussions of soliloquy, interaction with the audience, and improvisation all tend to contain some contemplation of direct address.  Thus Neil Carson in "The Elizabethan Soliloquy — Direct Address or Monologue," from 1976, focuses upon soliloquy, as one would expect, but considers as well the related issue of direct address.  In her 1978 dissertation, "Soliloquies, Asides, and Audience in English Renaissance Drama," Margaret Coleman Gingrich similarly focuses upon techniques related to direct address and considers direct address as it intersects with those issues, as does Lloyd A. Skiffington in his The History of the English Soliloquy from 1985.  Likewise, in Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy, from 1935, M.C. Bradbrook considers speech conventions, including soliloquies and asides, and, relatedly, direct address; since she considers soliloquies and asides as direct address, the connection here is quite close.  In his 1966 dissertation, "The Comic Turn in English Drama, 1470-1616," J.A.B Somerset includes a chapter on direct address.  In his recent (2003) article "The Improvising Vice in Renaissance England," David Klausner touches upon direct address for its connection to improvisation.  Other studies of Elizabethan soliloquies and asides, such as that found in Bernard Beckerman's Shakespeare at the Globe (1962), tend to mention direct address largely to downplay the possibility that many soliloquies and asides could have been directed to the audience. However, even when we include the material in which direct address is considered as a secondary focus, the scholarship on this subject remains painfully thin.

Much more commonly, the critical position of direct address is that of a technique which is mentioned during analysis of an entirely different topic.  For example, Howard B. Norland mentions direct address in his 1983 consideration of the relationship of Heywood's Johan Johan

to its source, "Formalizing English Farce: <u>Johan Johan</u> and its French Connection." In <u>The Tudor Interlude</u>, from 1950, T.W. Craik discusses in his chapter on "The Setting" of these interludes the effect of the intimate hall space, describing how the small playing area both allows and encourages direct address. Robert Carl Johnson undertakes a similar task in "Audience Involvement in the Tudor Interlude." Two major studies from 1962, Anne Righter's <u>Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play</u> and David Bevington's <u>From *Mankind* to Marlowe</u>, consider direct address as it intersects with their particular foci, the former following Fenton's lead in thinking of direct address as 'extra-dramatic.' These examples are an illustrative, not definitive, set. It is not *impossible* to pick up a volume of medieval or Tudor drama criticism and find that it does not mention direct address at least once, but it is uncommon. In general attention, if not in particular consideration, scholarship demonstrates the importance of direct address in early English dramaturgy.

Why has so much — and yet so little — scholarly attention been given to direct address? Mentioned almost everywhere but considered in detail almost nowhere, direct address has been allowed to lead the unexamined life for far too long. Both in our descriptions of early English dramaturgy and our scholarship on it, we acknowledge that direct address is a foundational technique in early drama, one of its essential elements, as were air, earth, water, and fire in the medieval cosmology. Like air, direct address is one of the crucial techniques that make up and give life to early drama, and contemporary scholarship clearly recognizes this. One also suspects that, as with air, the function and effect of direct address is assumed to be obvious, not necessary to consider further and certainly not requiring study focused on it exclusively.

The effects and functions of direct address are assumed to be straightforward, easily observable, and intuitively obvious. The four roles for direct address that Fenton describes —

providing humor, appealing to the audience, informing the audience, and exhorting the audience for spiritual and/or moral purposes — are purposes which are indeed commonly pointed to as the role that direct address plays in early drama. That direct address does fulfill these functions seems beyond dispute. But that it exists in early drama exclusively or even primarily for these purposes is an assumption that should be examined. Moreover, even if these are indeed the most common effects for which direct address is used, the strategies for employing direct address to create these effects are worth considering. When we do consider them, we find that 'simple' exposition and audience exhortation, for example, are achieved in ways which are anything but simplistic; the ways in which different forms of direct address are employed to effect these differing purposes are both compelling and sophisticated.

When we generalize about direct address, we tend to focus upon its 'positive' or 'constructive' effects. That is, in studies of the third type discussed above, which mention direct address as it intersects with their own particular topic of interest, the effects of direct address most commonly considered are 1) creating and/or strengthening a bond between the audience and the play, and 2) creating sympathy for a character. Indeed, these studies tend to assume that direct address always has these effects. Speaking directly to the audience is commonly assumed to create a link between the play and the audience, a link which serves to draw the audience more fully into the play. For example, in The Mary Play (1997), Peter Meredith comments that "Despite his occasionally learned and cumbersome language, Contemplacio, like all links between actors and audience, has the effect of drawing the audience into the play, not of distancing the action into greater formality" (22). Similarly, T.W. Craik considers direct address "just one means whereby continual contact with the audience is sought and maintained. The spectators are encouraged to join in" (24). We also assume that direct address creates sympathy

for the character who uses it.  That is, when a character uses direct address, the audience, hearing his side of the story, will be inclined to see things from his perspective.  Howard B. Norland's discussion of Heywood's <u>Johan Johan</u> in "Formalizing French Farce," for example, works from the assumption that the audience will feel a stronger connection to Johan Johan than Tyb or Sir Johan precisely because Johan Johan commonly speaks directly to them (151).

These assumptions are attractive not just because they are easy but because they are partially true.  In many instances, direct address does have the effect of strengthening the relationship between play and audience, and of encouraging sympathy for a character.  However, this is not always the case.  Indeed, sometimes direct address can have the exact opposite effect; instead of drawing the audience into the play, it can distance the audience.  Rather than creating sympathy for a character, direct address can encourage revulsion.  Some studies of the second type discussed above, in which direct address, closely connected to the central subject of the work, is considered in some detail, have noted these more complex effects.  Neil Carson says, for instance, that direct address can disturb dramatic illusion by drawing attention to it, or enhance the illusion by drawing the audience into the play (13), and M.C. Bradbrook comments that soliloquies and asides largely serve to bring the audience into the play, but some function to distance the audience through irony (111-24).

However, though the more complex functions of direct address have not gone utterly unnoticed, they tend to be neglected.  When we speak in general terms, the more disruptive potentials are not discussed, thereby limiting our discussion to only a part of its possible effects.  It is as if we have a claw hammer, but think only about how it can be used to pound nails, not noticing that it can also be used to remove them.  I submit that when we look for other functions of direct address, we find that they are broader and more common than we generally assume.

Furthermore, the assumption that direct address creates a relationship with the audience is problematic for medieval drama. It seems clear that direct address can be and often is used to strengthen the relationship with the audience. However, it seems illogical and unlikely that direct address *creates* a relationship with the audience. Rather, the cultural and societal position of drama in the middle ages is such that a close relationship with the audience exists already, and the drama taps into it. I will discuss this issue in more detail in later chapters.

Moreover, consideration of the role and effects of direct address tends to be rudimentary, even among studies that focus upon it and related dramatic issues. Exposition, exhortation, gathering sympathy from the audience, even 'stroking' the crowd — these tend to be techniques we think of as basic and straightforward, the J. Alfred Prufrocks of dramatic convention ('deferential, glad to be of use'), not sexy but reliable, the less-interesting character actors rather than the talented, difficult, enticing divas. Perhaps. As I mentioned above, these 'simple' effects of direct address turn out to be much less obviously and simplistically accomplished than we have tended to assume, as later chapters will demonstrate. In addition, however, there are instances in which direct address is used to create stunningly sophisticated effects. The best example of this type of use of direct address is found in the York Cycle, in which, as we shall see, direct address is constructed to embody rhetorically the incarnational theology that the Corpus Christi cycle itself is designed to portray.

Thus this study aims to identify, categorize, and analyze the effects of direct address in English drama from 1400 to 1585. A good place to begin would be to establish what direct address is and how it can be recognized; direct address occurs when a figure in a drama speaks to the audience, acknowledging their presence. In many cases, this figure is alone on stage but he

need not be.  This definition of direct address, naturally, is consistent with that employed by earlier scholarship upon this issue.[1]

The definition of direct address, then, is not problematic; the question of how to recognize it is somewhat more complicated. Fenton addresses this issue:

> It may be pertinent to inquire how, at our distance from actual Elizabethan performances, we may know whether a given passage was spoken 'ad spectatores' or not.  Stage-directions indicating this fact do occur, but they are rare.  Far more frequent are such forms of address as 'sirs' or 'masters.' There is also a less conspicuous use of the second personal pronoun, and sometimes of the imperative.  There are many passages, however, which have no such indisputable marks upon them and yet suggest that they were spoken in this fashion.  In general it seems reasonable to assume that if a character, alone upon the stage, indulged in witticisms, gave an account of himself or of others, or narrated events which the audience should know about, the player did not pretend to be talking to the empty air, but quite simply directed his words to those for whose information or delectation they were intended. (9)

Fenton comments here that stage-directions indicating that a speech should be given directly to the audience are uncommon in Elizabethan drama.  They are even rarer in the earlier drama.  Far more typical are the rhetorical markers that, as Fenton notes, instances of direct address often contain which indicate they are spoken to the audience.  There are three types of these rhetorical markers.  The first type is comprised of vocatives that refer to the audience ('sirs,' 'masters,' 'sovereigns,' 'friends,' etc.).  The second is comprised of second-person pronouns, addressing the audience with forms of 'you.'  The third is comprised of imperatives, which often contain the

---

[1] Except, of course, that Fenton and other earlier scholars considered direct address to be 'extra-dramatic,' an understanding which has since been rejected.

implication of a second person pronoun; when the audience is told 'Be quiet!', what is meant and understood is '[you] Be quiet!'  Thus, the identifying of marked, or explicit, direct address, is relatively straightforward.

Identifying direct address that is unmarked, or implicit, can be trickier.  Fenton's comments about this situation (quoted above) seem sensible; a character who is speaking alone on stage can generally be assumed to be speaking to the audience.  The technique of soliloquy — that is, of speaking thoughts aloud for the audience to hear, but not speaking them directly to the audience — is extremely uncommon in early drama.  Indeed, one of the aims of this project is to consider when and how soliloquy emerges as a technique in the sixteenth century.  For early drama, it is wisest to assume that when a figure speaks alone on stage, in the absence of a stated audience (for example, another character, even one who is absent; a deity or concept; the character himself, etc.), the figure is speaking to the audience.  At the beginning of the York cycle, for example, God speaks alone on stage:  "I am gracyus and grete, God withoutyn begynnyng,/ I am maker vnmade, all mighte es in me;/ I am lyfe and way vnto welth-wynning,/ I am formaste and fyrste, als I byd sall it be" (Beadle 1:  1-4).  Here God is speaking alone on stage, yet it is clear that, although he does not draw attention to that direct address by referring to the audience explicitly, God is speaking directly to the audience, relating his identity and characteristics to them, not thinking aloud to himself in some egotistical private contemplation of his own power.  Implicit direct address can also occur when two or more characters are on stage together, but one is talking to the audience without making the pretense of talking to the other characters on stage.  In these instances, one has to consider the context in which the speech is occurring and, in the absence of any reasonable possibility that the character is speaking to one of the other characters, assume that the character is therefore speaking to the audience.

Indeed, much of identifying unmarked direct address relies upon understanding the speech's sense in its context. Accepting a passage as direct address should mean that the passage is best understood as direct address, considered in its dramatic context. That is, the speech not only *could* be addressed to the audience, but it makes *the best sense* when considered in this way. I have been conservative in my identification of direct address. It is probable, even likely, that additional elements of these texts would, in performance, reveal themselves to be most suitably executed as direct address. However, I have identified instances of direct address that are certain, most probable, and make the best sense understood as direct address. I have not included speeches that are only *likely* to be direct address.

Even so, trying to understand how early drama was intended to be played to its original audiences is an undertaking that might make us justifiably anxious. Fenton, among others, comments upon this difficulty: "It may be pertinent to inquire how, at our distance from actual Elizabethan performances, we may know whether a given passage was spoken 'ad spectatores' or not" (9). In Sharon Lois Mazer's 1991 dissertation, "Scripting the Audience: Didactic Strategies in Middle English Drama," she spends much the first chapter considering how problematic it is to predict and understand audience response to drama, let alone to determine a play's intended effect and whether it was successful. However, this problem is not one unique to the consideration of direct address, or even to the study of drama. Rather, this concern is an ever-present one for anyone dealing with older literature. As Peter Meredith has put it, "We are not medieval people, our perceptions are only medieval by skillful grafting, and we can never be sure how true the fruit is" ("Original-Staging" 73). Since we cannot be certain that we are understanding that original intention, the logical alternative, taken to its extreme, is either not to study older literature at all, or to study it only for what it means to us in our current situation.

But as scholars of literature, we have generally agreed to study older literature at times for its meaning to us, and other times to attempt to understand it in its original context, with the caveat that we be aware of the barriers that prevent us from doing so fully or with complete confidence.

In addition to marked and unmarked direct address, which can be used by both characters and special personages (that is, figures who speak on stage but are not characters; for example, expositors), this study will consider asides, semi-asides, and compound direct address. Asides are comments spoken by one character, in the presence of others, who could 'realistically' overhear them, though according to the convention, they do not. (This project, focusing upon direct address, will naturally limit its consideration to asides that are spoken directly to the audience.) A semi-aside is an aside that, when first spoken, appears to be a standard aside, but immediately afterward, is responded to by another character, who indicates that something was said (though not what it was). Chapter 2 will consider these asides and semi-asides. Chapter 3 will examine how direct address, both marked and unmarked, is used by special personages in early English drama. Chapter 4 will consider compound direct address, a special form of marked direct address in which speeches are simultaneously addressed both to another character(s) and to the audience. Chapter 5 will look at the use of direct address by characters in medieval drama, while Chapter 6 will continue with direct address by characters in sixteenth-century drama. Chapter 7 will conclude the project, bringing together its findings and looking ahead to the possibilities for further research in this area.

*Appendix:  Data Collection Methodology*

Text Selection Criteria

> *"Read everything.  You shall soon enough find that nothing is superfluous."*
> *--Hugh of St. Victor, 12th century.*

In order to undertake a reliable analysis of how direct address is commonly employed in early English drama, this study must consider many works.  The final collection of texts for the dissertation totals 91 works (including the four extant 'Corpus Christi' cycles, counting them each as one work.)  The purpose of the following section is to describe and explain the criteria used to select these works as the base texts for this dissertation.

First, the time period 1400-1585 was selected as the focus of the study.  The beginning date was chosen because texts that survive from 1300-1400 are so rare and fragmentary that is it difficult and problematic to generalize from them about the use of direct address, and it is impossible to determine whether, or how much, later texts reveal backwards about the period. The end point of 1585 was chosen because by that point, medieval drama had largely ceased to be a living, performed drama, and we believed that the major changes in the use of direct address would be complete by that point.  For a listing of extant texts, I have relied upon the Annals of English Drama.[2]  For the dating of works prior to 1558, I rely upon Ian Lancashire's Dramatic Texts and Records of Britain:  A Chronological Typography to 1558.  For the dating of works after 1558, I have used the Annals of English Drama and Yoshiko Kawachi's Calendar of English Renaissance Drama:  1558-1642.

---

[2]   The Annals of English Drama.  2nd edition, by Alfred Harbage, revised by S. Schoenbaum.  I am using the second edition because, according to James L. Harner's Literary Research Guide, 2nd edition, the third edition "is so rife with errors, misprints, omissions, and inconsistencies that it cannot be trusted" (177).

I have also chosen to use only texts that survive in the vernacular. Thus plays in Latin, most usually seen at the universities during this time, are excluded. I focus upon vernacular works because they are the most widely accessible for their original historical context. However, I believe that it might be worth considering in a later study whether and how the use of direct address differs in the Latin plays from that in the vernacular.

In addition, direct translations are excluded; however, adaptations of foreign originals are included. I expect that direct translations would be less likely to modify their material according to the conditions of dramatic presentation current in sixteenth-century England, and hence their inclusion in this base collection of texts could tend to skew its analysis of the common uses of direct address in Early English drama. However, adaptations of foreign originals should be more likely to have been modified in accordance with those conventions. Hence my decision, although I believe here as well that a later study might well fruitfully consider those translations and whether and how their use of direct address differs from that of the vernacular English tradition. For the distinction between 'translations' and 'adaptations,' I have relied upon the characterizations of the plays given by The Annals of English Drama.

In addition, I have limited the text selection to works that are, within the range of surviving dramatic activities, most straightforwardly 'plays.' This distinction can be theoretically problematic and practically difficult to make but it is necessary. While royal entries and entertainments, mummings, masques, and processions are clearly dramatic or semi-dramatic, they are not dramatic in the same way or for the same purposes as more narrative or representative 'plays.' Moreover, I consider this study to be a beginning of a larger project rather than a entirely completed analysis; in this first step, direct address in 'plays' will be considered, but later studies can and indeed should look more fully at other forms of dramatic

activity, such as masques and royal entries, to consider how and why direct address is employed in those forms.  As above, with the distinction between translations and adaptations, for these distinctions among the various forms of dramatic expression, I rely upon the <u>Annals of English Drama</u>.

As a final factor, fragments of plays are excluded, but individual plays surviving from cycles are included.  This does not mean that plays which are missing any portion of their text are excluded.  Rather, if more of the play is most likely missing than survives, as is the case with fragments of only a few hundred words, that fragment is not included in this analysis.  It is simply not possible to reliably determine direct address from such a small piece of a play; context is crucial for determining whether direct address is being employed.  Complete plays, however short, are included.  Thus "Robin Hood and the Friar," a short (122 lines) but apparently complete play is included in the study, while its companion piece "Robin Hood and the Potter," both published in 1560 in William Copland's <u>A Mery Geste of Robyn Hoode,</u> is excluded; "Robin Hood and the Potter" is a 71 line fragment of a larger play.  Individual plays from otherwise lost 'Corpus Christi' cycles, such as the Coventry <u>Shearman and Tailors' pageant</u>, are also included.

Thus this dissertation uses as its base texts all English plays in the vernacular that survive from the time period 1400-1585, excluding direct translations and fragments.  Ninety-one works fit this criteria, and I have read these, entering information about their use of direct address into a searchable computer database, as described below.

## Table of Plays Used

| Date | Title | Edition |
|------|-------|---------|
| 1400<br>L: c1454-99 | Brome Abraham and Isaac | Early English Drama: An Anthology. Ed. John C. Coldewey. New York and London: Garland, 1993. |
| 1400-50<br>L: c1450-75 | N-town cycle | The N-Town Play: Cotton MS Vespasian D.8. Ed. Stephen Spector. Early English Text Society. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991. |
| 1425<br>L: 1427-1589 | Newcastle Noah's Ark | Non-cycle Plays and Fragments. Ed. Norman Davis. Early English Text Society. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1970. |
| 1425<br>L: 1397-1440 | The Castle of Perseverance | Medieval Drama. Ed. David Bevington. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1975. |
| 1430<br>L: c1450?<br>Or 1520? | Burial and Resurrection of Christ | The Late Medieval Religious Plays of Bodleian MSS Digby 133 and E Museo 160. Ed Donald C. Baker et al. EETS. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982. |
| 1445-50<br>L: 1461 | Abraham and Isaac (Dublin) | Non-cycle Plays and Fragments |
| 1461-1500<br>L: 1461-1520 | Croxton Play of the Sacrament | Early English Drama: An Anthology. |
| 1470<br>L: 1464 | Mankind | Early English Drama: An Anthology. |
| 1470<br>L: c1460-70 | Wisdom | Early English Drama: An Anthology. |
| 1476-1558<br>L: 1376-1580 | York Cycle | The York Plays. Ed. Richard Beadle. London: Edward Arnold, 1982. |
| 1480-1520<br>L: 1480-1520 | Digby Conversion of St. Paul | Early English Drama: An Anthology. |
| 1480-1520<br>L: 1480-1520 | Digby Mary Magdalene | Early English Drama: An Anthology. |
| 1480-1520<br>L: 1512 | Digby Massacre of the Innocents | Early English Drama: An Anthology. |
| 1495<br>L:c1490-1500 | Nature. Henry Medwall. | The Plays of Henry Medwall. Ed. Alan H. Nelson. Tudor Interludes. Woodbridge: D.S. Brewer, 1980. |
| 1495-1500<br>L:c1510-19 | Everyman | Early English Drama: An Anthology. |
| 1496<br>L:c1496-7 | Fulgens and Lucrece. Henry Medwall. | The Plays of Henry Medwall. |
| 1499<br>L: c.1440-50 | Winchester Dialogues: Occupation and Idleness & Lucidus and Dubius | Non-cycle plays and the Winchester Dialogues: Facsimiles of Plays and Fragments in Various Manuscripts and the Dialogues in Winchester College MS 33. Norman Davis. The University of Leeds, School of English, 1979. |
| 1500-22<br>L: c1507-8 | Mundus et Infans | Three Late Medieval Morality Plays. Ed. G.A. Lester. New Mermaids. London: A&C Black. New York: W.W. Norton, 1981. Reprinted 1990, 1993, 1997, 1999. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1500-25<br>L:c1450-1576 | Towneley Cycle | The Towneley Plays. Ed. Martin Stevens and A.C. Cawley. EETS. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994. |
| 1513<br>L: c1514 | Hick Scorner | Two Tudor Interludes: The Interlude of Youth and Hick Scorner. Ed. Ian Lancashire. The John Hopkins UP, Baltimore, MD, 1980. |
| 1513-29<br>L: c1513 | Youth | Two Tudor Interludes. |
| 1515-23<br>L: c1519-20 | Magnificence. John Skelton. | Magnificence. John Skelton. Ed. Paula Neuss. The Revels Plays. The Johns Hopkins UP. Baltimore, MD, 1980. |
| 1516-1609<br>L: 1421-1575 | Chester Cycle | The Chester Mystery Cycle. Ed. R.M. Lumiansky and David Mills. EETS. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1974. |
| 1516-33<br>L: c. 1520 | Andria | Terence in English: An Early Sixteenth-Century Translation of the Andria. Ed. Meg Twycross. Lancaster, 1987. |
| 1517<br>L: 1517-20 | The Nature of the Four Elements. John Rastell. | Three Rastell Plays. Ed. Richard Axton. Tudor Interludes. D.S. Brewer, Ipswich, and Rowman and Littlefield, Totowa, NJ. 1979. |
| 1520-57<br>L: Before 1520 | John the Evangelist | Recently Recovered "Lost" Tudor Plays with some others. Ed. John S. Farmer. Barnes and Noble, Inc. NY. 1966. Facsimile of Early English Drama Society, London, edition, 1907. |
| 1520-57<br>L: c1541-42 | Godly Queen Hester | Early English Dramatists: Anonymous Plays 2nd Series. Ed. John S. Farmer. NY: Barnes and Noble, 1966. Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906. |
| 1525-33<br>L: c1513-21 | The Pardoner and the Friar. John Heywood | The Plays of John Heywood. Ed. Richard Axton and Peter Happe. D.S. Brewer. Rochester, NY. 1991. |
| 1525-33<br>L: c1520-22 | The Four P's. John Heywood | The Plays of John Heywood. |
| 1525-33<br>L: 1528-33 | Johan Johan. John Heywood | The Plays of John Heywood. |
| 1525-33<br>L: c1519-28 | The Play of the Weather. John Heywood | The Plays of John Heywood. |
| 1525-33<br>L: 1528-33 | A Play of Love. John Heywood | The Plays of John Heywood. |
| 1525-33<br>L: c1520-33 | Witty and Witless. John Heywood | The Plays of John Heywood. |
| 1527-30<br>L: c1523-25 | Calisto and Melebea | Three Rastell Plays. |
| 1527-30<br>L: c1519-28 | Gentleness and Nobility. John Heywood? | Three Rastell Plays. |
| 1533<br>L: 1533-65 | Norwich Grocers' Play<br>(two versions) | Early English Drama: An Anthology. |
| 1534<br>L: 1392-1580 | Coventry Shearman and Tailors' Pageant of the Annunciation and | The Coventry Corpus Christi Plays. Ed. Pamela M. King and Clifford Davidson. Early Drama, Art, and Music |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Weavers' Pageant | Monograph Series 27.  Kalamazoo, MI:  Medieval Institute Publications, 2000. |
| 1536-46<br>L: c1544-47 | Wit and Science.  John Redford. | <u>Medieval Drama</u>. |
| 1537<br>L:  1537 | Thersites.  Nicholas Udall | <u>Three Classical Tudor Interludes</u>.  Ed. Marie Axton.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer, Cambridge, and Rowman & Littlefield, Totowa, NJ.  1982. |
| 1538<br>L:  1538 | God's Promises.  John Bale. | <u>The Complete Plays of John Bale</u>.  Volume 2.  Ed Peter Happe.  Woodbridge, Suffolk.  D.S. Brewer.  1986. |
| 1538<br>L:  1538 | John Baptist's Preaching.  John Bale | <u>The Complete Plays of John Bale</u>. |
| 1538<br>L:  1538 | Temptation of Our Lord.  John Bale | <u>The Complete Plays of John Bale</u>. |
| 1538<br>L:  1538 | Three Laws of Nature, Moses, and Christ.  John Bale | <u>The Complete Plays of John Bale</u>. |
| 1545-52<br>L: c1547-48 | Ralph Roister Doister | <u>Three Sixteenth-Century Comedies</u>.  Ed. Charles W. Whitworth, Jr.  New Mermaids.  London:  Ernest Benn Limited; New York:  W.W. Norton and Company Inc.  1984.<br><br>Also in <u>Tudor Plays:  An Anthology of Early English Drama</u>.  Ed. Edmund Creeth.  Garden City, NY:  Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, 1966. |
| 1547-53<br>L: c1550-53 | Lusty Juventus.  R. Wever. | <u>Four Tudor Interludes</u>.  Ed.  J.A.B. Somerset.  University of London:  The Athlone Press, 1974. |
| 1547-53<br>L:  1547-53 | Nice Wanton | <u>The Tudor Interludes Nice Wanton and Impatient Poverty</u>  Ed. Leonard Tennenhouse.  The Renaissance Imagination, vol. 10.  New York and London:  Garland Publishing, Inc., 1984. |
| 1547-58<br>L:  1553-58 | Impatient Poverty | <u>The Tudor Interludes Nice Wanton and Impatient Poverty</u>. |
| 1550-57<br>L: c1557-58 | Jacob and Esau.  N. Udall?  W. Hunnis? | <u>Reformation Biblical Drama in England</u>. Ed. Paul Whitfield White.  New York and London:  Garland Publishing Inc., 1992. |
| 1550-66<br>L:  1547-66 | The Life and Repentance of Mary Magdelene.  Lewis Wager | <u>Reformation Biblical Drama in England</u>. |
| 1552<br>L:  1553 | Respublica.  N. Udall? | <u>Respublica:  An Interlude for Christmas</u>. Ed.  W.W. Greg.  EETS.  Oxford:  Oxford UP, 1952.  Reprinted 1969. |
| 1552-63<br>L: c1551-54 | Gammer Gurton's Needle | <u>Tudor Plays:  An Anthology of Early English Drama</u>. |
| 1553-58<br>L:  1553-58 | Jack Juggler | <u>Three Classical Tudor Interludes</u>. |
| 1554<br>L:  1540 | A Satire of the Three Estates.  David Lindsay. | <u>Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis</u>.  Sir David Lindsay.  Ed. Roderick Lyall.  Canongate Classics 18.  Edinburgh:  Canongate Publishing Ltd., 1989. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1554-55<br>L: c1554-55 | Wealth and Health | Recently Recovered "Lost" Tudor Plays with some others. |
| 1558-61<br>L: c1564-65 | The Play of Patient Grissell. John Phillip. | Ronald B. McKerrow and W.W. Greg. Malone Society Reprint edition, 1909. |
| 1558-63<br>L: c1563 | Tom Tyler and his Wife | Early English Dramatists: Anonymous Plays. |
| 1558-69<br>K: 1558-59 | Cambises. Thomas Preston. | Tudor Plays: An Anthology of Early English Drama. |
| 1559-67<br>L: c1567 | Appius and Virginia | Tudor Interludes. Ed. Peter Happe. Baltimore: Penguin, 1972. |
| 1559-68<br>L: c1568 | The Longer Thou Livest the More Fool Thou Art. W. Wager | The Longer Thou Livest and Enough is as Good as a Feast. Ed. R. Mark Benbow. Regents Renaissance Drama Series. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967. |
| 1559-70<br>L: c1568 | Enough is as Good as a Feast. W. Wager. | The Longer Thou Livest and Enough is as Good as a Feast. |
| 1559-70<br>L: c1550? | The Disobedient Child. Thomas Ingelend | The Dramatic Writings of Richard Wever and Thomas Ingelend. Ed. John S. Farmer, 1905. |
| 1559-73<br>L: c1570-73<br>K: 1570-73 | New Custom | Early English Dramatists: Anonymous Plays 3rd Series. |
| 1559-77<br>L: c1572-77<br>K: 1559-77 | All for Money. Thomas Lupton. | English Morality Plays and Moral Interludes. Ed. Edgar Schell and Shuchter, J.D. New York: Holt, 1969. |
| 1560<br>L: c1560 | Robin Hood and the Friar | Robin Hood and the Friar. Ed. Mary A. Blackstone. PLS Performance Text: No. 3. Toronto: Poculi Ludique Societas, 1981. |
| 1560-63<br>L: 1539 (first version) | King John. John Bale | The Complete Plays of John Bale. Volume 1. Ed Peter Happe. Woodbridge, Suffolk. D.S. Brewer. 1986. |
| 1561-63<br>K: 1561-c63 | The Pedlar's Prophecy | Early English Books, 1475-1640 Microfilm of 1595 edition. |
| 1562<br>K: 1562 | Gorboduc (Ferrex and Porrex). Norton, T.; Sackville, T. | Tudor Plays: An Anthology of Early English Drama. |
| 1562-68<br>L: c1567-68 | Like Will to Like. Ulpian Fulwell | Four Tudor Interludes. Ed. J.A.B. Somerset. University of London: The Athlone Press, 1974. |
| 1563-69<br>L: c1562 | The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna. Thomas Garter. | English Verse Drama Full-Text Database: Literature Online Database (LION). Accessed at Duquesne University, October 17, 2000. |
| 1564<br>K: 1563-c1570 | The Bugbears | The Bugbears: A Modernized Edition. Ed. James D. Clark. Renaissance Drama: A Collection of Critical Editions. New York: Garland, 1979. |
| 1565<br>L: c1564-65 | King Darius | Early English Dramatists: Anonymous Plays 3rd Series. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1565<br>K: 1564 | Damon and Pithias.<br>Richard Edwards | Richard Edwards' Damon and Pithias: A Critical Old-Spelling Edition. Ed. D. Jerry White. New York: Garland, 1980. |
| 1565<br>K: 1568 | The Interlude of Vice (Horestes).<br>John Pickering | Three Classical Tudor Interludes. |
| 1566<br>K: 1566 | Gismond of Salerne Wilmot, R.; Stafford; Hatton; Noel; Al, G. | Early English Classical Tragedies. Ed. John W. Cunliffe. Oxford: Claredon Press, 1912. |
| 1567<br>L: c1566 | The Trial of Treasure. W. Wager? | Early English Dramatists: Anonymous Plays 3rd Series. |
| 1567-68<br>L: c1567-68 | Liberality and Prodigality | Early English Books, 1475-1640 Microfilm of 1602 edition. |
| 1568<br>L: c1567-68 | The Marriage of Wit and Science | Recently Recovered "Lost" Tudor Plays with some others. |
| 1570<br>L: 1547-53<br>K: 1560-70 | July and Julian | Ed. Giles Dawson and Arthur Brown. Malone Society Reprint Edition, 1955. |
| 1570<br>L: c1571<br>K: 1560-77 | Misogonus. Laurence Johnson. | Misogonus. Ed. Lester E. Barber. New York: Garland, 1979. |
| 1570<br>L: c1571-77 | A Marriage between Wit and Wisdom. Francis Merbury. | English Moral Interludes. Ed. Glynne Wickham. London: J.M. Dent, 1976. |
| 1570-83<br>K: c.1570-83 | Clyomon and Clamydes | Clyomon and Clamydes: A Critical Edition. Ed. Betty J. Littleton. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1968. |
| 1572<br>L: c1572-80<br>K: 1570-81 | The Conflict of Conscience. Nathaniel Woodes | English Morality Plays and Moral Interludes. |
| 1575<br>K: 1575 | The Glass of Government. George Gascoigne | The Complete Works of George Gascoigne. Ed. John W. Cunliffe. Cambridge, 1910. Reprinted 1969. |
| 1576<br>K: 1576 | Common Conditions | Elizabethan Club Reprints. Ed. C.F. Tucker Brooke. New Haven, 1915. |
| 1576<br>L: c1571-75<br>K: 1576 | The Tide Tarrieth No Man. George Wapull. | English Morality Plays and Moral Interludes. |
| 1578<br>K: 1578 | Promos and Cassandra. George Whetstone. | Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. Ed. Geoffrey Bullough. NY: Columbia UP; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966-75. Volume 2: 442-513. |
| 1581<br>K: 1582 | The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune | Early English Books, 1475-1640 Microfilm of 1589 edition. |
| 1581<br>K: 1581 | The Three Ladies of London. Robert Wilson. | English Verse Drama Full-Text Database: Literature Online Database (LION). Accessed at Duquesne University, October 17, 2000. |
| 1581-84<br>K: 1581-84 | The Arraignment of Paris. George Peele. | The Life and Works of George Peele. Ed. R.M. Benbow. New Haven: Yale UP, 1952-70. Volume 3. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1581-84<br>K:  1584 | Sappho and Phao.  John Lyly. | <u>The Plays of John Lyly</u>.  Ed. Carter A. Daniel.<br>Lewisburg:  Bucknell University Press, 1988. |
| 1584<br>K:  1584 | Campaspe.  John Lyly. | <u>The Plays of John Lyly</u>. |
| 1585<br>K:  1858 | Gallathea.  John Lyly. | <u>The Plays of John Lyly</u>. |

<u>The Database</u>

*"There is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so."* --<u>Hamlet</u>
*2.2.268-69*

For this dissertation, I have identified and categorized instances of direct address in the 91 plays of my text group, which as described above represents all extant plays (excluding direct translations and fragments) in English from 1400 to 1585. To assist in the collection and organization of such a large body of information, I used a computer database constructed using Microsoft Access 97, a widely-used database program for the organization and analysis of large bodies of information. It is highly flexible and can be customized to the specific needs of one's task. Access stores information, but can also be used to help organize the information. With the help of a local database expert, I constructed an Access database tailored to the particular needs of my data collection project. Using this Access 97 database has been of considerable importance in the production of this dissertation. There are almost 2500 direct address records in the database; without the database, keeping this volume of material organized and accessible would have been significantly more difficult and time-consuming.

In constructing the database, we first constructed a form to allow me to enter information about each play. First, when I constructed a new play record, the play would be automatically assigned a Play ID number, simply to make it easier for Access to handle the material; the program keeps track of information by the play's ID number rather than its title. Some plays have identical or similar titles, so that number allows the computer program to uniquely identify each play. I entered each play in my text set as its own separate record, with the exception of the cycle plays. Above, in the description of the set of texts used for the project, I noted that each cycle was counted as a single play, for a total of 91. However, in the database, due to the

cycles' length, it was far more sensible to enter each individual play in a cycle into the database as its own play record.

After the computer automatically assigned each new play record a Play ID number, I would then enter the crucial information about each play: its title, author (if known), text date, performance dates, and venue. The title and author information are relatively straightforward. The date information, however, is rather more oblique. By Text Date I mean the date of the extant text that is the source of the edition that I am working from. By Performance Date Range, I mean the earliest and latest dates when the play was performed, if known. The latter date is usually quite difficult to come by. Venue, like author and title, is straightforward in meaning, referring to where and by whom the play was produced, if known. A Comments section is included as well, in which I note other material of interest.

After a record was created for each new play, I would begin reading the play and entering its instances of direct address. For this purpose, we created a Direct Address Records form. For each instance of direct address, as with each play, the computer first automatically assigned a unique record number. I would then enter the first line or so of text for each instance of direct address, its line numbers, the type of direct address, and the speaker. For these last two, the database was constructed so that I selected the appropriate type and speaker from a pull-down list; that is, I would click on the arrow to the right of the box, a list would pop up, and I would then scroll through the list and select the correct type or speaker. The information in those two pull-down lists is stored elsewhere in the database in the form of tables.

The database was constructed in this way to allow important search capabilities. The direct address type table allows me to search the database by direct address type, an invaluable resource for writing the chapters of this dissertation. For the work on Explicit Direct Address,

for example, I used a Query to pull from the database all records categorized as Explicit Direct Address, then used a Report to collate and display those records, organized by the play in which they appear.  The usefulness of this search capability is clear.  The database allows me to pull together neatly and in just a few minutes all the direct address records necessary for a particular chapter, a process which I shudder to consider trying to accomplish with small scraps of paper and notecards.  *Vive la revolution!*  Similarly, the table of speakers, in which speakers are categorized as either characters or special personages, allows me to search the database for direct address by characters or special personages, pulling the desired records into a Report.  The database, then, was a phenomenally helpful tool in the organization and management of the data collected for this dissertation.

After I read all 91 plays of the text set, I created Queries and Reports to collect the materials for each individual chapter.  The usefulness of the database did not end there, however. Before I began going back through the collected examples of direct address for the purposes of analyzing them and from there to begin writing the chapter, I first went through each collection of records to verify them.  That is, I went back through each group of records, not just the text-lines included in the record but pulling out the plays and looking at each example again in context, to verify that I did indeed still consider it to be direct address, and if so, what type. Some instances were removed from the dataset in this process; some were recategorized as a different type of direct address.  Thus each instance of direct address discussed in this study has been identified as such not only during my original reading of the plays, but a second time, after all the plays had been read, as verification of that original designation.  For this purpose of verification, we created a Record Confirmation Form, in which I would check a box for each record, indicating that the record had been verified and should indeed be included in Queries and

Reports its direct address type.  After verification, I then worked with the confirmed records for each direct address type in the actual writing of the chapter.

A final task that the database proved useful for lies in the area of chronology.  During my reading of the plays, for each play I entered a text date and a performance date range, as described above.  However, as I read the plays, it became clear that these dates were not going to be adequate for the purposes of chronology in the project.  Indeed, chronology is one of the most difficult issues in the study of early drama.  We therefore created another form specifically to store the several pertinent dates necessary for the serious consideration of the chronology of early English drama.  For each play I include text date, earliest and latest date for performance, and also earliest and latest date of composition.  As you might expect, the database is searchable by any of those dates, thus enabling an intensely intricate study of the possible relationship of direct address and chronology, if that were desired.

Using a computer database as a base tool in the production of a literature dissertation may seem a bit odd.  However, the database is not the dissertation.  The collection of direct address records is itself a useful outcome of this project, regardless of my analysis of that material.  This collection is made feasible and accessible by the database, but the database itself is merely a tool, much as is the computer on which I am composing this paragraph, and as a tool it is only as good or bad as the use that is made of it.  But as a tool, the database was highly helpful in the production of this dissertation, and it was a tool that I would have been loath to do without for this project.

## Chapter 2: Asides

*"Convention: An unrealistic device that the public agrees to tolerate. Thus, a character in a drama may express his thoughts aloud and not be heard by other characters (aside)..." (Barnet, et.al. 256)*

Even the most gifted scholar among us would be hard-pressed to produce a book entitled The Aside in Medieval English Drama. There simply are not enough asides in English drama before 1500; there are less than a dozen.[3] That, in itself, is highly intriguing. We tend to assume that direct address is more common in medieval drama than in later drama, becoming less used over the course of the sixteenth century until it falls largely out of fashion in the seventeenth, with the exception of asides and soliloquies.[4] These exceptions were, we tend to believe, tolerated for their usefulness until the nineteenth-century fashion for highly realistic drama precluded even those remnants. However, though these notions are generally true about direct address, they are not true in the case of the aside. In the case of the aside, the sixteenth century meant a phenomenal expansion of its use, not a gradual diminishment and loss.

Before examining the use, or lack thereof, of the aside in medieval English drama, we should briefly consider what an aside is, the different types of asides that exist, and which types of asides are examined in this study; not all asides are examples of direct address. Overall, there is substantial consensus among scholars as to a general definition of the aside, but significant variation exists among definitions of the types of asides and their functions.

---

[3] That is, asides which are also direct address; as I discuss below, other types of asides are beyond the scope of this project. Although I did not collect the statistical data necessary to make this claim firmly about all sorts of asides I can say informally that from my reading, all the asides of all types in medieval English drama still would not warrant an entire book; one might be able to coax an article out of them, however.

[4] 'Soliloquy' is here being used indeterminately, in the manner typical of most criticism of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century drama, to mean a speech given by a character who is alone or believes he is alone, a speech in some cases directed to the audience and in other cases meant to represent 'thinking aloud.' Elsewhere in the dissertation I draw a clearer distinction between direct address and soliloquy, and in those cases 'soliloquy' is used more precisely to mean 'thinking aloud.'

Drama handbooks and introductory textbooks are an excellent source for the mainstream understanding of dramatic terms and concepts, and in them we find that drama scholars have a tendency to avoid general definitions of the term 'aside,' even when they are identifying and discussing different types of asides themselves, most likely assuming that a conception is common knowledge.[5] Jerry V. Pickering's 1978 anthology, <u>Theatre: A Contemporary Introduction</u>, defines 'aside' as "[one] of the conventions of theatre in which the audience accepts the idea that the words spoken by an actor, with appropriate side gesture and tone, can be heard by the audience but not by the actors onstage" (354). Sylvan Barnet, et al's 1962 <u>Aspects of the Drama</u> defines 'convention' as "[an] unrealistic device that the public agrees to tolerate," giving the aside as an example: "Thus, a character in a drama may express his thoughts aloud and not be heard by other characters (aside)" (203). The authors' choice of wording — that the audience 'tolerates' such conventions — suggests a distaste for asides and other 'unrealistic' dramatic conventions, a view typical among drama theorists of the nineteenth and early twentieth century.[6] Terry Hodgson's <u>The Drama Dictionary</u> defines the aside as "[a] remark addressed in mid-scene by an actor to the audience, presumed by convention to be inaudible to those on stage...In a more subtle way, the aside may be used *within* a play when a character addresses an aside to another character on stage..." (27). Jack A. Vaugh's 1978 <u>Drama A to Z: A Handbook</u>

---

[5] For example, all of the following scholarly considerations of asides do not provide a general definition of the term: Bernard Beckerman's 1962 <u>Shakespeare at the Globe 1599-1609</u> (186-92); Manfred Pfister's 1988 <u>The Theory and Analysis of Drama</u> (137-40); S. L Bethell's 1970 <u>Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition</u> (103-7); and Margaret Coleman Gingrich's 1978 <u>Soliloquies, Asides, and Audience in English Renaissance Drama</u> (8-10)

[6] See Margaret Coleman Gingrich's 1978 <u>Soliloquies, Asides, and Audience in English Renaissance Drama</u> (1-7) for a summary of the critical fate of the aside in twentieth-century drama scholarship. The general tale is a move from excoriation of the aside in the light of the theory of dramatic Realism (e.g. William Archer's 1923 <u>The Old Drama and New</u>, in which literary darwinism sees dramaturgy evolving from Elizabethan naivety to Realist sophistication) to defenders (Doris Fenton's 1930 <u>The Extra-Dramatic Moment in Elizabethan Plays before 1616</u>; M.C Bradbrook's 1935 <u>Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy</u>). We should note, however, that most scholarly work on the aside has focused upon Elizabethan and later English drama; very little considers medieval and Tudor uses of the aside.

calls an aside, "A dramatic convention in which a remark or speech of one character is presumed not to have been heard by the other character(s) on the stage" (15).

The features of these definitions are quite similar and suggest a widely accepted concept of what an aside is. An aside is a comment spoken by a character in the presence of other characters who could 'realistically' overhear it, but who according to the convention, nevertheless do not. Implicit in this general understanding of asides is a statement about who uses asides: asides are spoken by characters, never special personages such as prologues, epilogues, or expositors. My research bears out this assumption, having found no asides in the speeches of such figures. In addition, this definition carries the implicit belief that the aside is not 'heard' by the other characters on stage because it is important that they do not. The aside is either a comment that *must* be addressed to someone other than the characters that the speaker is with because it would not make sense for those other characters to 'hear' the remark; or it is the sort of remark the other characters would assuredly respond to if they did hear it (and in the absence of a response, we can assume they did not); or it would imperil elements of the plot if the other characters heard it.

Though there is consensus about the definition of an aside, there is less consensus about the types of asides that exist. Commonly, two types of asides are recognized, those addressed to the audience, and those addressed to other characters. Both S.L. Bethell and Bernard Beckerman focus upon these two types (104-7; 186-92). Warren Smith comments upon the custom of identifying only two types of aside and argues for a third, a category of asides that "appear to be aimed at, rather than addressed to, another character on stage" (511). A.C. Sprague also describes three types, though he categorizes them somewhat differently as asides in which characters speak to themselves, think aloud, or speak to the audience (65-70). Manfred Pfister

identifies three as well, using a still different system of categorization, that of the monological aside, the aside *ad spectatores*, and the dialogical aside.[7]  Drawing upon this prior work on asides and my own reading of the plays, I have identified five types of asides, three of which are considered in this study as direct address or potential direct address.

Of the five I have identified, the first is the conversational aside, as Beckerman calls it (186); Pfister identifies this type as the dialogical aside.  In this type of aside, one character makes a comment to another character, but the other characters on stage do not 'hear' it.  For example, in The Marriage of Wit and Science, Will and Wit exchange whispered comments in the presence of Experience and Reason that the latter are clearly intended not to overhear ("Soft and fair, sir boy!  You talk, you wot not what," Wit says.  Will responds, "Can you abide to be driven off with this and that?  Can they ask any more than good assurance at your hands?" [77]).  Wit and Will are clearly conferring and there would be trouble indeed if the others were to hear their whispered conference.  So, clearly, this is an example of dialogue spoken on stage, unheard by characters who could be expected to be able to hear it; nevertheless, this type of aside is not direct address to the audience, and hence is not a focus of the current study.

Another type of aside is the undirected aside.  This type occurs when one character makes a comment about another character, a comment which the audience is intended to hear but which is directed to no one in particular, including the audience.  This is the type of aside that Warren Smith discusses in his article "The Third Type of Aside in Shakespeare"; these asides "appear to be aimed at, rather than addressed to, another character on stage — and the words are evidently not intended for his ears or any other character's.  The audience hears them, to be sure, but such asides are apparently not addressed to the house either" (511).  For example, in the York Herod /

---

[7] The monological aside represents an instance of a character "thinking aloud."  The aside *ad spectatores* is an aside clearly directed to the audience.  The dialogical aside is an aside addressed to another character(s) (137-40).

The Magi, II Consolator comments as the Magi leave, "Fares wele — ye are bygilyd" (260).

Certainly the last half of this line would cause problems, and indeed compromise the plot, if the

Magi actually 'heard' it, so it must be an aside, but its rhetorical structure, being in the vocative,

precludes its being spoken directly to the audience. Likewise in Mundus et Infans, Folly's

comment, "And ere it be passed half a year/ I shall thee shear right a lewd friar,/ And hither

again thee send" is an aside of this type, a comment about Mankind but directed neither to him

nor to the audience (688-90). Like the conversational aside, this undirected aside is not a form of

direct address and thus is not considered in detail in the current project.

A third type is comprised of "audience asides," which Beckerman calls "solo asides" and

Pfister refers to as "asides *ad spectatores*." In this type, a character makes a comment directly to

the audience, and as with our previous examples, the other characters don't 'hear' it. Beckerman

describes this as "very like a soliloquy (usually short) spoken while other characters are present

— and known to be present by the speaker — but unheard by them" (186). For example, in

Cambises, Ambidexter informs the audience in asides of his plans to cause his companions Hob

and Lob to quarrel ("Now with bothe hands wil ye see me play my parte!" [782-83]; and later,

"By the Masse, I wil cause them to make a fray" [806]). Similarly, in The Play of Patient

Grissell, Politic Persuasion comments to the audience about the conversation he is witnessing

between Gautier and his counselors: "Honestlie spoken I swere by Saint tan,/ My master you see

is a francke harted Gentillman" (147-48). This type of aside, since it involves direct address to

the audience, is the focus of the present investigation.

