Tiffany Stern, 'Repatching the Play' [1]

Tiffany Stern
Oxford University

Theatre histories often explore the context surrounding the creation of the play. Was there one author or many? Did the physical make up of the theatre or the company shape the production of the work? Each of these topics importantly helps define the world that brought about the text. But despite the huge interest in what shaped the play, the nature of the play itself is less often questioned. The unity of a play is often taken as a given; articles on the revising of play texts tend to assume that one whole and complete text was equally revised over by its author. Why, it is then asked, did playwrights bother to write long plays that would then have to be cut and rewritten in the playhouse itself? By exploring the fragmentary nature of the text, an answer to that question can be suggested.

The designation 'playwright' seems to have come into being in the 1610s.[2] With its implications of writing plays as a trade – playwright obviously relating to such jobs as cartwright and wheelwright – 'playwright' was probably, as a title, originally pejorative. There were other more common and neutral words to describe the profession. One – the most usual – was 'poet', telling in itself with its implication that all plays are or should be in verse. Another less hierarchical term was 'play-maker', a simple description of the task of writing plays. A fourth title has not been critically noticed, or at least not for what it implies. When Thomas Dekker writes about 'a Cobler of Poetrie called a play-patcher' he alerts the reader not only to another term of abuse for a playwright, but also to another definition of what the playwright does.[3]

---

[1] Reproduced with the kind permission of Palgrave Macmillan, from Tiffany Stern, 'Repatching the Play' in Peter Holland and Stephen Orgel ed. *From Script to Stage in Early Modern England* (London: Palgrave, 2004), 151-77. For more on the topics addressed here, see Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern, *Shakespeare in Parts* (Oxford: OUP, 2007) and Tiffany Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009).

[2] *OED* quotes the first recorded use of 'playwright' as 1687, but in fact the word was extant by 1617. See John Davies, *Wits Bedlam* (1617), F7a: 'of all *Glory*, purchas'd by the small, / A *Play-wright*, for his *Praise*, payes most of all!'; Henry Fizgeffrey, *Notes from Blackfriars* (1617), F7a: Crabbed (Websterio) / The Play-wright, Cart-wright'. Ben Jonson publishes poems 'To Play-wright' and 'On Play-wright' in his 1640 *Works*.

[3] Thomas Dekker, *Newes from Hell* (1606) in *The Non Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, 5 vols. ed. Alexander B. Grosart (1884, New York: Russell and Russell, 1963), 2:146.

On one level the phrase 'to patch' a play implies that the writer is ransacking his commonplace book, gathering together disparate material from various sources to turn into theatrical events. The suggestion then is that a play is a collection of fragments taken from elsewhere and loosely held together; playwrights are 'men onely wise enough, / Out of some rotten-old-worme-eaten stuffe / To patch up a bald witlesse Comedy ...'[4] Other references suggest that there was something 'patch-like' in the very way a play was written in the first place. When 'Constantia Munda' accuses playwrights of defaming the female sex she writes 'Every fantasticke Poetaster which ... can but patch a hobbling verse together, will strive to represent unseemely figments imputed to our sex, ... on the publique Theatre.'[5] Here the very method of creating the play seems to be, somehow, 'patchy'. The noun 'play-patcher' and the verb 'to patch a play' take the glamorous edge off 'poet' and may reflect a worry that the worst plays combine borrowed phrases, ragged second-rate verse and prose. But 'play-patcher' also points in the direction of a truth about the theatre. There was a sense at the time that plays were not whole art-works in the way that poems were. Plays had the bit, the fragment, the patch in their very natures.

The way that spectators 'used' plays at the time confirms – and perhaps encourages – the sense of the fragmentary. If plays were themselves written out of odds and ends from commonplace books, they certainly resolved almost immediately back into them. It was normal for audiences to plunder the performances they attended, removing particular types of text for future use elsewhere in non-play contexts. A stock of jokes was always valuable:

> So there be among them that will get jestes by heart, that have gathred a Common-place booke out of Plaies, that will not let a merriment slip, but they will trusse it up for their owne provision, to serve their expence at some other time.[6]

[4] George Wither[s], *Abuses* (1613), 224.
[5] Constantia Munda, *The Worming of a mad Dogge* (1617), 3.
[6] Barnaby Rich, *Faultes Faults, and nothing else but Faultes* (1606), B4b. There are many such references. For an earlier one see John Marston, *Scourge of Villanie* (1598), H4a: 'H'ath made a common-place booke out of plaies, / And speakes in print, at least what ere he sayes / Is warranted by Curtaine plaudites'. Dekker's gull in *The Guls Horne-Booke* (1609) reproduced in *Non Dramatic Works*, 2:254, is advised to 'hoard up the finest play-scraps you can get, upon which your leane wit may most savourly feede, for want of other stuffe'.