A fourth type, which would seem to be easily distinguished from the audience aside,

poses interesting problems. In this type of aside, a character makes a comment to himself, one

which the audience overhears and the other characters do not, a type here referred to as a "self

aside." Whereas the undirected aside is rhetorically constructed as if it were addressed to another character, but cannot feasibly be spoken to him — it is aimed at the other character rather than addressed to him, as Smith says — this fourth type of aside gives no rhetorical indication that it is aimed at another character. Rather, the character speaks aloud to himself, either explicitly talking to himself, or seemingly thinking aloud. For instance, in <u>The Play of Patient Grissell</u>, Politic Persuasion sees an opportunity to further his own aims — Gautier's counselors have just informed him that his people have a reason to be unhappy with his goverance — and, in an aside, stirs himself up to seize it: "For twentie pounde here is some broyle toward,/ Now Polliticke perswasion shoe forthe thy skyll,/ I will make him obstinate stoberne and frowarde,/ If that I may atchiue my purpose and will" (137-40).

One might suppose that self asides, not being direct address, would be excluded from consideration in the current study. However, while it is possible in theory to separate self asides from audience asides, it is often difficult to do so in practice. In instances such as the one cited above, in which Politic Persuasion names himself explicitly in his aside, identifying the remark as a self aside is easily accomplished. Likewise, when characters explicitly address the audience as 'you' (or use other rhetorical markers) in their asides, identifying audience asides is straightforward. But in the absence of such rhetorical markers, distinguishing between these two types of asides can be extremely difficult.

For example, in <u>Promos and Cassandra</u>, after Promos presents an offer to Cassandra that he will spare her brother's life if she yields to him, Cassandra says, "And may it be, a Judge himself the selfe same fault should use/ For which he do[o]mes anothers death, O crime without excuse!" (3.2). It is clear both from the plot requirements at this point — Cassandra is certainly not going to antagonize Promos by flinging this accusation at him — as well as her statement

which follows ("Renowned Lorde, you use this speach (I hope) your thrall to trye...") that Promos does not hear her comment.  Is it an aside to herself, or to the audience?  Either would make good sense in the context and either would work in performance.  The author of this play, George Whetstone, is apparently cognizant of the potential ambiguity, for he includes a stage direction marking this line as 'to hir selfe.'  Indeed, Whetstone includes an atypically large number of stage directions, most of which exist to indicate how a potentially ambiguous line, as above, is meant to be understood; his care in resolving the ambiguity serves to underscore its existence.  Whetstone is unusually clear about how his asides; few plays make so clear a distinction between audience asides and self asides, and in those cases, perhaps it would be undesirable to attempt to force a distinction; the ambiguity may be intentional and functional. For the purposes of this project, then, the term 'aside' is used to mean both audience and self asides; a distinction between them is made only when clear rhetorical markers enable it.

　　The final type of aside is the semi-aside.  When it is first spoken, a semi-aside appears to be a standard aside; one character says something to the audience, in the presence of other characters who neither 'hear' what is said nor give any indication that they know anything was said at all.  It is only after we have heard the aside, and accepted it as an aside governed by the appropriate convention, that another character makes a comment indicating that the previous statement was in fact partially overheard, and we have to adjust our understanding of what has just transpired.  Johan Johan contains many examples of this technique.  For instance, Johan Johan comments upon the reputation and morals of Sir Johan ("In fayth, all the towne knoweth better that he/ Is a hore monger, a haunter of the stewes...") in what appears to be a straightforward aside, until Tyb responds, "What is that, that thou hast sayde?"  (233-38).  In such cases, the  character who has been "caught out" usually either substitutes a new statement

which sounds like what was said previously but is flattering rather than derisory, or, as in this example, changes the subject; here, Johan Johan responds as if he has said he would like to have the table set.

As mentioned above, direct address asides are extremely rare in medieval English drama, with fewer than a dozen examples of even potential asides occurring in just seven plays, The Castle of Perseverance, the Croxton Play of the Sacrament, Mankind, York Joseph's Trouble about Mary, Mundus et Infans, the Coventry Weavers' Pageant, and Occupation and Idleness. In The Castle of Perseverance, Voluptas and Stultitia each use an aside to tell the audience that although they are currently exulting and favoring Mankind, they are doing so in order to trap his soul (635-38; 641-46). In these two asides of Voluptas and Stultitia, we see several characteristics that are typical of the ways asides are used in medieval English drama and in early English drama in general. The asides here are the provenance of evil characters, a common method of using asides in early English drama. Evil characters use asides to clarify the fact that their true intent and motivation are at odds with what they appear to be doing.

In addition, the editorial handling of these two asides is worth noting. The asides by Voluptas and Stultitia are parallel in construction. Mundus has sent both to clothe Mankind richly and serve him (622-30), and both do so. Later, while with Mankind, they comment, in asides, on their reasons for providing him with such lavish treatment. Voluptas says to Mundus, "Trostily,/ Lord redy — ," indicating his obedience to his command, then to Mankind, "Je vous pry,/ Sir, I say — ," asking him to follow, indicating his obeisance to him, then saying to the audience, "In Lickinger-and-Lust/ He schal rust,/ Til dethys dust/ Do him to day," thereby telling the onlookers what his true motivation is (631-38). Similarly, Stultitia says that he will obey Mundus, "And I, Folye,/ Schal hyen him hye," but then comments to the audience, "Til sum

enmye/ Him overgoo./ In worldys wit/ That in Foly sit,/ I thinke yit/ His sowle to sloo" (639-46).

What is interesting here editorially is that while Voluptas' and Stultitia's speeches are clearly

parallel in their construction, only Voluptas' aside has been marked as an aside by the editor,

David Bevington. The infrequent occurrence and slippery boundaries of asides in medieval

English drama has caught not only this eminent and careful scholar, but others as well.

Throughout early English drama, as we shall see, the editorial handling of asides is frequently

inconsistent and often confusing, a consideration to which we will return.

These two asides are good examples with which to begin our consideration of the use of

asides because they illustrate patterns common in early English drama: the use of asides by evil

characters, and the use of asides to clarify a disjunction between appearance and reality in the

world of the play. They also clearly illustrate the characteristics of asides described in my

definition above. Both of them are given by characters (Voluptas and Stultitia) in the presence

of other characters (Mundus and Mankind, at least) who could 'realistically' overhear their

comments but do not. It is important to the plot of The Castle of Perseverance that Mankind not

hear Voluptas and Stultitia's asides; he would surely be more reluctant to accept his companions

if he overheard their gleeful relish at the thought of helping him lose his soul. That it is

important that the other characters not overhear the aside is one reason that the categorization of

asides becomes problematic.

It is after Voluptas' and Stultitia's asides that Mundus instructs Garcio to take Mankind's

belongings and turn him out, an act which will upset Mankind greatly, especially because Garcio

is not a relative. Mundus then says, "Oftyn time I have you told,/ Tho men that ye are to lest

behold,/ Comynly schal youre wonninge wold/ And ben youre next heirys" (2904-7). Who is

Mundus addressing here? It makes little sense that he would address these comments to Garcio,

who is benefiting from Mundus' workings, not grieved by them or in need of a reminder of what he already knows.  It is also unlikely that Mundus is speaking to Mankind, who is elsewhere, dying upon his bed; in addition, since Mundus has not warned Mankind previously about this likely event, the jibe seems misplaced if directed at him.  It seems most likely that Mundus' comments here are aimed at the onlookers, who have already been warned about covetousness.

But if Mundus' speech is addressed to the audience, is it an aside or is it explicit direct address?  The plot is not imperiled if Garcio overhears these comments.  What seems to be indicated by this passage is that medieval English drama assumes open communication among the characters and the audience; that is the default.  Comments that are made to the audience, then, can be made openly in the presence of other characters who hear them, if they are not particularly affected by them.  Only if the plot would be adversely affected is an aside used, and only when, apparently, it is crucial to clarify the disjunction between appearance and reality, as in the case of Voluptas and Stultitia.

We know already that medieval drama cultivates a close relationship with the audience.  What is interesting here is the way in which this close relationship affects the construction of the drama and the techniques used in it.  When speaking openly to the audience is the usual practice, speaking exclusively and secretly to the audience is a rare and, apparently, undesirable option, one taken only as a last resort.  Whereas dramaturgy of later centuries despises the aside because it disrupts the dramatic 'reality' of presentation, medieval dramaturgy holds that the aside should be avoided because it disrupts the norm of open communication among characters and between them and the audience.  Two opposing conceptions of the ways in which drama should properly relate to its audience both find the aside to be disruptive.

The reader might feel that these are large conclusions to draw from three speeches from The Castle of Perseverance. However, other asides in medieval English drama bear out these conclusions. In the York Joseph's Trouble about Mary, for instance, Joseph has two speeches which could be considered as potential asides, commenting at one point, "Excuse þam wele these women can," (162) and later, "But woman-kynde gif þam list yhelpe,/ Yhitt walde þei na man wiste þer wa" (219-20). In performance both of these comments work well when directed to the audience, and indeed that makes the most sense given the context; he is speaking about Mary and women generally here, not to Mary or her maids. But are these asides of the same sort as Voluptas' and Stultitia's? Is it important to the plot of this play that Mary and the maids do not overhear Joseph's comments? This is unlikely; although Mary does not directly respond to Joseph's criticism here, he criticizes her behavior (or what he believes to have been her behavior) throughout the play, and she responds directly to very few of his accusations. Similarly, in the Coventry Weavers' Pageant, Joseph comments, "Soo full of feyre wordis these wemenn be/ Thatt men thereto must nedis agre" (552-53), a statement clearly directed at the audience rather than at Mary, but again, the plot does not require that Mary not overhear it. Likewise in Mankind, Mercy's comment, "He ys so tymerouse, me semyth hys vytall spryt doth exspyre" (812) is spoken to the audience about Mankind, not to Mankind — the rhetorical construction of the statement indicates this, since Mankind is spoken of in the third person — but nothing necessitates that Mankind not 'hear' this observation.

We find, then, that asides are extremely rare in medieval English drama. The examples discussed in the previous paragraph are certainly potential asides; spoken in the presence of other characters who do not appear to respond to the comments, they make the best sense when directed at the audience. However, they do not fulfill an additional requirement implicit in the

understanding of aside as established by later dramatic theory, which is that it be important to the plot of the play that the information divulged in aside not be overheard by other characters. The distinction here is neither academic nor trivial; it points to a crucial difference between medieval dramaturgy and modern dramaturgy, and how dangerous and potentially misleading it is to apply simply the concepts and terminology from the latter to early English drama. Direct address asides, as understood by modern dramatic theory, do occur in medieval English drama. However, unlike asides in later drama, they are not a primary, or even common, type of direct address. Whereas later conceptions of drama focus upon asides as one of the few acceptable ways to address the audience directly, medieval drama avoids the aside as much as possible.

There are, however, instances of asides in medieval English drama that fulfill both the structural definition of asides — that they are spoken in the presence of other characters but to the audience — as well as the contextual necessity that the plot would suffer if the aside were overheard by the other characters. Voluptas' and Stultitia's asides, as discussed above, fulfill this role.[8] Likewise, in Mundus et Infans, Folly pretends to be Manhood's companion, but tells the audience, "Aha, sirs, let the cat wink!/ For all ye wot not what I think./ I shall draw him such a draught of drink/ That Conscience he shall away cast" (648-51). As in The Castle of Perseverance, here we see the aside being used by an evil character, specifically to clarify that his true motivation is at odds with his appearance. In the Croxton Play of the Sacrament, Colle, the boy servant of the quack doctor, has a speech of marked direct address in which he tells the audience how bad his master is, later claiming when the doctor arrives that he was only saying good things about him, though he comments in aside that there were some lies among his

---

[8] There are two other possible asides in The Castle of Perseverance, which Bevington marks. Both are by Bakbiter, in which he revels about having gotten the Seven Deadly Sins in trouble with Belial and Caro for having lost their hold on Mankind (1778-90; 1822-35). It seems unlikely to me that these are asides, however; the characters who would have to 'not hear' the speeches are otherwise occupied (beating or being beaten, as the case may be), and

statements (580).  In this instance, we find another element which we will recognize as a recurring pattern, the use of asides by a 'saucy servant' character.

The final example of medieval English drama in which asides are found is so striking that it deserves to be considered at some length.  Occupation and Idleness is not a widely read and known piece, available only in Norman Davis' 1979 edition of Non-Cycle Plays and the Winchester Dialogues, which is now out of print.  However, this piece deserves greater attention that it has hitherto received, especially for scholars interested in the medieval use of asides.  It is relatively early; both Ian Lancashire and Norman Davis date it to around 1450, perhaps a bit earlier.  Its early date enhances the intriguing quality of its use of asides.

It begins with a speech of marked direct address by Occupation, in which he introduces himself and his manner of living to the audience ("Now if ther be eny here/ Þat my name wold aspere,/Y telle ?ou, sovereynes al in fere,/ Occupacioun, þat is my name./ Y besy fuly besely in colde and in hete" [28-32]).  He goes aside, to "reste me a litel tyde," (48) and Idleness enters, who then also introduces himself to the audience in marked direct address, in which he is considerably more intimate than Occupation has been, although both address them explicitly; Idleness claims to have been well acquainted with several audience members previously, drinking before with one and able to borrow money from another.  He boasts of spending all his money, avoiding work, shunning church, and persuading others to buy his meals — and then notices Occupation and goes to find out who he is ("Ey, what is þat ?onder gadelynge/ that stondith ?ondere al stradelynge?/ Y wyl wite for al his babelynge/ what he is anone" [96-99]).  Occupation greets him and asks who he is.  Instantly seeing an opportunity, Idleness responds, it would seem, but as it turns out, his remarks cannot possibly be directed to Occupation:

---

given that situation are surely both too far away and so distracted that the convention of 'not hearing' doesn't come

41

Lo, now ariseth game!

Y am like to take blame

    But y þe better ware be.

Y muste change my name, y-wis,

And telle hym Besynesse my name is;

?e, for God, thus it is.

    This is a prety while!

And whan y am with hym at fese

Y wyl take myn owen ese.

To slepe ynough he shal nat chese;

    Y thynke hym to beguile.  (105-115)

A statement that he intends to pretend that his name is Busyness in order to fool Occupation and sponge off him for a while cannot conceivably be addressed to Occupation, or even overheard by him; it is clearly one of the rare asides, as we now commonly define asides, in medieval English drama.  His statement ("Syr, y wonder ?e haue for?ete me, y-wis...") makes this certain, for this is his direct response to Occupation in response to his question, his answer that he is surprised that he has not been recognized.  As we observed in the cases of Voluptas and Stultitia in <u>The Castle of Perseverance</u> and that of Folly in <u>Mundus et Infans</u>, the aside here is used by an evil character, specifically used to inform the audience concerning the disjunction between appeareance and reality.

These characteristics are fulfilled as well in Idleness' next aside.  Here, Occupation is skeptical at first about Idleness's claim to be Busyness.  "Are thou Besyness?" he says, "I trow

---

into play.

nay,/ me semyth be thi symple aray" (124-25), indicating that Idleness doesn't look like Busyness. Idleness replies that though he is not wearing his good clothes, he has "ten or twelf/ of good gownes in my presse,/ and furres of grete richesse," and claims that someone in the audience will vouch for him, indeed pointing toward one member of the audience specifically, "Of this man y take wytnesse--/ ?e may aske hym yourself" (127-31). Occupation asks Idleness what sort of work he knows how to do, Idleness responds and then agrees to work for Occupation but tells him that he needs money. Occupation hires him and advances him ten pounds, telling him that "And þou gouerne it wel on þis grounde/ and þou haue nede, com fech more" (146-47). His response is full of double meaning: "?is, hardely, syr, haue ?e no dowte" (148). Occupation hears, 'Yes, sir, I'll govern it properly," while we, informed about Idleness' true nature, hear 'Yes, indeed, I'll be sure to ask for more.' But just in case we missed it, Idleness reminds us in an aside what he intends to do with the money:

> Now haue y nede to loke abowte,
>
> Bothe with-in and with-owte,
>
> > Þat no thynge be a-mys.
>
> Y haue here in this purse
>
> Ten pounde of golde, it is no worse.
>
> To þe kokis wil y me trusse
>
> > Anon, so haue y blys. (149-55)

Only the audience knows that Idleness intends to give the money to the cooks. Here, as before, the evil character uses an aside to make explicit reality, as opposed to appearance. After Occupation's departure, Idleness reiterates his plans for the money: "Þou are ful madde to trust me,/ for this gold shalt þou neuer se,/ so God me amende,/ for in Bredestrete, samfayle,/ it shall

be spent in good vytayle./ Of wyne and ale y wyl nat fayle!" (172-77).  As in many other examples of early English drama, the concern here is that we know precisely what is happening, particularly when there is a potential for confusion, the aside is the technique used to make sure the action is clear.

A third aside that occurs in <u>Occupation and Idleness</u> is an identifiable audience aside. Occupation returns to find that Idleness has wasted his money, and thus he discovers Idleness's true nature.  Doctrine, Occupation's teacher, arrives, and Idleness decides it would be better for him to leave, telling the audience:

Herke, siris, ?e shull here,

For now two shrewis ben mette.

Be my trouthe y wil me hide.

Like a mows in ?onder ?erde,

For of hym þat gapith wide

Yn feithe y am euel a-ferde.  (349-54)

That this speech is directed to the audience is clear, as it addressed to 'siris' who cannot be Doctrine and Occupation.  Moreover, immediately after this, Idleness says, "Y wyl be go," a line which is directed to the other characters, as we know because Doctrine responds to it ("Be my feith þou shalt a-bide...").  In this instance, as in asides considered previously, the aside is reserved for use by an evil character to explain his intentions to the audience.

Thus we see that there are a mere seven direct address asides in English drama before 1500, and almost half (three) occur in <u>Occupation and Idleness</u>.  Moreover, of the four texts in which these asides occur, <u>Occupation and Idleness</u> is the shortest piece, at only 877 lines; <u>The Castle of Perseverance</u> has 3649, <u>Mundus et Infans</u> 977, and the Croxton <u>Play of the Sacrament</u>

1007.  Asides in The Castle of Perseverance, Mundus et Infans, and the Croxton Play of the

Sacrament are isolated, occurring only once in each (though there are two asides in The Castle of

Perseverance, they are parallel passages within the same scene and thus do not constitute

separate employments of the technique).  Thus in Occupation and Idleness we see the only

systematic and sustained use of asides in all of medieval English drama.

This fact raises an interesting question:  why does Occupation and Idleness show a

systematic and sustained use of asides 50-75 years earlier than the next earliest known texts to do

so, Johan Johan and the Andria?  Questions of the provenance, purpose, and production of

medieval drama are often thorny, and Occupation and Idleness provides no exception.  We have

no clearly applicable records that describe its provenance and purpose.  However, from the text

itself it seems safe to conclude, as Ian Lancashire does, that Occupation and Idleness "is

undoubtedly a school play, and the appearance of Doctrine, a doctor of divinity of a university,

to schoolboy Idleness suggests auspices at Winchester College, founded in conjunction with

New College, Oxford, from which every year the warden and two fellows came to the school in

visitation" (283).  If Occupation and Idleness is indeed a school play, its authors were familiar

with forms of drama besides that of their native English tradition.  It seems probable that the use

of asides in Occupation and Idleness derives from another form of drama, most likely classical

drama, which would be available in a school setting; this observation is consistent with what we

find in later drama, particularly in the Andria, and thus we will postpone a detailed discussion of

this possibility until our discussion of that later drama.

The scarcity of asides continues as we move into the early Tudor drama.  Henry

Medwall's Nature, often pointed to as the beginning of Tudor humanist drama (although it

makes considerable use of the allegorical dramatic conventions that preceded it) employs just

one aside.  Sensuality, in the midst of a debate with Reason and Innocencye about who will ultimately guide Man, loses patience, exclaiming, "Pece, no more of thys dysputacyon!" and then comments in an aside "Here be many fantasies to dryve forth the day--/ That one chatreth lyke a pye, that other lyke a jay./ And yet, whan they both have done what they can,/ Maugry theyr teeth I shall rule the man" (367-71).  As with many of the asides we observed in medieval English drama, this aside in <u>Nature</u> is used by an evil character to explain his plans to the audience; however, here he is not particularly explaining to the audience how and why his actions and words do not match, but, rather, giving his view of affairs.  Similarly, in John Heywood's <u>A Play of Love</u>, in the midst of the debate No Lover Nor Loved comments to the audience in an aside, "Ye thynke them both mad, and so do I, by jys,/ So mot I thryve, but who that lyst to marke/ Shall perceyve here a praty peyce of warke" (772-74).  This aside functions as that in <u>Nature</u> does; in the midst of a debate, the vice speaks to the audience about what is occurring around him, giving his view of the situation and relating his plans.  It may seem that the main function of the aside that we observed in medieval English drama is here being modified as we move into the sixteenth century, since neither aside is used by a vice to explain a disjunction between his words and actions.  However, that function continues, as we will see in later sixteenth-century drama.  In these two instances, the vice is not disguised or pretending to be anything other than what he is, so there is no need to clarify his true intentions; each could say, like Shakespeare's Don John, "though I cannot be said to be a flattering honest man, it must not be denied that I am a plain-dealing villain."  Moreover, as we continue into sixteenth-century drama, we see that the function seen here in <u>Nature</u> and <u>A Play of Love</u> is commonly employed, and hence we see here the first instances of another major function of asides in early English drama.

Another significant element in the history of asides in early English drama survives for the first time in John Skelton's <u>Magnificence</u>, which contains one instance of an aside which looks very similar to those we have seen in the earlier drama. Collusion, a vice, kneels to Magnificence — a gesture of submission and fealty — yet his comment to the audience belies the action: "I set not a fly and all go to all" (1711). As was typical of the asides in medieval English drama, here the vice uses his aside to point out and clarify a disjunction between his words and his behavior. A second potential aside proves to be more complicated. Later in the play, Folly is entertaining Magnificence, who says to him, "By cock's heart, thou art a fine merry knave" (1827). Folly's response, at first glance, appears to be an aside: "I make God avow ye will none other men have" (1828), since it would certainly not be prudent for Folly to make this sort of threatening statement directly to Magnificence, revealing his intention to dominate Magnificence. And indeed, it must be delivered in such a way that Magnificence does not 'hear' it, at least not well enough to understand it. Magnificence responds, "What sayst thou?", which implies that he knows that Folly said something, but did not 'hear' what was said. Thus here we have an aside which partially disregards one of the definitive characteristics of the basic technique, which is that the other characters on stage not only do not 'hear' what was said, but do not seem even to know that something was said. This is, of course, the first extant example of a semi-aside.

The semi-aside has been noted by scholars of the drama but largely ignored. Beckerman, for instance, comments upon the existence of four instances in Shakespeare's work in which "the character either speaks loudly enough for the sound but not the sense to be overheard or fears being overheard" (243) but considers them no further. Margaret Coleman Gingrich believes the semi-aside to indicate either authorial incompetence or an awkward move towards realism,

characterizing it as "[a] seldom used but very different type of aside [which] occurs in plays where the author, apparently uncomfortable with the convention or so sophisticated he can play upon it, veers towards realism by having the sound (but not the sense) of the aside responded to with a question like, 'What is that you are saying?'" (9).

If it is true, as I suggested earlier, that the aside is largely incompatible with medieval dramaturgy and that asides are thus generally avoided in these plays — which appears to be true for early Tudor drama as well, since the paucity of asides continues into the sixteenth century — then perhaps one might argue that the semi-aside is not an intentional variation on the aside convention, but rather an incompetent usage of the aside. In addition, if it is true (as will be argued later in this chapter) that the aside is not native to English drama but is in fact imported from classical and continental models, semi-asides may simply be mistakes as the dramatists learn to handle an unfamiliar technique. A case may be made for this position, but I prefer not to make it too hastily. Historically, there has been a tendency to "credit mediaeval actors and technicians with a mental age of [no] more than seven," a tendency which the past fifty years or so of scholarship in the field has shown to be ill-founded. We would do better, then, "to give them credit for knowing what they were doing and why — at least until it can be proved that they did not" (Wickham 151).

Moreover, if we look back at the semi-aside in Magnificence, we can see that Skelton, far from appearing inept, appears, rather, to know what he is doing in employing this semi-aside, and what he does with it in fact heralds a new use of this technique which will continue throughout the sixteenth century. Folly's statement, in semi-aside, is "I make God avow ye will none other men have," but when Magnificence demands to know what he said, Folly answers, "Marry, I pray God your mastership to save" (1828-29). This strategy of, when 'caught,'

providing a plausible substitution for what was actually said, rather than substituting an out-and-out fabrication, is one that recurs throughout sixteenth century drama.  Vices tend to use it, their ability to play with language in this way linked to their tendency to 'change' their names to appear good, in order to deceive a good character as to their true moral standing, for the purpose of corrupting him.  For this purpose, vices disguise themselves not physically but rhetorically.  Asides reveal their true intentions and how those contrast with their unctuous behavior, while semi-asides reveal both their linguistic prowess and their ultimate cowardice; they are willing to talk bravely to the audience, but when caught by the character that they are trying to abuse, they back down and toady up.

The semi-aside in <u>Magnificence</u> is not an isolated occurrence but the first example of a type of aside that is used throughout the sixteenth century.  In <u>Calisto and Melebea</u>, c.1523-25, Calisto, feeling sorry for himself about his unrequited love, exclaims, "Gretter is my fyre and lesse pyte shewd me," claiming that he is in a worse state than Nero, to whom Sempronio has been comparing him, in hopes of making him feel better.  Sempronio, eyes undoubtedly rolling, says "I wyll not mok — this foule is a lover" — a statement which appears to be an example of a normal aside until Calisto responds, "What sayst thou?" (122-24).  Likewise, later in the same play Celestina comments upon her progress in persuading Melebea to come to love Calisto, "[the] more straunge she makyth, the gladder am I;/ Ther is no tempast that ever doth endure," to which Melebea responds, "What seyst thou, what seyst thow, shameful enmy?/ Speke out"  (822-24).  Interestingly, Sempronio, who is a servant, not a vice, does not have a snappy retort, as does Folly in <u>Magnificence</u>, but Celestina the bawd, who is more closely related to a vice in this play, does, bolstering the observation about the functions of semi-asides when used by vice figures.

But though the semi-asides in <u>Magnificence</u> and <u>Calisto and Melebea</u> are interesting, we note again the scarcity of their use. <u>Magnificence</u> is 2568 lines long, and <u>Calisto and Melebea</u> is 1086 lines long, yet they use only two regular asides and three semi-asides between them. This is the usual state of affairs, and it is that that causes <u>Johan Johan</u> to be so surprising. <u>Johan Johan</u> uses more asides and semi-asides than any other piece of English drama in a span of nearly two centuries. Its closest competition is <u>The Play of Patient Grissell</u>, which has fewer than half as many, although it is more than three times as long. At 678 lines, <u>Johan Johan</u> is a tiny little play packed with 19 asides and 9 semi-asides (see Table 1, following page). For comparison, <u>The Play of Patient Grissell</u> is 2120 lines long and uses 10 asides and 2 semi-asides. Three questions seem pertinent. One is the question of why <u>Johan Johan</u>'s prodigious employment of asides (and semi-asides) have not been identified hitherto. Editors and scholars of this play have noted, of course, that <u>Johan Johan</u> employs asides but not that its uses them so much more than any other surviving play in English for nearly a hundred years before or after. Second is the question of the function or effect of the many asides. Third is the question of the role, if any, that the French source, <u>La Farce Nouvelle du Pasté</u>, has in <u>Johan Johan</u>'s extraordinary uses of asides.[9]

---

[9] The identification of the <u>La Farce Nouvelle du Pasté</u> as the source for <u>Johan Johan</u> seems beyond dispute. T.W. Craik's 1950 article "The True Source of John Heywood's 'Johan Johan'" identifies <u>La Farce Nouvelle du Pasté</u> as the source for <u>Johan Johan</u>, saying that "The publication of the <u>Farce du Pasté</u> makes it now evident that Heywood has taken very few liberties with his real source, of which <u>Johan Johan</u> is a close (though none the less spirited) translation" (290). Howard B. Norland's 1983 article "Formalizing English Farce: <u>Johan Johan</u> and Its French Connection," included in a revised form as chapter 18 of his 1995 <u>Drama in Early Tudor Britain 1485-1558</u> modifies this approach somewhat, saying that "What a close examination of the two texts reveals is that <u>Johan Johan</u> is in fact a very careful adaptation of the French farce to the English cultural and dramatic context" (142). Richard Axton and Peter Happé's 1991 <u>The Plays of John Heywood</u>, a critical edition of all the plays attributed to Heywood, treats the identification of <u>La Farce Nouvelle du Pasté</u> as the source for <u>Johan Johan</u> as a given. They include a translation of the French farce "so that readers can make their own judgments" (36) not about whether Heywood used this source but about his "dramatic achievement and development" (36) since he did so.

| Type | First Line | Reference | Speaker | Marked |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Semi-aside | "By cokkes soule, nowe I dare lay a swan..." | 127-30 | Johan Johan | B, C |
| Aside | "If he do not fight, chyde, and rate..." | 136-38 | Tyb | B, C |
| Aside | "If that the parysshe preese, Syr Johan..." | 139-42 | Johan Johan | B, C |
| Aside | "Nowe wolde to God and swete saynt Dyryk..." | 146-49 | Johan Johan | B, C |
| Semi-aside | "By kokkes lylly woundes, that same is she..." | 163-64 | Johan Johan | B, C |
| Semi-aside | "Yea, rounde about the bed doth he go..." | 175-78 | Johan Johan | B, C |
| Aside | "But I beshrewe both your heartes therfore" | 192 | Johan Johan | B |
| Semi-aside | "Shall he cum hyther? By kokkes soule, I was a curst..." | 206-11 | Johan Johan | B, C |
| Semi-aside | "Full ofte I se my husbande wyll me rate..." | 226-27 | Tyb | B, C |
| Semi-aside | "In fayth, all the towne knoweth better that he..." | 233-37 | Johan Johan | B, C |
| Aside | "Nowe I pray God that his malediction..." | 267-68 | Johan Johan | C |
| Semi-aside | "I pray to Christ, if my wyshe be no synne..." | 270-71 | Johan Johan | |
| Aside | "What a myschefe wylt thou fole?" | 272 | Johan Johan | C |
| Aside | "Nowe go to, a lyttell wolde make me..." | 274-75 | Johan Johan | C |
| Aside | "I go with a myschyefe lyght on thy face." | 280 | Johan Johan | C |
| Aside | "Nowe a vengeance and a very myschyefe..." | 288-93 | Johan Johan | C |
| Aside | "Lorde, howe my husbande nowe doth patter..." | 300-301 | Tyb | |
| Aside | "I wyll not gyve a strawe I tell you playne..." | 304-305 | Johan Johan | C |
| Aside | "Nay than if my wyfe be set a chydyng..." | 310-13 | Johan Johan | C |
| Aside | "But was I not a very knave?" | 369-74 | Johan Johan | B, C |
| Aside | "Cokkes soule, loke howe he approacheth nere..." | 429-30 | Johan Johan | B, C |
| Aside | "Cokkes soule, what have we here?" | 439-41 | Johan Johan | C |
| Semi-aside | "Nowe so God helpe me, and by my holydome..." | 465-66 | Johan Johan | B, C |
| Semi-aside | "And is not this a very purgatory..." | 486-90 | Johan Johan | B, C |
| Aside | "And I ymagyn, to make you both good cheere..." | 492-96 | Johan Johan | B, C |
| Aside | "And I chafe it so hard that my fingers krakkes..." | 508-12 | Johan Johan | B, C |
| Semi-aside | "Ye, that a vengeance take ye both two..." | 517-20 | Johan Johan | B, C |
| Aside | "Loke how the pyld preest crammyth in..." | 527-28 | Johan Johan | B, C |
| Aside | "By kokkes soule, they were I am other dronke or mad..." | 623-24 | Johan Johan | B |

**Table 1: Asides and Semi-asides in <u>Johan Johan</u>**

The last column indicates whether an editor marked the example as an aside. 'B' refers to David Bevington's <u>Medieval Drama</u>, and 'C' refers to Edmund Creeth's <u>Tudor Plays</u>.

I see no definitive answer to the first question. Since nearly every scholar who has worked with Johan Johan has commented upon its profuse use of asides and that Johan Johan as a whole is unlike anything else in early English drama, but not that its extensive use of asides is unique among early English drama, it might simply be that recognizing this singularity requires the type of detailed yet wide ranging comparative analysis made possible by a computer database such as was employed for this project. It is possible, then, that this example reveals the potential of new technology for our studies.

However, the second question is more readily answered. One aspect of the use of asides and semi-asides in Johan Johan that we notice immediately from a glance at Table 1 is that the vast majority of the asides belong to Johan Johan; Sir Johan has none, while Tyb has only three. Howard B. Norland suggests, reasonably, that the effect of these asides "is to enhance Johan Johan's comic role and to reinforce his bond with the audience" (150); Ian Maxwell has also commented upon the play's use of asides for comic effect (60). However, it is also true that the asides play an important role in the characterization of Johan Johan himself. In his asides (and in his marked direct address speeches at the beginning and end of the play), Johan Johan, secure in the knowledge that no one is listening except the audience, speaks his mind openly, boldly wishing for revenge. He calls down curses on his wife (146-49; 267-68; 274-75; 288-93) and prays for the priest to choke to death (517-20; 527-28). Certainly it is an important element of the play's humor that Johan Johan's often violent desire for revenge is expressed only in words.

But in his full asides, Johan Johan tells the audience what he would really like to happen, and since no one but the audience hears these desires, Johan Johan goes right along cherishing them without acting upon them. In semi-asides, Johan Johan expresses his suspicions about Tyb and Sir Johan (127-30; 175-78;), his feelings about the Christian virtue of Margery (163-64; 465-

66), Sir Johan (233-37), and Tyb (237), or wishes that Sir Johan will break his neck when he arrives (270-71) in semi-aside. While it first appears that his comments are heard only by himself and the audience, Tyb also hears and is quick to react, asking him what he said. Johan Johan, thus caught, always backs off from his previous statements or changes the subject. For example, when Johan Johan comments that Tyb always says she is sick when she returns from visiting Sir Johan and Tyb challenges him, "What sayst thou?", he substitutes a placating remark: "Mary I say/ it is mete for a woman to go play/ Abrode in the towne for an houre or two" (127-33). In another instance, when Tyb responds to Johan Johan's assertion that Sir Johan is known throughout the town as "a hore monger, a haunter of the stewes," he changes the subject when she demands what he said, saying that "I wolde have the table set and layde" (233-40). In contrast, in the instance in which Tyb is challenged by Johan Johan to repeat her one semi-aside, "[full] ofte I se my husbande wyll me rate/ For this hether commyng of our gentyll curate," she neither retracts the comment or changes the subject but sticks to her original point: "Mary, I perceyve very playne/ That thou hast Sir Johan somwhat in suspect..." (226-30). Johan Johan's semi-asides, particularly in contrast to Tyb's, emphasize his inability or unwillingness to follow through on the desire for revenge that he expresses so strongly when it is safe to do so. As with the vices, as we noted earlier, Johan Johan's asides and semi-asides not only reveal his true thoughts to the audience, but also point out his cowardice in refusing to stick to them when pressed.

The importance of asides and semi-asides in the characterization of Johan Johan is also evident when we consider what different editors have marked as asides. Richard Axton and Peter Happé's edition, found in their volume The Plays of John Heywood, marks only one aside. As is noted in Table 1, there is excellent correspondence between David Bevington's Medieval

Drama and in Edmund Creeth's <u>Tudor Plays</u>; of the 29 asides and semi-asides, 17 are marked by both. Moreover, the most significant difference between them is located in the scene in which Tyb, having sent Johan Johan to invite Sir Johan to supper, keeps calling him back to perform household tasks. During all this, Johan Johan makes violently vengeful comments such as "I pray to Christ, if my wyshe be no synne,/ That the preest may breke his neck when he comes in" (270-71). It is impossible to state with certainty whether these comments are asides; that is, Johan Johan muttering viciously under his breath or to the audience, or comments that Tyb can hear but ignores, secure in the knowledge that she is firmly in control of the situation — he is, after all, performing exactly as she wishes, even with his grousing. The answer to this question for each editor must lie in his interpretation of Johan Johan. If Johan Johan is understood as generally spineless and ineffectual, a man who can only nerve himself to fight with Tyb and Sir Johan at the end of the play, then in this scene, the comments must be asides, the approach Creeth takes. Bevington apparently believes that Johan Johan is willing to quarrel openly with Tyb here, and does not mark these instances as asides. We see again how the handling and identification of asides by editors of these texts is neither an academic technicality nor a trivial consideration, but is connected to our understanding of a play's core and our interpretation of its characters.

Of interest also is the question of the relationship of <u>La Farce Nouvelle du Pasté</u> to <u>Johan Johan</u>. <u>La Farce Nouvelle du Pasté</u> does indeed employ many asides, and most of the asides in <u>Johan Johan</u> have parallels in the <u>Farce du Pasté</u>. In turn, most of these are marked as asides by both the editor of the French original, Gustave Cohen, and the editors of the translation included within <u>The Plays of John Heywood</u>, Richard Axton and Peter Happé.[10] A casual survey of the

---

[10] Intriguingly, Axton and Happè choose to mark more asides in their translation than Cohen did in the original, although they marked only one aside in their text of <u>Johan Johan</u> itself.

other fifty-two farces contained in Cohen's <u>Recueil de Farces Francaises Inédites du XV<sup>e</sup> Siécle</u> reveals over 80 asides, as marked by Cohen. Not every play in the collection employs asides, but many do, and moreover, several do so to the extent seen in <u>Farce du Pasté</u>.

Thus it seems reasonable to adopt the working hypothesis that <u>Johan Johan</u>'s use of asides derives from its use of the <u>Farce du Pasté</u>, and that this extensive use of asides was common and acceptable in French farces. The tradition of drama that was current in England when Heywood was writing did not commonly use asides (with the notable exception of <u>Occupation and Idleness</u>), asides being antithetical to the norm of complete open communication between and among actors and audience. <u>Johan Johan</u> therefore imports not only the technique of extensive use of asides, but also an entirely different understanding of the relationship between audience and play. It represents a crucial moment in the history of asides in early English drama, evidence of the immigrant technique putting down roots.

Pedagogically, it is also important to recognize <u>Johan Johan</u>'s singularity in this area. Editors and scholars of <u>Johan Johan</u> often remark upon its unique position in the history of English drama,[11] not just for its content but for its use of dramatic technique. Since <u>Johan Johan</u> is one of the most widely anthologized and commonly taught of early English plays, it is important to present it clearly in these contexts as a highly unrepresentative, albeit interesting, work.

<u>Johan Johan</u> suggests one way in which asides could have come to be an accepted and commonly employed element of English dramaturgy, the imitation of continental models. Another possible path was mentioned in our consideration of <u>Occupation and Idleness</u>. This short play, as mentioned earlier, uses three asides, providing us with nearly half of all complete

---

[11] For example, Howard B. Noland says, "<u>Johan Johan</u> has long been recognized as vastly different in form and style from Heywood's known plays or those of his contemporaries" (<u>Drama</u> 255)

asides employed in English drama before 1500.  <u>Occupation and Idleness</u>, unlike most other

surviving texts, is a school play, made to be performed by schoolboys for their education and

entertainment.  It is a possibility worth exploring that different influences upon school drama are

responsible for the atypical use of asides here, in specific, the influence of classical drama.  The

overall techniques and content of <u>Occupation and Idleness</u> are typical of early English drama of

its time; it uses allegory and is a morality-type play.  Yet we know that its use of asides is non-

characteristic of that form of drama, and it is likely that its model was classical drama, which

would be much more available and desirable as a source and influence for a play composed in

and for a school or university setting than it would be for a play in the more mainstream popular

tradition.

Although scholars have historically disagreed about the question of the extent to which

classical drama was known in the Middle Ages, if it was known at all, most now believe that

classical drama was never entirely lost.  Its primary use, however, was to provide "schools in the

Middle Ages...with models of Latin composition" rather than as performance or even as drama;

nevertheless, performances of Terence's comedies are "now thought likely in twelfth-century

England and France" (M.Axton 2).  Ian Lancashire also suggests that classical drama was more

widely known than has been typically believed, noting that "[lists] of holdings record copies of

Terence at many sites in the twelfth century, such as monasteries at Canterbury, Durham, and St.

Albans — the last, interestingly, with ink-drawings of masked actors" (xiii-xiv).  But however

widely or narrowly classical drama was known in the Middle Ages, what is not generally

disputed is that by the turn of the fifteenth century into the beginning of the sixteenth, classical

drama, particularly that of Terence, was becoming increasingly better known.  As Marie Axton

describes the situation, "The increasing popularity of Terence at the end of the fifteenth century,

followed by a revival of interest in Plautus, particularly in Italy, is connected with the growth of humanist education.  Effective public speaking and graceful deportment were fostered through productions of Latin comedy" (2).  Most of these productions were in Latin, but some were done in English translation or adaptations.  What is intriguing, for our purposes, is how asides are used in the earliest known of such translations, The Andria:  Terence in English.

This English translation or adaptation of the Andria is dated by Ian Lancashire c.1520 (19) and by its editor, Meg Twycross, to the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century.  It uses four asides and one semi-aside, most belonging to Davus, Pamphilus' servant, an example of a stock figure in classical drama, the scheming, smart-witted, fast-talking saucy servant.  Indeed, Simo, Pamphilus' father, comments upon Davus' role:  "Davus, I was late afeared lest thou/ Wouldest do as all servants are wont to do commonly:/ Mock me because my son loveth, truly" (3.4.3-5).  Meg Twycross, editor of the 1987 edition, Terence In English:  An Early Sixteenth-Century Translation of The Andria (from which all citations of the play here are made) explicates Simo's statement as, "Davus, in the past I've been afraid that you would do what all servants [in classical comedy] tend to do; play tricks on me because my son is having a love-affair," and comments, "Simo has a lively appreciation of the stock roles in the kind of comedy he finds himself in" (82).  Simo has been working to arrange a proper marriage for his son Pamphilus but Pamphilus is in love with Glycery, who is pregnant with his child.  Unknown to either Pamphilus or Simo, Glycery is actually a suitable bride for Pamphilus, though her family and financial situation are unknown to everyone for most of the play.  Davus helps his master Pamphilus plot to avoid the arranged marriage and instead wed Glycery.

Davus' asides and semi-asides are comments on the progressive success or failure of his various schemes towards this end.  For instance, when Davus convinces Simo that Pamphilus is

dragging his feet about the wedding only because he believes Simo is being too cheap with the wedding feast, and Simo rises to the bait, Davus comments in an aside, "I have moved him." Simo then says that he will look into the matter, and comments, "But what meaneth this, or what will this knave do?/ If any mischief be, he is the head of all" (2.5.26-28). It seems likely that Simo, who has already shown previously in the play that he is aware of Davus' untrustworthy nature, makes this comment in an aside as well, laying all deceit at Davus' door. Davus' other asides consist of outbursts as his plot unravels: "Be we not now undo?" he says, "What hear I now?" and "I am undone" (3.4.14b, 16a, and 18a). This last is actually a semi-aside, since Simo responds to it with the question, "What diddest thou say?", to which Davus bluffs in reply, "Very well done" — a strategy we've seen before (3.4.18b-19a). Davus' saucy servant, characterized by the use of direct address (he employs explicit and implicit direct address as well) to present and chart the progress of his schemes, is the first example in early English drama of a type that we will see frequently. He is *not* the first saucy servant character in English drama — there are several figures of this sort in medieval English drama, Cain's servant Garcio in the Towneley Killing of Abel being one example, but he is the first to make sustained use of asides.

In fact, it may be that the saucy servant figure that we see in medieval drama is a type learned from classical models, its use adapted to the dramatic conditions of medieval English drama. This stock type in classical drama is marked by the use of asides, as we see in The Andria. Moreover, there is a recurring type of scene that appears in both traditions but which in its use of asides differs in plays derived from classical sources. In the Towneley Murder of Abel, Cain orders Garcio, his servant, to make a proclamation for him. What Garcio actually announces, however, though it sounds rather like what Cain had told him to say is utterly derogatory towards Cain. Consider the first few lines of the scene:

Caym: I commaund you in the kyngys name

Garcio: And in my masteres, fals Cayme.

Caym: That no man at thame fynd fawt ne blame,

Garcio: Yey, cold rost is at my masteres hame.

Caym: Nowther with hym nor with his knafe,

Garcio: What! I hope my master rafe. (421-26)

It might make sense for Garcio to perform his lines here as asides, since Cain would, supposedly, try to stop him if he were aware of what Garcio is saying. Yet these lines cannot be asides; Cain does know, or perhaps comes to know, as is shown when he becomes angry with Garcio (442-45). How much of this scene, if any, was first intended as to be performed as an aside is thus unrecoverable. A similar scene exists in <u>The Bugbears</u>, "an adaptation of Grazzini's L Spirittata (1561), with episodes from Gl'Ingannati and the Andria of Terence" (Boas 134), a play, then, with both continental and classical sources. In this scene, Squartacantino, the servant, mocks his master Cantalupo, himself a stock figure of an old man desiring a young wife. Cantalupo sings a love song, which Squartacantino makes fun of in his asides:

Cantalupo: O love I die.

Squartacantino: O fool I fry.

Cantalupo: O mine own sweetheart.

Squartacantino: O cockscomb that thou art.

Cantalupo: O my queen and my lady.

Squartacantino: O my twichild and my baby. (67-69)

The scene continues in this manner, but unlike Cain, Cantalupo never becomes aware of Squartacantino's mockery. Given these examples, it seems possible that though the stock

character of the saucy servant — and in particular the character's use of mocking repetition — derives in some measure from the classical drama, the inherited use of asides is modified in the English drama so that, instead of a scene being delivered completely in asides, one has a scene wherein lines are delivered as aside.

The influence of classical drama upon early English drama can be seen most clearly in plays which are translations or adaptations of classical plays, such as The Andria.  While in English, these plays are dramaturgically closer to their classical originals than to native English drama.  But some early English plays use classical tales as a source for their content, adapting the scripts to better fit the dramaturgy of the English drama.  For example, Jack Juggler, Thersites, and Horestes have classical sources for their content, but their dramaturgy is much more English than classical; Horestes uses one aside, Thersites and Jack Juggler two each; as their editor, Marie Axton, says, "They are classical in subject and inspiration rather than form" (1).  Still other plays are constructed in the opposite manner, adopting and adapting classical dramaturgy to present a story whose content has a largely native source, or 'Englishing' content common to classical drama, though not translating a specific play.  All of these methods require a translator or author familiar with classical drama, but the last type does so especially, since it requires familiarity not only with a specific play or story, but with the general elements and conventions of classical drama.  The use of classical models in England was varied, producing a drama which as A.P.Rossiter describes, "included on the one side, the translations and imitations of Roman Comedy, and especially Plautus; on the other, the later development from *acting* Seneca through *imitating* him in Latin to the third stage of applying his rigid form to original matter, and in the native language.  Here highbrow England was the cultural borrower from the

more theatrically erudite world of Italy and France, the latter already converted by Italian example" (129-30).

Ralph Roister Doister in an excellent example of this last type of classical and English hybrid, a play that draws upon classical dramatic techniques and content, but in general, rather than in the translation of any specific classical play. As Howard B. Norland explains, "Latin comedy, as interpreted by Donatus and Renaissance humanists, clearly served as the external model for Roister Doister, though as Udall's old schoolmaster at Oxford, Vives, believed, the classics should be regarded not as masters but as guides" (Drama 270). Ralph Roister Doister is the only play that can be firmly attributed to Nicholas Udall, due to a "lucky reference in the third edition of Thomas Wilson's Rule of Reason" (Wilson 43). Udall is an important figure in early English drama, though how important is difficult to gauge. As F.P.Wilson says, "If he wrote all the plays that have been attributed to him — Thersites, Jack Juggler, Respublica, Jacob and Esau as well as Roister Doister — he would become the most important figure in comedy between Heywood and Lyly, indeed between the Wakefield Master and Lyly" (43). But, though Udall's authorship of Ralph Roister Doister and Respublica is now generally accepted, the others are still under discussion.

The important position of Ralph Roister Doister in the history of English drama has been accepted for quite some time, as Norland indicates, saying: "Roister Doister is traditionally considered to be 'the first regular English comedy'" (267). More specifically, for our purposes, Ralph Roister Doister illustrates how the aside makes its way into English dramaturgy in the sixteenth century. In medieval and early Tudor drama, as we have seen, asides are extraordinarily rare, with the exception of a few plays which have sources outside the popular, mainstream tradition. With Ralph Roister Doister, dating about two decades after Johan Johan

and The Andria, we see a marked shift; from the 1540s and 50s on, asides will become more common. More plays will use them, and more plays will use them extensively.

The asides in Ralph Roister Doister are used for two functions, and by two types of characters. Over half belong to Mathew Merrygreek, a figure Wilson links with the stock 'parasite' character of classical drama (109); however, Norland suggests that "his manipulation of Roister Doister more closely resembles the role of the witty slave of Roman comedy than the parasite" (Drama 272). Wilson also sees a more native English parallel in this character: "the very active delight with which this character entangles Roister Doister in absurd situations reminds us as much of the mischievous Vice of the morality plays as of the classical parasite" (109). Given the kind of dramatic hybridization that Udall is working with, it seems likely that these parallels are not mutually exclusive. Nor is it surprising to find that his Vice uses asides as does a vice or saucy servant. Merrygreek comments in an aside that he knew that Roister Doister didn't need money before he offered to lend him some (1.2.40); he revels in the trouble he will stir up, using the very vice-like phrase, "We shall have sport anone" (3.2.11, 18); and he mocks Roister Doister (4.3.58, 69). All of these instances recall the functions to which saucy servants and vices put their asides.

The other asides in Ralph Roister Doister are plot-motivated asides spoken by good characters. As Suresby falls for a trick constructed by Roister Doister and Merrygreek to cast suspicion on Custance's fidelity, he comments upon this suspicion in asides. This is necessary to the plot; he must express the concern so that the audience knows what is happening, but he cannot audibly do so, or Custance will naturally defend herself. Similarly, Custance comments upon her fear that Suresby will indeed suspect her because of Roister Doister and Merrygreek's

behavior.  In both of these examples, the function of the asides is based on the plot, rather than connected to the nature of the character who is using them, or used to establish character.

Similarly, the other plays in which asides appear in the 1540s and 50s use the asides in this same mixture.  Saucy servants use them for mockery and plotting; vices and evil characters use them to clarify their nefarious purposes, and good characters use them to further the plot.  In The History of Jacob and Esau, the saucy servant character, Ragau, uses asides to mock his master, Esau, muttering, for instance, that the mighty hunter Esau will kill a duck (142).  In Nice Wanton, Xantippe, a bad mother who allows her children to run wild, pretends to be grateful to a neighbor for bringing their misbehavior to her attention, but she reveals her true feelings in an aside:  "Such a fool to teach me, preaching as she please!" (123).  Later in the same play, Iniquity, the vice, comments that he will strangle Ismael rather than allow him to tell Daniel how Iniquity led him into misdeeds (411).  Infidelitie, the vice in The Life and Repentaunce of Mary Magdalene, uses asides to express his disgust at having to attend to Jesus when he dines with Simon (1671-72; 1694-96); Avarice responds similarly to the arrival of Mercy and Verity in Respublica (1288).  Likewise in Jack Juggler, poor Jenkyn Careawaye, having been convinced by Jack Juggler that Jack is actually Careawaye himself, wonders what his name will be, at which point Jack Juggler comments in what must be an aside, "By my faith, the same that it was before--/ Whan I lust too be Careaway no more" (562-3).  In Gammer Gurton's Needle, Hodge comments that if Gammer knows — or thinks she knows — who has her needle, he will not get any work done, the implication being that she will make him go with her to get it back (3.2.6).

The use of asides by saucy servants and by vices remain common modes as we move into the 1560s and beyond, but the usage of asides also expands in other directions.  Saucy servants who use asides as part of their mockery appear in The Bugbears (Squartacantino), Promos and

Cassandra (Rosko), The Marriage of Wit and Science (Will), and Misogonus (Cacurgus).  Asides

are used by vices in  The Play of Patient Grissell, The Trial of Treasure, Common Conditions,

Clyomon and Clamydes, Cambises, The Longer Thou Livest, Enough is as Good as a Feast,

Liberality and Prodigality, The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom, The Conflict of Conscience, and

The Three Ladies of London.  In all of these plays, the vices reveal their nefarious plans while

pretending to be helpful, commenting sardonically upon the action going on around them, as we

have observe them to do before.

    While asides remain common throughout the 1560s, 70s, and 80s, there are some

modifications worth nothing.  In several of these plays, such as The Play of Patient Grissell,

Common Conditions, and Clyomon and Clamydes, the vice figure is conflated with the saucy

servant stock character, insinuating himself into someone's service and wreaking havoc from

that position.  An earlier, brief instance of this occurs in The Life and Repentaunce of Mary

Magdalene, in which Iniquity is a servant of Simon's when Jesus comes to dinner; however, in

this case, Iniquity spends only a short time in a servant role, whereas in the later plays, vice

figures spend a majority of the time employed as servants.  In many of these plays, semi-asides

are used, as a complementary technique for revealing the vice's cowardice, while the asides bear

witness to his boastfulness.  In some plays, these purposes are accomplished in straight asides.

For example, in Common Conditions, the vice (also called Common Conditions) uses asides to

show both his evil desires ("And if I might you should be sure to have hornes like a Bucke"

[695]) and his cowardice ("Ah now am I readie to beray my self for feare...[1546]).  In other

plays, asides are used more for revealing cowardice than for establishing the vice's nasty

intentions.  Thus when Shift in Clyomon and Clamydes uses his asides to reveal his true

thoughts, those largely concern his cowardice; the same is true with Bryan saunce foy, the cowardly knight in the same play.

While the characteristic uses for asides noted hitherto continues with modifications into the later sixteenth century, other aspects of their usage expand. In Ralph Roister Doister, we noted asides that were used not by their typical personages — saucy servants or vices — nor for their typical functions — revelation of intentions, nasty commentary, mockery, or characterization. Rather, in some cases, good characters used asides for the purpose of advancing the plot. This usage expanded considerably from the 1560s to 1580s, examples of which are Cantalupo and Trappola in The Bugbears, Aristippus, among others, in Damon and Pithias, Sedmond (disguised) in Common Conditions, Neronis (disguised) in Clyomon and Clamydes, Cassandra, among others, in Promos and Cassandra, the Son in The Disobedient Child, Eusebius in The Conflict of Conscience, and Phillada and Gallathea in Gallathea. This expansion brings the aside closer to what we expect it to be. In later plays we are not surprised by either Richard III's or Iago's use of asides, but we do not necessarily expect them to be the only characters who use them, either. This expansion of the usage of asides is emblematic of the sixteenth-century shift in English dramaturgy.

Also intriguing is the fact that among the plays wherein asides are spoken by good characters, there is considerable variation in the number of asides, and characters who use them, in each text. The plays most full of these asides have sources outside England (Promos and Cassandra and Damon and Pithias.) This implies that even after the aside became an accepted part of dramatic technique in England, the impetus to expand its usage comes from plays whose sources are rooted in a different tradition of dramaturgy.

Semi-asides also continue into the 1560s and beyond, in their originally observed function, as an important tool of characterization, emphasizing the cowardice of characters who are willing to talk big to the audience but back down when challenged. Such semi-asides appear in The Play of Patient Grissell, The Trial of Treasure, The Longest Thou Livest, and The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom. The evidence suggests that the semi-aside, by 1585, is a technique whose height of usage has past, although the technique is not completely lost.[12] As we have seen, while semi-asides appear in several plays in the 1560s to 80s, there are several in which their primary function is taken over by regular asides, while in others, the model for the future of how asides, they do not appear in significant measure.

We have seen, then, that the aside, far from having a simple structure, was complex in form and usage. It is thus not surprising that asides pose particular problems for editors of the early drama. Several different forms of the aside are usually marked simply as 'asides': conversational asides (in which one character says something to another character); undirected asides (in which one character makes a comment that is rhetorically directed to another character but which cannot possibly be heard by that character); audience asides (in which a character speaks directly to the audience); self asides (in which a character speaks to himself); and semi-asides (in which a character makes a comment to himself or to the audience which appears to be an aside, but turns out to be overheard by another character, at least in part). In addition, other techniques are marked as asides but which are not asides at all, the most common example being a situation in which a speech is given by a character who is hidden, or situated in a different part of the stage from other characters, who are not aware of his presence. For example, in The Conflict of Conscience, Hypocrisy has a long speech of explicit direct address, after which, noticing others coming, he says he will step aside until he knows who they are ("But whist, not a

---

[12] Shakespeare uses one in Richard III, emphasizing, undoubtedly, his characterization as a vice.

word, for yonder come some,/ While I know what they are I will be dumb" [335-36]).  Thus hidden, Hypocrisy watches Tyranny and Avarice, making snide comments to the audience about what they are doing.  Similarly, in Misogonus, the hidden Cacurgus mocks Philogonus and Liturgus as they talk (2.1).  In both cases, these comments are marked by the editor as asides.  Clearly, however, they are not the same types of aside as the ones listed above; no convention of 'not hearing' is involved, since the other characters are not 'aware' of the commenting character's presence.

Thus at least half a dozen different techniques are all editorially marked in early English drama by the single term 'aside.'  This situation is ripe for confusion.  With so many different techniques given the same label, a reader — or a director, or an actor — can easily be unsure of how to understand a line called an 'aside,' which can be directed to the audience, to the character himself, or to another character.  Must the other characters conventionally 'not hear', or is a different convention involved (such as a 'different location' or 'hidden character' convention)?  An experienced scholar is not likely to be confused by the multiplicity of techniques included under this one term.  However, for the reader to whom the plays are unfamiliar, that so many diverse events are called 'asides' is likely to be confusing.

It would be prudent, then, to strive for more editorial consistency in the marking of asides, and indeed to develop editorial methods of marking them that differentiate the various types of asides.  Enhancing the clarity of editorial markings would require only minor adaptations, but would provide significant benefits.  Conversational asides can easily be marked as 'aside to so-and-so,' thus indicating the character to whom it is directed.  Undirected asides and semi-asides can be marked simply as asides.  An aside which is clearly directed to the audience should be marked as 'aside to audience,' as in fact some editors have already done (for

example, as Paul Whitfield White does in his <u>Reformation Biblical Drama in England</u>). Similarly, when a self aside has clear markers that indicate that the character is speaking to himself, it should be marked as an 'aside to himself' or 'to himself.'  As discussed above, audience asides and self asides can be difficult to differentiate in the absence of markers, and in those cases I would recommend marking the line simply as 'aside.'  In this way, we can reduce the confusion of readers while avoiding the introduction of new terminology, which would be unfamiliar to readers (and hence just as confusing) or require a great deal of notation.

The story of the aside in early English drama, then, is the story of a rarely used technique becoming a common technique, while the functions for which it is used expand.  First the *extent* of its usage expands, then the *types* of its usage do.  Before 1520, 25 plays survive; of these, 5 employ asides (20%).  Between 1520 and 1540, 19 plays survive, of which asides are found in 4 (21%).  From 1540 to 1560, there are 12 plays, of which 8 have asides (66%).  Between 1560 and 1585, there are 37 plays extant, of which 21 use asides (57%).  Percentage-wise, the highest portion of plays employing asides occurs between 1540 and 1560.  Given the difficulties of dating early plays, as well as the fact that this selection is the smallest sample of the four periods I study, I would not want to overinterpret these numbers.  For example, I would not want to suggest that the aside hits a peak of usage between 1540 and 1560, after which it declines. Rather, I find from these statistics that over the course of the sixteenth century, the aside moves from being an obscure to being a common technique in English drama.  Before 1540, a fifth of plays used asides (20%); after 1540, more than half did (59%).  Before 1540, the aside conflicted with the dramatic theory inherent in mainstream drama; after 1540, English dramatic theory shifted and changed, accommodating new techniques and concepts imported from continental and classical drama.

Of interest is that many of the plays here identified as important in the history of asides in English drama have also been previously identified as significant milestones in the 'development' of English drama during the sixteenth century. In particular, <u>Johan Johan</u> and <u>Ralph Roister Doister</u> have commonly been pointed to as significant steps in the 'evolution' of English drama in the sixteenth century from the 'primitive didacticism' of medieval drama to the 'sophisticated realism' of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. This approach to the history of English drama, current in the first half of this century, has been largely abandoned in the latter half. But the prominence of <u>Johan Johan</u> and <u>Ralph Roister Doister</u> in both the specific history of asides and in the general history of English drama suggests that one of the major principles used to identify the 'good' plays from the sixteenth century is the extent to which they reflect the dramatic theory which would ultimately prevail. If we who teach or produce early English drama continue to use the canon or argue for its expansion without addressing the issues underlying its formation, the earlier approach to English drama is still alive and well.

Over the course of the sixteenth century, the dramaturgy of the native English tradition was modified by influences coming from continental and classical drama until, by the end of the century, it became nearly entirely different. Drama scholars in the past accepted the later sixteenth century drama as the beginning of 'modern' (that is, good and worth of study) drama, essentially beginning the history of English drama with Kyd or Marlowe and moving backward from there, deriving from this later drama a theory and terminology. In constructing a canon of works that led up to the 'full flourishing' of Elizabethan drama, these scholars chose the works of medieval English drama that most closely reflected the later dramaturgy, with which they were familiar. Later scholars have successfully argued for the expansion of the canon, recognizing its shortcomings, but these efforts will be more effective if we recognize that part of

the problem is that a different theory of drama was in place in the early part of the sixteenth century.  We will not be able to persuade scholars of Renaissance drama (or scholars of later drama, for that matter) of the worthiness of earlier English drama unless we can show that these plays were not inferior examples of early modern dramaturgy, but drama that operates from an altogether different theory of how drama could and should function.  We need to strive to derive this theory from the drama itself and articulate it.  That is what this project aims for:  to show how the techniques of early English drama differ in use and function from the later drama, and to develop a new terminology for discussing those.

## Chapter 3:  Direct Address by Special Personages

Throughout early English drama, direct address is used by various types of characters and by special personages, figures who are familar with and comment upon the action of the drama but do not themselves participate in it.  The use of direct address by characters will be considered in later chapters.  Here we are concerned with how special personages employ the technique.  There are two major types of these special personages:  vexillators, who provide banns before the actual performance and thus are external to the play, and presenters, who appear within the play itself.

We do not know the extent to which banns were used to advertise and promote performances of medieval English drama.  We have no way of knowing whether they were common and could usually be expected before a production but have not survived or were never written down, or whether the few that we do see constitute their entirety.  It seems likely, given how little of this drama does survive, that some banns were among the high percentage of material lost, but that is a only a guess — a reasonable guess, but a guess nonetheless.  What we do know is that the extant banns (which survive for the N-town Play, The Castle of Perseverance, and the Croxton Play of the Sacrament) indicate that their purpose was to promote the production, some time before the actual performance, and that to do this they announced when and where the performance would take place, providing some information as to the play's

content, and raising interest in the event.[13]  A consideration of the direct address in the extant

banns of medieval English drama suggests that in them rhetorical markers indicating direct

address were used and eschewed deliberately and to a purpose.

The banns for The Castle of Perseverance reveal this purposeful use in two major types

of direct address, explicit and implicit.  At the beginning and end of the banns, markers are

employed heavily, but in the middle none is used.  The first Vexillator, for instance, prays for the

king, the nobles of the realm, "And all the goode comowns of this towne that before us stonde,"

then continues, "We mustyr *you* with menschepe,/ And freyne *you* of frely frenchepe./ Crist safe

*you* all fro schenchepe,/ That knowyn wil our case!" (8-13; emphasis added).  That the speech is

heavy in its use of markers reflects a need to attract attention and gather a crowd.  A bit of

judicious flattery and well-wishing clearly directed at one's listeners are well-chosen tactics for

such purposes. The second Vexillator's speech opens with the comment "The case of oure

cominge, *you* to declare,/ *Every man in himself* forsothe he it may finde," again showing clear

rhetorical markers of direct address (14-15; emphasis added).  However, these markers are used

heavily only in the two opening speeches, suggesting that the Vexillators can rely upon a

preexistent close relationship between their spectacle and their audience rather than needing to

establish one.  Medieval drama assumes an infrastructural relationship with the audience, that is,

that a close relationship with the audience is a preexistent condition of medieval drama.  The

opening of the banns for The Castle of Perseverance supports that assertion.

The middle section of The Castle of Perseverance's banns uses implicit direct address to

provide the audience with information about the play's subject, content, and plot.  This use of

unmarked rather than marked direct address also indicates the preexistent close relationship with

---

[13] A cogent exploration of the role and function of banns is provided by David Bevington in his Medieval Drama
(242).

the audience.  Having gotten people's attention, the Vexillators can relay their message without

having to continually reinforce the bond with their listeners; they have invoked the preexisting

bond, and now may rely on it.  At the end, however, when their plot-summary section is finished,

the Vexillators switch back into explicit direct address, providing information about the venue

and time of performance, urging the crowd to attend the show.  Here, then, is another purpose of

marked direct address:  emphasis.  It is not necessary for the Vexillators to use markers to

establish a relationship with the audience or to gather a crowd, both of these purposes having

been achieved; rather, they choose to employ marked direct address to emphasize what they are

saying and the audience's connection to it.  They do not say that 'this play will be performed at

such-and-such a time at such-and-such a place' but that "*we* purpose *us* to playe/ This day

sevenenyt, before *you* in syth...Ye, haste *you* thanne thedyrward, *sirys*" (132-35; emphasis

added).  The first phrasing suggests a play that will be performed at a particular time and place

and that the presence of an audience is desirable, whereas the second indicates a play for which

performance is dependent upon being seen, something that 'we' will show to 'you,' if 'you'

agree.  There are twenty markers used in the twenty-six lines of these final speeches, making it

an example of intensely marked direct address, providing a hammering emphasis.  The

information being given is crucial, and the ensurance of an audience is crucial, so the speeches

use rhetorical fireworks to underscore this.

     The banns preceding the Croxton <u>Play of the Sacrament</u> function very similarly.  The first

two speeches use explicit direct address to draw attention and gather a crowd, praying for the

audience (God "Save *all thes semely*, bothe leste and moste,/ And brynge *yow* to the blysse that

he hath *yow* to bowght!" [3-4; emphasis added]) and declaring their purpose, inviting the

audience to listen ("We be ful purposed with hart and with thowght/ Off our mater to tell the

entent...*Sovereyns*, and yt lyke *yow* to here the purpoos of this play/ that ys represented now in *yower* syght..." [5-6, 9-10; emphasis added]).  As in The Castle of Perserverance's banns, the explicit direct address is heavily marked but brief.  The middle speeches of the banns provide the content and plot in unmarked direct address, while the last two speeches return to explicit direct address to emphasize the logistical information about the play's performance and urge the crowd to come see the show ("And yt place *yow*, *thys gaderyng that here ys*,/ At Croxston on Monday yt shall be sen;/ To see the conclusyon of this lytell processe/ Hertely welcum shall *yow* bene" [73-76; emphasis added]).  As in The Castle of Perseverance, the banns partake of an existing close relationship between drama and its audience; they indicate as well that this knowledge and technique were widespread and not unique to either play.

The banns for The N-town Play employ direct address techniques in a manner consistent with the usage observed in the previous two sets of banns, although in a more complex way.  The banns for The Castle of Perseverance and the Croxton Play of the Sacrament are 156 lines and 80 lines long, respectively, but N-town's are much longer, 529 lines.  Like the shorter sets, the N-town banns use heavily marked address at the beginning and end, first to gather a crowd and gain its attention, then to emphasize the practical concerns of seeing the show.  However, the middle section does not entirely avoid marked address, apparently for two purposes.

First, the marked address in the middle section of the N-town banns quickly reminds or informs listeners, in case they weren't present for the beginning speeches, couldn't hear them, or have forgotten them altogether.  Examples of such usage are seen in the phrases, "In oure play ?e xal hem sene," "[as] ?e xal se at oure pleyng," "[we] xal ?ow shewe, if ?e wyl dwelle," "þe weche ?e xal here," and several versions of "as ?e xal se." These phrases inform recent arrivals and reinforce the idea that this presentation is not the show but itself an advertisement of the

show, even though the advertisement is nearly as long as other pieces of medieval drama in their entirety.  Johan Johan, for example, is only about 150 lines longer than these banns; Mankind is not even twice as long.

Intriguingly, some instances of marked direct address in the N-town banns concern plays with particularly impressive special effects.  For example, two of the "as I ?ow tell" phrases occur in speeches describing The Salutation and Conception, a stage direction which indicates a spectacular effect:  "Here þe Holy Gost discendit with iij bemys to oure Lady, the Sone of þe Godhed nest with iij bemys to þe Holy Gost, the Fadyr godly with iij bemys to þe Sone.  And so entre all thre to here bosom..." (293 SD).  Scholars agree that this effect would have been impressive even though we are not entirely certain how it would have been achieved.[14] Similarly, the banns use explicit direct address when promoting the Creation of Adam and Eve, Cain and Abel, The Death of King Herod, Christ's Temptation, and the Crucifixion, all plays for which spectacular special effects are probable.  It seems probable that some elements of the marked address within the midst of the banns serve to draw attention to, or perhaps remind the crowd of, plays in which the visual aspects are particularly striking, though these instances of explicit direct address may be sufficiently explained by the rationale discussed above, and thus that they occur in the description of the spectacular plays may be accidental rather than purposeful.

The use of a proclamation to advertise and promote a production survives as well in David Lindsay's mid-sixteenth-century Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis.  As is commonly

---

[14] John R. Elliot, Jr., for example, refers to this in his 1989 Playing God:  Medieval Mysteries on the Modern Stage as "The famous, and enigmatic, stage direction in the *Ludus Coventriae* Annunciation play...which was presumably accomplished in the middle ages by a contrivance of gilded wires" (61).

recognized, much of Lindsay's dramaturgy in <u>Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis</u> is medieval.[15]

However, the Proclamation is very different from any of the surviving medieval banns. Only the

beginning and ending speeches, given by Nuntius, specifically announce and promote the

upcoming performance; the rest of the Proclamation is actually a mini-play in which characters

emerge from the audience, as if they were members of the audience responding to Nuntius'

announcement of an upcoming production, and perform a brief farcical sketch which,

presumably, promotes the larger show, by drawing a crowd to hear Nuntius' ending

announcement about when and where the production will be held. It may well be that the

constrast in style and construction between Lindsay's Proclamation and the extant medieval

banns is an accident of manuscript survival. Bruce Moore has argued that

> the dramatic activity associated with the proclamation of the banns, especially in the
>
> southern counties, was more extensive than has hitherto been suspected. In the absence
>
> of extant contemporary descriptions, the interpretation of the evidence is of necessity
>
> conjectural. However, the records of payments to the performers of the banns and the
>
> texts of the surviving banns offer strong evidence for the argument that proclamation of
>
> the banns involved condensed versions of the complete plays or narration accompanied
>
> by mime (115-16).

Moore has found significant payments to 'criers of the banns,' which suggests that they were

providing entertainment sufficient to be deemed worthy of payment[16]; he argues that this

entertainment is likely to have been either a briefly enacted summary of the coming play or a

mimed accompaniment of the narrated summary. However, no texts survive of those banns for

---

[15] A discussion of this appears in <u>The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Theatre</u>, in which Pamela M. King's chapter on morality plays mentions Lindsay's as an example of the genre as it persisted in the sixteenth century, and Meg Twycross' chapter, "The Theatricality of Medieval English Plays," discusses place-and-scaffold production, using Lindsay's play as an example.

which payment was given, so it is impossible to say with certainty what entertainment was being provided there.  It is possible, as Moore argues, that the surviving banns were accompanied by mimed action; this possibility would not significantly affect the analysis provided earlier of the use of direct address in those banns.  What is relevant here is that Moore's argument suggests that it would be unwise to assume that a major structural shift in the construction of banns between the medieval examples and Lindsay's, from directly spoken promotion to a show bookended by production information.  Enactment in some form may have been a part of medieval banns, for which examples simply do not survive; that said, it should be noted that Lindsay's mini-play is a much more complete, albeit brief, dramatic presentation than would be those that Moore is postulating. What is significant for our purposes about Lindsay's Proclamation is that informational speeches at the beginning and end follow the pattern observed in the medieval banns:  they are heavily marked, they provide the logistical and pragmatic information about the production, and they urge the crowd to come see it.

From the banns, we move on to presenters.  Presenters occur in medieval English drama in several non-cycle plays (the Brome Abraham and Isaac, the Digby Conversion of St. Paul, the Digby Killing of the Children, and Everyman) and in the N-town, Chester, and York cycles, as well as in the Norwich Grocers' play, sole survivor of the Norwich cycle. What we find among the presenters in medieval English drama is a clear and consistent tradition of their usage, that, with the exception of the York Doctor, is characterized by the use of heavily marked direct address and similar functions and behaviors.

The roles of the Presenters in these plays range from brief to extensive.  In the Brome Abraham and Isaac, for example, the Doctor appears only once, providing the final speech of the

---

[16] For example, the banns criers of Frieston were paid five shillings, a payment made in addition to five shillings given for the play itself and a payment made to provide food and drink for the players (96).

play, in which he explains the lesson ("For thys story schoyt yowe [here]/ How we schuld kepe to owr po[we]re,/ Goddys commaumentys wythowt grochyng" [440-42]), providing a contemporary application for it ("And thys women that wepe so sorowfully/ Whan that hyr chyldryn dey them froo,/ As nater woll, and kynd;/ Yt is but folly..." [449-52]), and ending by praying for the audience. The speech is extremely heavily marked, employing 20 markers in 31 lines.

In Everyman, the presence of presenters is somewhat more extensive, since two different presenters appear. A Messenger opens the play in heavily marked direct address (using 8 markers in 21 lines) in which he asks the audience to pay attention to the upcoming play ("I pray you all gyve your audyence" [1]) and explains what it will be about ("of our lyves and endynge shewes/ How transytory we be all daye" [5-6]). The play ends with a Doctor who explains the lesson ("forsake Pride, for he deceyueth you in the end" [904]) in moderately marked (there are 3 markers in 20 lines) address; several imperative verbs appear in his speech as well ("forsake," "remembre," and "be-ware"), which also carry a connotation of 'you,' further enhancing the explicitness of the address.

Similarly, the presenter, "Poeta," appears twice in the Digby Killing of the Children, beginning and ending the play. In his opening speech, he explains the occasion for the performance ("[this] solenne fest to be had in remembraunce/ Of blissid Seynt Anne" [1-2]), asks the audience to excuse the company if the quality of the production is lacking (20-24), reminds the audience of the show they saw last year and tells what the current performance is about (25-49), and asks them to "geve us peseable audiens!" (52). His concluding speech again asks the audience for "youre paciens,/ To pardon us of oure offens," thanks them for "your good attendaunce," announces what the show will be the following year (561), and calls the

"menstralles" to "geve us a daunce" (565-66). Poeta's speeches are moderately marked and heavily marked, respectively (the preamble uses 7 markers in 56 lines; the ending speech uses 8 markers in 16 lines).

Poeta, in the Digby Conversion of St. Paul, has the most sustained presence found in these plays, giving six speeches throughout the play, including the speeches which begin and end it. His larger presence is paralleled by a wider variety of functions. In his first speech, he prays for the audience and asks them for "lycens" to proceed with the play; the middle speeches conclude and begin the action at each station, asking the audience to follow to the next station and, once there, again asking them for "lycens" to continue with the next; the last concludes the show, asks the audience to excuse "owur symplynes...That of retoryk have non intellygens," and prays for them (659-60).

These non-cycle presenters' use of direct address is suggestive in several ways. It is intriguing that all the presenters who appear in stand-alone plays employ marked direct address, usually heavily marked. It is possible that this choice is connected with the functions that these presenters serve. Several of their functions are pragmatic, master-of-ceremonies type work — 'please be quiet,' 'here's what the play's about,' 'please look kindly upon our show' — and the markers can serve to underscore these requests, emphasizing them and focusing attention on them. Also, it is possible that some of these plays were travelling productions. All medieval drama seems to indicate the assumption of a preexisting close relationship with the audience — rather than each show establishing its own from nothing — but it would make sense that travelling shows would choose to employ a heavy use of markers to quickly tap into and reinforce that existing relationship; certainly there could be an economic incentive for the performers or author to want to ensure that the audience felt thoroughly engaged with the play. I

present this possibility as a suggestion rather than a conclusion, however, since the state of our understanding about medieval English travelling texts and productions is still fragmentary.

But what these presenters' speeches undeniably indicate is both the range of possibilities for, as well as the constraints on, the use of presenters in non-cycle plays. There are other stand-alone plays which do not use presenters to accomplish the functions handled by these presenters; the Croxton Play of the Sacrament, The Castle of Perseverance, the Digby Mary Magdalene, Mankind, and Wisdom fulfill these functions with characters (in the Croxton Play of the Sacrament, Episcopus provides the ending speech and moral; Mercy accomplishes the same in Mankind) or sidestep the problem by omitting them altogether (for example, speeches involving overt groveling, such as 'please listen nicely' or 'please excuse our poor little play' are generally absent from the non-presenter stand-alone plays.) Furthermore, within the non-cycle plays which do include a presenter, the range of that figure's involvement in the script can vary widely, from appearing once (as in the Brome Abraham and Isaac), to beginning and ending the play (as in the Digby Killing of the Children), to acting as master of ceremonies (as in the Digby Conversion of St. Paul). Given the small amount of extant medieval English drama, it is striking that this small collection of works shows such a wide range of dramaturgical possibilities. We have no reason to believe that the surviving texts survived precisely because they provided a good collection of works, together indicating all possibilities of dramaturgy in medieval drama. In fact it seems far more likely that a host of dramaturgical possibilities have perished with the multitudes of lost texts, possibilities that we may never know to have existed, simply because the texts in which they were used have not survived. And yet, despite the accidental and sparse nature of these texts' survival, within them we see a wide range of dramaturgical choice.

However, although there are many possible ways to use a presenter, there are conventions associated with doing so. The most obvious discussed so far is the use of markers in their speeches. All of these presenters employ markers, indicating that an accepted and conventional element of the use of presenters is that they will speak in heavily marked address. Their functions and behaviors are also consistent; they explain elements of the play, describe the plot, pray for the audience, ask the audience to pay attention, and request that the audience look kindly upon the performance. It is important to recognize this element because it balances the previous observation. The dramaturgy of medieval English drama includes a great deal of freedom in the use of presenters, but it is not unlimited. The method is expansive but not chaotic. The use of presenters in non-cycle medieval English drama is not compulsory, but when they are used, their usage is consistent.

Non-cycle plays are not the only plays containing presenters, however; presenters are also used in the N-town, Chester, and York cycles. Their usage differs from that in the non-cycle plays; when we consider the example of the Doctor in the York cycle, we find this presenter to be strikingly different than that observed in the non-cycle plays. While the non-cycle presenters uniformly employ marked direct address, the York Doctor does not. He is the only presenter in the York cycle, and fulfills a function accomplished in other cycles by a Play of the Prophets; that is, he provides a link between the old and new testament plays by relating and explicating christological prophecies. He opens with a prayer, but his prayer differs from those typical of the non-cycle presenters; the audience as audience is not acknowledged and interceded for, rather, the state of mankind, fallen and depraved, is lamented, and God implored to redeem humanity.

The rest of the Doctor's speech employs implicit direct address. He says, for instance, that it is "nedfull for to neven/ How prophettis all Goddis counsailes kende," proceeding to relate

several prophecies to the audience (13-14).  He never employs the markers that characterize explicit direct address but his speech nevertheless acknowledges the audience's presence, in his use of first person plural pronouns, including himself in their number, speaking of "oure blisse," "oure myscheues," and "oure lorde."  As we shall see in a later chapter, the York cycle rarely uses explicit direct address, and here we see that it is possible for the cycle to maintain that choice even while employing a presenter.  We see here as well an indication of the range of usage possible for direct address.  Here, no explicit markers are used but the audience is nonetheless acknowledged.  The rhetorical construction of this address is clever and careful, allowing the Doctor to present the material in a way that connects the prophecies to the audience's spiritual condition, but nevertheless maintains the York cycle's overall strategy for avoiding marked direct address, a strategy in which the direct address is rare and strategic.

In the N-Town cycle, we find three instances of presenters:  Contemplacio (who appears in Joachim and Anna, The Presentation of Mary, The Visit to Elizabeth, and the Passion Play 2), the Doctor who begins the Assumption of Mary play, and the Doctors who end the Passion Play 1.  Contemplacio's speeches seem to undercut immediately a hypothesis that presenters are used differently in cycle and non-cycle plays, since his use of direct address consistently resembles that of the non-cycle presenters.  He typically uses heavily marked direct address (his 25 line speech beginning the Joachim and Anna play has 4 markers; his two 17 line speeches in The Presentation of Mary have 11 markers total; his 20 and 36 line speeches in The Visit to Elizabeth have 8 markers total; and a 20 line speech beginning Passion Play 2 has 11 markers) and performs as a master of ceremonies as do the non-cycle presenters, hushing the crowd and focusing their attention on the upcoming performance, explaining what the play will be about,

narrating intervening material that will not be performed, asking the audience to charitably accept the production, and praying for the audience.

However, it is now widely accepted that large portions of the N-town cycle[17] are interpolated plays that previously had their own independent existence.[18]  The plays that include Contemplacio are among those interpolated into the collection, as are The Assumption of Mary and the Passion Plays, in which the N-town presenters appear.  Furthermore, the one speech assigned to Contemplacio that does not closely resemble the model for non-cycle presenters is the one that begins The Parliament of Heaven, in which Contemplacio begs God to intervene in history on mankind's behalf.  The speech is not even an example of direct address; it is rhetorically directed entirely to God.  This speech, however, was not originally Contemplacio's, according to Peter Meredith, who says that, "Contemplacio's speech at the beginning of the Parliament episode was once clearly spoken by two speakers and...its attribution to Contemplacio occurred when the Parliament episode was linked with the Annunciation in the Mary Play" (Mary Play 3).[19]  Contemplacio's speeches are therefore not surprising.  The speech that did not originally belong to a presenter does not resemble a presenter's speech, and the speeches that belonged to Contemplacio before the plays were interpolated into the N-town collection resemble what indeed they were, speeches belonging to a non-cycle presenter.  Contemplacio's speeches support rather than undermine the clear distinction made in the use of direct address by cycle and non-cycle presenters.  Similarly, the Doctor who appears at the

---

[17] Whether the N-town plays are a cycle continues to be discussed among scholars.  Discussion of these plays is included in this section on cycle plays because scholars still tend to classify N-town among the cycles, then modify what that means.

[18] For an examination of this question, see, for example, Appendix I of Volume II of Stephen Spector's 1991 The N-Town Play, Douglas Sugano's 1994 article "'This game wel pleyd in good a-ray':  The N-Town Playbooks and East Anglian Games," and Peter Meredith's 1987  The Mary Play from the N.town Manuscript.

[19] Alan J. Fletcher's 1980 note "The 'Contemplacio' Prologue to the N-town Play of the Parliament of Heaven" also discusses this issue.

beginning of the interpolated <u>Assumption of Mary</u> behaves like the non-cycle presenter he once was, using marked direct address in his role as master of ceremonies.

But the Doctors who appear at the end of the <u>Passion Play 1</u> are another, more problematic issue. They resemble no other presenters, cycle or non-cycle, and it is not clear how much, if any, of their speech is direct address. They begin with a prayer for the audience, their speech directed to God. Primus Doctor then speaks a stanza that is potentially direct address ("To þe pepyl not lernyd I stonde as a techer...") although this is not unambiguously direct address, since his rhetorical construction is that he is speaking *of* his audience not *to* them. Secundus Doctor's following speech — with the possible exception of his first line ("Welcome of þe apostelys þe gloryous qwere"), which may be an imperative directed at the audience — and the rest of the scene are rhetorically directed to the apostles as they arrive and are hailed by the doctors. Of course, the audience is supposed to hear these statements, but the speeches are spoken for their benefit not to them directly. It is impossible to decipher precisely the object of these speeches; it provides an example of presenters who do not fit the pattern, a sobering reminder of the limitations of scholarship and theory.

Of all medieval drama, it is the Chester cycle which is most closely associated with presenters. Many commentators consider the recurring Expositor figures to be a preeminent characteristic of the Chester cycle, and the significance, function, and meaning of these figures have been a source of considerable debate. The Expositor figures are joined by other presenters; they appear in <u>Abraham</u> (Preco, Expositor, Messenger), <u>Moses</u> (Doctor), <u>Salutation and Nativity</u> (Nuntius, Preco, and Expositor), <u>Temptation</u> (Doctour), <u>Antichrist's Prophets</u> (Expositor), and the H-manuscript version of <u>Balaam</u> (Expositor). Earlier scholars such as E.K. Chambers and F.M. Salter considered the Expositor to be a primitive technique, removed by later revisers of the

cycle in favor of more sophisticated dramatic methods. It this were true, the presence of an Expositor would indicate the oldest sections of the cycle (Travis 41), but current scholarship has suggested that the opposite is true, and that the portions of Chester containing Expositors are among the latest, added to the cycle sometime in the early sixteenth century, when the cycle was transformed from a one-day to a three-day production (Travis 47-61). Both Peter W. Travis and Jörg O. Fichte suggest that a significant motivation for the introduction of presenters, particularly the Expositor figures, into the Chester cycle is to provide information from A Stanzaic Life of Christ and the Legenda Aurea; as Fichte says, "[this] evidence leads to the conclusion that the playwright of the Chester Cycle probably invented the character Expositor, in order to incorporate the non-dramatic material he took over from A Stanzaic Life of Christ and the Legenda Aurea" (102).[20]

This seems likely enough. However, it seems less likely that the reviser "invented the character Expositor," as Fichte suggests, than that he adapted a technique hitherto found only in the non-cycle plays. The revision for a three-day performance at Whitsun occurred early in the sixteenth century, perhaps by 1521, almost certainly by 1532, as Travis explains: "the Corpus Christi play came to be first called (in 1521) the Whitsun play and then (by 1532 and thereafter) the Whitsun plays" (44). But the extant non-cycle plays, in which a tradition of presenters thrived, all pre-date this revision. The Chester cycle reviser, desiring to incorporate additional material but finding no appropriate technique within the dramaturgy of the cycle plays, turned to the non-cycle plays. The sole example of a presenter in a medieval English cycle before Chester's Whitsun revision, the York cycle Doctor, was apparently an unsatisfactory model; the York strategy is used only for the provision of information rather than to provide commentary, explanation, and detail. For that strategy, the model of the presenters in the non-cycle plays is a

---

[20] See also Travis (48-61).

more satisfactory one, as it fulfills these functions and more.  It should not therefore be surprising to find that the Chester Whitsun reviser has incorporated not only Expositors, to provide the material from the <u>Stanzaic Life</u> and <u>Golden Legend</u>, but also Messengers (such Preco and Nuntius) who function as masters of ceremony, as do the presenters in the non-cycle plays.

In medieval English drama, then, presenters were used almost exclusively by non-cycle plays, and marked direct address was used only by presenters, and only in non-cycle plays, until the Chester cycle.  However, non-cycle plays were not required to employ presenters; they could choose to not do so at all.  When they did use them, they could use them rarely or frequently. There was an established tradition of how they spoke and what sorts of functions they fulfilled. With the exception of the York Doctor, presenters were absent from cycles until the Chester Whitsun reviser adopted this technique from the non-cycle plays, using presenters in his revised pageants.  The theory that the presenters in Chester indicate the oldest strand of the cycle has already been discredited, through evidence of the cycle's history of revision, which shows that those plays are among the latest rather than the earliest.  Here we see also that the presence of presenters in Chester indicates not stagnation or dramatic naiveté but innovation, the incorporation of a new technique by a groundbreaking playwright. He is not carelessly stuffing material from the <u>Stanzaic Life</u> and <u>Golden Legend</u> into the cycle in the easiest way handy, but rather, having made the decision to include this material, has adapted a technique from outside the established dramaturgy of the cycle play tradition.  Whether we consider the use of the technique to be dramatically successful and satisfying is another issue; the evidence shows that the reviser was innovative in his revision, cleverly adapting a non-cycle technique to his cycle play purposes.

As we have seen, in medieval English drama, presenters were used consistently but not constantly. In the sixteenth century, this situation changed rapidly. Of the 67 surviving plays from 1520 to 1585, 49, or 73%, use presenters. If we look at the period 1530-1585, the ratio is even more striking; of the 56 extant plays, 45, or 80%, use presenters. (For comparison, in medieval English non-cycle plays, 4, or 28%, of 14 plays employ presenters; for all extant plays before 1520, presenters are used in 7, or 29%, of 24 plays.[21] While presenters became substantially more common over the course of the sixteenth century, in the earliest of the sixteenth-century plays, the use of presenters differed in its methods and functions. Whereas medieval drama used presenters consistently but not constantly, sixteenth-century drama employed presenters constantly but not consistently.

The most striking example of this inconsistency appears in the relationship of the presenters to the other actors. In the medieval plays, the presenters always speak of themselves as one of the actors; for instance, the Doctor in the Brome Abraham and Isaac begins the speech which concludes the play, "Lo! Sovereyns and sorys, how have *we* schewyd,/ Thys solom story to grete and smale" (435-36; emphasis added). Poeta, in the Digby Conversion of St. Paul, asks the audience for "lycens/ To procede *owur* processe, *we* may [show] under your correccyon,/ The conversayon of Seynt Paule" (8-10; emphasis added). In the Digby Killing of the Children, Poeta says, "*We* be comen hedere as servauntes diligent,/ *Oure* processe to shewe you, as *we* can" (19-20; emphasis added). Similarly, Contemplacio clearly speaks of himself as one of the players when he asks the audience to be quiet "[and] tak hed to *oure* talkyn[g], what *we* xal say" (N-town Joachim and Anna 17; emphasis added). Likewise, in the Chester Balaam (the manuscript H version), the Expositor comments, "Now, worthye syrs both great and smale,/ here

---

[21] Included in this count are Gismond of Salerne, Gorboduc, and The Glass of Government, which use Choruses. As these three plays are the only plays in English before 1585 to use Choruses, a discussion of the use of the Chorus in

have *wee* shewed this storye before," grouping himself with the other players (448-49; emphasis added). Nor is this approach lost in the later-revised version of this play, the Hm manuscript version, where the Expositor comments that "[moe] prophetes, lordinges, *we* might play/ but yt wold tary much the daye" (409-10; emphasis added). Without exception, presenters in medieval drama rhetorically group themselves with the other actors.

But in sixteenth-century drama, the presenters' relationship to the other actors becomes varied. In some plays, the presenters continue to group themselves with the players. In Gentleness and Nobility (c1519-28), Phylosopher ends the play by asking the audience to "holde *us* excused" (1174; emphasis added) if anything in the play was offensive. The prologue of Ralph Roister Doister (c1547-48) speaks of "*[us]* in thys Enterlude" and "*[oure]* Comedie or Enterlude which *we* intended to play" (3, 22; emphasis added). The prologue of Nice Wanton (1547-53) describes the plot and characters, ending with the promise "[all] these parts will *we* play" (24; emphasis added). The prologue of The Disobedient Child (c1550) asks the audience for quiet so that "we" can play an interlude. In Respublica (1553), the prologue speaks of "*we* that are theactours" (5; emphasis added). In Damon and Pithias (1564), the prologue consistently speaks of "*oure* Aucthor" and describes what "here *wee* shall present" (7, 30; emphasis added). The preface to The Trial of Treasure (c1566) speaks of "*we* the players" (207; emphasis added). The prologue of July and Julian (1560-70) asks the audience's patience and attention for "*we* [who] are come hither to troble yow as boyes" (7; emphasis added). The Three Ladies of London (1581) and John Lyly's Sappho and Phao, Campaspe, and Gallathea (1584 and 85) all repeatedly use "we" in their prologues, the presenters clearly aligning themselves with the

---

early English drama is not feasible; there is simply not enough evidence.

actors.[22]  Moreover the degree to which these plays mark their presenters' alignment with the

actors varies.  Some, as in <u>All for Money</u>, have the prologue speak only once of "our Author"

(93), whereas others, such as <u>Damon and Pithias</u>, employ such markers frequently.  In all, of the

49 plays surviving from 1520-85, 27, or 55%, have presenters who rhetorically align themselves

with the other players.

But in other plays, the presenters are clearly separated from the actors.  <u>The Nature of the</u>

<u>Four Elements</u> (1517-20) has a Messenger who gives the opening speech, which ends:

> But *they* that shall nowe this matter declare
>
> Openly here unto this audyence—
>
> Beholde I prey you, see where *they* are!
>
> *The pleyers* begyn to appere in presence;
>
> I se well it is tyme for me to go hense
>
> And so I wyll do.  (141-46; emphasis added)

The Messenger's wording indicates that he considers himself to be a different sort of figure than

the other actors.  The players are they 'that shall nowe this matter declare/ Openly here unto this

audyence.'  The Messenger does not align himself with the players; 'they' will perform the play,

not 'we.'  Moreover, nowhere in his speech does the Messenger group himself with the other

performers.  Rather, he refers to the interlude that "[before] your presence shall be declaryd";

"this work declaryd shall ye see"; and "Which matter before you shortly/ In this interlude here

---

[22] I provide only a few examples here.  The full list of plays from 1520-1588 in which the presenters speak of themselves as one of the players is:  <u>Gentleness and Nobility</u> (c1519-28), the <u>Norwich Grocers' Play</u> (1533-65), <u>Ralph Roister Doister</u> (c1547-48), <u>Nice Wanton</u> (1547-53), <u>The Histories of Jacob and Esau</u> (c1557-58), <u>The Life and Repentanunce of Mary Magdalene</u> (1547-66), <u>Respublica</u> (1553), <u>The Play of Patient Grissell</u> (c1564-65), <u>Appius and Virginia</u> (c1567), <u>The Longer Thou Livest the More Fool Thou Art</u> (c1568), <u>Enough is as Good as a Feast</u> (c1568), <u>The Disobedient Child</u> (c1550), <u>New Custom</u> (c1570-73), <u>All for Money</u> (1559-77), <u>King John</u> (1560-63), <u>The Pedlar's Prophecy</u> (1561-63), <u>Like Will to Like</u> (c1567-68), <u>The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna</u> (c1562), <u>King Darius</u> (c1564-65), <u>Damon and Pithias</u> (1564), <u>The Trial of Treasure</u> (c1566), <u>July and Julian</u> (1560-

shall be declaryd" (7, 103, 127-38). The Messenger's wording in these instances suggests that the separation of him from the other players is deliberate. Similarly, the Prologue of Jack Juggler speaks of the actors as different from himself, telling the audience that if they are ready to see the play, "I woll goo shew *the actours* what your pleasure is,/ Which to wait upon you I know bee redie or this./ I woll goo send *them* hither in too your presens,/ Desiryng that *they* may have quiet audience" (80-83; emphasis added). This approach is much less common than the previous one; only two plays of the period use it, and yet it employs an unmistakeably and significantly different conception of presenters and their position in the play.

In still other plays, the position of the presenters is ambiguous; they speak of themselves both as one of the actors and as separate from them. The Andria (c1520) is largely a translation of Terence, but its prologue is not. Indeed, the opening speech argues for the efficacy of English as a language for complex concepts. The presenter refers to "our comedy," grouping himself with the actors, but also says "The players be come now! I do them see," implying that the players are other people, and that he is not among them (99, 102).

John Bale's plays God's Promises, John the Baptist's Preaching, The Temptation of Our Lord, and Three Laws (all 1538) also show this ambivalence towards the role of their presenters. At times, their presenters group themselves with the actors. Baleus Prolocutor concludes God's Promises by advising the audience, "[the] matters are soch that *we* have uttered here/ As ought not to slyde from your memoryall" and "More of thys matter conclude herafter *we* shall" (948, 982; emphasis added). In John the Baptist's Preaching, he speaks of the action "[whych] *we* entende before yow to declare" (7; emphasis added). In The Temptation of Our Lord, he uses "[take] the word of God, lete that be your defence/ So wyll Christ teache yow in *our* next

---

70), Misogonus (1560-77), The Three Ladies of London (1581), Sappho and Phao (1584), Campaspe (1584), and Gallathea (1585).

comedye" (30-31; emphasis added), and at the end, clarifies the play's views about fasting: "Lete non report *us* that here *we* condempne fastynge./ For it is not true — *we* are of no soch mynde./ But thys *we* covete..." (427-29; emphasis added). In these lines, Baleus Prolocutor clearly aligns himself with the other players.

However, almost as frequently as he speaks of himself as one of the players, he rhetorically separates himself from them. In The Temptation of Our Lord, he instructs the audience to "Lerne first in thys acte..." and "Marke in thys processe..." (15, 21), speaking of the play as distant and distinct from himself, not something he is part of. Similarly, in John the Baptist's Preaching, he says, "Thys vysyble sygne do here to yow declare..." (458), and in God's Promises, he provides the audience with the plot of the coming play, along with its moral, ending by assuring them that "[they] come that therof wyll shewe the certytyde" (35). In these lines, Baleus Prolocutor speaks of himself as distinct from the plays and the other actors.

In the same way, Tom Tyler and His Wife (c1563), Cambises (1558-59), A Marriage between Wit and Wisdom (c1571-77), Clyomon and Clamydes (c1570-83), The Conflict of Conscience (c1572-80), Common Conditions (1576), and The Tide Tarrieth no Man (1576) all have presenters whose relationship to the other players is ambiguous. In most, the presenters' wording suggests that they are both aligned with and separate from the other actors, such as in Tom Tyler and His Wife, in which the prologue says "we crave your silence and goodwill" but then asks the audience "to make them room and silence as you may,/ Which being done, they shall come in to play" (291). In A Marriage between Wit and Wisdom, two presenters, the Prologue and Epilogue (as listed in the doubling chart) appear. The Prologue speaks of himself as separate from the actors, while the Epilogue refers to what "we" have performed, so the overall position of presenters in the play is ambiguous.

A fourth and final approach taken by some sixteenth-century plays is to provide no information whatsoever about the relationship of the presenter to the other actors. In Godly Queen Hester (c1541-42), Lusty Juventus (c1550-53), and Gammer Gurton's Needle (c1551-54), no stance is taken about the position of the presenters. In Godly Queen Hester, "The Prologue" is included among the list of "The Names of the Players," but the opening speech of the play provides no rhetorical indication whether the prologue is considered to be one of the actors or separate from them. Similarly, Lusty Juventus includes "The Messenger" among its list of "The Personages that speake," but "The Prologue of the Messenger" does not speak of him as one of the actors. Nor should we assume that listing the presenter among the players necessarily indicates his connection to them. In The Nature of the Four Elements, "The Messengere" is included in the play's list ("Here folow the namys of the pleyers"), but the Messenger's actual speech rhetorically separates him from the players. In Gammer Gurton's Needle, no presenter is included in the list of players, and the prologue includes nothing to indicate whether the speaker is considered to be one of the actors or separate from them.

What we find, then, in the sixteenth century is that the use of presenters is widespread but it is not cohesive. Just over half over the plays position their presenters clearly as one of the actors, while about one-fourth are ambigous in their presentation, sometimes grouping the presenters with the actors and sometimes speaking of them as separate from the other players. The remaining plays, a full one-fourth of those that use presenters, either provide no information concerning the relationship of the presenters to the other actors or speak of him only as separate from the other actors. There is no discernible pattern — as, for instance, a change over time — in the different strategies of positioning the presenter. Since approximately 75% of the plays that use presenters align them with the players, although some of these also rhetorically separate the

presenters from the actors, there is an observable tendency to align the presenters with the other players, but the consensus seen in medieval drama has been lost.  Moreover, there is no consensus in the presenters' use of direct address. Whereas the presenters in medieval drama nearly always use heavily marked direct address, in sixteenth-century drama the presenters use anything from completely unmarked direct address, as in the prologue to <u>Gammer Gurton's Needle</u>, to heavily marked address, as in <u>Damon and Pithias</u> or <u>Respublica</u>.

It seems likely that the new vogue for classical drama in the sixteenth century was a reason for the near-ubiquitous but inconsistent usage of presenters in sixteenth-century drama. Classical drama was not unavailable during the Middle Ages, but the plays were studied more as examples of how to compose Latin rather than as performable plays, as Marie Axton says:  "The classical Roman dramatists provided schools in the Middle Ages primarily with models of Latin composition, though performance both of Terence and of the *comediae* inspired by him is now thought likely in twelfth-century England and France" (2).  However, interest in classical drama was growing by the beginning of the sixteenth century, again for the purposes of education, specifically to teach "public speaking and graceful deportment...through productions of Latin comedy" (M.Axton 2).  Terence's works were among the earliest and most popular of the classical plays, incorporated into the Cambridge curriculum in 1502, and widely enough known and desired among the non-university public to justify published editions of his plays; in 1495-97, six of his comedies were published by Richard Pynson (Lancashire xxiv).  Somewhat later in the sixteenth century, Plautus also became popular, providing, for example, the model and source for <u>Jack Juggler</u> (circa 1553-58).

Perhaps as important as Terence's and Plautus' plays, if not more so, was Donatus' critical description of what comedy should be like.  As Peter Happé says:

> [T]he critical writings of Donatus, the fourth-century grammarian, were used in close
>
> connection with the printed editions of Terence as instructional manuals.  Donatus
>
> showed the fourfold construction of comedy which became a standard of criticism for
>
> generations.  The division comprised the *prologue*, the *protasis* in which the characters
>
> were introduced, the *epitasis* in which the plot was complicated, usually of the basis of
>
> errors, 'perturbations' or misunderstandings, and the *catastrophe* in which there was a
>
> resolution of the errors and a happy ending (96).

According to Happé, Donatus' description of comedy was used as an 'instructional manual' and

became the standard understanding of how comedy should be structured 'for generations,' in

which case, Donatus' structure goes far towards helping us understand the spectacular increase in

the use of presenters after 1520.

Since Donatus includes a prologue as one of his four parts of comedy, a prologue is,

according to this structure, a necessary, essential part of a comedy, so it seems reasonable that

playwrights following Donatus' pattern would include a prologue.  Indeed, given the explosion

in the use of presenters in sixteenth-century drama compared to earlier drama, it seems fair to

attribute this new widespread use of presenters to the influence of Donatus' structure of comedy,

as well as the plays of Terence and Plautus, particularly when we recall that most sixteenth

century presenters are employed to give prologues.[23]

Donatus' description of the prologue, as well as Terence's and Plautus' handling of

prologues, also helps explain the inconsistency described above in the sixteenth-century use of

presenters.  In medieval drama, there is a clear concept of a special personage within the drama,

---

[23] Meg Twycross notes that "[in] early and modern editions, the plays of Terence are each preceded by a summary
of the plot written in the 2nd century A.D.  These summaries were certainly not part of the original performance"
(Terence 6).  But sixteenth-century readers and playwrights would have no way of knowing that the summaries were

a figure who is familiar with and comments upon the action of the drama but does not himself

participate in it, and is nevertheless part of the play, referring to himself as one of the actors.  In

Donatus' structure of comedy there is a concept of a special speech, the prologue, that occurs

before the play proper.  However, there is no corresponding concept of a special personage who

exists to deliver that speech. Donatus describes what prologues should do but does not specify

who gives the speech:

> The prologue is the first speech, called προλογος by the Greeks; that is, an address
>
> preceding the actual structure of the story.  There are four kinds of prologues:
>
> Συσατικος, a laudatory passage wherein the author or the story is praised; Αναπορικος,
>
> one in which an opponent is cursed or the audience thanked; Υποθετικος, one telling the
>
> plot of the play; and one, Μικτος, a composite which contains all of the above elements.
>
> There were some who wished this to be between a prologue and a preface, inasmuch as a
>
> prologue is to a certain extent the introduction of the story wherein something more is
>
> told than in the plot, to the audience; either from the poet or from needs of the drama
>
> itself or the actor.  The preface is where an account of the plot is given  (Clark 35).

Here, Donatus defines what a prologue is, describes four different types of prologues, and

explains what characterizes each type, but provides no statement concerning a special dramatic

personage who exists to give the prologue.  The prologue is, for Donatus, a speech, not a

dramatic figure.  In addition, his description makes it clear that he perceives the prologue as

something separate from the play, since he calls it, "an address preceding the actual structure of

the story."  Thus the notion of prologue coming into English dramaturgy from classical dramatic

---

not prologues originally intended to be part of the production, so for them, prologues would be perceived as part of
the structure.

theory was that of a speech, separate from the play proper, but with no indication about who should deliver that speech.

This conception of prologues is reflected in the plays of Terence and Plautus. Terence's plays have prologues, speeches that occur before the play itself and perform the functions described by Donatus. However, there is no special figure who exists to give these prologues. Neither the late fifteenth-century editions of Terence's comedies,[24] a modern Latin edition,[25] and two modern English translations[26] specify a speaker for the prologue. The notes to one modern edition indicate that most of these prologues were given by "L.Ambivius Turpio, the manager of the troupe and the most famous actor in Rome before Roscius" (Bovie 10). Likewise, in Plautus there are sometimes prologues though no special personages to present them, and indeed, the opening prologue is occasionally assigned to a character. There seems to be a concept in Plautus of a person who gives a prologue, as one gathers from remarks in one prologue concerning why an old man is giving the speech rather than a more typical young man, but these remarks indicate a convention of delivery rather than a convention of personage. Moreover, the ambiguity of role seen in the sixteenth-century drama's positioning of presenters is also observable in both Terence and Plautus's prologues, which tend to be ambivalent, speaking both of 'our play' and 'our poet' but also referring to the play as something separate.

The influence of classical drama seems apparent, then, in the sixteenth-century's ambivalent understanding of presenters. English playwrights, adopting the classical model of comedy, find the structure problematic. It is not clear who speaks the prologue, whether a separate special personage or one of the other players. Many playwrights adopt the medieval strategy of having special personages give the prologue, and group them with the actors. Others,

---

[24] Andria, Eununchus, Heuton Timorumenos, Adelphoe, Phormio, and Hecyra, printed 1495-97 by Richard Pryson.
[25] Perseus Digital Library, Tufts University.

as we have seen above, adopt different strategies, such as separating the presenters from the players, or simply providing no information at all about their relationship to the players. In many, the position of the presenters is ambiguous. Still, however, we see the influence of the medieval drama, composed earlier, but still being performed: nearly all sixteenth century plays that use prologues use special personages to deliver them, just as medieval drama had done.

The ambiguous position of their presenters did not escape the notice of sixteenth-century playwrights. They often appear aware of the conflicted nature of presenters and took steps to rectify this. Indeed, while the influence of classical drama upon sixteenth-century drama was substantial, the concepts adopted from classical drama were rapidly modified. As mentioned above, most sixteenth-century playwrights, perhaps troubled that no speaker is specified for the prologue in classical drama, provide one in their plays. In Lusty Juventus, there is a prologue that is spoken by 'the Messenger.' The same is true in Nice Wanton. The Disobedient Child provides a Prologue-speaker for the prologue.

Indeed, the impetus for providing a speaker for the adopted prologue is so strong that during the sixteenth century, 'prologue' went from meaning "a speech," as it did in the classical model of comedy described by Donatus, to being a special personage, the Prologue. The shift was not linear, for the more self-consciously classical English plays tended to stick more closely to the classical model no matter when they occur in the sixteenth century. Nevertheless, it is valid to say that over the course of the sixteenth century, there was an observable shift from 'prologues,' meaning speeches, to 'Prologues,' meaning personages. Republica and The Historie of Jacob and Esau both have speeches marked as prologues, but provide speakers called 'the prologue, a poete' for them in their lists of players. Later plays, such as New Custom, have a speech called 'the prologue' and give the speaker as 'the Prologue' in their list of the players'

---

[26] Palmer Bovie's Terence: The Comedies, and translation at Perseus Digital Library.

names. In <u>Common Conditions</u>, both a prologue and epilogue are provided in the text, but only a Prologue is listed among the players, and we may wonder if by this point the Prologue is so established that this figure would present both speeches. We know that by the writing of <u>Liberality and Prodigality</u> (c1567-68), the Prologue was indeed an established and expected figure, for the play provides a Prologue in its list of speakers although there is no prologue provided for the figure to deliver. By the end of the century, this special personage and its features and functions are well established, as is clear from these lines in <u>The Four Prentices of London</u> (c1592-94), "Doe you not know that I am the Prologue? Do you not see this long blacke cloke upon my backe? Have you not sounded thrice?...Nay, have I not all the signes of a Prologue about me? (1-5), which indicate that the play contains a concept of a Prologue as a special personage, recognizable by sight and with set functions and behaviors.

It seems likely that the modification of the classical model of 'prologue' from a speech to a special personage was the result of the collision of the existing — that is, medieval — dramaturgy and the classical concepts. Medieval presenters were clearly conceived of as special personages, whereas the classical prologues were conceived of as speeches. Sixteenth-century playwrights tended to follow the medieval model of constructing a special personage to deliver their classically-derived prologue. Furthermore, though medieval presenters were conceived and spoken of as members of the troupe, their sixteenth-century counterparts up until 1585 were ambivalently positioned as one of the actors, separate from them, or both.

Later in the sixteenth century, this issue would become resolved. The Chorus in Shakespeare's <u>Henry V</u>, for instance, consistently speaks of himself as one of the actors, asking the audience "[gently] to hear, kindly to judge, our play" (33) in his opening speech, and reminding the audience of earlier plays "which oft our stage hath shown" (13) in his epilogue,

behavior is typical of presenters in Shakespeare, as a quick perusal of his work indicates (the Chorus of <u>Romeo and Juliet</u>, the prologue and epilogue of <u>Henry the Eighth</u>). The medieval presenter becomes Prologue, embodying a concept adopted from classical drama.  By the end of the sixteenth century, presenters in English drama almost universally would bear titles drawn from classical drama.  However, their construction as a special personage who speaks of himself as one of the actors suggests that in concept and at core, they resemble medieval presenters far more, resulting in 'an Expositor's heart wrapp'd in a Prologue's hide.'

**Chapter 4: Compound Direct Address**

*"Historians of the drama have often taken direct address as evidence of crudity, but Lindsay, like Medwall and others before him, was wise in his generation, and one reason why he sustained the interest of 'ane exceeding greit nowmer of pepill' for so many hours may be that he set up no barriers but brought his audience into his play. Properly handled, no audience objects to participation." (F.P. Wilson 17-18)*

Stage directions are rare in early drama. We are therefore grateful for whatever scraps of stage direction have been left for us within the surviving play texts, particularly when they are as full and descriptive as those at the beginning of Henry Medwall's Nature:

> Fyrst cometh in Mundus (The Worlde) and syttyth down and sayth nothynge, and wyth hym Worldly Affeccyon berynge a gown and cap and a gyrdyll for Man.

> Than cometh in Nature, Man, Reason, (Sensualyte,) and Innocencye, and Nature syttyth down and sayth [his first speech]:

This stage direction, indicating the entrance of the characters before the play's action begins, is noteworthy for our purposes because it helps us recognize Nature's speech that follows as compound direct address, a special type of marked direct address in which a character speaks directly to both other character(s) on stage and, simultaneously, to the audience. The understanding that direct address can function in this way is not new; however, as with direct address itself, little work has been done on this concept beyond pointing out its existence. Like explicit direct address, compound direct address is recognizable by the use of rhetorical markers, such as vocatives, forms of the second person pronoun, and imperatives. In explicit direct address, the second person pronouns refer to the audience, but when compound direct address uses 'you,' the pronoun refers simultaneously to the other characters and the audience. In addition, compound direct address is characterized by the use of universalizing phrases, which indicate that the character's instruction or advice is beneficial for humanity as a whole, not just

for the characters on stage. Unlike other types of direct address, compound direct address is used almost exclusively by characters who represent virtue and/or holiness, and is used to provide instructions and advice. Furthermore, like explicit direct address, compound direct address is used strategically, reserved for moments in which intensity and emphasis are desired. Explicit direct address works well for most purposes, but sometimes more is needed, and a further level of intensity can be provided by compound direct address. However, the technique is so powerful that it can easily be overused, so early dramatists were extremely careful to limit the use of compound direct address, using it in small doses, at moments of high importance. Both the presence, and the limited, but strategic use, of compound direct address demonstrate the complex nature of medieval dramaturgy and the strategic way in which it was constructed. Compound direct address occurs most frequently in medieval drama, although it appears as well in some early sixteenth-century drama, but by the mid-sixteenth century, the technique was lost from English dramaturgy. Indeed, the career of compound direct address in early English drama is a reminder that English dramaturgy lost some functions, abilities, and techniques during the sixteenth century even while others were being added to its repertoire.

Nature's speech is a good locus within which to identify the characteristics and use of compound direct address. Nature's speech illustrates both types of rhetorical markers, the use of second-person pronouns and the use of universalizing phrases. She begins by stating that "[t]halmyghty God that made eche creature" established her as his minister, "[f]or thencheson that I shold perpetually/ Hys creatures in such degre mayntayne" as his plan dictates for them (1, 5-6). She says that she has authority over all God's creatures, a claim that alerts us to the potential that her coming speech might well be directed to both the audience and the characters

that accompany her, and continues by explaining her role and responsibilities as God's minister. She then disavows any need for further examples of her power, saying,

> What nedeth yt to speke of thyngys here bylow
>
> As fowles, bestys, and fysshes in theyre kynde?...
>
> One thyng be *ye* sure and thynk yt in *your* mynde:
>
> *No maner creature may take on hym* the cure
>
> Of these workys but onely I, Nature.  (29-35; emphasis added)

In this passage we see both types of rhetorical markers that characterize compound direct address.  Nature addresses someone (audience and characters) directly, using the pronoun 'ye,' and also uses a universalizing phrase — "No maner creature may take on hym."  Taken together, these constructions indicate that she addresses her comments not just to the characters that accompany her, but the audience as well.  The universalizing phrase, in combination with the forms of 'you' that she uses, indicate that the audience is intended to be direct recipients of this instruction, not merely to overhear her instructions to the other characters.

Similarly, later in the speech, Nature again employs forms of the second person pronoun "you" (53, 54, and 57), and another universalizing phrase, "My self addresse to do hys hygh pleasurs/ And to thys same move all other creaturs" (69-70).  This particular universalizing phrase is striking.  Here, Nature is not just asserting her authority over all God's creatures, but gives them a command, urging "all other creaturs" to obey God's behests as she does.  This makes even more certain the identification of her speech as compound direct address.  The audience, as part of 'all other creaturs,' is spoken to directly by Nature, as she simultaneously instructs the other characters.

The lines which immediately follow provide further evidence for recognizing that Nature's speech is compound direct address; she continues, "[e]nforce you therfore, hys creaturs eche on,/ To honour your maker wyth humble obeysance" (71-72). As above, she employs both the pronoun 'you,' and a universalizing phrase, "hys creaturs eche on." In the presence of such universalizing phrases, Nature's use of 'you' implies an audience wider than that of the characters sitting beside her; the audience watching the play is included; and in this particular example, as in the one above, Nature gives a command — "Enforce you therfore, hys creaturs eche on" — which also indicates that her focus includes both audience and characters. Furthermore, after this point, Nature narrows her focus ("Namely thow, Man, I speke to the alone," she says, and proceeds to explain to the character Man his particular responsibilities), which also indicates that her speech before was more widely directed.

Nature's opening speech, then, provides a good model for recognizing compound direct address. We see here the markers and universalizing phrases, which are the rhetorical hallmarks of compound direct address, as well as the provision of holy or moral instruction to both the audience and characters within the play. As we shall see, there are other functions that compound direct address is used for, but this one is by far the most common; approximately half of the instances of compound direct address perform this function.

Nature's speech provides a good model of compound direct address, but attractively clear and simple, it is somewhat static. In medieval drama, compound direct address tends to be used not just for moments of holy instruction, but for the most important holy instruction: how to get to Heaven. We see this fundamental use of compound direct address in the Last Judgment plays, which exists in all four extant cycles, and the Doubting Thomas episodes, which appear in the Chester, York, and Towneley cycles.

The Chester, York, Towneley, and, to a lesser extent, N-town, <u>Judgment</u> plays use compound direct address to underscore their message. When Jesus speaks to the good and bad souls gathered for the judgement, he speaks simultaneously to the audience. In the Chester <u>Judgment</u>, Jesus uses universalizers (such as, "Behould now, all men!", "Therefore eych man reacon his," and in several instances, "man" as an vocative), as well as using the pronoun "you" in its various forms profusely, 25 times in this 79 line speech, indicating that he is speaking to the audience as well as the representative good and bad souls before him. Indeed, the Chester speech leads to a conclusion which is unmistakably wide in the scope of its address:

Nowe that *you* shall appertly see

Freshe blood bleede, *man*, for *thee*—

Good to joye and full greate lee,

The evyll to damnatyon.

*Behould nowe, all men*! *Looke* on mee

And see my blood freshe owt flee

That I bleede on roode-tree

For *your* salvatyon.

Howe durst *you* ever doe amys

When *you* unthought *you* of this,

That I bleede to bringe *you* to blys

And suffered such woo.

Me *you* must not white, iwysse,

Though I doe nowe as right ys.

Therefore *eych man* reacon his,

For ryghtwysenes must goo.  [421-436; emphasis added]

Clearly, the rhetorical markers indicate the dual address of this speech.  Jesus instructs both

crowd and characters about their need for salvation, and how to obtain it, as well as their

responsibilities after having received it.  The speech emphasizes the importance of its message

by using the rare technique of compound direct address, and doing so so firmly that the audience

cannot help but understand that the message is meant for them, not just for the good and bad

souls assembled on the stage.

Similarly the York and Towneley Judgement plays employ compound direct address to

emphasize mankind's need for salvation. [27]  As in Chester, the dual focus of the speech is

unmistakable.  It begins, "Ilke a creature, takes entent/ What bodworde I to you bringe," using

both the universalizer "ilke a creature" and the "you" marker (Y:  229; T:  560).  Here, as in

Chester, Jesus instructs the gathered souls and the audience about their need for salvation and

how the opportunity for salvation has been obtained for them:

Here may *?e* see my woundes wide,

Þe whilke I tholed for *youre* mysdede.

Thurgh harte and heed, foote, hande and hide,

Nought for my gilte, butt for *youre* nede.

*Beholdis* both body, bak, and side,

How dere I bought *youre* brotherhede.

Þes bittir peynes I wolde abide—

To bye *you* blisse þus wolde I bleede...

*Behalde, mankynde*, þis ilke is I,

---

[27] Since those two plays contain parallel passages, the Towneley play in all likelihood copied from the York play, I will discuss these two plays together, giving quotations from the York version.

Þus was I dight for *thy* folye—

*Man, loke, thy* liffe was to me full leffe.

Þus was I dight þi sorowe to slake;

*Manne*, þus behoued *þe* to borowed be.

In all my woo toke I no wrake,

Mi will itt was for þe loue of *þe*.

*Man*, sore aught *þe* for the quake,

Þis dreadfull day þis sight to see.

All þis I suffered for *þi* sake—

Say, *man*, what suffered *þou* for me?  (245-276; emphasis added)

With the markers emphasized as above, the indication of the dual address of the speech becomes

obvious; clearly, both characters and crowd are addressed as 'mankind' and called to recognize

their need for salvation and accept it.

And indeed, the suggestion that these speeches in the Last Judgment plays address the

audience as well as the representative saved and damned souls is unlikely to surprise scholars of

medieval drama.  Martin Stevens and A.C. Cawley, editors of the Towneley plays, comment that

"[e]ach [of Jesus' parallel speeches in the York and Towneley Last Judgment plays], moreover,

is addressed to mankind, and, by implication, also to the audience" (Volume 2 643).  What is

interesting, then, about these passages is not that they are direct address in general but that they

are instances of compound direct address in specific.  Compound direct address is rare; in the 91

plays considered in this study, there are just under 70 instances of compound direct address,

compared to nearly 1,000 instances each of both explicit direct address and implicit direct

address.  In other words, there are over ten times as many occurrences of explicit direct address

and implicit direct address as there are of compound direct address. Like explicit direct address, compound direct address is employed as a type of rhetorical and dramatic underscoring. But the impact of compound direct address is even stronger than that of explicit direct address, and hence its use is more limited. Not surprisingly, the Last Judgment plays provide an excellent example of this focused use of compound direct address. In these speeches, the audience, along with the good and bad souls, hear Jesus' declaration that judgment has (will) come and salvation or damnation is (will be) determined. Like John upon the isle of Patmos, the audience experiences the end, and lives to tell about it — and to change, if they choose, given that experience.

Moreover, the effect of compound direct address here and elsewhere is stronger than that of explicit direct address because the crucial message is provided by two methods simultaneously. The audience is both given instruction directly, and provided with a representative of itself in the characters who are also given instruction, who model either the correct or incorrect way to respond to the instruction. The intensity of the compound direct address — the number of rhetorical markers used within the passage — suggests the degree of seriousness of the concepts that it presents. Thus, in the case of the Last Judgment plays, the audience experiences the hope of salvation or fear of damnation directly through Jesus' address to them, and simultaneously, through the souls' reactions to the call to judgment.

Compound direct address is used to similar effect in the Doubting Thomas episodes. As in the Judgment plays, the Doubting Thomas plays use compound direct address to emphasize a moment of intense spiritual significance, directing the character and the audience to the importance of belief in Jesus in order to be saved. And in the Chester Emmaus, Jesus speaks in strikingly clear compound direct address. He speaks first to Thomas alone ("Yea, Thomas, thou sees nowe in me...") but quickly switches to addressing the audience as well, as indicated by the

use of universalizing phrases ("But blessed must they all be," "Whoeso to this wyll consent," "Whoeso to this wyll not consent," "Whosoever on my Father hath any mynd," and "for all you thyder shall goe" [254, 260, 264, 268, and 275]) and second person pronouns (e.g. "on a crosse your sowles did bye" [258]). We note here the use of the plural — "your sowles" — clearly indicating its dual focus. In addition, we see in this speech repeated use of the universalizing phrase 'whosoever....,' a common marker in compound direct address. It is not difficult to see why this is so; a character commenting, 'whosoever wishes to...' seems eager to have his statements applied beyond the scope of the particular situation he currently considers. The use of those words in particular seems to suggest a desirable generalization of a character's comments, which also shows us that his statements are directed at both the other characters and the audience. Jesus emphasizes to Thomas and to the audience the importance of faith in him, encouraging the audience to believe, as Thomas does, though they must do so with faith deeper than that of Thomas, for they must believe without seeing.

In the same way, in the York The Incredulity of Thomas, Jesus begins his final speech by addressing Thomas ("Thomas, for þou haste sene þis sight..." [187]) but soon shifts his focus to include the audience ("but ilka wight,/ Blissed by they euere/ þat trowis haly in my rising right,/ And saw it neuere" [189-92]). Here we see another common universalizer, 'ilka.' As in the case of the universalizer 'whosoever,' statements about what 'ilka,' 'each,' or 'every' person ought to do imply an intention that the instruction be understood as generally applicable. Not every use of this phrase indicates that compound direct address is being used, but when we see such phrases, we should be alert to that possibility, because they frequently function as universalizers. Here, as in the previous example, the audience is both urged to imitate and go beyond the faith of Thomas, and to gain salvation through their faith in Jesus.

The use of compound direct address is even more strongly indicated in the Towneley _Thomas of India_, where compound direct address is used in two separate scenes. First, when Jesus appears to the all the apostles except Thomas, he greets them, tells them not to be afraid, and explains both to them and the audience the significance of his death and resurrection. The audience, along with the disciples, is told to "[behold] my woundes fyfe," for "[of] syn who will hym shryfe/ Thyes woundys shal be his boytt" (139, 143-44). We note here the universalizing phrase that indicates that his instruction is directed beyond the characters to the audience as well. Others, such as "[man] sawll, my dere derlyng" and the use of "man" as a vocative, occur in the speech also, as do several forms of the second person pronoun. Later, Jesus appears when Thomas is present, who then repents of his unbelief, after which Jesus instructs both him and the audience together. As above, several universalizing phrases are employed in this scene, indicating the double focus ("Whoso hath not trowid right," "Those that trow in my myght," and "All that it trowest and not se" [625, 629, and 645]). The use of compound direct address to instruct the audience not once but twice in this play suggests the importance of its instruction, and its concern that the audience understand this instruction, suggesting again that compound direct address is reserved for moments of most crucial importance.

In these scenes, the audience is spoken to without mitigating or deflecting filters, such as a pretense that they are part of the play's action or that they are simply 'the audience' at a play. They are instead included as part of the same spiritual reality that the play represents, making the instruction undeniably relevant to their real existence. As in the Last Judgment plays, the presence of Thomas and the other disciples further enhances the audience's reception of the message; they are given both the message, and an example of how to respond to it. Compound direct address is a comparatively rare but powerful technique for emphasizing a play's spiritual

content, one that we can fully appreciate only when we consider direct address as a collection of techniques, each used in different situations and to different effects.

As stated above, its use in emphasizing important spiritual issues, particularly the need for salvation, is the most common way that it is employed. The previous examples of this use of compound direct address (those found in the Last Judgment and Doubting Thomas episodes) are particularly fine ones, but other instances exist. In the Chester Antichrist play, Helias (Elijah) warns against putting faith in the false Christ ("I warne you, all men, wytterlye" [293]). In the Chester Noah, God cautions both the characters and the audience against murder ("Manslaughter also aye yee shall flee...They that sheden blood, hee or shee,/ ought-where amongste mankynde" [293, 295-96]). The method is used in the York Transfiguration by "Pater in nube" to instruct "[þe] febill of faithe, folke affraied" that "[who] trowis þis stedfastly/ Shall byde in endles blisse" (169, 179-80), and in the York Ascension, in Jesus' speech given just before he is taken up into heaven (81-176). In the Towneley Ascension, after Jesus' departure, the angels give instructions, using the phrases "[whoso] his byddyng will obey...And who that wyrk amys..." (326, 330). And in the Towneley Lazarus, Jesus says, "I warne you, both man and wyfe/ That I am rysyng and I am life;/ And whoso truly trowys in me/ That I was euer and ay shall be/ Oone thyng I shall hym gif:/ Though he be dede, yit shall he lif" (51-56). As with the instances found in the Judgment and Doubting Thomas plays, in these examples compound direct address is used sparingly, to emphasize significant spiritual concerns.

Compound direct address occurs more commonly in cycle plays than in other types of medieval drama, but it is not exclusive to them. In Mankind, the weeping Mercy uses it to chastise first the character Mankind alone, then both the audience-as-mankind and the character together, saying: "[man] onkynde, wherever thou be! for all this world was not aprehensyble,/

To dyscharge thin orygynall offence, thraldom and captyvyte,/ Tyll Godys own welbelouye son was obedient and passyble./ I dyscomende and disalow thin oftyn mutabylyte./ To every creature thou art dyspectuouse and odyble" (742-47). Mercy is direct here, driving home his message of man's depravity and necessary salvation, both to the absent but clearly addressed character Mankind and to the audience, in his use of compound direct address, which is recognizable here through his use of the universalizing phrase '[man] onkynde, wherever thou be!" and his multiple use of second person pronouns. In Wisdom, the title character says to Anima, and the audience with her, "[to] all clene sowlys I am full hende" and "[wo] takyt me to spowse may veryly wene/ Yff above all thynge ye love me specyall/ That rest and tranqwyllyte he shall sene/ And de in sekyrnes of joy perpetuall" (45, 57-60). Here we note again the indications of compound direct address, in the universalizing phrase "[wo] takyt me to spowse..." and the "ye" which follows it, in this context clearly addressed dually to Anima and the audience. In Mundus et Infans, Age (now repentant) asks Perseverance whether there is any more instruction "[that] is necessary to all mankind/ Freely for to know?" (899-900). The compound direct address thus neatly set up, Perseverance answers, "[that which] every man must on believe" (902).

In the Croxton Play of the Sacrament, the usage of the method deserves closer consideration. As with Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice, the Croxton Play of the Sacrament can be a difficult experience for modern readers, for whom the anti-Semitism is both painful and embarrassing. An analysis of the direct address in the Croxton play, though, suggests that the play is not simply, or at least solely, one that exists to afford the audience the anti-Semitic pleasure of seeing unbelieving Jews foolishly torment Christ, then be ashamed and converted through a miracle. Jesus, appearing as "an image...with woundys bledyng," does indeed rebuke Jonathan and his servants who have been abusing the Host in an attempt to

disprove the doctrine of transubstantiation, saying, "Oh, ye merveylows Jewys,/ Why ar ye to yowr kyng onkynd?" (712; 719-20). But after they repent, He speaks again:

> *All ye* that desyryn my serauntys for to be
>
> And to fullfyll the preceptys of my lawys,
>
> The intent of commandement knowe *ye*:
>
> Ite et ostendite vos sacerdotibus meis.
>
> To *all you* that desyre in eny wyse
>
> To aske mercy, to graunt yt redy I am.
>
> *Remember and lett yowr* wyttys suffyce,
>
> Et tunc non auertam a vobis faciem meam. (762-69; emphasis added).

Jesus speaks here in compound direct address. The onlookers are not allowed simply to gloat over the harsh conversion of Jonathan and his servants; the play does not pander solely to the sadly universal desire to see the bad guys punished. Rather, Jesus' speech here shortcircuits self-righteousness on the audience's part by reminding them, immediately after the conversions, of their own need to rely upon God's mercy, and of the fact that mercy is freely and widely available to whomever requests it.

Indeed, the construction of this passage as compound direct address has the effect of placing the audience into the same category as the repentant Jews. Addressed simultaneously, audience and characters are thus grouped together, the implication being that the audience is to recognize in what ways they resemble the figures before Jesus. If the audience has been enjoying watching these characters punished for their impious desire to test the Host, if they have been enjoying the Jews' terror and repentance when the miracle appears, this speech, directed both to the audience and to these characters, must be intended to shock the audience out of their

smug conviction of their own superiority.  The anti-Semitism inherent in this play, painful as it

is, is mitigated somewhat by — or at least should be understood as existing within the context of

— an assertion that the audience's own need for mercy makes them the equal of the offending

characters.

The second most common function for compound direct address is to explain religious

commandments and rituals, frequently in the form of the ten commandments.  For example, in

the N-town Presentation of Mary, Episcopus uses compound direct address to explain the ten

commandments both to Mary and to the audience.  As usual, the method is identifiable by its

rhetorical markers — particularly in his usage of the universalizing statement that the

commandments "must be kept of all Crysten men" (172).  Similarly, Jesus explains the ten

commandments in the York Christ and the Doctors, using the rhetorical marker of "whoso" as a

universalizing phrase:  "Whoso ther two fulfilles then," he says, and "Thez are þe biddingis x,/

Whoso will lelly layte" (161; 191-92). In the Chester Moses play, God presents the ten

commandments to Moses and "all my people that bine here" (2).[28]

Compound direct address is also used to explain religious rituals, baptism being the most

frequent example.  In the York Baptism, Jesus explains to John the Baptist that his baptism sets

an example for all mankind, saying, "[and] sithen myselffe haue taken mankynde,/ For men

schall me per myrroure make/ And haue my doyng in ther mynde/ Also I do þe baptyme take"

(92-95), and also explains why baptism is necessary, saying, "[what] man þat trowis and baptised

bes/ Schall saued be and come to blisse" (162-63).  These statements, addressed within the

structure of the play's narrative to John the Baptist, but simultaneously addressed to the audience

as well, reinforce for the audience members why this element of their faith is important.  The

method of compound direct address is here, again, reserved for concepts crucial to the audience's spiritual health, the double address serving as a dramatic form of highlighting. Also, just as in the previous instances of the primary use of compound direct address, we see in these examples that the characters addressed provide a model for the audience. The characters' response to the information provides another way for the audience to understand the importance of what is being explained.

A third but highly uncommon way in which compound direct address is used, is to provide advice or instruction to the audience under the guise of one character commenting to another. For example, in the Brome <u>Abraham and Isaac</u>, Deus commands his angel to go tell Abraham to sacrifice his son, then comments, "All men schall take exampyll hym be/ My commaumentys how they schall fulfyll" (45-46). Here, Deus' statement is part of his speech to his angel, but the instruction within it is directed towards the audience. It is more insistent in its wording than statements that exist simply for the instruction of the audience, since its phrasing, "all men schall take exampyll hym be," is constructed as a command, one which must be directed at the audience; the angel has no need of it. It is thus more forceful than a statement that is simply meant to be 'overheard' by the audience. Moreover, this statement makes the best sense if understood as compound direct address, since it is best performed by having Deus turn his head and look at the audience to speak these lines, continuing his speech to the angel but indicating by his posture and gaze the real focus of these lines. Similarly, in the York <u>Death of Christ</u>, Joseph of Arimathea comments to Nichodemus after they remove Jesus' body from the Cross that "[all] mankynde may marke in his mynde/ To see her þis sorowfull sight" (365-66).

---

[28] This particular use of compound direct address is typical in that it is being used to explain a religious commandment or ritual, but it is unusual in that it 'assigns' the audience a role within the current action, that of the Israelites, whereas most compound direct address speaks to the audience as audience.

This use of compound direct address is exceedingly rare, but follows the observed characteristics of compound direct address, and to interpret it as such makes the best sense in context.

Another rare but noteworthy use of compound direct address is its employment by evil characters. Hitherto the examples discussed have been found in speeches given by virtuous characters for virtuous purposes — to instruct the audience about salvation, explain an element of faith, or provide advice. But there are a very few instances — fewer than five in the surviving plays — in which compound direct address is used by an evil character for an evil purpose, and it is worth considering these rare occasions.

In the Chester Antichrist, Antichrist urges the audience as well as the characters surrounding him to worship him, saying, "Nowe will I dye, that you shall see,/ And ryse agayn through my postee./ I will in grave that you put mee/ And worshippe me alonne...Then will I ryse as I have sayde-/ Take tent to me eycheone!" (121-24,127-28). Similarly, in the Digby Mary Magdalene, the "hethen prest" commands all the assembled beings, saying, "lordys and ladys, lesse and more/ Knele all don wyth good devocyon./ Yonge and old, rych and pore,/ Do yower oferyng to Sentt Mahownde" (1202-5), making the command again soon after (1230-48.) In Mankind¸ Mischief calls his court together and makes his speech — "Take hede, sers, yt stoude you on hande" — addressing himself to his lackeys but also assuming that the audience is part of the 'felyschyppe' to be summoned (as they are, then, by Nowadays: "All manere of men and comun women/ To the cort of Myschyff other cum or sen!" [666-67]). The implications of how direct address is used in Mankind will be discussed more fully in a later chapter; suffice it to say here that this use of compound direct address is an indication of the audience's relationship to the devils. Mischief's familiar address to the audience members, and his grouping of them with his

lackeys, suggests the audience's position at that moment, and reveals much about the play's treatment of the audience.

Hitherto, we have discussed only examples of the technique of compound direct address which are found in medieval drama, a reflection of the general usage of compound direct address. While examples do exist in later drama, the preponderance of instances occurs in works which are usually identified as being medieval drama; of the approximately 70 instances of compound direct address, about 60 occur in the medieval plays. When we consider the later plays, we find that in earlier examples, there are in general no surprises in the usage of the technique, but that ultimately, by the later examples, the technique is lost.

As in the medieval examples, the bulk of the early modern — mostly Tudor — instances of compound direct address provide holy or moral instruction to the audience and characters. Henry Medwall's Nature contains two examples, the first mentioned earlier, at the beginning of this chapter. As discussed previously, in this speech Nature instructs the audience, and the characters who accompany her, concerning her role as God's minister, and their duties as God's creatures. In the second, Reason explains to Man, and the audience as well, what temptations humanity faces in life from the World, the Flesh, and the Enemy (1-49). In the Nature of the Four Elements, which uses Nature as one of its sources, Natura Naturata has a speech of compound direct address very similar to Nature's, in which he explains to Humanity and Studious Desire his role as God's minister and the way in which the cosmos is constructed (148-203). In John the Evangelist, John preaches to Actio and Eugenio, urging repentance; that this speech is directed simultaneously to the audience is clear from its rhetorical markers ("All they that praiseth themself do sin, be you sure," for instance, and "Who deemeth himself good is far therefro," "You and all they that it doth sustain" [367]).

In these examples, compound direct address is used in the same way that it was most commonly employed in medieval drama. We should note, though, that the plays in which these examples occur are generally considered to be separate from medieval drama for reasons other than chronology. Henry Medwall's Nature is actually a late fifteenth-century production, dating from 1495. The Nature of the Four Elements dates from around 1517-20, and John the Evangelist to before 1520. In comparison, the Digby Mary Magdalene dates from 1480-1520, Everyman to c.1510-19, and the cycles were modified throughout the sixteenth century. Recent scholarship on early English drama has therefore tended to focus upon the continuities among these plays, rather than upon their differences. In the area of compound direct address, we do indeed see continuity rather than change in the early part of the sixteenth century.

This continuity continues into the 1520s. The plays of John Heywood, arguably the preeminent playwright of the 1520s and 30s, reveal this continuity, though we begin to see some variation. In The Foure PP, for instance, (c1520-22), the Pedlar instructs the other characters, along with the audience, that there are many ways of pursuing virtue, and Christians ought not to scorn their fellows' different methods of doing so. We note here the characteristic use of rhetorical markers by which we recognize the compound direct address (for instance, "And so for all that do pretende/ By ayde of Goddes grace, to ensewe/ And maner kynde of vertue" [1156]), and that the compound direct address is employed at a moment of crucial importance, to underscore the play's message and it applicability to the audience.

Similarly, in The Play of Love (c1528-33), the final two speeches universalize the message, including the audience in their focus. "First Lover Loved," in a speech of clear compound direct address (it begins, "Thus not we foure but al the world beside/ Knowledge them selfe or other in joy or payne" [1557-58]), explains, at the end of their debate over who is most

happy, that everyone should be content in whatever their situation (1557-63). "Lover Not Loved" follows this up, adding that the humans should pursue the love of Christ, who was content, for love, to suffer for mankind (1564-70). We see here, then, a variation in the use of compound direct address. As with prior examples, the address here is used to emphasize the play's message to the audience, though only part of that message is explicitly holy.

In the same way, The Play of the Weather ends with Jupiter's declaration that he has made peace throughout the earth, and that "all ye that on yerth sojourne" ought "to know us your lord onely" (1250-51). Here, we see a significant change in the use of compound direct address, which underscores the message of the play, but only briefly. Most of this passage is concerned with Jupiter's declaration that he does not need to boast about himself, though everyone ought to reverence and rejoice in him. Moreover, the message here is not one of crucial spiritual significance, the knowledge of which is important for the ultimate wellbeing of the audience's souls. In addition, the use of compound direct address in this way by *Jupiter* differs substantially from its usage hitherto; Jupiter may represent virtue or heavenly power, but in the cultural context of this play, he is a fictional character, not a representation of a true deity. It may be argued that Jupiter is being used here to represent the true God, but one wonders why Heywood would have chosen to do so, since it was not yet illegal — or even, to judge from other plays of the period, unacceptable — to represent the true God in drama. This speech from The Play of the Weather, then, illustrates a significant break with prior usage of compound direct address. All Heywood's plays were written within about twenty years, and The Play of the Weather is an early one (from c1519-28, according to Ian Lancashire), so it would be invalid to suggest a straight chronological change in the way that compound direct address is used. In the case of Heywood, what we can see is that he can and does use compound direct address for its traditional

purposes, but that traditional use is not, for him, its exclusive use; he also sees no problem with employing the technique in the unusual way he does in The Play of the Weather.

Especially given the example of Heywood, we see that it is dangerous to make claims about how compound direct address changed over time, given that the we see Heywood using the technique in both traditional and nontraditional ways. However, as we move further into the sixteenth century, we find evidence that the usage of compound direct address changed significantly over time. In John Bale's King John, Veritas uses compound direct address to instruct the other characters and the audience that the King is God's minister and that they owe him certain duties. There is a plethora of universalizers, suggesting the play's concern that the audience understand that this instruction applies to them as well (e.g. "He that condempneth a kyng..." [2350]; see also 2351, 2352, and 2354). In this instance, then, compound direct address is used to emphasize the play's message and its relevance to the audience, but the matter here is secular, not sacred. King John was written originally c.1534, revised after 1538 into a one-book form (the A-text), and revised again, reaching its final form in 1560-63. This instance of compound direct address was present in the play's A-text form, and not removed as Bale revised later, suggesting both that compound direct address could be acceptably used in this new way around 1538, and that it remained comprehensible as a technique in the 1560s.

In the same way, Sir David Lindsay's Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis (c.1552) uses compound direct address in a form technically identical to its earlier usages, but for a secular purpose. As does King John, Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis considers the management of the kingdom, and the relationship of the king to religion, particularly in regards to his responsibilities to help the poor rather than to advance the rich. Compound direct address is used to emphasize that concern. In one instance, the Doctour of Divinitie preaches, exhorting the characters and the

audience about their religious duties, which are clearly outlined in the Bible for "quha-sa lists to reid the veritie" (3480).  In the second, Diligence announces to the characters and the audience what laws have been enacted by Parliament (3823-3981).  The joint concerns of religion and kingdom, and their relationship, are clear from these two usages of compound direct address.

As the sixteenth century continued, compound direct address grew rarer and weaker.  In Lewis Wager's The Life and Repentance of Mary Magdalene (c1547-66), Mary Magdalene asks Justification to explain Christ's statement that her sins are forgiven because she has loved much. We have seen how in earlier drama such a scenario sets up a virtuous character to instruct both a character and the onlookers.  In this case, though, Justification dips into compound direct address only weakly; the only universalizers he employs are found in the sentences, "[it] were a great errour for any man to beleue..."(2059) and "[the] which Iustification here I do represent,/ Which remayn with all suche as be penitent" (2085-86).  Moreover, his speech is not consistently constructed as compound direct address.  Justification frequently uses forms of 'you' that can only refer to Mary Magdalene alone, shortcircuiting the speech's ability to direct itself to the audience as well.  For example, Justification refers to Jesus' recitation of a parable to Mary Magdalene (2075).  This is an example of direct address that is not clearly and absolutely compound.

Other than the retained compound direct address in King John, the technique is used in only two instances in the 1560s, and they are sorry remnants of a proud tradition indeed.  In Tom Tyler and His Wife (c.1563), the characters Destiny and Desire enter, according to a footnote, and proceed to introduce themselves to the audience and to each other.  They respond to each other's statements, so they clearly have heard what the other said.  That they would introduce themselves to the audience is no surprise; we have seen that this is a function of both explicit and

implicit direct address.  Compound direct address, though, was never used in this way in the earlier drama.  Likewise, in <u>The Longer Thou Livest</u>, Wrath calls out "make room!" to both the other characters and the audience (636-37), a usage for which compound direct address is not traditionally employed.  We can see, then, that by the 1560s, compound direct address had vanished.  A major medieval technique, of considerable import and effect, was no longer available to playwrights by the last half of the sixteenth century.  The dramatic theory that allowed for the use of compound direct address to emphasize moments of intense spiritual importance (and largely precludes asides, we recall) has been modified extensively; compound direct address as a viable technique has been lost.

Moreover, it was lost so thoroughly by the time the Chester manuscripts were being copied that the example of compound direct address in the Moses play (in which Deus speaks to Moses and "all my people that bine here") has been mislabeled by what I submit is a later, interpolated stage direction, "ad Moysen."  This stage direction does not exist in manuscript H's version of that play, which varies in many respects from the other copies but for this speech is very similar.  Indeed, these Chester manuscripts are full of stage directions indicating who is being spoken to, unlike any other medieval plays (and most early English drama generally), suggesting, I would argue, a later scribe's discomfort with or ignorance of the way that direct address techniques were employed in earlier English drama.

Compound direct address, then, flourishes as a technique reserved for moments of special import and significance throughout medieval drama, to give instruction (particularly about salvation), and to explain religious rituals, one used almost exclusively by holy characters, one which addresses the audience as themselves rather than through rhetorical or conceptual filters.  It survived into the first half of the sixteenth century, then vanished.  The landscape of English

dramaturgy had changed radically by the 1560's, and compound direct address was not longer part of the typography.  But we can recognize this loss only after we have recognized that compound direct address once existed, and thus it provides a good example of why this project has been necessary.  Only by considering direct address in detail, rather than assuming that its functions and effects are obvious, can we see the delicate details of its construction, particularly ones that were lost as English dramaturgy was radically reconstructed during the sixteenth century.

## Chapter 5: Direct Address by Characters in Medieval Drama

*"My purpose is to...explore [soliloquy's] six-hundred-years' reign in the theatre of England. The one exemption*
*which may rightly be claimed in such exploration is the patent impossibility of an exhaustive treatment...*
*Shakespearean soliloquy alone is voluminous;*
*the mass of medieval English soliloquy is far greater." (Skiffington ix)*

In medieval drama, characters frequently speak directly to the audience, which for many scholars provides one of the most striking, memorable, and appealing elements of this drama. God begins the cycles, openly declaring himself and expounding upon what he will create; devils address the crowd and try to lure them; tyrants like Herod and Pilate command and verbally abuse the audience; Jesus appeals to the crowd from the cross; prophets and other holy people advise and instruct. We quickly think of examples such as these when we consider characters addressing the crowd in medieval drama, but do they use direct address in same way, and for the same effect? Do the devils' lures and Jesus's appeals work in the same manner? When the crucified Christ appeals to the crowd in the York cycle, is the effect the same as when he does so in the Towneley cycle?

I think not. The effects of direct address depend upon both the way in which the technique is used in particular instances and the way that the technique is used throughout the work as a whole. We find that seemingly similar instances, such as Jesus's calls from the cross in various <u>Crucifixion</u> plays, function differently depending upon their larger context. Moreover, medieval plays do not employ direct address for a uniform effect; rather, direct address has different effects depending upon how it has been constructed. Direct address is often discussed as if its primary functions were to create a relationship with the audience and provide exposition or homily, with the implication that the use of direct address for these purposes is rather obvious and natural. However, we find that it is not used solely for these purposes, but can be employed

for more complicated dramatic effects.  Moreover, even when it is used for its 'basic' functions, its effects are not necessarily easily or simply created.  In addition, the dramaturgy of the middle ages allows a wide range of use of the technique; there are plays which use no direct address at all, such as the Brome <u>Abraham and Isaac</u>, and plays such as <u>The Castle of Perseverance</u>, which is steeped in direct address.

The Brome <u>Abraham and Isaac</u> ends with a special personage, a doctor, who gives the moral using direct address, but within the narrative body of the play the characters never directly address the audience.  Abraham's musings about whether to kill Isaac (which take place while the angel is present) are constructed as prayer:

> I had lever, yf God had be plesyd
>
> For to a forbore all the goods that I have,
>
> Than Ysaac my son schuld a be desessyd,
>
> So God in Hevyn my sowll mot save!
>
> I loyvd never thyng soo mych in erde,
>
> And now I must the chyld goo kyll.
>
> Lord God, my conseons ys strongly steryd,
>
> And yyt my dere Lord, I am sore aferd
>
> To groche ony thyng ayens yowre wyll.
>
> I love my chyld as my lyff,
>
> But yyt I love my God myche more,
>
> For thow my hart woold make ony stryffe,
>
> Yyt wyll I not spare for chyld nor wyffe,
>
> But don after my Lordys lore.

Thow I love my sonne never so wyll,

Yyt smyth off hys hed sone I schall.

Fader of Hevyn, to thee I knell,

An hard deth my son schall fell

For to honore thee, Lord, wythall.  (72-90)

The speech is worth quoting at length here because of the importance of its construction; it is

entirely composed as prayer, carefully and consistently indicating that the speech is directed to

God, and hence not to the audience directly; Abraham repeatedly reminds us that his words are

directed to the "Lord God," "my dere Lord," and "Fader of Hevyn."  Other Abraham and Isaac

plays, such as the pageant in York, tend to construct Abraham's thinking in unmarked direct

address, placing him onstage alone, describing his thoughts about his dilemma.  Some, like the

Towneley play, have Abraham specify that "Alone, right here in this playn,/ Might I speke to my

hart brast" (109-110), which raises the question of whether the speech is direct address or

soliloquy.[29]  The Brome Abraham and Isaac demonstrates that while character direct address is a

common technique in medieval drama, it is not necessary; medieval English dramaturgy allows

for the construction of plays that use none at all.

This particular play also brings up the question of whether if there is a correlation

between the use of presenters and the absence of direct address.  The Brome Abraham and Isaac,

the Digby Conversion of St. Paul, the Digby Killing of the Children, and Everyman all contain

special personages, and when we consider their use of character direct address, we find evidence

for the conclusion that the use of special personages is correlated with the use of less direct

address by characters.  The Digby Killing of the Children uses character direct address only

once, in Herod's first speech, which is constructed as unmarked direct address.  The Digby

Conversion of St. Paul contains more — two marked speeches by Paul, one marked lightly (only one marker) and the other marked heavily, and an unmarked direct address speech by Belial. The Belial scene, however, is interpolated, and hence should not be considered as part of the play's overall original strategy for using direct address.[30] The two speeches by Paul work well together; in the first, Saul, sounding much like other tyrants of medieval drama, boasts of his power and wealth; in the second, he preaches to the audience about avoiding sin, particularly pride, and imitating Christ's meekness. Together, the two speeches show neatly the effects of his conversion, especially interesting because they are the only two speeches of direct address within the original play's narrative body. This play thus provides a good example of how the effect of an instance of direct address relies not just upon what it says, but upon how it is constructed and the context in which it occurs.

In Everyman, there are seven instances of direct address, all but one of which are unmarked. After the Messenger's opening speech in marked direct address, God speaks in unmarked direct address, explaining why he is sending Death to summon Everyman to make a reckoning of his life and deeds (22-63). Death, also in unmarked direct address, comments upon the condition in which he finds Everyman ("His mynde is on flesshely lustes and his treasure" [82]). Everyman, in several speeches, shares his thoughts as he searches for help in undertaking his journey (184-204; 303-17; 378-91; 463-84). And in the play's only clear instance of explicit direct address, Everyman urges the audience, "Take example, all ye that this do here or se,/ How they that I loved best do forsake me,/ Excepte my Good Dedes that bydeth truely" (867-69).[31] The direct address in Everyman, as in the Digby Conversion of St. Paul, is carefully chosen and

---

[29] That is, 'thinking out loud,' a technique which will be discussed later.

[30] John Coldewey discusses the evidence for concluding that the Belial scene is interpolated (164-65).

[31] There is another potential another instance of marked direct address; when Discretion leaves, he says "Fare well, everychone!", which could be directed to the audience, the other characters, or both (840).

constructed for a particular effect.  Everyman shares his thought process as he looks for someone to go on his journey with him, but the play accomplishes this goal in unmarked direct address, reserving explicit direct address for Everyman's last speech, in which he appeals to the audience explicitly to take him as an example.  The impact of that appeal must surely be enhanced both by its context and by its singularity; it is the only clear use of marked direct address within the narrative body of the play.  <u>Everyman</u>'s Messenger and Doctor begin and end the play in marked direct address, but within the body of the play, Everyman's appeal is the solitary instance.  Here also, context as well as content affects the meaning of direct address.

The non-cycle plays that use presenters, then, are careful and reserved in their use of direct address by characters.  They do not all, like the Brome <u>Abraham and Isaac</u>, elect to avoid character direct address.  But when they do use the technique, they commonly use unmarked direct address, reserving marked direct address for particular emphasis or impact, such as a comparison of Paul's behavior and attitude before and after his conversion, and an invitation by Everyman to take him as an example.  Non-cycle plays which employ special personages do tend to use direct address less frequently than do the others, but they use direct address by characters in similar ways.

The Brome <u>Abraham and Isaac</u> shows one end of the range of possibilities for the use of direct address by character.  Other non-cycle plays that use presenters show the careful construction and placement of direct address, particularly marked direct address, when the technique is employed.  Non-cycle plays which do not use special personages use the technique more than the ones that do.  This is a tendency, not a rule, but the pattern is shown by <u>Lucidus and Dubius</u>, which uses no special personages and employs character direct address only minimally.  It begins with a speech by Lucidus, constructed in moderately marked explicit direct

address, in which the character prays for the audience, introduces himself, and invites anyone who has a question to ask it (1-19). Dubius then begins to ask questions, after which the play proceeds as a dialogue, using no more direct address. Lucidus and Dubius, as with the Brome Abraham and Isaac and Digby Killing of the Children, illustrates one end of the range of possibilities available for using character direct address.

But Wisdom, as with the Digby Conversion of St. Paul and Everyman, shows how plays that do use character direct address tend to reserve marked direct address for moments of particular emphasis. Wisdom contains seven instances of direct address, only one of them heavily marked. The opening speech of the play, in which Wisdom introduces and describes himself, contains only one marker; the other examples of direct address, in which Mind, Will, and Understanding present themselves, and Lucifer explains his plan to lead them astray, are unmarked. The only heavily marked address in the play is found in Wisdom's speech in which he explains the nine virtues that please God best (997-1064). Similarly, the Dublin Abraham and Isaac uses character direct address five times, a fairly substantial amount for a play containing only 369 lines, but all except the last instance is unmarked. Deus explains how he is going to test Abraham, and Abraham thinks over whether he should sacrifice Isaac, in unmarked direct address. Only Abraham's last address is explicit, in which he urges the audience, "Now ye þat haue sene þis aray,/ I warne you all, boþe ny?t and day,/ What God comaundeþ say not nay,/ For ye shal not lese þerby" (366-69). Again, this play uses a significant amount of direct address but rhetorically marks only a fraction of it, reserving the technique to emphasize lessons and to enhance the effect of those lessons by presenting them in a context in which marked direct address is rare and therefore noticeable.

The Croxton <u>Play of the Sacrament</u> also employs marked direct address to underscore lessons, when Episcopus warns priests in the audience to be careful that their pixes are locked (924-27) and ends the play by instructing the audience to keep the commandments and please God (988-1007). However, this effect is not the only one for which explicit direct address is used in the play. It begins with two speeches of direct address, first Aristorius's, then Jonathas's, both boasting of wealth and power. Aristorius' is unmarked, while Jonathas' is heavily marked. The effect of these speeches' different rhetorical construction is that Jonathas comes across as significantly more villainous than Aristorius, the same effect, as we will see, as that caused by tyrants, particularly in the York cycle — heavily marked explicit address actually repels the audience. Jonathas insists upon his wealth, his power, and the audience's duty to pay attention to him: "I tell yow all, bi dal and by hylle,/ In Eraclea ys noon so moche of myght./ Werfore ye owe tenderli to tend me tyll" (193-95). The more he insists upon his power over the crowd and the audience's duty to obey him, the more the audience (silently) disagrees. Direct address does not inherently strengthen the relationship between the play and its audience; rather, as heavily marked tyrant speeches indicate, it can be employed for the exact opposite purpose. Both Aristorius and Jonathas are horrible, as we know from their prideful boasting about their wealth and authority, but Jonathas is the worse. This effect is important to achieve, for we must hope for and expect Aristorius' repentance (since he is sinful but Christian) but Jonathas' conversion (since he is a Jew).

Intriguingly, stage directions in the Croxton <u>Play of the Sacrament</u> and the Digby <u>Mary Magdalene</u> suggest that "bost" is a technical dramaturgical term used for heavily marked direct address speeches by tyrants, like Jonathas's. The stage direction before Jonathas' speech reads, "Now shall the merchantys man withdrawe hym and the Jewe Jonathas shall make hys bost"

(following 149). Similarly, in the Digby <u>Mary Magdalene</u>, the King of Marseilles has a speech

of heavily marked direct address, which begins, "Avantt! Avant thee, onworthy wrecchesse!/

Why lowtt ye nat low to my lawdabyll presens," and continues in typical tyrannical fashion

(925); this speech is likewise preceded by a stage direction, the end of which reads, "and here

begynnyth [the Kyng of Marcylle] hys bost" (preceding 925). 'Bost' thus appears to be a

dramaturgical term used to designate this type of speech.

At the other end of the range of possible use for character direct address is <u>The Castle of</u>

<u>Perseverance</u>, which a great deal of character direct address — 55 instances — showing the

flexibility of medieval English dramaturgy, which can accommodate both plays heavily reliant

upon this technique and plays which do not use it at all. As in the plays considered above, the

character direct address in <u>The Castle of Perseverance</u> is not dominated by marked direct

address. Indeed, what is most striking about the use of direct address in <u>The Castle of</u>

<u>Perseverance</u> is not how much direct address it uses but how little of that total is heavily marked.

Of the 55 instances of character direct address, fewer than half, 26, are marked. Of these

instances of marked address, most are only lightly marked; for example, the opening speeches of

Belial and the Flesh (196-234; 235-74), Voluptas' announcement and invitation to the audience

to align themselves with Mundus (491-503; 517-25), Envy's description of himself (932-40), and

Mankind's asssessment that "I se no man but they use somme/ Of these seven Dedly Sinnys"

(1238-59), are all speeches of direct address containing only one marker. Others are moderately

marked, as is Mankind's first speech, in which he introduces himself (275-326; 3 markers) or the

speeches in which he invites the audience to look upon him as an example (1416-29, 2876-94,

2995-3007; 2 markers each). Far less common are speeches of heavily marked direct address:

Backbiter's introduction and description of himself (647-99), the Good Angel's lament when

Mankind chooses to follow Mundus rather than heed his proper advice (789-801), Mankind's speech about the resistence he meets when he turns to good (1995-2019), and the speeches given by Pater Sedens in Juditio which that ends the play (3604-49).

The Castle of Perseverance thus tends to use direct address, particularly marked and especially heavily marked address, for lessons, a function we have seen previously. Good characters draw the audience's attention to how Mankind is (or should be) behaving, Mankind himself instructs the audience to learn from his example, and God the Father ends the play by instructing the audience as to how they should behave. In other instances, evil characters urge the audience to indulge in bad behavior as they do. Pleasure and Folly invite "[whoso] wil be riche and in gret aray" and "all the men that in this werold wold thrive/ For to ridyn on hors ful hie,/ Cum speke with Lust-and-Likinge believe" (493, 517-19). Similarly, Backbiter encourages the crowd to behave as he does: "I schal goo abowte and makyn moo/ Rappys for to route and ringe./ Ye bakbiterys, loke that ye do so!" (1782-84). Given the unabashed evil — and unattractive evil, unlike that of the vices in Mankind — of these figures, it is unlikely that these appeals actually incline an audience towards their cause. Rather, as do the tyrant 'bosts,' these invitations provide a reverse-psychology teaching, encouraging good by inviting the audience into overt evil, thus repelling the crowd from that evil into good.

Most of the character direct address in The Castle of Perseverance is unmarked or lightly marked. Heavily marked direct address is a technique clearly recognizable but easily abused, useful but not subtle, and hence reserved for moments of particular emphasis, moments chosen to convey a didactic message powerfully and concisely. Extant medieval English drama is didactic, but the authors' handling of their didactic purposes indicates that they understand well how best to accomplish that purpose, and when direct address is used well for this purpose, it is neither

natural nor obvious. A more 'natural' approach would be to bludgeon the audience with the

message, seeking to ensure that the message got through, but medieval English drama uses a

lighter touch, employing heavily marked address only occasionally, to emphasize a message.[32]

Similarly, the Digby Mary Magdalene uses a great deal of direct address, very little of it

heavily marked, and most of that comprised of the sort of 'bosts' discussed above. Intriguingly,

there is a further parallel between the Digby Mary Magdalene and The Castle of Perseverance;

both plays open with multiple speeches of direct address given by evil figures. The Castle of

Perseverance begins with speeches by Mundus, Belial, and Flesh, in which they declare their

power and their resolution to 'distroy' Mankind. Not long after, Backbiter makes his first

appearance, introducing himself to the audience in heavily marked direct address. Soon the

Seven Deadly Sins are summoned, each with a speech of direct address in which he introduces

himself and explains the power he has to tempt humanity. In the same way, the Digby Mary

Magdalene begins with direct address speeches by the Imperator, Syrus,[33] Herod, Pilate, the

World, the Flesch, and Satan, in which they brag about their wealth, power, and authority over

the audience, in moderately to heavily marked address. I suspect that this parallel is not

coincidental. Both plays are staged with multiple scaffolds with a *platea*, in a circular

arrangement for The Castle of Perseverance as we know from its staging diagram, and for the

Digby Mary Magdalene perhaps "in a circle like the stage plan of the Castle of Perseverance, or

in facing rows with a playing ground between them" (Coldewey 187). The many speeches of

direct address that begin each play work together with the multiple-place staging to represent a

---

[32] If anyone thinks that this approach to conveying didactic messages through direct address is obvious and natural, I invite him to watch evangelical Christian videos produced today for children, many of which fail to hold children's attention (and thus to convey their message) because they are too heavy-handed in their approach, seeking to teach at all times. The Castle of Perseverance, as does other medieval English plays, avoids this problem by restricting its use of heavily marked direct address.

[33] Syrus may well be intended to be a good figure, since he is Mary Magdalene's father, but the wording of his opening speech is just like that of the evil tyrants.

foundational conception of the medieval Christian universe, that of the earthly world, literally

surrounded by evil.  These plays establish from the beginning, in their staging and in these

opening speeches of direct address, that evil is all around, watching, powerful, and malevolent.

Likewise Mankind, as has been well-recognized, initially presents a world in which evil

characters outnumber good ones, and in which evil is apparently more powerful and more

attractive than good.  Mercy has often been understood to be presented as stodgy, intentionally

unattractive, so that the entertaining New Guise, Nowadays, and Nought are more appealing by

comparison.  As Coldeway says, "Mercy, dressed as an old cleric, does not come off well

initially; and his pompous language and moral pontifications to the audience...are allowed to

continue just long enough (44 lines) to establish his humorless credential before Mischief begins

his subversive work" (106).  In recent years Mankind's star has risen considerably, and many of

its brilliant strategies are now well-recognized, chief among which is the strategy of luring

audience members into aligning themselves with the devils, causing them to fall into sin before

Mankind does, in singing the 'Christmas song', and paying to see the devil, thus not simply

instructing the audience about sin, but actually luring onlookers into sin and revealing their

culpability, thus taking the audience through the same process of sin and repentance that

Mankind is taken through.

However, an analysis of the use of direct address in Mankind reveals more detail

concerning how that process is accomplished, detail which has not been previously observed.  In

addition, a consideration of how Mankind uses direct address gives insight into the question of

how Mercy is intended to be presented initially.  The author of Mankind uses direct address

carefully and strategically, but employs a substantially different approach than anything seen

hitherto.  Rather than restricting marked direct address for moments of special emphasis,

Mankind uses it abundantly.  Indeed, marked direct address is the main tool through which the play accomplishes its strategy of luring the audience into culpability with the devils.

Mankind uses marked direct address to both influence and reflect audience sympathy.  It opens with Mercy speaking directly to the audience, in very heavily marked direct address; he uses 22 markers in 44 lines.  Hitherto, we have seen heavily marked direct address used frequently, although not exclusively, by evil figures, and I have argued that the audience would experience such heavily marked address as intrusive, and would be repulsed by, not attracted to, the speaker.  However, I do not believe that the onlookers experience this same technique, when used by Mercy (or any other heavily marked speech when spoken by a good character) in that way.  Rather, this speech strengthens the connection between Mercy and the audience, creating a strong bond before the appearance of the devils.  The audience members encounter Mercy first, and this speech aims to make the most of that.  I have argued previously that direct address in medieval drama does not function solely either to establish or to strengthen the connection between the audience and the play, and that is true; however, it is important to recognize that is not its sole function, not that it is never used for that purpose.  Mercy's opening speech gives an example of the technique used in just the way we have heretofore assumed it to be used; here, the object is indeed to solidify that relationship, to put the onlookers firmly on the good side.  This is, of course, crucial to its strategy of luring them into sin and collusion with the devils.  The audience members cannot fall into sin unless they have first been good.

Mercy's speech attracts rather than repels the audience, although it is as heavily marked as a tyrant's speech, because before he begins speaking to the audience as 'you,' he establishes himself as one of 'us.'  The first 12 lines contain no markers.  Rather, he groups himself with the audience:

The very fownder and begynner of owr fyrst creacyon

Amonge us synfull wrechys he oweth to be magnyfyede,

That for owr dysobedyence he hade non indygnacyon

To sende hys own son to be torn and crucyfyde.

Owr obsequyouse servyce to hym shulde be aplyede. (1-5)

Audience members would not perceive Mercy as a tyrant because he does not speak as one, although later in the speech he uses marked direct address to urge them be 'perseverante' in their faith, resisting temptation.  Tyrants insist upon their authority over the onlookers, but Mercy first aligns himself with them.  He behaves incarnationally; he becomes a human being, one of "us synfull wrechys."  Mercy may come across to modern sensibilities as tedious in this opening speech — and perhaps our perception of Mercy is influenced by Mischief and the other vices, who claim that Mercy is tedious — but I do not think that is what the play intends, or do I think that would have been its original effect.  Rather, this opening speech is constructed to align the observers' sympathies with Mercy, to put them into a consciousness of holiness from which they will then be tempted away, and to ensure that when they do succumb to the lures of the devils, they have no basis to claim (as Mankind tries to) that they were tricked; Mercy's speech ensures that, as was Mankind, the onlookers were warned.  Mercy does not *exactly* say, 'Remember this, there will be a quiz later,' but he ends his speech with the faintly ominous and certainly admonitory, "I besech yow hertely, have this premedytacyon" (44).

Furthermore, the audience members' bond with Mercy remains intact through the initial appearances of Mischief and the other devils.  Mischief's appearance is often discussed as if the onlookers are relieved at his entrance and find themselves immediately shifting their sympathies to him, and, when they appear, the Worldlings.  Perhaps, but we should note that the play

provides no direct address for any of these four devils in their first appearance. The leaf that

contained Mischief's departure and New Guise, Nowadays, and Nought's arrival is missing, and

we can make no argument about material that is not there, but in the dialogue that is extant, none

of the devils speaks directly to the audience. They harass Mercy, and each other, but they are not

given direct address. Surely if the play were intending for the observers' allegiance to switch

immediately to the devils, the devils would here appeal to them directly — not in the heavily

marked, obnoxious manner of the tyrants, who repulse the onlookers, but in the attractive,

moderately marked fashion that the Worldlings employ later in the play. Moreover, after they

leave, Mercy again speaks directly to the onlookers, and that speech rhetorically positions Mercy

and the audience as cohorts: "Thankyde be Gode, we have a fayer dylyverance/ Of thes thre

onthryfty gestys" (162-63). He proceeds in this speech, in explicit direct address as before, now

moderately marked, to warn the onlookers again, not, now, in theory, but in specific, concerning

those vices they have just seen. Having thus instructed the audience members, Mercy remains to

provide the same instruction to Mankind and then departs; he will not speak directly to the

audience again until after Mankind's fall.

Having used direct address to align the onlookers' sympathies with Mercy and put them

into a position of holiness from which they can then appropriately fall, the play begins to shift

their sympathies. As does the audience, Mankind begins from a position of spiritual holiness.

His first speech is directed to the audience members, encouraging them to identify and

sympathize with him next. As does Mercy, Mankind groups himself with the audience, a

grouping emphasized in his speech; indeed, the rhetorical markers indicating the speech as

explicit direct address are minimized (there are two), since the emphasis in the speech is on

Mankind's identification with the audience members rather than on the differences between

them.  Thus <u>Mankind</u> uses direct address to influence, but also reflect, the audience's sympathy for and identification with the characters; direct address is used to establish a firm bond with Mercy, putting the audience in a position of appropriate holiness to begin the play, and then to shift the identification to Mankind.

Only after this are the devils allowed to make their assault upon Mankind and the audience.  The first direct address by a devil in <u>Mankind</u> is Nowadays' "Make rom, sers, for we have be longe!/ We wyll cum gyf yow a Crystemes songe" (331-32), to the singing of which he and the other Worldlings invite the audience.  Mankind refuses, but probably some of the audience members, at least, sing along for part of the song.  Mankind chases the Worldlings away when they attempt to subvert him, but after he leaves, they return, their assault fiercer than ever.  In their first appearance, the play allows none of them to speak directly to the audience; now, direct address is pervasive.  Mischief returns, and in lightly marked direct address summarizes unnecessarily the action that the audience members have just witnessed.  The Worldlings return and soon address the audience directly and explicitly, extorting money to bring Titivillus in.  The strategy works brilliantly, because the audience's position ensures their cooperation and thus their collusion.  As audience, they are expected to pay for their entertainment, but that act of payment, posited by the play as paying to bring in Titivillus, forces them to collude with the devils.

Similarly, once Titivillus arrives, direct address is again used to cajole and coerce the audience members. Titivillus consistently speaks to the audience directly in moderately marked address, describing his temptation of Mankind as he goes about it.  Here again, the onlookers' position is used to ensure their collusion. Titivillus speaks as if the onlookers' silence, which is of course a condition of their role as members of an audience, is an indication that they have

sided with him: "Ande ever ye dyde, for me kepe now yowr sylence./ Not a worde, I charge you, peyn of forty pens" (589-90).

Only after Mankind and the audience have become thoroughly entwined with the devils does Mercy return. Having fallen, the onlookers are admonished to correct their behavior. Mercy's "My mind is dispersed" speech posits itself as a sorrowful reflection upon Mankind-the-character's fickleness, but of course Mankind has left with the Worldlings and only the audience members hear this encouragement to repent. Indeed, the audience's repentance and Mankind's are handled separately. Mankind's objections are answered by Mercy, Mankind departs, and then Mercy directly addresses the audience, urging them, like Mankind, to repent (907-14).

Thus Mankind instructs the audience in sinfulness and repentance by taking the onlookers through the same process as that the character Mankind goes through. Direct address, particularly marked direct address, is crucial to this strategy. Rather than restrict its marked direct address, this play uses it profusely, but precisely; the direct address is strategically employed to control and manipulate the audience's sympathy. The technique and functions of using direct address in Mankind are strikingly different than any we have seen hitherto, again testifying to the versatility and range of medieval English dramaturgy. The effect and function of the direct address here qualifies are nothing short of brilliant.

Thus the non-cycle plays demonstrate in their use of character direct address, as we have seen previously in their use of special personages, the flexibility of medieval English dramaturgy. This range and versatility is all the more striking when we recall how little of this drama is extant, and that there is no reason to believe that the surviving works provide a full representation of the scope of medieval English dramaturgy. When we turn to the cycles, we

find that they also illustrate this versatility.  In addition, the use of direct address found in the York cycle is as sophisticated as that found in Mankind.

There are a few generalizations which can be made about the use of character direct address in all four extant cycles.  God the Father nearly always speaks in unmarked direct address.  All four contain tyrant speeches, many of which are heavily marked.  Joseph complains to the audience about Mary.  John the Baptist preaches to the crowd.  But the differences between the cycles' handling of character direct address, are far more numerous.  Moreover, even when speeches which appear similar occur in different cycles, they do not necessarily have the same function or effect.

If we consider the Towneley plays to be medieval,[34] we find that the use of direct address in them does not fit well with its use in the other medieval plays, but instead provides another exception that serves to prove the rule that direct address is seldom used to strengthen the play's relationship with the crowd.  My analysis indicates that this function is not in fact the most common use of the technique in medieval drama, although it would be wrong to claim the technique is never so used, and indeed it does function in that way in Mankind, especially.  But this function is nevertheless uncommon.  Towneley is odd, in that the strengthening of the relationship of play and crowd does appear to be its most typical function.  Towneley uses more direct address, in a greater variety of places within the context of play's action than does any

---

[34] The dating of the Towneley manuscript has recently been reevaluated by Alexandra F. Johnston and Malcolm Parkes, who conclude that "this manuscript was written and decorated in the Marian period (1553-58) by a single scribe who was a trained legal scrivener" (quoted in Palmer, 96).  Barbara D. Palmer has examined the Towneley family, finding that they were "educated, recusant lawyers," which suggests that the Towneleys may well have been the people responsible for the compilation and construction of the manuscript, not simply collectors of the material (104).  These re-examinations of the Towneley collection will no doubt affect our understanding of many elements of these plays, direct address being no exception.  Indeed, an analysis of the direct address is affected by an understanding of the Towneley plays as surviving fifteenth-century drama, as they have previously been understood to be, or as an early-to-mid sixteenth-century compilation (of older plays and/or new compositions), the more recent suggestion.

other cycle, except possibly N-town.  An even more striking difference between the Towneley plays and other medieval drama is that the Towneley cycle rarely uses marked and unmarked direct address to indicate significant differences among characters, and does not give a majority of its direct address to earthly tyrants, who use direct address to repel the audience.

Although several of the cycle's plays are unfinished and the cycle has fewer plays than either York or N-town, Towneley contains 111 instances of direct address.  In comparison, Chester has 45, York 82.  Only N-town has more, 121. The position of direct address within the play also differs in Towneley.  In Towneley direct address tends to occur within the context of a play's action, rather than isolated from it.  For example, in the Noah play, Noah and his wife both comment directly to the audience about their situation, as do Mak and Gill in the Second Shepherds' Play.  In both cases, the comments come *in medias res*, the characters pausing in their dialogue to address the audience, afterwards returning to the discussion.  Direct address *in medias res* is not unheard of in other cycles; in York, for example, Joseph's comments to the audience about Mary in Joseph's Trouble, the Devil's baffled descriptions of his failures in The Temptation, and the instances of characters saying farewell come *in medias res*, but its occurrence is far less common than in Towneley.  In York, direct address is far more typically constructed as a speech which occurs in isolation from the action of the play, not in the middle of it.  The tyrant speeches, for example, nearly all occur at the beginning of the plays in which they appear, and the shift made by one character from addressing the audience to addressing other characters is usually clearly indicated.

Moreover, unlike other medieval drama, the Towneley cycle does not carefully employ marked and unmarked direct address to different effects.  For example, in the Noah play, some of Noah's and his wife's comments to the audience are marked, while others are not.  Similarly, in

the Second Shepherds' Play, the first two shepherds' speeches are marked, the third shepherd's is not; Gill makes her complaint to the audience about Mak in unmarked direct address, while Mak makes his in marked direct address.  There does not seem to be any difference in either effect or purpose between the speeches of marked and the speeches of unmarked direct address.  Indeed, the marked direct address tends to be lightly marked, making the distinction between the two less obvious.

Compared to that found in other medieval drama, the approach to direct address found in the Towneley plays is puzzling.  Direct address in medieval drama uses marked and unmarked address for different functions, and is used strategically, but Towneley ignores these principles.  However, if we think of the Towneley plays as early-to-mid sixteenth-century drama, the direct address is less jarring.  In the early sixteenth century, as will be discussed later, one technique used in direct address is to employ a great deal of marked direct address to no particular purpose.  One begins to suspect not only that the Towneley compilation comes from the sixteenth century, but that its composition does as well, or that, like Chester, it was significantly revised then.  Since most of the direct address within the cycle, in particular the examples of marked direct address used to no particular purpose, occurs within plays attributed to the 'Wakefield Master,' it seems possible that he used the new methods of handling direct address in vogue in the early sixteenth century. [35]  If so, the Towneley plays provide an interesting contrast with the Chester cycle and the Norwich Grocers' play, both of which were revised in the sixteenth century; in their revisions of the latter plays, the medieval dramaturgy was maintained, but in at least some of the Towneley plays, new dramatic techniques were adopted.

So the recent move towards dating the Towneley cycle to the sixteenth rather than the fifteenth century causes its non-medieval use of direct address to be less problematic; the issues

of the perennially problematic N-town cycle are not so easily solved.  In N-town, there is little

unity of approach to direct address, not surprising given that N-town, as many scholars now

believe, is a compilation in the form of a cycle rather than a set of plays constructed as a cycle.[36]

Several sections of the N-town manuscript, such as the sequence concerning the life of Mary, the

Passion plays, and the Assumption of Mary play, are now generally accepted to have been

interpolated, having been first written as separate plays.  But the very problem in the structure

serves to clarify its usage of direct address; when we consider N-town in sections rather than as a

whole, patterns in the usage of direct address emerge.

The 'base' strand of the cycle, into which the stand-alone plays were interpolated,

minimizes the use of direct address and reserves marked direct address to underscore lessons, a

function we have seen before.  That is, these sections of N-town employ marked direct address to

provide instruction to the audience, and emphasize that instruction by restricting the use of direct

address for other purposes.  From The Creation of Heaven; The Fall of Lucifer play which

begins the cycle to the beginning of the interpolated Mary play, marked direct address is

uncommon.  God, as in York and Towneley, begins the cycle, speaking to the audience in

unmarked direct address.  Indeed, most of the direct address used by characters in the first

section of the cycle is unmarked (that spoken by Cain, Lameth, Abraham, and Moses, for

instance).  The prophets who appear in Jesse Root nearly all speak in unmarked direct address,

and those speeches that do employ markers use very few.

In this context, the heavily marked speeches of God (found in The Creation of the World;

the Fall of Man) and Moses (found in Moses) stand out.  In the first, one of only three instances

---

[35] The case for positing the existence of a 'Wakefield Master' has been recently scrutinized by John T. Sebastian.
[36] See, for example, the introduction to Stephen Spector's EETS edition of the N-town plays, Peter Meredith's The Mary Play, and Douglas Sugano's " 'This game wel pleyd in good a-ray':  The N-Town Playbooks and East Anglian Games."

of God the Father speaking in marked direct address in all of medieval English drama, God instructs the audience concerning the Sabbath: "My blyssyng ?e haue both est and west./ Of werkyng þe vijte day ?e sees./And all þo þat sees of laboryng here/ Þe vijte day, withowtyn dwere,/ And wurchyp me in good manere,/ Þei xal in hefne haue endles pes" (51-56). Here the desire to take provide a lesson, having God explain the Sabbath and instruct the audience as to how they should behave, overrides the widespread convention that God does not acknowledge, and hence become dependent upon, the existence of the audience through markers. Similarly, though at much greater length, Moses explicates the Ten Commandments in heavily marked direct address.

In the same way, after the Mary play, we see again the strategy of reserving marked direct address to provide a lesson. Death instructs the onlookers not to behave as Herod does, and expounds on the power of death over all mankind. John the Baptist preaches to the audience in several places, as he does in other cycles, but Jesus also instructs the viewers: "Þe vertu of mekenes here tawth xal be,/ Euery man to lere/ And take ensawmple here by me/ How mekely þat I come to þe" (74-77). God the Father, speaking from Heaven and explaining Jesus, tells the crowd to "Take good heed what he doth preche/ And folwyth þe lawys þat he doth teche./ For he xal be þoure altheris leche,/ To saue ?ow from deuelys derke" (102-105). In the midst of the Temptation play, and then again at its end, Jesus instructs the crowd, first, "[to] here Goddys wurde, þerfore, man, loue," and second, to follow the example he has given ("Now all mankende exaunple take/ By these grete werkys þat þu dost se") [100; 196-97]. At the beginning of The Woman Taken in Adultery, Jesus instructs the audience to ask for mercy, returning to this topic in his final speech of the play. After the two interpolated Passion Plays, we see the tactic again

in Thomas' speech which ends <u>The Appearance to Thomas</u>, in which he urges the crowd to believe without seeing, unlike himself.

N-town's emphasis upon instruction is clear and well-recognized.[37]  But scholars have not previously discussed the use of direct address to accomplish this purpose.  Marked direct address in N-town is used for lessons, and avoided at other times.  As scholars, we have treated the use of direct address in medieval drama as if it were natural or obvious, rather than constructed skillfully, well planned, and used to differing effects.

In the interpolated <u>Passion Plays</u>, marked direct address reflects the central theological concept of the incarnation, being used everywhere in these plays *but* the Crucifixion section.  <u>Passion Play 1</u> opens with two contradictory speeches of marked direct address, the Devil's and John the Baptist's, both of which urge the audience members to acknowledge the rightness of their position and align themselves with their side (the Devil says, "Gyff me ?oure love, grawnt me myn affeccyon" [61]; John the Baptist says, "Þe weys of oure Lorde cast ?ow to aray,/ And þerin to walk, loke ?e be applyande" [133-34]).  Peter and John the Apostle urge the onlookers to repent and acknowledge the Lord, positioning the audience as the crowd in Jerusalem, characters representing this crowd stepping up at their behest.  Jesus uses a special marked direct address, compound direct address,[38] to instruct both disciples and audience together in <u>The Last Supper</u> and <u>The Betrayal</u>.  After the crucifixion, Anima Christi tells the audience to rejoice; the Centurion urges the onlookers to recognize that the dead Jesus was the son of God; Jesus, returning to his body, reminds the crowd that "For mannys loue I tholyd dede...Man, and þu lete me þus gone/ And wylt not folwyn me anone,/ Such a frende fyndyst þu nevyr none/ To help þe

---

[37] See, for example, Appendix 3 of Stephen Spector's EETS edition.
[38] See Chapter 4.

at þi nede" (81, 85-88); and the Virgin Mary instructs the audience that "deth is deed, as ?e may

se' (126).  But within the Crucifixion section itself, Jesus never addresses the audience.  He

speaks from the cross to his mother and prays to God the Father, but does not appeal to the

crowd to look at him and consider their culpability in his sufferings, as in York and Towneley.

This absence is striking.

I suspect that here the play choses not to use direct address in order to underscore an

important element of the incarnation; Christ's isolation, his estrangement from humanity, in the

moment of the crucifixion.  Only God incarnate can undertake to redeem humanity, and we can

neither be part of this process, nor be acknowledged during it.  This isolation underscores the

need for salvation; the contrast with what has gone before, the sudden separation, is a glimpse, a

taste of the permanent estrangement from God awaiting those who choose not to accept Christ's

offer of salvation.  Proper consideration of the use of direct address involves not only studying

the times when direct address is employed, the methods by which it is constructed, and the effect

to which it is put, but also its absence, and the effect of that absence.

In the Chester cycle, direct address is also absent from the Passion sequence; indeed,

direct address is absent from the action even longer than it is in N-town; Jesus does not speak

directly to the audience until his resurrection.  But this similarity does not necessarily mean that

by eschewing direct address the cycles create the same effect.  We know that the effect of direct

address relies not only upon its content but upon its context; not only upon what is said, but also

how it is spoken.

Of all the cycles, Chester uses the least direct address, and of that, only about a third is

marked direct address, most of which occurs in the last pageants of the cycle. In the early parts of

the cycle, marked direct address is rare, and of a familiar sort.  Noah appeals to the audience to

bolster his position that women are crabby creatures.  Expositors and Messengers, as discussed previously,[39] guide and explain the action.  Moses speaks to the audience members as to the people of Israel, urging them to obey the ten commandments.  Tyrants boast about their power and prowess.  But as we move into the New Testament plays, the cycle begins to emphasize the existence of evil, taking care to warn the audience of the dangers of unbelief and sinful behavior. It uses both marked direct address, and its more forceful form, compound direct address, to draw the audience's attention to those perils.  The Demon, coming to fetch the dead Herod, warns the audience, "all false beleevers I burne and lowe" (439).  The Mulier, left in hell after the harrowing, speaks to all "[tavernes], tapsters of this cittye" about cheating in their sales (301-2). The plays of Antichrist's Prophets, Antichrist, and the Last Judgment employ both marked and compound direct address profusely, emphasizing the dangers of evil.  Even Jesus, in his speech of marked direct address following the resurrection, speaks more about the dangers of evil behavior than about the joys of the mercy he offers:

I am verey bread of liffe.

From heaven I light and am send.

Whoe eateth that bread, man or wiffe,

Shall lyve with me withowt end.

And that bread that I you give,

Youre wicked life to amend,

Becomes my flesh through your beleeffe

And doth release your synful band.

And whosoever eateth that bread

In synne and wicked liffe,

---

[39] See Chapter 3.

He receaveth his owne death—

I warne both man and wiffe

The which bread shalbe seene instead

The joye is aye full ryffe.

When hee is dead, through fooles read

Then ys he brought to payne and stryffe.  (170-85).

In Chester, then, as we have seen elsewhere, there is a tendency to reserve marked direct address for lessons, but in Chester, the focus is upon negative instruction, the dangers of evil and how to avoid it, rather than upon positive instruction, how to follow Christ and receive mercy.  In both Chester and N-town, the use of direct address reveals that using direct address to emphasize points that the audience should not miss, is an important function of direct address — one that we have seen previously in the non-cycle plays.

But the York cycle provides the epitome of sophisticated and careful construction of character direct address.  This usage supports crucial claims made throughout this project.  I have insisted elsewhere that direct address was not used in medieval drama solely, or even primarily, to establish a connection with the audience.  Culturally, this connection already existed, and medieval drama was constructed to take advantage of, and build upon, that preexisting relationship.  Direct address could be used in medieval drama to deepen that relationship, but it never constructed its foundations.  In the York cycle, very little marked direct address is used, and the bulk of what does appear is in tyrant speeches, which, as I have argued previously, do not have the effect of creating or deepening a close relationship with the audience.  The absence of any significant amount of marked direct address which could conceivably be used in order to establish a connection with the audience supports the conclusion that it is unnecessary for

medieval drama to establish such a connection.  Of the little marked direct address that occurs outside of speeches given by tyrants, much comes in the form of brief farewells, prayers, or blessings at the end of pageants.  Abraham ends the <u>Abraham and Isaac</u> play, "God þat is most of mayne/ Vs wisse and with ?ou be" (379-80); similarly, III Rex finishes, "He þat is well of witte/ Vs wisse, and yow be" (391-92); <u>The Baptism</u> ends with John the Baptist's "Now sirs, þat barne þat Marie bare/ Be with ?ou all" (174-75); <u>The Death of Christ</u> ends with Joseph of Arimathea's "Þis lorde so goode/ Þat schedde his bloode,/ He mende youre moode,/ And buske on þis blis for to bide" (413-16); Pilate says good-bye to the audience to end <u>The Resurrection</u> (453-54); and Christ's blessing to the audience ends <u>Christ's Appearance to Mary Magdalene</u>:  "Mi blissing on þe [Mary] lende,/ And all þat we leffe here" (148-49).  All of these examples of marked direct address occur at the end of plays; the relationship of the plays to the audience is so secure that characters can suddenly address the onlookers directly and explicitly, without previously having "established a relationship" with them.  Their close relationship to the audience pre-exists.  It is not created by direct address.

Nor does direct address necessarily strengthen the relationship of characters to audience, as the use of direct address in the York cycle demonstrates.  In the York cycle, the majority of the marked direct address occurs in speeches given by tyrants.  Pharoah, Herod, Pilate, one of the Miles, and Caiaphas all verbally harangue the audience, ordering them to be quiet, boasting of their power, and laying claim to the audience as their subjects.  It is extremely unlikely that the audience members experience these speeches as ones that draw them more deeply into the play, or more closely to the characters.  As is generally recognized, the audience is being positioned by the tyrants here as on the side of evil; Miles even tells the crowd not to have sympathy for Jesus but to do whatever they can to make his lot more miserable.  Other plays, such as <u>Mankind</u>, lure

the audience into alignment with the evil figures, then reveal that alignment to be wrong, revealing at the same time the audience's culpability. However, in York it seems unlikely that, although the audience members are positioned as part of the evil crew by the tyrants, they actually find their sympathies with them. Rather, this pushy direct address — the tyrant speeches are nearly all extremely heavily marked — would more likely be experienced as repulsive, as I argued previously. In medieval drama, direct address does not in and of itself strengthen the relationship between the play and its audience; rather, as is clear in the speeches given by tyrants throughout the drama, especially including those given in the York cycle, it can be employed for the opposite purpose.

The use of direct address in the York cycle thus supports two major conclusions, which this project demonstrates, that medieval drama does not use direct address to create *ex nihilo* a close relationship with the audience and that direct address does not always strengthen the relationship between a play and the members of the audience. But the York cycle has more to reveal in its use of direct address. Analysis of the marked and unmarked direct address in York shows that throughout the cycle, a consistent strategy is employed in its use of direct address, which is crafted to reflect and embody foundational theological concepts, in particular a sophisticated rhetorical construction of incarnational theology.

God the Father always speaks in unmarked direct address. He speaks directly to the audience in the speeches which begin The Fall of the Angels, The Creation (which is almost entirely a speech to the audience), The Creation of Adam and Eve, The Building of the Ark, and The Last Judgment, but his speeches are crafted as implicit direct address; no markers in them directly acknowledge the presence of the audience. This approach is entirely appropriate for God. His divinity and majesty are independent of a human audience, his speech meaningful and

powerful whether anyone is listening or not.  He depends neither upon the audience nor anyone else for his existence and authority, and hence his speech does not make itself dependent upon his listeners by acknowledging — and thus being linked to — listeners who hear it.  The independent power and majesty of a divinity who names himself "I am that am" is embodied in these speeches, rhetorically constructed to be self-contained.

Similarly, holy but human figures such as Noah, Abraham, Moses, Mary, Joseph, the Magi, Anna, Simeon, Mary Magdalene, John the Baptist, and Thomas usually speak also in unmarked direct address.  They are holy figures, special humans, and this status is reflected in their speech, which approximates but does not fully replicate God's.  They are not, as he is, fully self-contained; they are human figures, not supernatural.  So their speech contains rhetorical markers on occasion, as does Noah's opening speech of The Flood, but their speech is largely constructed to be independent of acknowledged listeners.

However, implicit direct address is not solely associated with divine or holy human characters.  One evil figure is also allowed to use this technique, Satan.  Again, this choice makes good theological sense.  Satan is a supernatural figure, likewise not dependent upon humanity for his existence or power.  His speeches in The Fall of Man, The Temptation, and Christ before Pilate 1:  The Dream of Pilate's Wife are largely unmarked, reflecting his independent existence in the world and his ability to walk through it without the approval or recognition of humans.  But Satan, like the holy figures, is a creature, fallen, not divine, and his speech is crafted to reflect this; his opening speech at the beginning of The Temptation contains markers, indicating his difference from God.  The speeches of Satan and the holy humans indicate their independence in the universe, but only God is fully reliant upon no one but himself.

Thus the York cycle reserves unmarked direct address for God, Satan, and the holy humans, reflecting their full or partial independence. This approach also means that the York cycle restricts the use of marked direct address, and that when it finally occurs, its impact is intensified by its rarity. As mentioned previously, the majority of marked direct address in the York cycle occurs in speeches given by tyrants, which nearly always occur at the beginning of pageants, typically running 20-25 lines. These speeches occur in <u>Moses and Pharoah</u>, <u>Herod and the Magi</u>, <u>The Slaughter of the Innocents</u>, <u>The Conspiracy</u>, <u>Christ before Annas and Caiphas</u>, <u>Christ before Pilate 1</u>, <u>Christ before Herod</u>, <u>The Remose of Judas</u>, <u>Christ before Pilate 2</u>, <u>The Road to Calvary</u>, <u>The Death of Christ</u>, and <u>The Resurrection</u>. Clearly, these speeches cluster in the plays concerning Christ's passion and resurrection. In them, earthly tyrants command and abuse the audience members, laying claim to them as their subjects. As discussed above, this approach has the effect, in fact, of alienating the onlookers, making it less likely, not more likely, that they will align their sympathies with these evil figures. But this approach is also highly appropriate for these figures. Unlike Satan, the earthly tyrants depend upon subjects; their power requires being able to bully others into submission and obedience. Their heavily marked speech, then, reflects their heavy dependence upon the audience. They are the exact opposite of God — earthly tyrants who have no independent existence or authority without subjects who fear and obey them. The cycle is careful to restrict the use of marked direct address, so that we do not miss this association of the earthly tyrants and heavily marked direct address.

Though the bulk of marked direct address — and all of the most heavily marked address — is given to the earthly tyrants, brief instances of explicit direct address occur occasionally at the end of the York pageants, as discussed above. There is, however, one other area in which a large amount of explicit direct address occurs, and that is in Jesus' speeches, within which the

sheer genius of the craft used in the construction of direct address in this cycle becomes evident.

Theological conceptions of the universe are reflected in the type of direct address assigned to

God the Father, Satan, and the holy human characters, as discussed above.  Similarly, Jesus'

speeches of direct address rhetorically embody incarnational theology.  Throughout the passion

sequence Jesus is nearly always silent, and the visual impact of this silent figure, surrounded by

and suffering from increasingly violent words and deeds, is powerful.  This has been discussed

elsewhere, and is a scholarly commonplace; what has not been widely recognized is that during

Jesus' silence, the York cycle busily associates marked direct address with earthly tyrants.

Nearly every play in this sequence opens with a character verbally commandeering and

commanding the audience.  Thus when Jesus does finally speak in The Crucifixion, saying,

> Al men þat walkis by way or strete,
>
> Takes tente ?e schalle no trauayle tyne.
>
> Byholdes myn heede, myn handis, and my feete,
>
> And fully feele nowe, or ?e fyne,
>
> Yf any mournyng may be meete
>
> Or myscheue mesured vnto myne, (253-58)

he speaks in a form and technique that is sullied contextually.  Only the earthly tyrants have

spoken in this way, using marked direct address and giving orders.

Does this mean that the York cycle's presentation of Christ is radically subversive,

presenting a Christ who is rhetorically constructed as an earthly tyrant, and that he is given the

tyrants' method of speaking to the audience so that the parallel is too subtle to invite an

excommunication?  I suppose if one were so inclined, one might make a case for this position.

But we should be careful about reading our twentieth and twenty-first century skepticism and

cynicism about religion into fifteenth-century drama. It seems much more likely that Jesus is given marked direct address here, after this method has so carefully been associated with the earthly tyrants, in order to illustrate and embody incarnational theology. The godhead incarnates itself in Jesus and incorporates the worst of humanity, using it to bring salvation, using fallen human nature and the language it employs, redeeming both that humanity and that language. The earthly tyrants use explicit direct address to proclaim their power and threaten the audience to obey; Jesus uses the same rhetorical technique to show his suffering and invite the audience to benefit from it.

The York cycle's Last Judgment pageant demonstrates nicely the ways in which direct address is used in the cycle in order to embody theological concepts, particularly the incarnation, within the very wording of the plays. The pageant begins with God the Father's declaration that he made the earth and that the time has come for its destruction. Like all his speeches of direct address in this cycle, this one is unmarked. After the souls are called to judgement, God the Son, still in heaven, then speaks directly to the audience, saying that "till erþe nowe will I wende/ Miselue to sitt in magestè./ To deme my domes I woll descende" (179-181). What is noteworthy here is that the first part of this speech, spoken to the audience, is unmarked. Thus the incarnational theology displayed by the rhetorical construction of direct address is here fully shown; God the Son, while in heaven, speaks in unmarked direct address, in the same manner as God the Father. When he descends, his direct address becomes marked, heavily marked in fact. Indeed, his speech is constructed in a special form of marked direct address, compound direct address, whose functions are discussed elsewhere, and which is used is simultaneously address

both other characters and the audience members.[40]  The direct address used here is constructed to embody the incarnation.

There are two other instances in which explicit direct address is used in the York cycle, worth noting because they too indicate the care taken in constructing its direct address according to theological principles.  As above, both are instances in which figures come from heaven to earth and address the audience.  In <u>The Expulsion</u>, Angelus begins the pageant with a speech of marked direct address, telling the audience to pay attention to what he is saying and to learn from it, since Adam and Eve have sinned and will be expelled from heaven.  The second occurs when Lazarus returns from the dead and urges the onlookers to obey Jesus so that he will "lede ?ou to his light" (197).  In both speeches, the character comes from heaven with a message for the audience, and delivers that message in marked direct address.

The York cycle thus strategically constructs its direct address to embody rhetorically a Christian understanding of the universe, particularly incarnational theology.  Its construction of character direct address to represent rhetorically these concepts is careful and sophisticated. With this in mind, we can see that Lloyd Skiffington's assessment of the use of direct address in medieval drama is deeply unjustified:

> To sum up, soliloquy existed in the mysteries, as in all other epochs of drama, exclusively to inform the audience.  With rare exceptions, it is couched in what is (aside from its customary rhyming) by far its most prominent textual characteristic, naiveté.  It is dominated by plot-exposition and homily, the former disclosing either plot-action or role-action, the homily hardly ever found except in combination with the exposition.  (41)

---

[40] See Chapter 4 for this discussion.

Direct address in medieval English drama may indeed be said to provide information and homily (that is, emphasizing lessons) but only by willfully ignoring the York cycle's careful and clever construction of character direct address, which represents and embodies the incarnation at the level of its language, can its dramaturgy of direct address be called naive.

*The Question of Soliloquy*

Did soliloquy exist in medieval drama? Skiffington, as quoted in the epigram to this chapter, claims that Shakespearean soliloquy was 'voluminous' but that even more existed in medieval English drama. Meg Twycross makes the opposite claim, saying, "The true amount of direct address in these plays becomes apparent only when they are performed. There is no such thing as a soliloquy: the character shares his fears and distresses with the audience's willing ears" (55). The question is unanswerable unless we know what is meant by 'soliloquy', and determining that is considerably difficult. The problem is that the term "soliloquy," as with the term "aside," has become a term whose meanings are so extensive as to be almost meaningless.

Traditionally (that is, in the first half to three-quarters of the twentieth century), a "soliloquy" was generally agreed to be a speech in which a character onstage, alone or believing himself to be alone, thinks aloud. As discussed previously,[41] handbooks and introductory textbooks for good sources for mainstream understandings of elements of drama, and such works consistently define "soliloquy" in this way. For example, Sylvan Barnet, Morton Berman, and William Burton's Aspects of the Drama, published in 1962, defines a soliloquy as, "[a] speech wherein a character utters his thoughts while alone" (256). Jack A. Vaugh's Drama A to Z:  A Handbook (1978) describes a soliloquy as, "[a] speech made by a character while he is alone on the stage, presumed to be an externalization of his thoughts or emotions; a 'thinking out loud,' as

---

[41] See Chapter 2.

it were, for the benefit of the audience" (183). "For the benefit of the audience" does not mean, as this definition makes clear, 'to' the audience. Similarly, Jerry V. Pickering's Theatre:  A Contemporary Introduction, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, also published in 1978, calls a soliloquy "[a] speech delivered by an actor alone onstage, which by convention is understood by the audience to be the character's internal thoughts, not a part of the dialogue" (361).  I have taken these definitions from introductory drama handbooks precisely because they reflect the generally accepted notions of the field, not what is thought or proposed in cutting-edge research; they reflect not what scholars of medieval or early modern drama think but what generalists think.

For scholars of early drama, and particularly scholars of Shakespeare, this understanding of soliloquy became inadequate more quickly than in it did the field of drama in general.  From the handbook definitions cited above, we know that the traditional notion of soliloquy as a form of thinking aloud remained strong into the 1970's.  But as early as the 1930's, Shakespeare scholars had begun to see difficulties with this definition, and propose changes to it.  The prevailing ideal of realism in drama discounted all 'unrealistic' conventions, such as the soliloquy and the aside "as excrescences of a primitive drama" (Gingrich 1); nevertheless, "thinking aloud" was indeed preferable to directing speeches to the audience.  However, Shakespeare scholars found that, inescapably, some Shakespearean 'soliloquies' did appear to be intended to be spoken directly to the audience.  Thus A.C. Sprague classifies soliloquies into three types:  those in which a character thinks aloud, those in which a character talks to himself, or those in which a character talks to the audience.  However, Sprague considers the 'talking to the audience' type to be problematic, for "it is surely a necessary convention that the audience are supposed not to exist at all" (68).  In this context, soliloquies directed to the audience are

assumed to be considerably rarer than those which take the form of thinking aloud, or, in a pinch, talking to oneself.

A few radicals contemporary with Sprague, such as M.C. Bradbrook and Doris Fenton, suggested that most soliloquies were indeed meant to be given directly to the audience, but several years passed before this notion gained popularity within scholarly and performance circles, and even more years passed before the general understanding of soliloquy, as it is reflected in drama handbooks, altered. By end of the 1980's, soliloquies were being widely reconsidered. Terry Hodgson's The Drama Dictionary, published in 1988, defined soliloquy as "[a] monologue delivered by a character who either is — or assumes he is, alone on stage...The soliloquy could be spoken as if the actor were unconscious of the audience. The audience listened in, as it were to the character's uttered thoughts. The actor could also address a soliloquy directly to the audience, taking it into his confidence" (357). Similarly, John Barton's Playing Shakespeare, published in 1984 as an acting handbook, considers the problem:

> There's one particular kind of set speech which many actors find the hardest problem of all. What should they do with a soliloquy? A situation in which a character is almost always alone and seems to be talking to himself. Should such a speech be done to oneself, or should it be shared with the audience? There are very few absolute rules with Shakespeare but personally I believe that it's right ninety-nine times out of a hundred to share a soliloquy with the audience. I'm convinced that it's a grave distortion of Shakespeare's intention to do it to oneself. If the actor shares the speech it will work. If he doesn't it'll be dissipated, and the audience won't listen properly. And yet the soliloquies are very often done the other way. So which is better? (36)

Which is better is a question I am pleased to leave to someone else.  What is crucial for this study is a recognition of the blurring caused between soliloquy and direct address as the definition of soliloquy is modified.

The traditional understanding of soliloquy as thinking aloud both establishes and assumes a clear distinction between soliloquy and direct address.  Indeed, Barnet, Berman, and Burton's Aspects of the Drama handbook makes this distinction concrete.  After having defined "soliloquy," the handbook clarifies what soliloquy is not by providing a definition of direct address for contrast:  "In direct address, a character turns from the world on stage and speaks directly to the audience, telling it, for example, to watch closely" (256).  But as the definition of soliloquy becomes expanded, the relationship between direct address and soliloquy becomes muddy.  Soliloquy sometimes, but not always, becomes direct address.

Thus the meaning of 'soliloquy' as a term, and its relationship to direct address, has become confused.  Skiffington's understanding of soliloquy is an excellent example of that confusion.  He claims to define soliloquy as "a locution dominating the stage and the attention of the theatre audience, delivered by a speaker who is alone on the stage" and assumes, apparently, that soliloquy is the same as direct address:  "Throughout my text, the assumption of Address to the Audience is primary" (ix-x).  However, he includes as 'soliloquy' speeches that are clearly not addressed to the audience, such as Jesus's prayers in the Garden of Gethsemane, from the N-Town Passion Play 1, which are rhetorically directed to God the Father.  Skiffington claims to be working from a definition of soliloquy which considers it be to essentially equivalent to direct address, thereby eliding the difference between the two, but includes material that is not direct address, thereby confusing the matter still further.

Thus, after their terminology is translated, we find that there actually is not a contradiction between Skiffington's and Twycross' assertions, cited above. Skiffington, conceiving of soliloquy as equivalent to direct address, claims that there is a great deal of it in medieval drama. Twycross, conceiving of soliloquy as thinking aloud, claims that there is no such thing as soliloquy in medieval drama; the plays are full of direct address instead. Unclear and inconsistent terminology creates unnecessary confusion.

I find the traditional understanding of soliloquy as representative of thinking aloud to be most helpful in considering early drama, rather than the idea of soliloquy as equivalent to direct address, since another term for direct address seems unnecessary, but a term that means thinking aloud seems useful. The question, is there soliloquy in medieval drama becomes the question, are there speeches in medieval drama in which a character, alone, thinks aloud rather than sharing his thoughts directly with the audience? This question is answerable, and the answer is yes, in a way, but such speeches are rare and always marked.

There are fewer than half a dozen soliloquies in medieval drama, identifiable because they are rhetorically marked as speeches in which the character is alone and thinking aloud.[42] For example, in the Towneley Abraham and Isaac, Abraham reflects upon whether to kill Isaac, beginning, "Alone, right here in this playn,/ Might I speke to myn hart brest," and as the speech continues, explains the reasons he must kill Isaac and what he must do in order to prepare for the sacrifice. His wording indicates that he is conceived of as being alone, not presenting his thoughts to the audience. Similarly, in the Towneley Second Shepherds' Play, the first shepherd comments, "It dos me good, as I walk/ Thus by my oone,/ Of this warld for to talk/ In maner of mone" (66-69). Here also, the wording indicates that the shepherd is not speaking to the

audience, but is alone and thinking aloud.[43] In the same way, Joseph in the Coventry Weavers'

Pageant notes at both the beginning and end of his speech that he is alone to pray and work out

his thoughts:  "I wandur abowt myself alone...Lorde, benedissete, whatt make I here/ Among

these heggis myself alone?" (503-518), and in this speech he considers his situation and prays for

guidance.

Soliloquies are rare in medieval drama, I submit, because as with asides, they violate a

core principle of medieval drama, which is that of complete and open communication.  For

soliloquies to occur, it must be accepted that only the character can 'hear' what is being said.

The audience, of course, overhears the speech, and so can the actors off stage, but the convention

is that the words are not spoken to the audience, and no other characters hear the speech either.

The character speaks alone, and is heard by no one.

In other forms of drama, it can often be assumed that if a character is alone on stage, what

is spoken is private, and is, by convention, not overheard.  However, this is not true in medieval

English drama, in which being alone on stage does not indicate an assumption of privacy.  In

many cases, a character speaks while apparently alone on stage, only to have another character

enter and begin speaking, clearly in response to what has just been said.  Mischief, for instance,

cannot possibly have been present for Mercy's speech, which begins Mankind, yet when he

arrives he responds to what Mercy has been saying.  In The Castle of Perseverance, the Good

Angel bemoans Mankind's fall into sin, and after this, Confession, who is appearing in the play

for the first time, arrives and comments upon what the Good Angel has been just saying, without,

apparently, being present to hear it.  Similarly, Lucidus and Dubius begins with the speech given

---

[42] And again we are reminded of the problematic dating of the Towneley plays, since several of these "medieval" soliloquies are from that compilation.  If we omit the Towneley examples, soliloquy is very, very rare in medieval drama.

by Lucidus, in which he invites the audience to ask him questions. There is nothing to suggest that Dubius is already present, yet when he begins speaking he responds to Lucidus' statements. The lack of an assumption of privacy is also seen in the Towneley Buffeting. At the end of the play, Caiphas and Annas are apparently alone when Caiphas says that he would not mind stabbing Jesus personally. Annas warns him, "Sir, you must shame/ Sich wordys for to meyn/ Emang men" (644-46). Annas and Caiphas are 'alone'; no other characters are with them. But they are not alone, for the audience is there; hence the phrase "emang men." In medieval drama, then, the audience is always there unless the play specifies that they are not — the characters state that they are 'alone' — and the normal state of things consists of an assumption of open communication which is so strong that characters can respond to statements made by other characters, statements which physically they could not possibly have 'heard.'

In medieval drama, soliloquies are rare but direct address is common. Direct address is not used solely or even primarily to establish or strengthen a connection with the audience, although it can be used to solidify that bond. Direct address in medieval drama also tends to be discussed as if its most common functions are for exposition and the provision of homily (Skiffington 41; Clemen 5). However, analysis of direct address as used by characters in medieval English drama suggests that it is used for other functions and to other effects. It is a technique which is neither primitive nor natural, but one for which careful construction is necessary and with which considerable sophistication is possible, such as is found in Mankind and the York Cycle. Nor is direct address used exclusively or primarily for heavy-handed didactic purposes; most is unmarked, with marked direct address tending to be reserved for moments of emphasis. Moreover, the range of usage of character direct address illustrates the

---

[43] Intriguingly, this speech indicates a shift in its address; for earlier it contains one marker ("As ye ken"), which suggests that it is addressed to the audience, but as the speech continues, the address shifts, as indicated by the lines

flexibility of medieval English dramaturgy, which allows an astoundingly wide array of methods, as well as a wide array of choice, from heavy usage to none at all.  This range include the soliloquy — a technique that in fact conflicts with the dramaturgy's core concepts and beliefs — if the speech is rhetorically marked as spoken by a character who is alone.  Medieval English dramaturgy is thus in its scope and flexibility significantly more highly developed and adaptable than proponents of nineteenth and early twentieth-century realistic dramatic theory imagined.  The early drama was neither primitive, unsophisticated, nor poorly conceived in its dramaturgy, but it did not assume that the purpose of drama is to imitate only 'real' life.  It assumed that reality has a far greater scope than that held by the World, the Flesh, and the Devil.

---

quoted above.

**Chapter 6:  Direct Address by Characters in Sixteenth-Century Drama**

*"Now, Sir, your soliloquy — but speak more to the pit, if you please —*
*the soliloquy always to the pit — that's a rule."*
*(<u>The Critic</u> 3.1)*

Consideration of direct address by characters in medieval English drama reveals the great flexibility of its dramaturgy; it allows for a wide range in the amount of direct address used.  Yet though flexible, this dramaturgy remains unified, its principles and purposes for using direct address consistent.  Sixteenth-century English drama likewise shows tremendous range in its usage of direct address, but it does not show such consistency, manifesting no unified understanding of how direct address might be used, or the purpose to which it might be put.  Rather, different strands of sixteenth-century drama show differing concepts of the technique.  Towards the end of the century, the use of direct address moved towards a dramaturgical synthesis.  However, as we know, English drama did not 'progress' in a neat linear fashion through the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.  Nevertheless, for convenience's sake, we tend to write and discuss English drama linearly, as if medieval drama died, giving way to Tudor drama, which in turn, fled in the face of Elizabethan drama, though we know this is not true.  Medieval drama remained hale and hearty throughout most of the sixteenth century.  Likewise, elements of Tudor drama — most notably the secular morality play — retained their form through the sixteenth century.  Thus sixteenth-century English drama was complex in part because new forms were added while old ones persisted.  In fact, remembering that medieval drama was present throughout the sixteenth century is crucial to understanding the latter's usage of direct address, for much of what early sixteenth-century drama does with direct address seems to be in reaction to the use of the technique in medieval drama.  This awareness of direct address as a technique and the continual manipulation of it point to the importance of the technique for both

periods of drama.  Indeed, direct address appears to be one of the sites upon which the sixteenth century fought the 'culture wars' which were occurring in all forms of English literature.  In addition, an analysis of direct address in sixteenth-century drama is crucial to understanding the emergence of the soliloquy as a convention in English dramaturgy.  As discussed in the previous chapter, soliloquy (meaning 'thinking aloud') was nearly non-existent in medieval drama.  And although criticism of Tudor and Elizabethan drama tends to discuss soliloquy as if it were already an established technique in sixteenth-century drama, an analysis of direct address and related speeches indicates that by 1585, the soliloquy convention was emerging, not fully formed.

The plays of Henry Medwall, one of the earliest of the Tudor playwrights, provide a good example of the conscious manipulation of (and perhaps rebellion against) methods of using direct address found in medieval drama.  Both of Medwall's extant plays, <u>Fulgens and Lucres</u> and <u>Nature</u>, date from the late fifteenth century, and Medwall appears to fully comprehend how direct address is used in his contemporary — that is, what we now call medieval — drama.  This awareness informs his playwriting, but he does not simply use the techniques of direct address as he inherits them.  Rather, he adapts them for the situations in which he works.

Medwall appears to understand that in medieval drama, a close relationship between the audience and play was already in place, and the play did not need to use direct address to establish one.  Though this close relationship appears not to exist in the context within which he wrote, in <u>Fulgens and Lucres</u> he uses direct address to mimic it, and perhaps to some extent, create it.  <u>Fulgens and Lucres</u> begins with the characters "A" and "B" behaving as if they were part of the audience, discussing the play to come — B is asked by A whether he is one of the actors, which he hotly denies — and leaping into the action once it begins.  This pretense seems

designed to blur the line between play and audience, to replicate or imitate the kind of close relationship between play and audience implicitly present in medieval drama.

Similarly, the many references to the audience during the action of the play seem to be used to the same purpose. B tells A not to talk too loudly about their plans, for instance, "[leste] any man of this company/ Know oure purpose openly" (388-89). When A worries that Ancilla has been alone with B, B retorts that "here be to many wytnes" for any hanky-panky to have been going on (1017). A tells Gayus that "dyverse others many moo/ Besyde this honorable audyence" (1315) are expected to arrive in order to hear Lucres' decision. At the end of the first part of the play, A tells B that "[these] folk that sitt here in the halle" need a break before the play continues (1413). At the beginning of part two, A asks "[one] of you" to go answer the door, upon which B is knocking; apparently no one does, for B, when he comes in, says they wouldn't bother, to which A responds that he is surprised that B would criticize anyone here (74-83). B, sent to Lucres with a message, asks if she wants him to give it "[byfore] all this audience" (273). Cornelius asks Lucres what entertainment she has planned for "these folke" while they are waiting for the situation to be met in which she can give her decision about who to marry (377-82). After Lucres has announced her decision, B tells A that "[all] these folke" can testify as to what her decision was (846-47). B objects to Lucres' decision, warning the audience that this is a bad way to choose a wife; A tells B that no one here cares about his advice (866). B says he still doesn't like the outcome but that the purpose of the show was only to provide "[this] company some myrth" (900-1). This lengthy list shows that there are a great many times in this play when the actors refer to the audience, drawing attention to them and making their presence part of the show. I suspect that these references are meant in part to create the pretense of a close relationship between the play and the audience. But Medwall is careful. The relationship is not

too close.  There are more references to the audience than direct address to them, particularly marked direct address, most particularly heavily marked direct address, of which there is, in the play, very little.  There is very little heavily marked direct address in this play.  Medwall appears to want to create the illusion of a close relationship between play and audience, but not to be too forward with his audience.  Given his context — this is a hall play with a very different audience than that of medieval drama — and content — it concerns the problematic subjects of nobility and marriage — Medwall's caution seems reasonable.  The play is meant to be cozy, not threatening to its audience; it is meant to provide the illusion of participation without actually demanding anything.

This technique of referring to the audience, to create the illusion of a close relationship, also has the seemingly contradictory effect of underscoring the difference between the play and the audience.  Medieval dramaturgy assumes that the play and audience inhabit the same spiritual reality, that all participants are equals in Christ if not in society.  Fulgens and Lucres shows an awareness of the social differences between the actors and audience, and the importance of these differences.  Repeatedly referring to the audience has the paradoxical effects both of creating a perception of a connection between the play and audience and at the same time, a reminder of the inescapable differences between the play and the audience, since the audience is continually being referred to as an audience.  This technique of referring to the audience is not often used in medieval drama, for the very reason that Fulgens and Lucres makes obvious; a close relationship with the audience cannot survive the repeated reminders of the audience's presence, and hence its separate existence from the play.

Fulgens and Lucres also differs in its usage of direct address from complete open communication between the play and the audience found in medieval drama, in which it is an

attendant consequence of the preexistent close audience-play relationship.  In <u>Fulgens and</u>

<u>Lucres</u>, though, in which a close relationship is mimicked but not actually created, this norm of

complete open communication is likewise imitated but, again, not created.  Most of the direct

address in <u>Fulgens and Lucres</u> is spoken by A and B, creating only an impression that the play is

talking openly and frequently to the audience; the characters of the play proper talk to the

audience much less frequently, and when they do, they speak only in unmarked or only lightly

marked direct address.  Of the 31 instances of direct address and references to the audience

found in the play, all but 6 are given by A or B.  The remaining are the first speech of Fulgens

(which contains 2 markers), in which he introduces himself and explains his situation (202-91);

the first solo speech of Cornelius (containing 4 markers), in which he states his intention to woo

Lucres and asks the audience if anyone there wants to help, a request to which B responds (347-

59); two from Lucres, one being the speech in which she explains why she chooses Gaius rather

than Cornelius; and a comment from Cornelius concerning Lucres' plan to entertain the

audience.  Again, clever use of direct address creates the illusion of intimacy with the play, but

that closeness is carefully contained.

Furthermore, that the issue of complete open communication with the audience is not the

policy of the play is made obvious.  Twice, in the references to the audience discussed above, the

issue being considered is whether to withhold certain information from the audience.  B tells A,

for instance, not to speak so loudly, "[leste] any man of this company/ Know oure purpose

openly" (388-89).  B asks Lucres if she really wants a message to be spoken in the hearing of the

audience (273).  Moreover, A and B's pretense that they are not part of the play, maintained

throughout — B claims, when A asks, that he is certainly not one of the players, and throughout

the play, A and B speak about themselves as being separate from the play and not actors — is a

stance that is itself a violation of open communication with the audience. They are in fact actors, and even if, as is likely, no one in the audience is actually fooled about that, their stance is constructed as deception. Players — characters or special personages — do not lie to the audience in medieval drama, at least not about whether or not they are actors.

Another significant way in which Fulgens and Lucres differs from its medieval model is found in the purposes for which it employs direct address. The play, and hence its direct address, is not intended to convey a moral message, as it insists. As we know, medieval drama tends to use direct address in such a way that it will best convey a spiritual or moral message, reserving heavily marked direct address for that purpose, and using it sparingly; for the more mundane purposes of exposition or plot advancement, medieval drama uses lightly marked or unmarked direct address. The choice of Fulgens and Lucres to employ direct address *not* to convey a spiritual or moral message should be carefully noted, because we see it commonly in early sixteenth-century drama. Apparently in reaction to the medieval methods of using direct address, early sixteenth-century drama uses direct address for anything *but* exhorting the audience members to consider their spiritual well being. Fulgens and Lucres, likewise, does not exhort the audience towards anything of such importance; it engages the audience in trivialities.

Medwall's Fulgens and Lucres is constructed in the presence — and perhaps shadow — of a two-hundred-year tradition of medieval English dramaturgy, one in which direct address is a fundamental tool, a chisel finely honed, one handled with precision and to great effect by its artisans. Medwall's play seems decidedly aware of the choice to employ this tool differently, and the effects of that choice. Medwall's context is different from that of the surviving medieval drama, and his dramaturgy therefore differs, adapting direct address accordingly. Medwall, and other playwrights of the early sixteenth century, seem quite consciously aware of what they are

doing in using direct address differently and enjoy seeing what happens when you use a chisel as a hammer.

For Medwall's <u>Nature</u>, the image of choosing to use direct address as a hammer rather than a chisel is particularly appropriate. <u>Fulgens and Lucres</u> uses direct address differently than medieval drama does, but those changes are relatively subtle and are often designed to imitate the feel of the audience-play relationship in medieval drama. <u>Nature</u> provides an example of the deliberate employment of direct address for purposes opposite to those of medieval drama, and none too subtly, either. In medieval drama, marked direct address, in particular moderately and heavily marked address, is used less commonly, reserved for instances in which more impact is desired (<u>Mankind</u> providing the notable exception), especially when the play has a moral or spiritual message to convey to the audience. Moreover, when medieval drama uses heavily marked direct address it frequently does so for the purpose of exhorting the audience members to change their behavior in spiritual or moral matters. Early sixteenth-century drama inverts these characteristics, using marked direct address, even that moderately and heavily marked, more commonly than unmarked. It does not reserve heavily marked address for moments of instruction. Indeed, it tends to not exhort its audience at all.

In <u>Nature</u>, there are 14 instances of marked direct address; of these, only 3 are lightly marked. There are merely 3 instances of unmarked direct address. Clearly, the method of using unmarked and lightly marked direct address more commonly than moderately or heavily marked is here inverted. In this play, marked direct address is used for many purposes, none deep. Using marked direct address, evil characters tell the audience about themselves and what they will do; they also harass the audience, as when Pride asks for directions to the stews (400-7), insisting that a particular man in the audience knows the way, or when Worldly Affection orders

that someone in the audience bring him a stool (516-19).  As in <u>Fulgens and Lucres</u>, the direct

address in <u>Nature</u> seems designed to mimic the close relationship between the play and the

audience that is found in medieval drama, but in both plays, no spiritual demands are made of the

audience.  <u>Nature</u> looks on the surface like a morality play with Man as its main character, and

good and bad cohorts influencing his behavior, but the lesson for the audience is not driven home

with direct address as it would be in medieval drama.  Rather, the lesson learned is Man's, and

Man's alone, and it is up to the audience members to decide whether it also applies to

themselves.  Consider the endings of <u>Mankind</u> and <u>Nature</u>.  At the end of <u>Mankind</u>, Mercy,

having blessed Mankind and sent him off to begin his work anew, turns to the audience, saying:

> *Wyrschepyll sofereyns*, I have do my propierté
>
> Mankynd ys deliveryd by my faverall patrocynye.
>
> God preserve hym fro all wyckyd captivitè
>
> And send hym grace hys sensuall condicions to mortifye!
>
> Now for hys love that for us receyvyvd hys humanitiè,
>
> *Serge your* condicyons wyth dew examinacion.
>
> *Thynke* and *remembyr* the world ys but a wanitè,
>
> As yt ys provyd daly by diverse transmutacyon.
>
> Mankend ys wrechyd, he hath sufficyent prove.
>
> Therefore God grant *yow all* per suam misericordiam
>
> That *ye* may be pleyferys wyth the angellys abowe
>
> And have to *your* porcyon vitam eternam.  Amen!  (903-914; emphasis added)

The audience exhortation here is quite clear, and powerful, which is why I have cited it, but the same technique is used commonly in medieval drama. 'You,' the onlookers are told, are sinners, and 'you' need repentance and salvation. At the end of <u>Nature</u>, though, Reason says:

> I here say, to my great joy and gladness,
>
> That accordyng to my counsell and advyse
>
> Thys mortall creature doth well hys besynes
>
> To correct and forsake all hys old vyce,
>
> And that he ys in a good way and lykely to aryse
>
> From the vale of syn whyche ys full of derkness
>
> Toward the contemplacyon of lyght that ys endles.
>
> Lo, *syrs*, are not we all myche behold
>
> To our Maker for hys great patyence,
>
> Whyche not wythstanding our synnes manyfold
>
> Wherein we dayly do to hym offence,
>
> Yet of hys mercyfull and great magnyfycence
>
> He doth not punyshe as sone as we offende
>
> But suffereth in hope that we wyll amende.
>
> He suffereth a synner sometyme to endure
>
> A long lyfe in honour and great prospertye:
>
> It ys a thyng that dayly ys put in ure,
>
> And meny a great daunger escapeth he
>
> Where good men peryshe — thys may *ye* se —
>
> And all bycause that he wold hym wyn

And have hym to tourne and forsake hys syn. (1371-1391)

A summary of the content of this speech might resemble very closely that of Mercy's final speech in Mankind: human beings are sinful, and reliant upon God's mercy. Yet the handling of this message differs significantly. Using marked direct address, Mercy's speech emphasizes the idea that each audience member is a sinner and must act accordingly. Reason's speech is much less insistent about the personal, individual situation of each audience member, being couched firmly in the plural, addressing the audience as 'syrs,' not the more ambiguous and potentially personal 'you,' and saying that 'we' are beholden to 'our' Maker for mercy for 'our' sins, which he tolerates hoping that 'we' will repent. The final stanza of Reason's speech addresses the audience with a 'you' form, but does in order to say that 'ye' have seen how God sometimes allows a sinful person to prosper while waiting for him to change his ways. The effect here is not to call upon the audience members to see themselves as that kind of sinful person but to call to mind other sinful people whom they remember prospering while 'good men peryshe.' The effect of Reason's speech upon the audience is not recognition of individual and personal sinfulness, but the acknowledgment of humanity's sinfulness generally, moving on to individual offenders in particular, offenders separate from the audience.

Medwall has provided our first examples but these choices in using direct address — more marked address, for purposes besides moral and spiritual lessons, and to avoid exhorting the audience — are common features of early sixteenth-century drama. Mundus et Infans (c1507-8), Hick Scorner (1513), Youth (c1513), Magnificence (c1519-20), Four Elements (1517-20), and John the Evangelist (before 1520) all show these characteristics. In Mundus et Infans, marked direct address is used far more than unmarked, largely for exposition purposes, such as Infans' description of how he is changing as he ages. The lessons for the audience are handled,

as they are in Nature, with little direct exhortation of the audience.  Conscience and Perseverance both use 'you' in praying for the audience, but neither urges the audience members to consider their sinfulness and repent.  The closest the play comes to direct exhortation used in that manner is in is Conscience's statement that he advises "you men, both in earnest and in game,/ Conscience that ye know" (306-7), the mankind's figure's plea, "[now], sirs, take all ensample by me" (961) — which we notice is constructed in the plural, as in Reason's speech in Nature — and Conscience's speech, "[lo,] sirs, a great ensample you may see" (717-40), in which he explains how 'mankind...he' falls into temptation.  The construction of 'mankind...he,' rather than 'mankind...you' allows the audience members some psychological space.  They can acknowledge and accept the moral of the play, that men are sinful, without the next, logical step of acknowledging consciously that they themselves are sinful.  Mankind pushes the onlookers to this next step, exhorting them to consciously deal with this reality; Nature and Mundus et Infans, as are other early sixteenth-century plays, are not constructed to push their audience to that last step.  In Fulgens and Lucres, the use of direct address mimics, but cannot recreate — and indeed, in imitating, points up its inability to recreate — the close relationship between the audience and the play found in medieval drama.  Similarly, the use of direct address in Nature and Mundus et Infans, as well as in other early sixteenth-century morality plays, mimics but does not recreate the spiritual circumstances and effects of medieval drama.  The plays convey a similar message, but do not specifically exhort their audience to do anything about that spiritual reality.

This is a common situation.  In Hick Scorner, Pity tells the audience who he is and says that he is come to help them, and Conscience says that he has come to preach God's word, but neither character exhorts the audience members to acknowledge either their sin or their need for such help.  Charity begins Youth by saying to the audience that he is come to tell 'you' about

God's laws, but when it comes to actually pointing fingers, he switches to the non-directly

accusatory third person construction: "There may no man saved be/ Without the help of me" (8-

9). The only request made of the audience in The Nature of the Four Elements is for room for

the players (416). John the Evangelist comes a bit closer to spiritual exhortation of the audience,

when Eugenio briefly warns about lust: "[all] young folk remember this...So great delight thou

mayst have therein/ That afore God it is deadly sin" (357), but the moment is very short. St.

John the Evangelist immediately enters, saying he has come to preach for the audience's good,

but as in Youth, his lessons are given in the third person, when he says that "Men" love riches as

they should love God alone. Similarly, Magnificence includes a brief moment of exhortation, in

which Adversity advises the audience members, "of adversity look ye beware...To take, sirs,

example of that I you tell,/ And beware of adversity, by my counsel," but even this is undercut

when the speech ends with a reminder of the merely representative nature of what is being

shown: "For though we show you this in game and play,/ Yet it proveth earnest, ye may see,

every day" (1937, 1945-46, 1949-50).

Direct spiritual exhortation of the audience, such an important technique of medieval

drama, is scarcely to be found in early sixteenth-century drama, which offers spiritual lessons,

but obliquely. But at the same time, marked direct address, which had been uncommon in

medieval drama, became the rule in the early sixteenth century. Why are these changes so

abruptly evident? Perhaps they are related to changes in performance conditions, the increase in

marked direct address designed to simulate the missing cultural relationship between audience

and play, the decrease in audience exhortation founded upon a new class distinction between the

actors and their audience. Perhaps it is related to genre, the morality play genre being associated

marked direct address (although that would not help explain the omission of audience

exhortation). I suspect that it is a deliberate contrast with medieval drama at work here, that early sixteenth-century playwrights desired to innovate in drama, and direct address was so fundamental to medieval drama that playwrights found such innovation impossible without substantially changing it.

The desire to innovate in drama, and the recognition that to do so required changing direct address, is also evident in the works of John Heywood. Heywood does not alter the techniques of direct address as do the other early sixteenth-century plays discussed above. Indeed, his plays do not show a consistent strategy for using direct address. But what they do show consistently is his willingness and apparent desire to create a drama different from that of the middle ages, and his efforts in changing direct address in order to get that done.

In The Pardoner and the Friar, almost half the play consists of the two corrupt clerics directly addressing the audience, each coaxing and cajoling the crowd to see things his way. Though satirical, this is the logical extreme of medieval direct address, where it is not uncommon for spiritual opposites to present their cases, each making a pitch to the audience, usually sequentially, as appears at the beginning of Passion Play 1 in N-town, when Lucifer and John the Baptist address the audience one after the other. Having the two characters present their arguments simultaneously is a rather brilliant satire of this technique, making absurd their attempts to sway the onlookers. The satire is particularly biting, since neither of the choices is compelling — we are given no choice between good and evil, only a choice between two corrupt churchmen. Indeed, I wonder if Heywood has changed direct address here even further than is shown by the satire of the simultaneous appeals. To the best of my knowledge, these are the first corrupt Christian clergy who appear in extant English drama.[44] Such figures appear in other

---

[44] At least, in a complete, extant play; the fragmentary, fourteenth-century Interludium de Clerico et Puella includes a corrupt cleric and thus may indicate the existence of anti-clerical medieval drama which does not survive.

forms of English literature before the early sixteenth century, and evil religious figures, such as Annas and Caiphas, appear in medieval drama, but Heywood's pardoner and friar seem to be the first corrupt Christian clergy, rather than heathen or Jewish clergy, to appear onstage.  I suspect that Heywood recognizes how direct address is used in medieval drama, setting out in The Pardoner and the Friar to use the same technique to different ends, in the process calling the earlier usage into question.

Heywood's plays show both his familiarity with other examples of English drama and his willingness to change their techniques — including that of direct address — as he seeks to change how English plays can be constructed.  Whereas nearly half of The Pardoner and the Friar is constructed of direct address, The Four PP, The Play of Love, and Witty and Witless contain very little.  The Four PP contains direct address only in the opening speech of the play.  It is worth noting that nearly all sixteenth-century plays, at least until 1585, begin with a speech constructed of direct address, even those like The Four PP which contain no other passages of direct address.  This method of opening plays appears to have been established as a convention early in the sixteenth century, to remain intact for many years.  Indeed, Witty and Witless is notable for being one of only a handful of sixteenth-century plays that does not begin with a speech of direct address.  It contains direct address only at the end, another location in which direct address is frequently found in sixteenth-century drama.  Jerome tells the audience "[eche] man hym self so to aply in thys/ As ye all may obtayne the hye degre of blys" (701-1), the same exhortation to the audience members, to apply the play's instruction in their own lives, common in medieval drama, but strikingly absent from other early sixteenth-century drama.

Heywood appears to be familiar not only with the direct address of medieval drama but also with that of the early sixteenth-century drama contemporary with him.  Heywood's The Play

<u>of Love</u> contains only 4 instances of direct address, but as with other early sixteenth-century drama, uses marked direct address far more often than unmarked; 3 of the 4 speeches of direct address are marked.  In <u>The Play of the Weather</u>, he uses the most direct address, and here, as in <u>The Play of Love</u>, the direct address is predominantly marked.  But one of Heywood's most startling innovations in direct address occurs, surprisingly, in <u>Johan Johan</u>, which is in large part a translation of a French farce.[45]  At the end of <u>Johan Johan</u>, however, Heywood gives Johan the husband a speech unparalleled in the source, in which he introduces a new possibility for direct address.

In my dealings with <u>Johan Johan</u> hitherto, I had assumed that at the end of the play, Johan Johan finally challenges Tyb and Sir Johan but is physically trounced for his trouble.  In my research, I was startled to find Craik ("True Source" 291), Norland ("French Connection" 147), and F.P. Wilson (32) all interpreting Johan Johan's final speech as meaning that he beats both his wife and the priest, but after this moment of triumph falls back into his subservience and irresolution.  I can certainly see where this interpretation is coming from; Johan Johan *says* that he has "payd some of them even as I lyst;/ They have borne many a blow with my fyst./ I thank God that I have walkyd them well,/ And dryven them hens" (665-68).  But the lines that follow seem to undercut this assurance:  "But yet can ye tell/ Whether they be gone?  For, by God, I fere me/ That they be gone together..." (669-70).  How can it be that he has triumphantly beaten Tyb and Sir Johan, driving them away, but failed to notice which way they went?  The stage direction included is singularly unhelpful in deciphering who has won this round, reading, "Here they fyght by the ers a whyle and than the preest and the wyfe go out of the place."  Do Tyb and Sir Johan leave, after giving Johan Johan a good beating, or are they driven out after receiving one at

---

[45] T.W. Craik demonstrates that the <u>Farce du Pasté</u> is the source for <u>Johan Johan</u> in his article "The True Source of Johy Heywood;" for further discussion of the relationship between <u>Johan Johan</u> and its source, see Howard B.

his hands?  Comparison with the source likewise does not settle the issue, for this is one of the places where Heywood diverges most from the <u>Farce du Pasté</u>; he has greatly expanded and modified the husband's final speech.  But though considering the source, a translation of which is included in Richard Axton and Peter Happé's <u>The Plays of John Heywood</u>, does not definitively settle the question, it certainly suggests that it is the husband who is beaten:

> Man    Come on!  Come on!  Ah!  Master Priest,
>
>         I'll make you clear out of this house.
>
>         You'll get what's coming, take that, take that!
>
>         You have eaten up our pie,
>
>         But you will have to pay for it:
>
>         I shall see you soundly thrashed.
>
>         Up and at him!  Come on!  Come on!
>
> Wife    Come on, Father!
>
> Man                I saw you.
>
>         Ah!  You are too much for me.
>
>         Ah!  By the Holy Body, I'll be off,
>
>         And let him keep what he wants! (750-59)

The stage action implied here is that the husband tries to rebel against the priest and is thrashed in return, ultimately running away.

      Given that, it seems more likely that Johan Johan is beaten by Sir Johan and Tyb rather than that he is victorious over them.  In addition, our sympathy for him rests largely upon his ineffectualness.  The viciousness of his imagined revenge takes on a new aspect if, in the end, he is able to rise up and realize it in part.  Recall that throughout the play, the imagined vengeance

---

Norland's article "Formalizing English Farce: <u>John Johan</u> and Its French Connection."

is always characterized by death and violence (he desires to beat his wife nearly to death; he desires that Tyb and Sir Johan choke to death). If he becomes even partly competent, he becomes a frightful rather than a sympathetic figure.

Nevertheless, if it is true that Johan Johan is in fact beaten at the end of the play, we are left with a quandary. As quoted above, Johan Johan says that he has beaten Tyb and Sir Johan and driven them away. Why would he lie? No one is there to hear him but he himself and the audience. Moreover, that he *can* lie in direct address is not clear. The mainstream modern theory of the usage of direct address holds that when a figure speaks directly to the audience, or share his thoughts in soliloquy, he or she tells the truth. Likewise, in medieval English drama, when characters speak in direct address, they tell the truth, or at least the truth as they perceive it. The devils in medieval drama (at the beginning of the N-town Passion Play 1, for example) frequently boast of their power and wealth, boasts we know to be not fully true, but this is boasting; the devils make claims that are exaggerated versions of what is partially true, rather than wholesale fabrications, and these are claims they believe or would like to believe.

Johan Johan claims to have beaten and chased away Sir Johan and Tyb, which is apparently a lie. I suspect that in performance this would not be as disconcerting as it is on the page, because in performance, his words being belied by the previous actions, would appear less like an outright lie and more like an attempted bluff, a pitiful bid to maintain some shreds of personal dignity before the audience who has just witnessed his beating. He misrepresents himself in this concluding speech, presenting to the audience what he would like to have happened rather than what has really happened, exactly what he has done throughout the play in asides. And throughout the play, our attention has been drawn to this by his semi-asides; in them, he is continually 'caught' voicing his vengeful thoughts, and must retract them.

Heywood's inclusion of Johan Johan's bluff is a new thing for direct address, a premeditated change to the technique he inherited. Throughout his works, we see an awareness of the usage of direct address in other plays, and his desire to experiment with the technique.

Early sixteenth-century drama is marked by the willingness to experiment with direct address, to deliberately change how the medieval technique. To say that early sixteenth-century playwrights show this tendency to innovate does not, however, imply that they improved English dramaturgy, since change does not necessarily mean progress; sometimes experiments fail. But this air of experimentation does help to account for the wide and inconsistent range the usage of direct address in the sixteenth century. Another source of the diverse approaches to direct address in the sixteenth century is classical drama, which became more and more of an influence on sixteenth-century English drama.

In the <u>Andria</u> (c.1520), largely a translation of Terence, direct address is used differently than it is either in medieval drama or in other early sixteenth-century plays. It uses very little marked direct address indeed. As we have seen, medieval drama often uses more unmarked direct address than marked, reserving marked address for moments of heightened attention or importance. The <u>Andria</u> uses considerably less. There are 32 instances of direct address; of these, only 4 are marked. Of those 4 examples of marked direct address, 3, lightly marked, are spoken by Pamphilus, complaints to the audience about his sad situation, and the last is Davus's, the final speech of the play before the epilogue. The prologue and epilogue of the <u>Andria</u> are fairly heavily marked, but within the body of the narrative itself, marked direct address is almost entirely absent. Moreover, the unmarked direct address is far more ambiguously constructed than we have previously seen. Over the course by the sixteenth century, the technique of soliloquy emerged slowly, and was not fully formed by 1585. In medieval drama, soliloquy was

rare and was 'marked' when it occurred; the character carefully informs us that he is alone and can safely work through his thoughts.  In the Andria, on the other hand, it is not always possible to determine whether a speech is unmarked direct address or soliloquy.  I suspect that this casual attitude towards distinguishing the form of speech is connected to the play's classical roots, and that it indicates that classical drama works from significantly different assumptions than those of the native English dramaturgy, in which direct address, a core technique, needed to be carefully demarcated.  The Andria indicates other ways in which its dramaturgy differs from that of medieval English drama, most strikingly in its failure to assume complete open communication.  In the Andria, eavesdropping is common, as are scenes in which two characters are both on stage but are unaware of each other, both addressing the audience; neither of these scenarios typically occur in medieval English drama.

When English dramaturgy begins to use classical drama as a model, then, what is brought into the picture are not only new plots, differing conceptions of dramatic time and place, or new conceptions of 'secular' drama, but a radically different concept of drama altogether, based on core assumptions unlike those not only of medieval drama, but also of the contemporary sixteenth-century drama.  This is strikingly evident in the use of direct address.  Very likely, classical drama influenced the emergence of soliloquy in the sixteenth century, but soliloquy could not be lifted from classical drama and grafted into English dramaturgy.  Before soliloquy could emerge as a technique, the assumption that characters on stage alone speak in direct address had to alter.  In addition, the assumption of complete open communication with the audience also had to change, becoming what we see in the Andria, and, correspondingly, a new assumption of privacy (that is, when a character speaks alone on stage, the other characters do not hear what he says) must come into being.  In many ways, the story of sixteenth-century

drama is the story of how English dramaturgy shifts from one set of foundational assumptions, which allow direct address to be used with proficiency, to another set of assumptions, which avoid direct address but allows soliloquy. I do not care to evaluate which of these dramaturgies is 'better,' nor am I certain such an attempt would be appropriate, but I am certain that a fundamental shift, in process throughout the sixteenth century, explains why much sixteenth-century drama has been perceived as inferior when compared to its predecessors or its followers. Sixteenth-century drama often appears to be either badly redone medieval drama or proto-Elizabethan, as 'drab' as the poetry contemporary with it, so damningly dubbed by C.S. Lewis. The process of experimentation was not always successful or pretty.

Early sixteenth-century drama thus shows itself to be a period of experimentation, particularly in the construction of direct address, a technique which had to be addressed, if the dramaturgy were to change at base. Toward the mid-sixteenth century, the process of experimentation continued. The tendency to use mostly marked direct address and to avoid the use of direct address to exhort the audience, a tendency observed in several early sixteenth-century plays, became much less common, being one of several approaches rather than the primary one. What continued was the diverse range of ways of using direct address.

Within this range, four distinct 'strands' of direct address usage can be identified. In the first, the approach to using direct address is largely medieval. In Calisto and Melebea, for instance, marked and unmarked direct address are used in roughly equal measure, quite unlike the early sixteenth-century drama considered previously. Similarly, its use of marked direct address more closely resembles that of medieval drama, being reserved for moments of importance, such as Celestina's devilish introductory speech, in which she tells us who she is and what she has come for, promising us "a pretty game," as does Titivillus (319). Marked direct

address is also used in Danio's speech which ends the play, in which he exhorts "ye vyrgyns and fayre maydens all" to "take good hede" of the example given in the play, and "ye faders, moders," and others in charge of children, to "bryng them up verteously," a speech which shows both the play's strategic use of marked direct address and its willingness to exhort the audience in a medieval fashion.

Likewise, Thersites employs direct address in the manner of medieval drama. Thersites boasts and swaggers, as does Herod or Pilate, in marked direct address. His mother confides in an unmarked speech that he is out of her control. Miles ends the play in very heavily marked address, exhorting the audience not to boast, to shun pride, and to obey their rulers. Marked direct address is used strategically in this play, as in medieval drama, for Thersites' bellowing and, of course, for Miles' final speech. Intriguingly, the sources for both Thersites and Calisto and Melebea are non-English, but their authors have chosen to produce these works using traditional English dramaturgy. Even more interesting is that the use of direct address in Thersites is almost completely unparalleled in its source, Ravisius Textor's Thersites, a Latin play, written in France, created to be performed by Textor's students (the text of this play, as well as a translation, are included in Marie Axton's Three Classical Tudor Interludes). Thersites' opening rant and Miles' final exhortation are, for example, both unprecedented in the source. The reasons that the playwright would add so much direct address to the play cannot be reconstructed at this point. But we know classical drama takes a different approach to direct address, one in which marked direct address is rarely used within the narrative body of the play. That Textor's play avoids marked direct address on the model of classical drama is a possibility, but an only partly satisfactory one. Thersites' source uses very little direct address at all, but classical drama is perfectly willing to use unmarked direct address. One is left to wonder if

direct address functions differently in continental drama (since Textor worked in France ) than in English drama in the sixteenth-century, which would explain both its absence from Textor's play, and the English playwright's decision to add it when rewriting the work in English.  The evidence here is tenuous, so I do not wish to burden it with more significance than it can bear, but certainly the question of how direct address is used in drama in other languages, and what effect that had upon its usage in drama in English is worthy of further study.

There are other examples of the medieval usage of direct address in other plays from the mid-sixteenth century.  David Lindsay's <u>A Satire of the Three Estates</u> is so obviously medieval in its dramaturgy that it scarcely merits mention; suffice to say that in its direct address, as in its other elements, <u>A Satire of the Three Estates</u> is medieval in form and concept.  Indeed, Lindsay's play serves as another reminder that 'medieval' drama continued into the sixteenth century as a live fire, not as spent ashes, and that it was quite possible for playwrights to choose this style, as Lindsay did.  The decision to use medieval dramaturgy is due to purposeful choice.  <u>Impatient Poverty</u> and <u>The Life and Repentance of Mary Magdalene</u> are also plays for which the more traditional medieval technique of direct address has been employed, and since their usage of direct address largely follows the methods discussed previously, I will pass over them.

However, John Bale's use of medieval dramaturgy for his plays cannot be passed over. John Bale chooses to employ traditional medieval dramatic techniques for very Protestant purposes, a decision which in itself is intriguing, as are the modifications he makes to that dramaturgy to accomplish that purpose.  That Bale sees his plays as improved versions of medieval drama is well-known, and he himself is direct about this; the opening speech given by Baleus Prolocutor in <u>God's Promises</u> makes clear what Bale considers to be the relationship between his plays and those that came before:

> Yow, therfor, good fryndes, I lovyngly exhorte
>
> To waye soche matters as wyll be uttered here
>
> Of whome ye maye look to have no tryfelinge sporte
>
> In fantasyes fayned, nor soche lyke gaudysh gere;
>
> But the thynges that shall your inwarde stomake stere
>
> To rejoyce in God for your justyfycacyon,
>
> And alone in Christ to hope for your salvacyon.  (15-21)

What he presents in his plays, Bale says, is the truth that will turn his audience to faith in Christ. His plays are not mere entertainment or dangerous fabrication; he implies here, of course, that such fabrication is precisely what was found in earlier plays.  Bale's grouping and linking of his plays also suggest a conscious reworking of medieval concepts; it is clear that he conceives of his project as creating a Protestant set of 'cycle' plays.

What is interesting, then, is not the observation that Bale intends to revise and improve medieval drama, which is well known, but first, that he chooses to use medieval dramaturgy for his Protestant drama, and, second, that he must change that dramaturgy in order to improve its efficacy for his Protestant plays. The fact that Bale chooses to adopt and revise medieval dramaturgy for his plays implies that, despite the fact that medieval drama is, largely by chronology, Catholic drama, its techniques were not inextricably linked with Catholicism. Medieval dramatic techniques could be adopted for other purposes.  Indeed, if my observations about the Towneley cycle are correct — that its use of direct address far more closely resembles that of the early sixteenth-century drama than that of the medieval drama — and this is connected to the recent findings by Barbara Palmer, and Alexandra Johnston and Malcolm Parkes, that the Towneley cycle is quite likely to be a later construction than we have believed

(and may indeed be a cycle constructed by Catholic holdouts with Catholic sensibilities in mind), the borrowing appears to travel in both directions. The Protestant John Bale can adopt medieval dramaturgy for his plays, and the Catholic Towneley cycle can use early sixteenth-century 'newfangled' techniques. This would lead us to the conclusion that dramatic techniques were not connected with particular religious perspectives, which would in turn suggest that the reduction in the use of direct address during the sixteenth century, a decline that accelerated rapidly in the last three decades of the century, should not be assumed to be the result of the religious changes in England. The ship of Catholicism went down in England in the sixteenth century, but direct address was not lashed to the mast. The reasons for the decline of direct address must be found elsewhere than in the religious battles.

Secondly, Bale's modifications of medieval direct address strategies are worth noting. Bale clearly knows and understands how direct address is employed in medieval drama. When it suits him, he uses the inherited methods unaltered. In God's Promises and Three Laws, he follows the conventions of medieval direct address of constructing more unmarked than marked address and reserving marked address for moments of desired emphasis, often moments of exhortation to the audience. Speeches of expository direct address, such as Pater Coelestis' opening description of creation, are unmarked, as in medieval drama; moments of importance and exhortation, such as Pater Coelestis' speech warning the audience against idolatry and Esaias Propheta's call to the audience to repent and accept the Lord (682-95; 792-98) are heavily marked.[46] As does God's Promises, Three Laws shows Bale's familiarity with the techniques

---

[46] Intriguingly, God the Father's exhortation uses forms of 'you,' the plural and more formal second person pronoun, to address the audience, while Isaiah's relies upon 'thee,' the singular and more personal form, raising the question of whether there are, in some instances, differences in how the two forms of the second person pronoun are used in direct address, a question worthy of further study.

used in medieval direct address, containing a prevalence for unmarked address and the strategic use of marked address.

Bale's other extant 'Protestant cycle' plays, <u>The Temptation of Our Lord</u> and <u>John the Baptist's Preaching</u>, show, on the other hand, his modification of medieval direct address strategies.  At first glance, these plays might appear to fit more comfortably with the early sixteenth-century plays considered above, whose distinguishing characteristic was their predominant use of marked direct address, since in both, marked direct address is used far more than unmarked.  However, unlike that set of early sixteenth-century plays, Bale's plays use marked direct address for exhortation; indeed, nearly all the instances of marked direct address in <u>The Temptation of Our Lord</u> and <u>John the Baptist's Preaching</u> contain exhortation to the audience.  Apparently, Bale's desire that his plays clearly present Protestant concerns leads him to include more marked direct address, using it to exhort the audience about those concerns.  In <u>John the Baptist's Preaching</u>, Bale has Jesus emphasize the message that he has come to save and that salvation comes through faith in him; likewise, Pater Coelestis urges the audience to listen only to Jesus, putting no trust in "mennys tradycyons" (440).  Similarly, in <u>The Temptation of Our Lord</u>, Jesus explains that his fast before his temptation does not mean that he expects the audience to fast.  Bale thus modifies the medieval usage of direct address, including more marked direct address to allow him to clarify important points and urge the audience to adopt his Protestant view of those issues.

Bale modifies the medieval usage of direct address in one other significant fashion, also connected with his desire to put forth Protestant concepts clearly.  His use of direct address indicates his concern that his plays allow no room for misinterpretation.  He includes the special personage, Baleus Prolocutor, who begins and ends each play, explaining in marked direct

address what the audience will learn, and later, should have learned, from the play. Moreover, he radically minimizes the use of direct address by evil characters. Only rarely do evil figures address the audience, and when they do, they speak, nearly always, in unmarked direct address. Only once in his four 'cycle' plays does an evil character speak in heavily marked direct address to the audience, and that occurs in a situation which is carefully constructed to be unambiguous: Infidelitas, in Three Laws, offers to sell indulgences to the audience, as well as unmistakably false relics, such as "a wynge of the Holy Ghost" (1684), and other 'holy items' with dubious powers. Infidelitas does get some business from Pseudodoctrina and Hypocrisis, but is quickly denounced by Evangelium, making it clear that Infidelitas' actions are deplorable. Heavily marked direct address of the type found in medieval drama, in which, for instance, Herod bullies the audience, or in which the Devil pleads his case to the crowd, appears to strike Bale as problematic and dangerous, and he chooses, therefore, to use direct address in a straightforward manner, to appeal to, instruct, and exhort the audience. Ironically, this one-dimensional approach to direct address may be one reason that his plays seem less successful and engaging than the medieval drama they purport to improve. Bale has chosen to omit an element of medieval direct address technique, the use of direct address by evil characters, for the sake of his content's clarity, but the complexity of his play suffers for it.

A second strand of direct address usage in the mid-sixteenth century consists of plays that use predominantly marked address but without exhorting the audience, the same strategy observed previously in early sixteenth-century plays. Wit and Science (c1544-47), The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna (c1562), King Darius (c1564-65), The Trial of Treasure (c1566), Like Will to Like (c1567-68), Liberality and Prodigality (c1567-68), and Horestes (1568) are all plays belong to this strand. In Wit and Science, all but one of the instances of direct address are

marked, and there is no exhortation of the audience.  In <u>The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna</u>, the majority of the direct address is likewise marked, although there are also a few noteworthy developments, one being that the direct address is largely associated with the vice, Ill Report, a technique found in other plays as well.  The second is that some exhortation is included; towards the end of the play, Susanna is given a speech constructed of marked direct address, in which she urges the audience to take comfort from her story, because God does help the innocent, and Daniel is given a speech warning "you that are wicked" that God will punish evil.  Here, then, we can see the beginnings of the synthesis which will, by 1570, make it almost impossible to separate English drama into 'strands' based upon the use of direct address.  In <u>King Darius</u>, as in <u>The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna</u>, nearly all the direct address is marked and given by the vice, Iniquity, though there is no exhortation of the audience; Constancy explains the play's message in his final speech but does not then exhort the audience to examine or change their own behavior.  As in <u>Wit and Science</u>, <u>King Darius</u> follows the early sixteenth-century model of using marked direct address but not exhorting the audience, a reminder that while we begin to see dramaturgical synthesis in <u>The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna</u>, there is no reason to expect that all plays contemporary with it will show that synthesis.  The 1550's and 60's may well be the period of the greatest diversity in the use of direct address in the sixteenth century; all the 'strands' had emerged by that time, and the synthesis was only beginning.

The beginning of synthesis can be seen in <u>The Trial of Treasure</u> as well, which, as do the others in this 'strand,' constructs its direct address in such a way that it is nearly all marked.  Here, as in other plays of the mid-sixteenth century, but unlike examples from the early sixteenth century, the direct address focuses around a specific character, the vice.  Here also, as in <u>The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna</u>, we find exhortation; Trust admonishes "ye emperors,

potentates, and princes of renown" to rule well, and "[ye] poor men and commons" to work well (230-31). The situation is similar in Like Will To Like and Liberality and Prodigality, though differing in the amount of exhortation each contains, Like Will To Like having more, Liberality and Prodigality very little.

Horestes likewise uses marked direct address almost exclusively and avoids exhortation, showing also the beginnings of what would eventually become soliloquy. In the mid-sixteenth century, as dramatic experimentation with direct address continued, playwrights apparently desired to create a technique for having a character speak on stage, alone, but *not* using direct address. As mentioned above, this was apparently possible in classical drama, but the technique could not be easily grafted onto English drama: someone standing on stage alone, talking, was assumed to be speaking in direct address. So playwrights had to determine how to signal rhetorically by the construction of the character's language that he was not talking to the audience, but thinking aloud. The solution they found is the one that had been employed in the rare medieval soliloquies, as discussed in the previous chapter; they marked the speech as one which was *not* addressed to the audience. Several 'thinking-out-loud' characteristics ultimately emerge in the mid-to-late sixteenth century, one speech in Horestes showing some of them. Early in the play, Horestes considers his situation and what to do about it, and to signal that he is thinking aloud rather than talking to the audience, his speech is rhetorically constructed as addressed to a concept ("O paterne love") and to the gods (171-88). Thus, his deliberations are presented as thinking aloud rather than directly addressing the audience, not by simply relating what he is thinking — as would be the case in later soliloquies—but by substituting a different (and absent from the stage) addressee, one separate from the audience. The emergence of this technique is clearly a crucial change that would allow soliloquy to emerge. This speech also

shows another interesting element in the emergence of soliloquy — upper class and serious characters were given the technique first. Put another way, direct address survived longest in the lower class, comic, and vice figures. Indeed, direct address used in this way would survive beyond the sixteenth century, as we find, for instance, in the Porter in Shakespeare's Macbeth.

The third strand of direct address technique found in mid-sixteenth century drama experiments with limiting the amount of direct address used, and when it is used, strongly preferring unmarked address to marked. Plays in this strand include Godly Queen Hester (c1541-42), Lusty Juventus (c1550-53), Wealth and Health (c1554-55), The Pedlar's Prophecy (1561-c63), Tom Tyler and His Wife (c1563), The Marriage of Wit and Science (c1567-68), and New Custom (1570-73). As found above, these plays show an awareness of medieval techniques for the use of direct address and work from them, but in a modified fashion, using considerably less direct address than do the other 'strands' of mid sixteenth-century drama, but, when it is used, following the medieval strategy of preferring unmarked direct address, reserving marked address for moments of particular emphasis.

In Godly Queen Hester, for example, there are only four instances of direct address, of which only one is marked; as in the previous strand, we see here a tendency to focus marked direct address upon the vice, for the sole speech of marked direct address here belongs to Pride. Godly Queen Hester is also noteworthy for being one of the very few plays before 1585 *not* to begin its narrative action with a speech of direct address. Lusty Juventus has 8 direct address speeches, 2 of which are heavily marked, 2 lightly marked, and 4 unmarked. The scarcity of direct address in Lusty Juventus is even more obvious when we realize that 3 of the direct address speeches are those that end the play, in which the audience is prayed for and the government flattered. Compared to Wit and Science, for example, a play of comparable length

— both are approximately 1,000 lines long — the lesser amount of direct address in Lusty Juventus is striking.  Wit and Science contains 12 instances of direct address, spread throughout the play.  Wealth and Health contains only 9, 3 of which, like in Lusty Juventus, are praise-and-prayer speeches concluding the play.  Wealth and Health uses marked direct address rarely, and marks these speeches lightly.  Tom Tyler and His Wife, New Custom, The Pedlar's Prophecy, and The Marriage of Wit and Science all behave similarly, averaging 6-9 instances of direct address, whereas plays of similar length in other strands average 10-20 instances.

In this strand, then, we see playwrights using techniques for the use of direct address similar to those used by the medieval drama, but experimenting by using direct address roughly half as much.  None of the plays extant in this strand is typically considered to be a stellar example of sixteenth-century dramaturgy, to put it kindly.  I personally would gladly trade any one of them for another medieval play, or the whole lot for another play from the hand that composed Mankind.  But it is possible that the poor quality of these plays is due not to being created by lesser talents but to the task that these playwrights set for themselves.  Direct address, as we have seen, is a foundational technique of medieval and sixteenth-century drama; writing a play in which this technique was severely limited would be like a contemporary filmmaker making a movie without a soundtrack — bold, innovative, surely, but very difficult to do well.  The poor quality of these plays might well attest that the reach of the playwrights exceeded their grasp, not that they should not have been writing at all.

A final strand of direct address technique found in mid-sixteenth-century drama occurs in those plays that derive their structure or source from classical or foreign plays.  Plays that fall into this category are Ralph Roister Doister (c1547-48), Gammer Gurton's Needle (c1551-54), Respublica (1553), The Bugbears (1563-c1570), and Jacob and Esau (c1557-58).  As with the

Andria, discussed above, these plays use direct address commonly, but nearly always employ unmarked address. Ralph Roister Doister has 25 instances of direct address, only 3 of which are marked.  In this play, as in others observed hitherto, there is a tendency for the direct address to be focused upon the vice figure, in this case, Matthew Merrygreek, whose behavior resembles that of the vice, although his dramatic heritage is more widely derived.  In addition, marked direct address in this strand is not reserved for significant or important moments.  Respublica, The Bugbears, Jacob and Esau, and Gammer Gurton's Needle behave similarly, heavily favoring unmarked direct address over marked address, but not reserving marked address for particular emphasis, and focusing direct address around a vice or comic figure.  However, these plays by and large do not experiment with marking speeches as what would become soliloquy; they are not part of the great experiment which would produce that technique.

There are, of course, some anomalies.  Gorboduc is a mid-sixteenth-century play, but it does not fit into any of these strands; indeed, it uses very little direct address at all, containing only 6 speeches of direct address, all unmarked.  I have often wondered what the interaction of direct address is with canonical texts, and therefore it is interesting that Gorboduc, often pointed to as one of the first attempts at tragedy in English drama and a precursor to the later Elizabethan and Jacobean tragedies, uses so little direct address.  It seems possible that since direct address declined in the sixteenth century — so that by the time of the great Elizabethan and Jacobean plays, it was rare — direct address, by definition, indicated a play 'not as fully developed' as the later plays in which there was so little.  If this is true, the constructors of the canon, looking for plays that led up to the Elizabethan and Jacobean, selected plays containing the least amount of direct address on the assumption that those plays were therefore the most advanced.  This would not necessarily have been fully conscious, the prejudice against direct address being so strong.

The case of Gorboduc provides a tantalizing morsel of proof for that theory, but not enough to go beyond speculation.[47] But were we to speculate further, we wonder if Gorboduc had an influence upon the emergence of tragic drama, providing a model for later playwrights that contributed to the decline in the use of direct address over the course of the sixteenth century.

One fact, at least, about the use of direct address in Gorboduc seems certain, at any rate. Gorboduc was part of the experiment in the development of techniques that would allow soliloquy, as at least two of its speeches show. The speeches of Videna (in 4.1) and Eubulus (in 4.2) have characteristics of 'thinking aloud,' rhetorical structures designed to indicate that the character's words are meant for the audience to overhear rather than words spoken directly to them, both Videna and Eubulus rhetorically addressing their speeches to absent figures ("[my] deare Ferrex," "[thou], Porrex," "[o] Jove," "[thee], Brittaine land"), indicating, of course, that the speech is not directed to the audience. Both speeches also use questions ("Why should I lyve, and linger forth my time/ In longer life to double my distresse?" "[o] Jove, how are these peoples harts abusde?") which represent a process of thought. In order to see how the technique of soliloquy emerged in the sixteenth century, it is crucial that we recognize the appearance of such rhetorical markers, which are, essentially, inverse direct address markers — that is, they mark a speech as not being direct address.

In the mid-sixteenth century, then, we find four distinct strands of direct address technique: the use of direct address in the inherited medieval method, the use of marked direct address to no special purpose, the use of significantly limited direct address, and the use of unmarked direct address almost exclusively, in the classical model. With the important exception of Gorboduc, nearly all extant plays of the mid-sixteenth century fit into one of these

---

[47] To make the case more forcefully, one would need, for instance, to consider what effects Gorboduc's classical sources, such as the tragedies of Seneca, had upon its avoidance of direct address.

four strands.  What we have in the mid-sixteenth century, then, is a collection of methods for using direct address, some of which clearly represent experiments with the technique.  The mid-sixteenth century is the point of greatest variety in the use of direct address, as playwrights tinkered and experimented with the possibilities for the technique.

After the mid-sixteenth century, the dramaturgy of direct address moved towards synthesis.  This is not to say, of course, that around 1565, all English drama began instantly to use direct address in the same way.  Differing patterns of usage were still present, but the differences between them are less distinct than the differences between strands of usage which are observable in the mid-sixteenth century.  In addition, unlike the four strands of mid-sixteenth-century drama, the patterns of usage in later sixteenth century drama are not roughly equally distributed.  In the later sixteenth century, though, different patterns can be identified, but one method of using direct address claims the lion's share of plays.

There are, for example, a few plays that use direct address in the same manner as Gorboduc.  As with Gorboduc, The Arraignment of Paris (1581-84), Sappho and Phao (1584), Campaspe (1584), and Gallathea (1585) use very little direct address; Paris has 2 instances, not including its typical concluding speeches, Sappho and Campaspe have 6 instances each,  and Gallathea has 9 instances.  In addition, as with Gorboduc, the vast majority of direct address in these plays is unmarked.  Moreover, just as in Gorboduc, several of the speeches show characteristics of thinking aloud, rhetorical markers used to indicate that a speech is not directed to the audience.  Intriguingly, these plays also avoid the problem of distinguishing direct address and thinking aloud by the simple method of avoiding having characters alone on stage.  One wonders if the extremely limited use of direct address in these plays, all John Lyly's, is related to the fact that they were "designed for performance before the queen," who had recently made

known her displeasure with plays intent upon conveying a message to her (Daniel 15). As Carter A. Daniel explains, "some of the people who presented plays during Elizabeth's earliest years viewed the occasions not just as an honor but even more as an opportunity to give advice to the queen," who became tired of the proselytizing and made arrangements with her Master of the Revels so that "[b]y 1570, the queen had taken firm control and now saw only what she wanted to see" (Daniel 15,16). We might wonder, then, if Lyly avoids direct address to avoid any hint of unwanted and untoward 'advice' to the queen, addressing her directly only in his careful controlled prologues and epilogues.

A different but similarly small set of plays shows the continuation of medieval direct address practices well into the sixteenth century. In <u>All For Money</u>, as we have seen with other plays of its type, direct address is used frequently, unmarked direct address being preferred for most purposes, marked direct address being reserved for moments of particular importance or emphasis, often exhortation and diabolic enticement. In this case, Godly Admonition does the exhortation, Sin-the-Vice the diabolic enticement. The situation is similar in <u>King John</u>, John Bale's historical, secular saint play, originally written around 1537 but revised in the 1560's, and in <u>Enough is as Good as a Feast</u> (c1568).

These two small patterns of usage of direct address are the only ones that may with any certainty be distinguished from the main stream of direct address technique in the later sixteenth century. Moreover, the differences between the second set and that mainstream are considerably smaller than those distinguishing the four strands in the mid-sixteenth century, since the major difference between this small group of plays and the larger group of plays is that the small group has exhortation as a defining characteristic, whereas the large group does not. What we see, then, is that most plays of the later sixteenth century fit into a large, mainstream group of direct

address technique, and even though patterns of usage may be identified, the differences between the large group and the small one are negligible.

In that large mainstream group, direct address is common, and both marked and unmarked address are used. In many plays, the marked direct address is clustered around a vice, comic, or servant character, and in some plays, one character is all three of these things. Other characters, particularly upper class characters, tend to speak in unmarked direct address; in many instances — but not all — these speeches are related to soliloquy, containing rhetorical markers indicating that they represent thinking aloud, and not directed to the audience. The presence or absence of markers which show thinking aloud, however, does not identify a separate strand of direct address usage. Some plays, such as The Disobedient Child, contain no speeches with thinking aloud markers, but no plays contain only speeches marked as thinking aloud (Lyly's plays, discussed above, come closest to this); most plays contain both speeches of implicit direct address and speeches in which thinking aloud characteristics appear.

So many plays fall into this mainstream category of the use of direct address that they cannot be covered in detail; I will simply provide the list and discuss representative examples:

Cambises (1558-59)

The Disobedient Child (1559-70)

July and Julian (1560-70)

Damon and Pithias (1564)

The Play of Patient Grissell (c1565-65)

Appius and Virginia (c1567)

The Longer Thou Livest, the More Fool Thou Art (c1568)

The Conflict of Conscience (1570-81)

Misogonus (c1571)

The Tide Tarrieth No Man (c1571-75)

The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom (c1571-77)

Common Conditions (1576)

The Three Ladies of London (1581)

The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune (1582)

Cambises, chronologically the earliest, is in many ways very typical. Direct address is fairly common in the play, most of it, including all but one of the speeches of marked direct address, given to the vice Ambidexter. Some, but not all, of the speeches of implicit direct address contain thinking aloud markers, moving them towards soliloquy and away from direct address; for instance, Smirdis' "I am wandering alone, heer and there to walke./ The court is so unquiet, in it I take no joy./ Solitary to myself now I may talke./ If I could rule, I wist what to say" (706-9) contains markers indicating the character is alone on stage, and markers indicating he is thinking things through. Similarly, in The Play of Patient Grissell, direct address is common, but largely used by the vice, Politic Persuasion, who has nearly all of the marked direct address, other characters' speeches, constructed of implicit direct address, are made into proto-soliloquies by characteristics which represent thinking aloud.

What we see in the use of direct address in English drama in the period from 1560-1585, then, is a movement towards consensus in how direct address can be used, coming out of an earlier period in which experimentation with direct address had multiplied its possibilities. The defining characteristics of this consensus have been discussed above. The fact that a feature of this new consensus was that marked direct address is confined to vice, comic, or lower-class figures while other characters rarely use it may well indicate why marked direct address fell out

of favor in the late-sixteenth century.  Bad company corrupts good morals, as the Bible says; it would make sense that marked direct address, having become closely associated with an 'unsavory' crowd, could no longer keep company with upper class or serious characters.  Thus, by <u>The Knight of the Burning Pestle</u> (1607), the only marked direct address in the play is given to Rafe, indicating both that he uses an old-fashioned dramatic technique, as marked direct address certainly was by that point, and making a statement about the kind of character he is (that is, he is in the same category as the vice, comic, or lower class figures).

But what is *not* here is almost more interesting than what is.  A detailed analysis of direct address in sixteenth-century English drama indicates without question that soliloquy was not fully emergent by 1585.  Playwrights were moving in that direction, working at transitioning from a dramatic context in which direct address was always the construction used when a character spoke while alone on stage, to a dramatic context in which a character, alone on stage, could speak his thoughts aloud, to be overhead by the audience, though the audience had not been directly addressed.  By 1585, what had emerged were rhetorical markers that could be used to indicate that a speech should be understood as thinking aloud rather than direct address.  They were an innovation.

There are several such rhetorical markers, which characterize 'thinking aloud.'  One is the technique of speaking in questions to simulate a thought process, for example, the series of questions asked by Clamydes:

Shall such defamed dastards, dard by Knights, thus beare their name?

Shall such as are without all faith, live to impaire our fame?

Shall valiant harts by cowardsly charme, be kept in captives thrall?

Shall Knights live subject to a wretch which hath no hart at all?

       (<u>Clyomon and Clamydes</u> 648-51)

The questions here and elsewhere simulate ideas as they occur to a character, ideas being articulated as they come into the character's mind, hence representing the thought process. Another rhetorical strategy used to indicate thinking aloud is the technique of addressing the speech to a deity, abstraction, or absent figure (at any rate, some being not present on the stage), such as in <u>Promos and Cassandra</u>, in which Cassandra addresses her complains to "blynde affectes in love" (2.1.5). In a related manner, a speech can be addressed to the character himself, as in <u>Damon and Pithias</u>, when Pithias says, "[ah] wofull Pithias, sithe now I am alone/ What way shall I first begin to make my mone?" (582-3). This leads us to the last characteristic used to represent thinking aloud, since the previous one is contained within: the character can pointedly state that he is alone and can work through his thoughts. This is a favorite of <u>Common Conditions</u>, in which the vice says some variant of 'ha! They're gone now!' at the beginning of nearly every speech in which, his victims having left the stage, he lays out the next step in his wicked scheme to harass them.

       These characteristics of thinking aloud are used in many speeches in later sixteenth-century English drama in order to indicate that a speech is *not* constructed as direct address. Very few speeches exist in English drama from this time period which are not either marked as 'thinking aloud' or clearly constructed as unmarked direct address. Speeches which, though characters speak their thoughts aloud, are not clearly marked as thinking aloud — that is, pure soliloquy — are nearly non-existent. Thus, the genesis of soliloquy is found after 1585, much later than we have typically assumed. Indeed, it is much later than I assumed in deciding upon the time period for this study. It seemed prudent, and sufficient, for my analysis to end at 1585, since the most important changes in direct address would have happened by then. But it turns

out that one of the most crucial changes in English dramaturgy overall, not just one of the most crucial changes in direct address — the emergence of the technique of soliloquy — was not fully present by 1585.  Although my study does not extend beyond 1585, and though I cannot definitely pinpoint when and how soliloquy ultimately emerged as a dramatic technique, a cursory glance at the later drama shows that playwrights reduce but did not eliminate the use of markers meant to show thinking aloud.  Before chastising himself as a "rogue and peasant slave," the most famous of soliloquizers notes that "Now I am alone;" and, of course, he begins his best-known soliloquy with "[to] be or not to be, that is the question" (Hamlet 2.2.575-76; 3.1.64).

The fact that soliloquy is only beginning to emerge by 1560, and was not fully developed by 1585 has important implications for our understanding of sixteenth-century drama.  We have been accustomed to speak of the existence of 'soliloquies' long before it is safe to do so.  In Plays of Persuasion, Greg Walker, for instance, says of John Heywood's The Play of the Weather, "[in] the account of the turbulent parliamentary session which Jupiter provides in his opening soliloquy, the audience is told that the arguments between the gods had been resolved only by their voluntary surrender of executive power over the weather to Jupiter" (148), and about John Bale's King John, "[having] entered the place alone and established in soliloquy his right to rule, John is approached by a poor widow, England" (178).  Walker seems to consider anything spoken by a character alone on stage to be a soliloquy, unless the speech has explicit direct address markers (he speaks of Sedition 'addressing the audience' [178] with a speech containing the marker 'serys').  Similarly, in his edition of Cambises, Robert Carl Johnson uses the term 'soliloquy' to refer to Sisamnes' speech and to Ambidexter's (14, 16, 18, 19).  Johnson's

understanding of this term is even more elastic than Walker's; Ambidexter's addresses to the audience are patently not soliloquies — most are constructed of marked direct address.

The origin of this expanded definition of 'soliloquy' in Renaissance drama scholarship, discussed in the previous chapter, need only be briefly mentioned here. In drama criticism from the late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century, the term "soliloquy" meant, specifically, a speech spoken by a character who was alone on stage, or believed he was alone, one in which he spoke his thoughts aloud. In introductory drama textbooks and handbooks, "soliloquy" is still defined this way. But during the twentieth century, as scholars of Renaissance drama began to consider whether some "soliloquies" in the plays they were considering might actually be spoken directly to the audience, the term "soliloquy" became more elastic. For example, Bernard Beckerman says, in Shakespeare at the Globe, "[in] none of the Globe plays is there any certain indication that the audience was directly addressed in the soliloquy" (186). The expanded definition has remained in currency in Renaissance drama scholarship, as seen by the examples of Walker and Johnson, given above, as well as in A.R. Braunmuller and Michael Hattaway's Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama, in which R.A. Foakes says in his chapter "Playhouses and Players," that "Two devices used with especial brilliance were the aside, in which an actor could step out of his role for a moment to comment on the action, and the soliloquy, in which the actor could address the audience directly, seem to take it into his confidence" (24). The problem with this expanded definition of soliloquy is, of course, the confusion which can and does result, as seen in the previous chapter, in the contradictory statements of Lloyd Skiffington and Meg Twycross that medieval drama was either full of — or completely devoid of — soliloquy.

The critical confusion resulting from using the use of the term "soliloquy" to refer both to speeches of direct address and to thinking aloud has made it very difficult to determine what, if any, sixteenth-century drama criticism was pertinent to this project, as it is almost impossible to discern whether a scholar is taking a stand upon whether a speech is direct address or thinking aloud, a distinction which was of course a critical concern for this study. But a bigger problem with this ambiguous use of "soliloquy" is that it obscures the history both of direct address and of soliloquy, since it implies that soliloquy has been present in English drama forever, and conceals the important difference between direct address and thinking aloud. Sixteenth-century playwrights recognized this difference, and we should do them the courtesy of acknowledging their understanding.[48] Moreover, obscuring the difference between direct address and soliloquy hides the sixteenth-century experimentation with the techniques of direct address, hiding as well the cleverness exhibited by the playwrights who devised a solution, another set of rhetorical markers, which could indicate 'thinking aloud.'

The story of direct address in the sixteenth century is that of a technique which underwent experimentation and expansion in the early and middle parts of the century. In the 1560s, 70s, and 80s, drama moved towards a new consensus in the use of direct address, propelled by experiments with thinking aloud, the use of rhetorical markers which indicated that a speech was not constructed as direct address. Full soliloquy, in which thoughts are spoken without being marked as such, was not present by 1585. The relationship of direct address to soliloquy, however, is often obscured in contemporary drama criticism, as soliloquy is used by some scholars to mean only thinking aloud and by others to refer to both direct address and thinking aloud. This project shows that playwrights were aware of the differences between

---

[48] The eighteenth century, by the way, was aware of this difference — the Sheridan quotation that begins this chapter relies upon that distinction for its humor.

203

techniques used to construct direct address and those used to construct thinking aloud.  If we

want to understand their dramaturgy more fully, we should be cognizant of that distinction also.

**Chapter 7: Conclusion**

I suspect that several of the findings of this project may seem frightfully obvious. For example, once pointed out, the observation that we should pay closer attention to direct address, a technique widely acknowledged as foundational and common in early drama, yet having received almost no focused scrutiny, seems patent. Likewise, the assertion that paying attention to the rhetorical construction of direct address — the notion that marked direct address would have different effects and be used for different purposes than unmarked direct address — also seems fairly straightforward, even if one does not agree with the conclusions that I have drawn about particular instances. But observations which, once made, seem obvious were not necessarily obvious to begin with. Indeed, sometimes it is quite difficult to see that which should be most clear. My two earlier assertions, the foundations upon which this project was built, are ones whose 'simplicity' is a virtue, their very nature making them more likely to be tools which can be employed beneficially by other scholars. As noted in Chapter 1, direct address is most often discussed in studies whose main focus is something else. This study suggests that more attention should be paid to direct address, especially in its systematic use of markers, and the study of its markers that I have provided can be beneficial as a tool of analysis in other related studies.

Other findings are important, as well, though not so blindingly obvious in hindsight, and arguably applicable in other contexts. My analysis of the position of direct address in early English dramaturgy — that direct address was the norm — and the conclusion that a change in dramatic theory itself would be necessary before soliloquy could exist, and the related idea that soliloquies had to be rhetorically marked as 'not-direct address,' are logical, though less overtly apparent, conclusions. Similarly, the discovery that the functions of direct address were not be

confined to 'simple' dramatic roles of exposition, audience exhortation, or even character revelation (although those functions were often handled with more finesse and skill than is generally assumed), but could be employed as well for effects of thematic significance, is an important, logical conclusion of this research. Both of these sets of observations have interesting implications for scholars working in other areas of early drama. The first revises critical assumptions concerning the cultural position of medieval drama within its societal context. In a related manner, it reinterprets "soliloquy" as a technique whose history needs to be written, and brings into question the use of "soliloquy" as a term and concept. Likewise, the second observation suggests that we reconsider our assumptions about the ways in which different dramatic techniques function; if direct address can be used for thematic importance, as it is used in the York cycle, perhaps other techniques which seem to be used for 'simple' purposes, such as exposition, might also serve interesting, unknown purposes.

But the most important implication of this research for scholars of early drama is that it shows we would benefit further from close consideration of the admittedly scanty extant playtexts, even those we consider inferior, in order to systematically reconstruct the dramatic theory of early English drama. Both text-based analysis and wide generalizations are rather out of fashion. Rather, our current research tends to be historically based, and specifically focused upon particular texts or issues. This critical trend may result from the influence of new historicism among scholars of sixteenth-century and Renaissance drama or the influence of the Records of Early English Drama project among scholars of medieval drama. I am not taking either of these approaches to task; such a position would be indefensible. As Theresa Colletti says in "Reading REED: History and the Records of Early English Drama," "my examination of REED's methodology in no way is intended as a criticism of archival research per se. That

would be a foolish thing for a medievalist to do" (251).  In my case, with two REED editors on

my dissertation committee, it might even qualify as suicidal, but at any rate, I have no desire to

put such a criticism forth; REED and other historically-based projects have unquestionably

provided early scholars with crucial information about the performance conditions, the cultural

and societal context, and economic significance of early English drama.

What our historicist focus has not provided is what can be reconstructed about early

dramatic theory from the texts themselves.  Indeed, the focus upon historical research tends to

make text-based analysis appear old-fashioned in technique, and less vigorous in approach.  In

addition, a move towards historicist analysis tends to encourage more focused, specific research

rather than research that aims towards locating general trends in literature.  This move towards

specificity has largely been beneficial; we have needed to question some of the generalities about

medieval drama that had been established, such as the genres into which the plays have been

formerly divided.  We needed to ask, for instance, if a "Corpus Christi" cycle genre really

existed, and if it did, what it looked like.  Similar questions have been raised about the genre of

morality plays.  These generalizations, inherited from scholars who had less knowledge about

early drama at their disposal, were overdue for reconsideration, and a focus on specifics, one text

at a time, has been crucial in that reconsideration.

So, our focused, historically-based research has substantially enhanced our understanding

of early drama.  Nevertheless, we would be helped as well by text-based studies seeking to

provide meaningful and accurate generalizations about the field.  In particular, a lack that my

research points to is that of an understanding of early English dramatic theory.  We need to

construct, from the playtexts themselves, and informed by the historical information, how and

why early drama was made.  My clearest example has been that we tend to speak about direct

address as creating a close relationship with the audience, which is the effect that this technique tends to have for us. But drama occupies a different cultural position for us than it did in the middle ages, when a close relationship between audience and drama already existed, an inherent part of the culture. I suspect that much of this reconstructed dramatic theory already exists, in the heads of scholars who have been wrestling with early drama for years. We need it on paper, systematically recorded, to avoid the need for every new scholar to rediscover the knowledge.

Ironically, in the area of the reconstruction of early dramatic theory, the research presented here both demonstrates the need for such a reconstruction and demonstrates its own inadequacy in so doing, at least in so far as the concept of soliloquy is concerned. In delineating the chronological bounds of this project, we chose 1585 as the terminus, under the assumption that the changes in direct address would be complete by then, and that by that time, the use of direct address would have diminished significantly, soliloquy replacing direct address. But the research shows that by 1585, soliloquy was only an emergent, not an established, technique. The true origin of soliloquy lies, we find, beyond the chronological bounds of this project. So to develop fully an understanding of the emergence of soliloquy, this research would need to be expanded chronologically.[49] Also, the chapter devoted to the "aside" suggests that a similar study, detailing how and when asides became a technique in English dramaturgy would be likewise worthwhile.

Future research in this area should also expand in terms of the texts considered. Plays in Latin were not included in this project, nor were masques, both of which would be interesting additions to the analysis. Latin (and the rare Greek) plays would be worth studying, to consider how they exhibit classical influence, and whether the modifications of the adopted classical

---

[49] I do indeed plan to do this, working in stages, first up to 1600, then 1620, then 1640. Since many more texts survive after 1585, the smaller chronological steps are designed to allow for manageable additions to the project.

techniques that we find in English plays occur as well in the Latin plays.  One could also consider whether their venue — since the Latin plays are nearly all university plays — affects their use of direct address.  And of course, the obvious question of how direct address works in another language would be a topic to consider.  As for masques, their relationship of the audience and play was different than was that of the public plays, and it would be intriguing to study the question of whether the use of direct address in masques differed as well.  And there is, of course, the problem of the relationship of early continental drama to early English drama; later, I would like to consider that, studying how direct address works differently in continental plays, particularly in consideration of whether the second-person pronoun, where singular-plural forms remain more distinct than they do in English, creates different effects.

The findings of this project will provide analytical tools useful to other scholars and they also suggest the potential benefits of studying direct address more closely.  Furthermore, the project will, I hope, stimulate interest in reconstructing the dramatic theory of early drama, systematizing the principles and rationale by which early drama is created.  As for myself, the projects in future research in direct address, revealed by this study, are considerable, and I am looking forward to pursuing them.

**Works Cited:  Primary Texts (by Play Title)**

All For Money.  Thomas Lupton.  In English Morality Plays and Moral Interludes.  Ed. Edgar T. Schell and J.D. Shuchter.  New York:  Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Andria.  In Terence in English:  An Early Sixteenth-Century Translation of The Andria.  Ed. Meg Twycross.  Medieval English Theatre Modern-Spelling Texts 6.  1987.

Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis.  Sir David Lindsay.  Ed. Roderick Lyall.  Canongate Classics 18.  Edinburgh:  Canongate Publishing Ltd, 1989.

Appius and Virginia.  In Tudor Interludes.  Ed. Peter Happé.  Baltimore:  Penguin Books, 1972.

The Arraignment of Paris.  George Peele.  In The Life and Works of George Peele.  Ed. R.M. Benbow.  Volume 3.  General editor Charles Tyler Prouty.  New Haven:  Yale University Press, 1952-70.

The Brome Abraham and Isaac.  In Early English Drama:  An Anthology.  Ed. John C. Coldewey.  New York and London:  Garland, 1993.

The Bugbears.  In The Bugbears:  A Modernized Edition.  Ed. James D. Clark.  Renaissance Drama:  A Collection of Critical Editions.  New York:  Garland, 1979.

The Burial and Resurrection of Christ.  In The Late Medieval Religious Plays of Bodleian MSS Digby 133 and E Museo 160.  Ed Donald C. Baker et al.  Early English Text Society.  Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1982.

Calisto and Melebea.  In Three Rastell Plays.  Ed. Richard Axton.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer, Ipswich, and Rowman and Littlefield, Totowa, NJ.  1979.

Cambises.  In A Critical Edition of Thomas Preston's Cambises.  Ed. Robert Carl Johnson.  Salzburg, Austria:  Institut fur Englische Sprache und Literatur, 1975.

Cambises.  In Tudor Plays:  An Anthology of Early English Drama.  Ed. Edmund Creeth.  Garden City, NY:  Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, 1966.

Campaspe.  John Lyly.  In The Plays of John Lyly.  Ed. Carter A. Daniel.  Lewisburg:  Bucknell University Press, 1988.

The Castle of Perseverance.  In Medieval Drama.  Ed. David Bevington.  Boston:  Houghton Mifflin Company, 1975.

The Chester Mystery Cycle.  Ed. R.M. Lumiansky and David Mills.  Early English Text Society.  Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1974.

Clyomon and Clamydes.  In Clyomon and Clamydes:  A Critical Edition.  Ed. Betty J. Littleton.  The Hague and Paris:  Mouton, 1968.

Common Conditions.  Ed. C.F. Tucker Brooke.  Elizabethan Club Reprints.  New Haven, 1915.

The Complete Plays of John Bale.  Volumes 1 and 2.  Ed. Peter Happe.  Woodbridge, Suffolk.  D.S. Brewer.  1986.

The Conflict of Conscience.  Nathaniel Woodes.  In English Morality Plays and Moral Interludes.  Ed. Edgar T. Schell and J.D. Shuchter.  New York:  Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Coventry Shearman and Tailors' Pageant.  In The Coventry Corpus Christi Plays.  Ed. Pamela M. King and Clifford Davidson.  Early Drama, Art, and Music Monograph Series 27.  Kalamazoo, MI:  Medieval Institute Publications, 2000.

Coventry Weavers' Pageant.  In The Coventry Corpus Christi Plays.  Ed. Pamela M. King and Clifford Davidson.  Early Drama, Art, and Music Monograph Series 27.  Kalamazoo, MI:  Medieval Institute Publications, 2000.

The Critic.  Richard Brinsley Sheridan.  In Eighteenth-Century English Literature.  Ed. Geoffrey Tillotson, Paul Fussell Jr., and Marshall Waingrow.  Fort Worth, TX:  Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1969.

The Croxton Play of the Sacrament.  In Early English Drama:  An Anthology.  Ed. John C. Coldewey.  New York and London:  Garland, 1993.

Damon and Pithias.  Richard Edwards.  In Richard Edwards' Damon and Pithias:  A Critical Old-Spelling Edition.  Ed. D. Jerry White.  New York:  Garland Publishing Inc., 1980.

The Digby Conversion of St. Paul.  In Early English Drama:  An Anthology.  Ed. John C. Coldewey.  New York and London:  Garland, 1993.

The Digby Mary Magdalene.  In Early English Drama:  An Anthology.  Ed. John C. Coldewey.  New York and London:  Garland, 1993.

The Digby Massacre of the Innocents.  In Early English Drama:  An Anthology.  Ed. John C. Coldewey.  New York and London:  Garland, 1993.

The Disobedient Child.  Thomas Ingelend.  In The Dramatic Writings of Richard Wever and Thomas Ingelend.  Ed. John S. Farmer.  New York:  Barnes and Noble, 1966.  Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906.

The Dublin Abraham and Isaac.  In Non-cycle Plays and Fragments.  Ed. Norman Davis.  Early English Text Society.  Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1970.

Enough Is As Good As A Feast. W. Wager. In The Longer Thou Livest and Enough is as Good as a Feast. Ed. R.Mark Benbow. Regents Renaissance Drama Series. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.

Everyman. In Early English Drama: An Anthology. Ed. John C. Coldewey. New York and London: Garland, 1993.

The Four PP. John Heywood. In The Plays of John Heywood. Ed. Richard Axton and Peter Happe. Tudor Interludes. D.S. Brewer. Rochester, NY. 1991.

The Four Prentices of London. Thomas Heywood. In Thomas Heywood's The Four Prentices of London: A Critical, Old-Spelling Edition. Ed. Mary Ann Weber Gasior. New York: Garland, 1980.

Fulgen and Lucres. Henry Medwall. In The Plays of Henry Medwall. Ed. Alan H. Nelson. Tudor Interludes 2. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer and Rowman & Littlefield, 1980.

Gallathea. John Lyly. In The Plays of John Lyly. Ed. Carter A. Daniel. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1988.

Gammer Gurton's Needle. In Tudor Plays: An Anthology of Early English Drama. Ed. Edmund Creeth. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, 1966.

Gentleness and Nobility. In Three Rastell Plays. Ed. Richard Axton. Tudor Interludes. D.S. Brewer, Ipswich, and Rowman and Littlefield, Totowa, NJ. 1979.

Gismond of Salerne. R.Wilmot, et al. In Early English Classical Tragedies. Ed. John W. Cunliffe. Oxford: Claredon Press, 1912.

The Glass of Government. George Gascoigne. In The Complete Works of George Gascoigne. Ed. John W. Cunliffe. Cambridge, 1910. Reprinted 1969.

God's Promises. John Bale. In The Complete Plays of John Bale. Volumes 1 and 2. Ed. Peter Happe. Woodbridge, Suffolk. D.S. Brewer. 1986.

Godly Queen Hester. In Early English Dramatists: Anonymous Plays. Second Series. Ed. John S. Farmer. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906.

Gorboduc (Ferrex and Porrex). T. Norton and T. Sackville. In Tudor Plays: An Anthology of Early English Drama. Ed. Edmund Creeth. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, 1966.

Hamlet. William Shakespeare. The Complete Works of Shakespeare. Ed. David Bevington. Updated 4th Edition. New York: Longman, 1991.

Hick Scorner.  In Two Tudor Interludes:  The Interlude of Youth and Hick Scorner.  Ed. Ian Lancashire.  The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 1980.

Horestes.  John Pickering.  In Three Classical Tudor Interludes.  Ed. Marie Axton.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer, Cambridge, and Rowman & Littlefield, Totowa, NJ.  1982.

Impatient Poverty.  In The Tudor Interludes Nice Wanton and Impatient Poverty.  Ed. Leonard Tennenhouse.  The Renaissance Imagination, vol 10.  New York and London:  Garland Publishing, Inc., 1984.

Jack Juggler.  In Three Classical Tudor Interludes.  Ed. Marie Axton.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer, Cambridge, and Rowman & Littlefield, Totowa, NJ.  1982.

Jacob and Esau.  In Reformation Biblical Drama in England.  Ed. Paul Whitfield White.  New York and London:  Garland Publishing Inc., 1992.

Johan Johan.  John Heywood.  In The Plays of John Heywood.  Ed. Richard Axton and Peter Happe.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer.  Rochester, NY.  1991.

John the Baptist's Preaching.  John Bale.  In The Complete Plays of John Bale.  Volumes 1 and 2.  Ed. Peter Happe.  Woodbridge, Suffolk.  D.S. Brewer.  1986.

John the Evangelist.  In Recently Recovered "Lost" Tudor Plays with some others.  Ed. John S. Farmer.  New York:  Barnes and Noble, Inc, 1966.  Facsimile of Early English Drama Society, London, edition, 1907.

July and Julian.  Ed. Giles Dawson and Arthur Brown.  Malone Society Reprints.  Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1955.

King Darius.  In Early English Dramatists:  Anonymous Plays 3rd Series.  Ed. John S. Farmer.  NY:  Barnes and Noble, 1966.  Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906.

King John.  John Bale.  In The Complete Plays of John Bale.  Volumes 1 and 2.  Ed. Peter Happe.  Woodbridge, Suffolk.  D.S. Brewer.  1986.

The Knight of the Burning Pestle.  Francis Beaumont.  In Drama of the English Renaissance II:  The Stuart Period.  Ed. Russell A. Fraser and Norman Rabkin.  Upper Saddle River, NJ:  Prentice Hall, 1976.

Liberality and Prodigality.  London, 1602.  Early English Books, 1475-1640.  Microfilm.

The Life and Repentaunce of Mary Magdalene.  Lewis Wager.  In Reformation Biblical Drama in England.  Ed. Paul Whitfield White.  New York and London:  Garland Publishing Inc., 1992.

Like Will to Like. Ulpian Fulwell. In Four Tudor Interludes. Ed. J.A.B. Somerset. University of London: The Athlone Press, 1974.

The Longer Thou Livest The More Fool Thou Art. W. Wager. In The Longer Thou Livest and Enough is as Good as a Feast. Ed. R.Mark Benbow. Regents Renaissance Drama Series. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.

Lucidus and Dubius. In Non-cycle plays and the Winchester Dialogues: Facsimiles of Plays and Fragments in Various Manuscrips and the Dialogues in Winchester College MS 33. Ed. Norman Davis. The University of Leeds, School of English, 1979.

Lusty Juventus. R. Wever. In Four Tudor Interludes. Ed. J.A.B. Somerset. University of London: The Athlone Press, 1974.

Macbeth. William Shakespeare. The Complete Works of Shakespeare. Ed. David Bevington. Updated 4th Edition. New York: Longman, 1991.

Magnificence. John Skelton. Ed. Paula Neuss. The Revels Plays. The Johns Hopkins University Press. Baltimore, MD, 1980.

Mankind. In Early English Drama: An Anthology. Ed. John C. Coldewey. New York and London: Garland, 1993.

A Marriage Between Wit and Wisdom. Francis Merbury. In English Moral Interludes. Ed. Glynne Wickham. London: J.M. Dent, 1976.

The Marriage of Wit and Science. In Recently Recovered "Lost" Tudor Plays with some others. Ed. John S. Farmer. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc, 1966. Facsimile of Early English Drama Society, London, edition, 1907.

Misogonus. Laurence Johnson. Ed. Lester E. Barber. New York: Garland, 1979.

The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna. Thomas Garter. Literature Online. Chadwyck-Healey English Verse Drama Full-Text Database. October 17, 2000.

Much Ado About Nothing. William Shakespeare. The Complete Works of Shakespeare. Ed. David Bevington. Updated 4th Edition. New York: Longman, 1991.

Mundus et Infans. In Three Late Medieval Morality Plays. Ed. G.A. Lester. New Mermaids. London: A&C Black. New York: W.W. Norton, 1981. Reprinted 1990, 1993, 1997, 1999.

Nature. Henry Medwall. In The Plays of Henry Medwall. Ed. Alan H. Nelson. Tudor Interludes 2. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer and Rowman & Littlefield, 1980.

The Nature of the Four Elements. In Three Rastell Plays. Ed. Richard Axton. Tudor Interludes. D.S. Brewer, Ipswich, and Rowman and Littlefield, Totowa, NJ. 1979.

New Custom. In <u>Early English Dramatists:  Anonymous Plays 3<sup>rd</sup> Series</u>.  Ed. John S. Farmer. NY:  Barnes and Noble, 1966.  Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906.

Newcastle Noah's Ark.  In <u>Non-cycle Plays and Fragments</u>.  Ed. Norman Davis.  Early English Text Society.  Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1970.

Nice Wanton.  In <u>The Tudor Interludes Nice Wanton and Impatient Poverty</u>. Ed. Leonard Tennenhouse.  The Renaissance Imagination, vol 10.  New York and London:  Garland Publishing, Inc., 1984.

Norwich Grocers' Play. In <u>Early English Drama:  An Anthology</u>.  Ed. John C. Coldewey.  New York and London:  Garland, 1993.

<u>The N-Town Play:  Cotton MS Vespasian D.8</u>.  Ed. Stephen Spector.  Early English Text Society.  Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1991.

Occupation and Idleness.  In <u>Non-cycle plays and the Winchester Dialogues:  Facsimiles of Plays and Fragments in Various Manuscrips and the Dialogues in Winchester College MS 33</u>. Ed. Norman Davis.  The University of Leeds, School of English, 1979.

The Pardoner and the Friar.  John Heywood.  In <u>The Plays of John Heywood</u>.  Ed. Richard Axton and Peter Happe.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer.  Rochester, NY.  1991.

The Pedlar's Prophecy.  London, 1595.  <u>Early English Books, 1475-1640</u>.  Microfilm.

A Play of Love.  John Heywood.  In <u>The Plays of John Heywood</u>.  Ed. Richard Axton and Peter Happe.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer.  Rochester, NY.  1991.

The Play of Patient Grissell.  John Phillip.  Ed. Ronald B. McKerrow and W.W. Greg.  Malone Society Reprints.  Chiswick Press, 1909.

The Play of the Weather.  John Heywood.  In <u>The Plays of John Heywood</u>.  Ed. Richard Axton and Peter Happe.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer.  Rochester, NY.  1991.

Promos and Cassandra.  George Whetstone.  In <u>Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare</u>. Bullough, Geoffrey, ed.  New York:  Columbia University Press; London:  Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966-75.  Volume 2:  442-513.

Ralph Roister Doister.  In <u>Three Sixteenth-Century Comedies</u>. Ed. Charles W. Whitworth, Jr. New Mermaids.  London:  Ernest Benn Limited; New York:  W.W. Norton and Company Inc. 1984.

Ralph Roister Doister.  In <u>Tudor Plays:  An Anthology of Early English Drama</u>.  Ed. Edmund Creeth.  Garden City, NY:  Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, 1966.

The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune. London, 1589. Early English Books, 1475- 1640. Microfilm.

Respublica: An Interlude for Christmas. Nicholas Udall. Ed. W.W. Greg. Early English Text Society. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952. Reprinted 1969.

Robin Hood and the Friar. Ed. Mary A. Blackstone. PLS Performance Text: No. 3. Toronto: Poculi Ludique Societas, 1981.

Sappho and Phao. John Lyly. In The Plays of John Lyly. Ed. Carter A. Daniel. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1988.

Temptation of Our Lord. John Bale. In The Complete Plays of John Bale. Volumes 1 and 2. Ed. Peter Happe. Woodbridge, Suffolk. D.S. Brewer. 1986.

Thersites. Nicholas Udall. In Three Classical Tudor Interludes. Ed. Marie Axton. Tudor Interludes. D.S. Brewer, Cambridge, and Rowman & Littlefield, Totowa, NJ. 1982.

Three Laws. John Bale. In The Complete Plays of John Bale. Volumes 1 and 2. Ed. Peter Happe. Woodbridge, Suffolk. D.S. Brewer. 1986.

The Three Ladies of London. R. Wilson. Literature Online. Chadwyck-Healey English Verse Drama Full-Text Database. October 17, 2000.

The Tide Tarrieth No Man. George Wapull. In English Morality Plays and Moral Interludes. Ed. Edgar T. Schell and J.D. Shuchter. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Tom Tyler and His Wife. In Early English Dramatists: Anonymous Plays. Ed. John S. Farmer. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906.

The Towneley Plays. Ed. Martin Stevens and A.C. Cawley. Early English Text Society. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

The Trial of Treasure. In Early English Dramatists: Anonymous Plays 3rd Series. Ed. John S. Farmer. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906.

Wealth and Health. In Recently Recovered "Lost" Tudor Plays with some others. Ed. John S. Farmer. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc, 1966. Facsimile of Early English Drama Society, London, edition, 1907.

Wisdom. In Early English Drama: An Anthology. Ed. John C. Coldewey. New York and London: Garland, 1993.

Wit and Science. John Redford. In Medieval Drama. Ed. David Bevington. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1975.

Witty and Witless. John Heywood. In The Plays of John Heywood. Ed. Richard Axton and Peter Happe. Tudor Interludes. D.S. Brewer. Rochester, NY. 1991.

The York Plays. Ed. Richard Beadle. London: Edward Arnold, 1982.

Youth. In Two Tudor Interludes: The Interlude of Youth and Hick Scorner. Ed. Ian Lancashire. The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 1980.

**Works Cited:  Primary Texts (by Author)**

Bale, John.  <u>God's Promises</u>.  In <u>The Complete Plays of John Bale</u>.  Volumes 1 and 2.  Ed. Peter Happe.  Woodbridge, Suffolk.  D.S. Brewer.  1986.

---.  <u>John the Baptist's Preaching</u>.  In <u>The Complete Plays of John Bale</u>.  Volumes 1 and 2.  Ed. Peter Happe.  Woodbridge, Suffolk.  D.S. Brewer.  1986.

---.  <u>King John</u>.  In <u>The Complete Plays of John Bale</u>.  Volumes 1 and 2.  Ed. Peter Happe.  Woodbridge, Suffolk.  D.S. Brewer.  1986.

---.  <u>Temptation of Our Lord</u>.  In <u>The Complete Plays of John Bale</u>.  Volumes 1 and 2.  Ed. Peter Happe.  Woodbridge, Suffolk.  D.S. Brewer.  1986.

---.  <u>Three Laws</u>.  In <u>The Complete Plays of John Bale</u>.  Volumes 1 and 2.  Ed. Peter Happe.  Woodbridge, Suffolk.  D.S. Brewer.  1986.

Beaumont, Francis.  <u>The Knight of the Burning Pestle</u>.  In <u>Drama of the English Renaissance II:  The Stuart Period</u>.  Ed. Russell A. Fraser and Norman Rabkin.  Upper Saddle River, NJ:  Prentice Hall, 1976.

Edwards, Richard.  <u>Damon and Pithias</u>.  In <u>Richard Edwards'</u> Damon and Pithias<u>:  A Critical Old-Spelling Edition</u>.  Ed. D. Jerry White.  New York:  Garland Publishing Inc., 1980.

Fulwell, Ulpian.  <u>Like Will to Like</u>.  In <u>Four Tudor Interludes</u>.  Ed.  J.A.B. Somerset.  University of London:  The Athlone Press, 1974.

Garter, Thomas.  <u>The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna</u>.  <u>Literature Online</u>.  Chadwyck-Healey English Verse Drama Full-Text Database.  October 17, 2000.

Gascoigne, George.  <u>The Glass of Government</u>.  In <u>The Complete Works of George Gascoigne</u>.  Ed. John W. Cunliffe.  Cambridge, 1910.  Reprinted 1969.

Heywood, John. <u>The Four PP</u>.  In <u>The Plays of John Heywood</u>.  Ed. Richard Axton and Peter Happe.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer.  Rochester, NY.  1991.

---.  <u>Johan Johan</u>.  John Heywood.  In <u>The Plays of John Heywood</u>.  Ed. Richard Axton and Peter Happe.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer.  Rochester, NY.  1991.

---.  <u>The Pardoner and the Friar</u>.  In <u>The Plays of John Heywood</u>.  Ed. Richard Axton and Peter Happe.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer.  Rochester, NY.  1991.

---.  <u>A Play of Love</u>.  In <u>The Plays of John Heywood</u>.  Ed. Richard Axton and Peter Happe.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer.  Rochester, NY.  1991.

---.  <u>The Play of the Weather</u>.  In <u>The Plays of John Heywood</u>.  Ed. Richard Axton and Peter Happe.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer.  Rochester, NY.  1991.

---.  <u>Witty and Witless</u>.  In <u>The Plays of John Heywood</u>.  Ed. Richard Axton and Peter Happe.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer.  Rochester, NY.  1991.

Heywood, Thomas.  <u>The Four Prentices of London</u>.  In <u>Thomas Heywood's</u> The Four Prentices of London:  A Critical, Old-Spelling Edition.  Ed. Mary Ann Weber Gasior. New York:  Garland, 1980.

Ingelend, Thomas.  <u>The Disobedient Child</u>.  In <u>The Dramatic Writings of Richard Wever and Thomas Ingelend</u>.  Ed. John S. Farmer.  New York:  Barnes and Noble, 1966. Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906.

Johnson, Laurence.  Misogonus.  Ed. Lester E. Barber.  New York:  Garland, 1979.

Lindsay, Sir David.  <u>Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis</u>.  Ed. Roderick Lyall.  Canongate Classics 18.  Edinburgh:  Canongate Publishing Ltd, 1989.

Lupton, Thomas.  <u>All For Money</u>.  In <u>English Morality Plays and Moral Interludes</u>.  Ed. Edgar T. Schell and J.D. Shuchter.  New York:  Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Lyly, John.  <u>Campaspe</u>.  In <u>The Plays of John Lyly</u>.  Ed. Carter A. Daniel.  Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1988.

---.  <u>Gallathea</u>.  In <u>The Plays of John Lyly</u>.  Ed. Carter A. Daniel.  Lewisburg:  Bucknell University Press, 1988.

---.  <u>Sappho and Phao</u>.  In <u>The Plays of John Lyly</u>.  Ed. Carter A. Daniel.  Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1988.

Medwall, Henry.  <u>Fulgen and Lucres</u>.  In <u>The Plays of Henry Medwall</u>.  Ed. Alan H. Nelson.  Tudor Interludes 2.  Cambridge:  D.S. Brewer and Rowman & Littlefield, 1980.

---.  <u>Nature</u>.  In <u>The Plays of Henry Medwall</u>.  Ed. Alan H. Nelson.  Tudor Interludes 2. Cambridge:  D.S. Brewer and Rowman & Littlefield, 1980.

Merbury, Francis.  <u>A Marriage Between Wit and Wisdom</u>.  In <u>English Moral Interludes</u>. Ed. Glynne Wickham.  London:  J.M. Dent, 1976.

Mr. S, Master of Art.  <u>Gammer Gurton's Needle</u>.  In <u>Tudor Plays:  An Anthology of Early English Drama</u>.  Ed. Edmund Creeth.  Garden City, NY:  Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, 1966.

Norton, T. and T. Sackville.  <u>Gorboduc (Ferrex and Porrex)</u>.  In <u>Tudor Plays:  An Anthology of Early English Drama</u>.  Ed. Edmund Creeth.  Garden City, NY:  Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, 1966.

Peele, George.  <u>The Arraignment of Paris</u>.  In <u>The Life and Works of George Peele</u>.  Ed. R.M. Benbow.  Volume 3.  General editor Charles Tyler Prouty.  New Haven:  Yale University Press, 1952-70.

Phillip, John.  <u>The Play of Patient Grissell</u>. Ed. Ronald B. McKerrow and W.W. Greg. Malone Society Reprints.  Chiswick Press, 1909.

Pickering, John.  <u>Horestes</u>.  In <u>Three Classical Tudor Interludes</u>.  Ed. Marie Axton. Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer, Cambridge, and Rowman & Littlefield, Totowa, NJ. 1982.

Preston, Thomas.  <u>Cambises</u>.  In <u>A Critical Edition of Thomas Preston's</u> Cambises.  Ed. Robert Carl Johnson.  Salzburg, Austria:  Institut fur Englische Sprache und Literatur, 1975.

---.  <u>Cambises</u>.  In <u>Tudor Plays:  An Anthology of Early English Drama</u>.  Ed. Edmund Creeth.  Garden City, NY:  Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, 1966.

Redford, John.  <u>Wit and Science</u>.  In <u>Medieval Drama</u>.  Ed. David Bevington.  Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1975.

Shakespeare, William.  <u>Hamlet</u>.  In <u>The Complete Works of Shakespeare</u>.  Ed. David Bevington.  Updated 4th Edition.  New York:  Longman, 1991.

---.  <u>Macbeth</u>.  In <u>The Complete Works of Shakespeare</u>.  Ed. David Bevington.  Updated 4th Edition.  New York:  Longman, 1991.

---.  <u>Much Ado About Nothing</u>.  In <u>The Complete Works of Shakespeare</u>.  Ed. David Bevington.  Updated 4th Edition.  New York:  Longman, 1991.

Sheridan, Richard Brinsley.  <u>The Critic</u>.  In <u>Eighteenth-Century English Literature</u>.  Ed. Geoffrey Tillotson, Paul Fussell Jr., and Marshall Waingrow.  Fort Worth, TX:  Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1969.

Skelton, John.  <u>Magnificence</u>.  Ed. Paula Neuss.  The Revels Plays.  The Johns Hopkins University Press.  Baltimore, MD, 1980.

Terence, Publius Afer.  <u>Andria, Eunuchus, Heauton Timorumenos, Adelphoe, Phormio</u>, and <u>Hecyra</u>.  Richard Pryson, 1495-97.  Online.  <u>Early English Books Online</u>.  12 October 2001.

---.  <u>Andria, Eunuchus, Heauton Timorumenos, Adelphoe, Phormio</u>, and <u>Hecyra</u>.  Latin text and English translations.  Online.  Perseus Digital Library.  15 October 2001. Available at http://www.perseus.tufts.edu.

Udall, Nicholas.  <u>Respublica</u>.  In Respublica<u>:  An Interlude for Christmas</u>.  Ed. W.W. Greg.  Early English Text Society.  Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1952.  Reprinted 1969.

---.  <u>Thersites</u>.  In <u>Three Classical Tudor Interludes</u>.  Ed. Marie Axton.  Tudor Interludes. D.S. Brewer, Cambridge, and Rowman & Littlefield, Totowa, NJ.  1982.

Wager, Lewis.  <u>The Life and Repentaunce of Mary Magdalene</u>.  In <u>Reformation Biblical Drama in England</u>.  Ed. Paul Whitfield White.  New York and London:  Garland Publishing Inc., 1992.

Wager, W.  <u>Enough Is As Good As A Feast</u>.  In <u>The Longer Thou Livest and Enough is as Good as a Feast</u>.  Ed. R.Mark Benbow.  Regents Renaissance Drama Series.  Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.

---. <u>The Longer Thou Livest The More Fool Thou Art</u>.  In <u>The Longer Thou Livest and Enough is as Good as a Feast</u>.  Ed. R.Mark Benbow.  Regents Renaissance Drama Series. Lincoln:  University of Nebraska Press, 1967.

Wapull, George.  The <u>Tide Tarrieth No Man</u>.  In <u>English Morality Plays and Moral Interludes</u>.  Ed. Edgar T. Schell and J.D. Shuchter.  New York:  Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Wever, R.  <u>Lusty Juventus</u>.  In <u>Four Tudor Interludes</u>.  Ed.  J.A.B. Somerset.  University of London:  The Athlone Press, 1974.

Whetson, George.  <u>Promos and Cassandra</u>.  In <u>Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare</u>.  Bullough, Geoffrey, ed.  New York:  Columbia University Press; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966-75.  Volume 2:  442-513.

Wilmot, R., et al.  <u>Gismond of Salerne</u>.  In <u>Early English Classical Tragedies</u>.  Ed. John W. Cunliffe.  Oxford:  Claredon Press, 1912.

Wilson, R.  <u>The Three Ladies of London</u>.  <u>Literature Online</u>.  Chadwyck-Healey English Verse Drama Full-Text Database.  October 17, 2000.

Woodes, Nathanial.  <u>The Conflict of Conscience</u>.  In <u>English Morality Plays and Moral Interludes</u>.  Ed. Edgar T. Schell and J.D. Shuchter.  New York:  Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.

**Works Cited: Primary Texts (by Editor)**

Axton, Marie, ed.  <u>Three Classical Tudor Interludes</u>.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer, Cambridge, and Rowman & Littlefield, Totowa, NJ.  1982.

Axton, Richard, ed.  <u>Three Rastell Plays</u>.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer, Ipswich, and Rowman and Littlefield, Totowa, NJ.  1979.

Axton, Richard and Peter Happe, eds.  <u>The Plays of John Heywood</u>. Tudor Interludes. D.S. Brewer.  Rochester, NY.  1991.

Baker, Donald C., et al, eds.  <u>The Late Medieval Religious Plays of Bodleian MSS Digby 133 and E Museo 160</u>.  Early English Text Society.  Oxford:  Oxford UP, 1982.

Barber, Lester E., ed.  <u>Misogonus</u>.  New York:  Garland, 1979.

Beadle, Richard, ed.  <u>The York Plays</u>.  London:  Edward Arnold, 1982.

Benbow, R.Mark.  <u>The Longer Thou Livest and Enough is as Good as a Feast</u>.  Regents Renaissance Drama Series.  Lincoln:  University of Nebraska Press, 1967.

---, ed.  <u>The Arraignment of Paris</u>.  In <u>The Life and Works of George Peele</u>.  Volume 3. General editor Charles Tyler Prouty.  New Haven:  Yale University Press, 1952-70.

Bevington, David, ed.  <u>The Complete Works of Shakespeare</u>.  Ed. David Bevington. Updated 4<sup>th</sup> Edition.  New York:  Longman, 1991.

---, ed.  <u>Medieval Drama</u>.  Boston:  Houghton Mifflin Company, 1975.

Blackstone, Mary A., ed.  <u>Robin Hood and the Friar</u>.  PLS Performance Text:  No. 3. Toronto:  Poculi Ludique Societas, 1981.

Bovie, Palmer, Ed.  <u>Terence:  The Comedies</u>.  Baltimore and London:  The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Brooke, C.F. Tucker.  <u>Common Conditions</u>.  Elizabethan Club Reprints.  New Haven, 1915.

Bullough, Geoffrey, ed.  <u>Promos and Cassandra</u>.  George Whetstone.  In <u>Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare</u>.  New York:  Columbia University Press; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966-75.  Volume 2:  442-513.

Clark, James D., ed.  <u>The Bugbears:  A Modernized Edition</u>.  Renaissance Drama:  A Collection of Critical Editions.  New York:  Garland, 1979.

Cohen, Gustave. <u>Recueil de Farces Francaises Inèdites du XV<sup>e</sup> Siècle</u>. Cambridge:  The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1949.

Coldewey, John C., ed.  <u>Early English Drama:  An Anthology</u>.  New York and London: Garland, 1993.

Creeth, Edmund, ed.  <u>Tudor Plays:  An Anthology of Early English Drama</u>.  Garden City, NY:  Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, 1966.

Cunliffe, John W., ed.  <u>Early English Classical Tragedies</u>.  Oxford:  Claredon Press, 1912.

---, ed.  <u>The Complete Works of George Gasgoigne</u>.  Cambridge, 1910.  Reprinted 1969.

Daniel, Carter A.  <u>The Plays of John Lyly</u>.  Lewisburg:  Bucknell University Press, 1988.

Davis, Norman, ed.  <u>Non-cycle Plays and Fragments</u>.  Early English Text Society. Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1970.

---, ed.  <u>Non-cycle plays and the Winchester Dialogues:  Facsimiles of Plays and Fragments in Various Manuscrips and the Dialogues in Winchester College MS 33</u>.  The University of Leeds, School of English, 1979.

Dawson, Giles and Arthur Brown, eds.  <u>July and Julian</u>.  Malone Society Reprints. Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1955.

Farmer, John S., ed.  <u>The Dramatic Writings of Richard Wever and Thomas Ingelend</u>. New York:  Barnes and Noble, 1966.  Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906.

---, ed.  <u>Early English Dramatists:  Anonymous Plays</u>.  New York:  Barnes and Noble, 1966.  Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906.

---, ed.  <u>Early English Dramatists:  Anonymous Plays 2<sup>nd</sup> Series</u>.  New York:  Barnes and Noble, 1966.  Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906.

---, ed.  <u>Early English Dramatists:  Anonymous Plays 3<sup>rd</sup> Series</u>.  New York:  Barnes and Noble, 1966.  Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906.

---, ed.  <u>Recently Recovered "Lost" Tudor Plays with some others</u>.  New York:  Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1966.  Facsimile of Early English Drama Society, London, edition, 1907.

Fraser, Russell A. and Norman Rabkin.  <u>Drama of the English Renaissance II:  The Stuart Period</u>.  Upper Saddle River, NJ:  Prentice Hall, 1976.

Gasior, Mary Ann Weber.  Thomas Heywood's The Four Prentices of London:  A Critical, Old-Spelling Edition.  New York:  Garland, 1980.

Greg, W.W., ed.  Respublica:  An Interlude for Christmas.  Early English Text Society.  Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1952.  Reprinted 1969.

---, ed.  The Pedlar's Prophecy.  Malone Society Reprints.  Cheswick Press, 1914.

---, ed.  Liberality and Prodigality.  Malone Society Reprints.  Cheswick Press, 1913.

Happe, Peter, ed.  The Complete Plays of John Bale.  Volumes 1 and 2.  Woodbridge, Suffolk:  D.S. Brewer, 1986.

---, ed.  Tudor Interludes.  Baltimore:  Penguin Books, 1972.

Johnson, Robert Carl, ed.  A Critical Edition of Thomas Preston's Cambises.  Salzburg, Austria:  Institut fur Englische Sprache und Literature, 1975.

King, Pamela M. and Clifford Davidson, eds.  The Coventry Corpus Christi Plays.  Early Drama, Art, and Music Monograph Series 27.  Kalamazoo, MI:  Medieval Institute Publications, 2000.

Lancashire, Ian, ed.  Two Tudor Interludes:  The Interlude of Youth and Hick Scorner.  The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 1980.

Lester, G.A, ed.  Three Late Medieval Morality Plays.  New Mermaids.  London:  A&C Black.  New York: W.W. Norton, 1981.  Reprinted 1990, 1993, 1997, 1999.

Literature Online.  The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna.  Thomas Garter. Chadwyck-Healey English Verse Drama Full-Text Database.  October 17, 2000.

---.  The Three Ladies of London.  R. Wilson. Chadwyck-Healey English Verse Drama Full-Text Database.  October 17, 2000.

Littleton, Betty J, ed.  Clyomon and Clamydes:  A Critical Edition.  The Hague and Paris:  Mouton, 1968.

Lumiansky, R.M. and David Mills, eds.  The Chester Mystery Cycle.  Early English Text Society.  Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1974.

Lyall, Roderick, ed.  Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis.  Sir David Lindsay.  Canongate Classics 18.  Edinburgh:  Canongate Publishing Ltd, 1989.

McKerrow, Ronald B. and W.W. Greg, eds.  The Play of Patient Grissell.  John Phillip.  Malone Society Reprints.  Chiswick Press, 1909.

Meredith, Peter.  The Mary Play from the N.Town Manuscript.  Exeter:  University of Exeter Press, 1987.

Nelson, Alan H., ed.  The Plays of Henry Medwall. Tudor Interludes 2.  Cambridge:  D.S. Brewer and Rowman & Littlefield, 1980.

Neuss, Paula, ed.  Magnificence.  John Skelton.  The Revels Plays.  The Johns Hopkins University Press.  Baltimore, MD, 1980.

Schell, Edgar T. and J.D. Shuchter.  English Morality Plays and Moral Interludes.  New York:  Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Slavitt, David R. and Palmer Bovie, eds.  Plautus:  The Comedies.  4 volumes.  Baltimore and London:  The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Somerset, J.A.B, ed.  Four Tudor Interludes. University of London:  The Athlone Press, 1974.

Spector, Stephen, ed.  The N-Town Play:  Cotton MS Vespasian D.8.  Early English Text Society.  Oxford:  Oxford UP, 1991.

Stevens, Martin and A.C. Cawley, eds.  The Towneley Plays.  Early English Text Society.  Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1994.

Tennenhouse, Leonard, ed.  The Tudor Interludes Nice Wanton and Impatient Poverty.  The Renaissance Imagination, vol 10.  New York and London:  Garland Publishing, Inc., 1984.

Tillotson, Geoffrey, Paul Fussell Jr., and Marshall Waingrow, eds.  Eighteenth-Century English Literature.  Fort Worth, TX:  Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1969.

Twycross, Meg, ed.  Terence in English:  An Early Sixteenth-Century Translation of The Andria.  Medieval English Theatre Modern-Spelling Texts 6.  1987.

White, D. Jerry, ed.  Richard Edwards' Damon and Pithias:  A Critical Old-Spelling Edition.  New York:  Garland Publishing Inc., 1980.

White, Paul Whitfield, ed.  Reformation Biblical Drama in England.  New York and London:  Garland Publishing Inc., 1992.

Whitworth, Charles W. Jr., ed.  Three Sixteenth-Century Comedies.  New Mermaids. London:  Ernest Benn Limited; New York:  W.W. Norton and Company Inc.  1984.

Wickham, Glynne, ed.  English Moral Interludes.  London:  J.M. Dent, 1976.

**Works Cited:  Primary Texts (by Edition Title)**

Andria, Eunuchus, Heauton Timorumenos, Adelphoe, Phormio, and Hecyra.  Publius Afer Terence.  Richard Pryson, 1495-97.  Online.  Early English Books Online.  12 October 2001.

Andria, Eunuchus, Heauton Timorumenos, Adelphoe, Phormio, and Hecyra.  Publius Afer Terence.  Latin text and English translations.  Online.  Perseus Digital Library.  15 October 2001.  Available at http://www.perseus.tufts.edu.

Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis.  Sir David Lindsay.  Ed. Roderick Lyall.  Canongate Classics 18.  Edinburgh:  Canongate Publishing Ltd, 1989.

The Bugbears:  A Modernized Edition.  Ed. James D. Clark.  Renaissance Drama:  A Collection of Critical Editions.  New York:  Garland, 1979.

The Chester Mystery Cycle.  Ed. R.M. Lumiansky and David Mills.  Early English Text Society.  Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1974.

Clyomon and Clamydes:  A Critical Edition.  Ed. Betty J. Littleton.  The Hague and Paris:  Mouton, 1968.

Common Conditions.  Ed. C.F. Tucker Brooke.  Elizabethan Club Reprints.  New Haven, 1915.

The Complete Plays of John Bale.  Volumes 1 and 2.  Ed. Peter Happe.  Woodbridge, Suffolk.  D.S. Brewer.  1986.

The Complete Works of George Gascoigne.  Ed. John W. Cunliffe.  Cambridge, 1910.  Reprinted 1969.

The Complete Works of Shakespeare.  Ed. David Bevington.  Updated 4th Edition.  New York:  Longman, 1991.

The Coventry Corpus Christi Plays.  Ed. Pamela M. King and Clifford Davidson.  Early Drama, Art, and Music Monograph Series 27.  Kalamazoo, MI:  Medieval Institute Publications, 2000.

A Critical Edition of Thomas Preston's Cambises.  Ed. Robert Carl Johnson.  Salzburg, Austria:  Institut fur Englische Sprache und Literatur, 1975.

Drama of the English Renaissance II:  The Stuart Period.  Ed. Russell A. Fraser and Norman Rabkin.  Upper Saddle River, NJ:  Prentice Hall, 1976.

The Dramatic Writings of Richard Wever and Thomas Ingelend. Ed. John S. Farmer. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906.

Early English Classical Tragedies. Ed. John W. Cunliffe. Oxford: Claredon Press, 1912.

Early English Drama: An Anthology. Ed. John C. Coldewey. New York and London: Garland, 1993.

Early English Dramatists: Anonymous Plays. Ed. John S. Farmer. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906.

Early English Dramatists: Anonymous Plays 2nd Series. Ed. John S. Farmer. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906.

Early English Dramatists: Anonymous Plays 3rd Series. Ed. John S. Farmer. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1966. Facsimile of Early English Drama Society edition, published 1906.

Eighteenth-Century English Literature. Ed. Geoffrey Tillotson, Paul Fussell Jr., and Marshall Waingrow. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1969.

English Moral Interludes. Ed. Glynne Wickham. London: J.M. Dent, 1976.

English Morality Plays and Moral Interludes. Ed. Edgar T. Schell and J.D. Shuchter. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Four Tudor Interludes. Ed. J.A.B. Somerset. University of London: The Athlone Press, 1974.

July and Julian. Ed. Giles Dawson and Arthur Brown. Malone Society Reprints. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955.

The Late Medieval Religious Plays of Bodleian MSS Digby 133 and E Museo 160. Ed Donald C. Baker et al. Early English Text Society. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Liberality and Prodigality. London, 1602. Early English Books, 1475-1640. Microfilm.

The Life and Works of George Peele. Ed. R.M. Benbow. Volume 3. General editor Charles Tyler Prouty. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952-70.

The Longer Thou Livest and Enough is as Good as a Feast. Ed. R.Mark Benbow. Regents Renaissance Drama Series. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.

Magnificence.  John Skelton.  Ed. Paula Neuss.  The Revels Plays.  The Johns Hopkins University Press.  Baltimore, MD, 1980.

The Mary Play from the N.Town Manuscript.  Ed. Peter Meredith.  Exeter:  University of Exeter Press, 1987.

Medieval Drama.  Ed. David Bevington.  Boston:  Houghton Mifflin Company, 1975.

Misogonus.  Ed. Lester E. Barber.  New York:  Garland, 1979.

The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna.  Thomas Garter.  Literature Online.  Chadwyck-Healey English Verse Drama Full-Text Database.  October 17, 2000.

Non-cycle Plays and Fragments.  Ed. Norman Davis.  Early English Text Society.  Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1970.

Non-cycle plays and the Winchester Dialogues:  Facsimiles of Plays and Fragments in Various Manuscrips and the Dialogues in Winchester College MS 33.  Ed. Norman Davis.  The University of Leeds, School of English, 1979.

The N-Town Play:  Cotton MS Vespasian D.8.  Ed. Stephen Spector.  Early English Text Society.  Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1991.

The Pedlar's Prophecy.  London, 1595.  Early English Books, 1475-1640.  Microfilm.

Plautus:  The Comedies.  Ed. David R. Slavitt and Palmer Bovie.  4 volumes.  Baltimore and London:  The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

The Play of Patient Grissell.  John Phillip.  Ed. Ronald B. McKerrow and W.W. Greg.  Malone Society Reprints.  Chiswick Press, 1909.

The Plays of Henry Medwall.  Ed. Alan H. Nelson.  Tudor Interludes 2.  Cambridge:  D.S. Brewer and Rowman & Littlefield, 1980.

The Plays of John Heywood.  Ed. Richard Axton and Peter Happe.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer.  Rochester, NY.  1991.

The Plays of John Lyly.  Ed. Carter A. Daniel.  Lewisburg:  Bucknell University Press, 1988.

Promos and Cassandra.  George Whetstone.  In Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare.  Bullough, Geoffrey, ed.  New York:  Columbia University Press; London:  Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966-75.  Volume 2:  442-513.

The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune.  London, 1589.  Early English Books, 1475-1640.  Microfilm.

Recently Recovered "Lost" Tudor Plays with some others.  Ed. John S. Farmer.  New York:  Barnes and Noble, Inc, 1966.  Facsimile of Early English Drama Society, London, edition, 1907.

Recueil de Farces Francaises Inèdites du XV$^e$ Siècle. Ed. Gustave Cohen. Cambridge: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1949.

Reformation Biblical Drama in England.  Ed. Paul Whitfield White.  New York and London:  Garland Publishing Inc., 1992.

Respublica:  An Interlude for Christmas. Ed.  W.W. Greg.  Early English Text Society. Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1952.  Reprinted 1969.

Richard Edwards' Damon and Pithias:  A Critical Old-Spelling Edition.  Ed. D. Jerry White.  New York:  Garland Publishing Inc., 1980.

Robin Hood and the Friar.  Ed. Mary A. Blackstone.  PLS Performance Text:  No. 3. Toronto:  Poculi Ludique Societas, 1981.

Terence in English:  An Early Sixteenth-Century Translation of The Andria.  Ed. Meg Twycross.  Medieval English Theatre Modern-Spelling Texts 6.  1987.

Terence:  The Comedies.  Ed. Palmer Bovie.  Baltimore and London:  The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Three Classical Tudor Interludes.  Ed. Marie Axton.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer, Cambridge, and Rowman & Littlefield, Totowa, NJ.  1982.

The Three Ladies of London.  R. Wilson.  Literature Online.  Chadwyck-Healey English Verse Drama Full-Text Database.  October 17, 2000.

Three Late Medieval Morality Plays.  Ed. G.A. Lester.  New Mermaids.  London:  A&C Black.  New York:  W.W. Norton, 1981.  Reprinted 1990, 1993, 1997, 1999.

Three Rastell Plays.  Ed. Richard Axton.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer, Ipswich, and Rowman and Littlefield, Totowa, NJ.  1979.

Three Sixteenth-Century Comedies. Ed. Charles W. Whitworth, Jr.  New Mermaids. London:  Ernest Benn Limited; New York:  W.W. Norton and Company Inc.  1984.

Thomas Heywood's The Four Prentices of London:  A Critical, Old-Spelling Edition. Ed. Mary Ann Weber Gasior.  New York:  Garland, 1980.

The Towneley Plays.  Ed. Martin Stevens and A.C. Cawley.  Early English Text Society. Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1994.

The Tudor Interludes Nice Wanton and Impatient Poverty. Ed. Leonard Tennenhouse. The Renaissance Imagination, vol 10.  New York and London:  Garland Publishing, Inc., 1984.

Tudor Interludes.  Happe, Peter.  Baltimore:  Penguin Books, 1972.

Tudor Plays:  An Anthology of Early English Drama.  Ed. Edmund Creeth.  Garden City, NY:  Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, 1966.

Two Tudor Interludes:  The Interlude of Youth and Hick Scorner.  Ed. Ian Lancashire. The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 1980.

The York Plays.  Ed. Richard Beadle.  London:  Edward Arnold, 1982.

## Works Cited:  Secondary Sources

Axton, Marie, ed.  <u>Three Classical Tudor Interludes</u>.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer, Cambridge, and Rowman & Littlefield, Totowa, NJ.  1982.

Axton, Richard, ed.  <u>Three Rastell Plays</u>.  Tudor Interludes.  D.S. Brewer, Ipswich, and Rowman and Littlefield, Totowa, NJ.  1979.

Barnet, Sylvan, Morton Berman, and William Burton.  <u>Aspects of the Drama:  A Handbook</u>.  Boston and Toronto:  Little, Brown and Company, 1962.

Barton, John.  <u>Playing Shakespeare</u>.  London and New York:  Methuen, 1984.

Beadle, Richard, ed.   <u>The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Theatre</u>. Cambridge:  Cambridge University Press, 1994.

---, ed.  <u>The York Plays</u>.  London:  Edward Arnold, 1982.

Beckerman, Bernard.  <u>Shakespeare at the Globe, 1599-1609</u>.  New York:  The MacMillan Company, 1962.

Bethell, S.L.  <u>Shakespeare and the Popular Dramatic Tradition</u>.  New York:  Octagon Books, 1970.

Bevington, David.  <u>From *Mankind* to Marlowe:  Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England</u>.  Cambridge, MA:  Harvard University Press, 1962.

---.  <u>Medieval Drama</u>.  Boston:  Houghton Mifflin Company, 1975.

Boas, Frederick S.  <u>University Drama in the Tudor Age</u>.  Oxford:  Claredon Press, 1914.

Bovie, Palmer, Ed.   <u>Terence:  The Comedies</u>.  Baltimore and London:  The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.

Bradbrook, M.C.  <u>Themes and Conventions of Elizabethan Tragedy</u>.  Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935.

Braunmuller, A.R. and Michael Hattaway, editors.  <u>The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama</u>.  Cambridge:  Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Braunmuller, A.R.  "The Arts of the Dramatist."  <u>The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama</u>.  Ed. A.R. Braunmuller and Michael Hattaway.  53-90.

Carson, Neil.  "The Elizabethan Soliloquy—Direct Address or Monologue?"  <u>Theatre Notebook</u> 30:1 (1976):  12-17.

Clark, Barrett H.  Revised by Henry Popkin.  <u>European Theories of the Drama</u>.  New York:  Crown Publishers, Inc., 1966.

Clemen, Wolfgang.  <u>Shakespeare's Soliloquies</u>.  London and New York:  Routledge, 1987.

Coldewey, John C.  <u>Early English Drama:  An Anthology</u>.  New York and London:  Garland Publishing, Inc., 1993.

Coletti, Theresa.  "Reading REED:  History and the Records of Early English Drama."  In <u>Literary Practice and Social Change in Britain, 1380-1530</u>.  Ed. Lee Patterson.  Berkeley:  University of California Press, 1990.

Craik, T.W.  "The True Source of John Heywood's 'Johan Johan.'"  <u>Modern Language Review</u> 45 (1950):  289-95.

---.  <u>The Tudor Interlude:  Stage, Costume, and Acting</u>.  Leicester:  Leicester University Press, 1962.

Cox, John D. and David Scott Kastan, editors.  <u>A New History of Early English Drama</u>.  New York:  Columbia University Press, 1997.

Elliot, John R. Jr.  <u>Playing God:  Medieval Mysteries on the Modern Stage</u>.  Toronto:  University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Fenton, Doris.  <u>The Extra-Dramatic Moment in Elizabethan Plays Before 1616</u>.  Philadelphia:  University of Pennsylvania Press, 1930.

Fichte, Jorg O.  <u>Expository Voices in Medieval Drama:  Essays on the Mode of Function of Dramatic Exposition</u>.  Erlanger Beitrage zur Spach- und Kunstwissenschaft Band 53.  Nurnberg:  Verlag Hans Carl, 1975.

Fletcher, Alan J.  "The 'Contemplacio' Prologue to the N-Town Play of the Parliament of Heaven."  <u>Notes and Queries</u> 27 (1980):  111-12.

Gingrich, Margaret Coleman.  <u>Soliloquies, Asides, and Audience in English Renaissance Drama</u>.  Diss. Rutgers University, 1978.

Happé, Peter.  <u>English Drama before Shakespeare</u>.  Longman:  London and New York, 1999.

Harbage, Alfred B.  <u>Annals of English Drama.  975-1700</u>.  Rev. edn S. Schoenbaum.  London:  Methuen, 1964.

Hodgson, Terry.  <u>The Drama Dictionary</u>.  New York:  New Amsterdam Books, 1988.

Johnston, Alexandra and Malcolm Parkes.  "Huntington MS HM 1 as Artifact:  A Paleographical and Codicological Consideration."  The Towneley Plays Reconsidered:  A Session in Memory of Martin Stevens.  International Congress on Medieval Studies.  Kalamazoo, MI.  May 3, 2002.

Johnson, Robert Carl.  "Audience Involvement in the Tudor Interlude."  Theatre Notebook 24:3 (1970):  101-111.

Kawachi, Yoshiko.  Calendar of English Renaissance Drama, 1558-1642.  Garland Reference Library of the Humanities, volume 661.  New York:  Garland, 1986.

Klausner, David. "The Improvising Vice in Renaissance England."  Improvisation in the Renaissance.  Ed. T.J. Mcgee.  Early Drama, Art, and Music Monograph Series. Kalamazoo:  Western Michigan University Press, 2003.  1-13.

Lancashire, Ian.  Dramatic Texts and Records of Britain:  A Chronological Topography to 1558.  Studies in Early English Drama 1.  Toronto and Buffalo:  University of Toronto Press, 1984.

Lewis, C.S.  English Literature in the Sixteenth-Century Excluding Drama.  Oxford: Claredon Press, 1954.

Maxwell, Ian.  French Farce and John Heywood.  Melbourne and London:  Melbourne University Press, 1946.

Mazer, Sharon Lois.  Scripting the Audience:  Didactic Strategies in Middle English Drama.  Diss.  Columbia University, 1991.

Meredith, Peter.  The Mary Play from the N.Town Manuscript.  Exeter:  University of Exeter Press, 1987.

---.  "Original-Staging Production of English Medieval Plays--ideals, evidence, and practice."  Popular Drama in Northern Europe in the later Middle Ages.  Ed. Flemming G. Andersen and others.  Odense:  Odense University Press, 1988.  65-100.

Moore, Bruce.  "The Banns in Medieval English Drama."  Leeds Studies in English 24 (1993):  91-122.

Norland, Howard B.  "Formalizing English Farce:  Johan Johan and Its French Connection."  Comparative Drama 17 (1983):  1-18.

---.  Drama in Early Tudor Britain 1485-1558.  Lincoln and London:  University of Nebraska Press, 1995.

Palmer, Barbara D.  "Recycling 'The Wakefield Cycle.'"  Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama 41 (2002):  88-130.

Pfister, Manfred.  The Theory and Analysis of Drama.  Trans. John Halliday.  European Studies in English Literature.  Cambridge:  Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Pickering, Jerry V.  Theatre:  A Contemporary Introduction.  2$^{nd}$ edition.  New York: West Publishing Company, 1978.

Righter, Anne.  Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play.  New York:  Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1962.

Rossiter, A.P.  Early Drama From Early Times to the Elizabethans:  Its Background, Origins, and Developments.  New York:  Barnes & Noble, 1967.

Sebastian, John T.  "The Birth, Death, and Afterlife of the Author:  The Case of the Wakefield Master."  Medieval Drama II.  The International Congress on Medieval Studies.  Kalamazoo, MI.  May 2, 2002.

Skiffington, Lloyd A.  The History of the English Soliloquy:  Aeschylus to Shakespeare. New York:  University Press of America, 1985.

Smith, Warren.  "The Third Type of Aside in Shakespeare."  Modern Language Notes 64 (1949):  510-13.

Somerset, J.A.B.  "The Comic Turn in English Drama, 1470-1616."  Diss.  University of Birmingham, 1966.

Sprague, A.C.  Shakespeare and the Audience.  Cambridge, MA:  Harvard University Press, 1935.

Stevens, Martin and A.C. Cawley, eds.  The Towneley Plays.  Early English Text Society.  Oxford:  Oxford University Press, 1994.

Sugano, Douglas.  "'This game wel pleyd in good a-ray':  The N-Town Playbooks and East Anglian Games."  Comparative Drama 28:2 (1994):  221-34.

Travis, Peter W.  Dramatic Design in the Chester Cycle.  Chicago:  University of Chicago Press, 1982.

Twycross, Meg.  "The Theatricality of Medieval English Plays."  The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Theatre.  Ed. Richard Beadle.  37-84.

---, ed.  Terence in English:  An Early Sixteenth-Century Translation of The Andria. Medieval English Theatre Modern-Spelling Texts 6.  1987.

Vaugh, Jack A.  Drama A to Z:  A Handbook.  New York:  Frederick Ungar Publishing Companry, 1978.

Walker, Greg.  Plays of Persuasion.  Cambridge:  Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Westfall, Suzanne.  " 'A Commonty a Christmas gambold or a tumbling trick':  Household Theater."  A New History of Early English Drama.  Ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan.  39-58.

Wickham, Glynne.  Early English Stages.  Volume One.  New York:  Columbia University Press, 1963-1981.

Wilson, F. P.  The English Drama 1485-1585.  New York and Oxford, 1969.