Other naturally separable fragments were 'amorous discourses'. These acted as flirtation- aids for the verbally insecure who could 'Court th' attracting beauties of the age / With some con'd stuffe brought from the Cockpit stage'.[7] Even the language of lawyers, wrote Thomas Trescot resignedly in 1642, consisted often of 'but a few shreds and scraps dropt from some *Stage-Poet, at the Globe or Cock-pit*, which they have carefully bookt up'.[8] Sections of plays, that is to say, habitually became detached from their contexts to thrive in others. Such sections might well outlive the full play; indeed, the more 'removable' a passage is, the less reliant on context, the more likely it is to appeal. Short quotations and 'easily extractable' passages went immediately into tablebooks and tavern-chatter; 'Hamlet: Revenge!' survives from the *Ur-Hamlet*, though the rest of the text is lost; from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* what seems to become immediately part of the currency of quotation was not 'to be or not to be' but 'hic et ubique?' or its paraphrase, 'here and everywhere'.[9]

Here is another fragment from Shakespeare's *Hamlet* in a form just different enough from any printed *Hamlet* to suggest its origins in a theatrical commonplace book. It adds to the sense that, were Shakespeare's play lost, what would remain would provide a startlingly lopsided picture of the text itself, for what seems to have been of value to Shakespeare's audience are parts of the play a modern reader might think least striking. In print, but hidden away in a volume on that offers a *Helpe to Discourse* (advice on how to improve one's conversation), this Shakespeare reference has not been noticed before.

---

[7] Thomas Beedome, *Poems Divine and Humane* (1641), G5a. Again, this is one of many references. John Stephens, *Satyrical Essayes Characters and Others* (1615), 276, describes a lawyer's clark who 'dares attempt a mistresse' only ...'with Jests, or speeches stolne from Playes, or from the common-helping *Arcadia*'; even Robert Burton in *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621), 581, bemoaned the 'silly gentlewomen' who 'are fetched over ... by a company of gulls ... that have nothing in them but a fewe players endes and complements'.

[8] Thomas Trescot, *The Zealous Magistrate* (1642), C3b.

[9] For the first, see Thomas Lodge, *Wits Miserie* (1596), 56: 'He ... looks as pale as the Visard of ye ghost which cried so miserally at ye Theator like an oister wife, Hamlet, revenge'; Samuel Rowlands, *The Night Raven* (1620), D2a: 'I will not cry Hamlet Revenge my greeves'; *Sir Thomas Smithes Voiage and Entertainment in Rushia* (1605), K1a: 'his fathers Empire and Government, was but as the Poeticall Furie in a Stage- action, ... a first, but no second to any Hamlet; and that now Revenge, just Revenge was coming with his Sworde drawne against him ... to fill up those Murdering Sceanes'. For the second, see E. S., *Anthropophagus: the Man-Eater* (1624), 14: These ambi-dexter Gibionites [flatterers], are like the Sea-calfes, Crocodiles, Otters ... Aristotle & Plinie speake of ... for they are like Hamlets ghost, hic & ubique, here and there, and every where, for their owne occasion'; Wye Saltonstall, *Picturae Loquentes* (1631), E4a: 'Hee's as nimble as Hamlets ghost heere and everywhere'.

> Q *What Birds are those that are called Prophets twice born?*
> A. The cock: first an egge from the Hen, after a Cock from the Egge: they foretell seasons and changes of weather, according to the Verse:
>
> Some *say for* ever 'gainst that season comes, sayes F that Q1, Q2, F
> Wherin our Saviours birth is celebrated,
> The Bird of dawning singeth all Night long,
> And then they say no spirit *dares walk* abroad,[10] dare stir Q1 can walk Q2, F
> So sacred and so *hallow'*d is that tune. gracious ... hallowed Q1 hallowed ... gracious Q2, F time Q1, Q2, F
>
> W. Shakes [italics and editorial notes mine][11]

Here the within-play context of the passage is irrelevant enough for the vital word 'time' to be mis-remembered / transcribed as 'tune', changing the nature of the observation from one about a religious moment to one about bird-song. Even very remarkable plays, in other words, could easily disintegrate into fragments that had only a tenuous connection to the whole; in the passage above, the title of the play is not provided. This extract illustrates not just how plays were listened to, but what plays were a resource for; tellingly, the very same passage is also extracted during performance by Edward Pudsey in his commonplace book, now in the Bodleian library.[12] Plays appear to have been enjoyed partly for their removable *mots* and 'sententiae'; they provided books like the *Helpe to Discourse* with proverbs and textual beauties as well as jokes, flirtatious phrases and, as here, nature tips. Playwrights concerned to publish their plays, meanwhile, like Ben Jonson, highlight with the use of quotation marks, parts of the play they thus identify as separable.[13]

---

[10] All texts at this point contain a version of these two lines (here quoted from the folio): 'The nights are wholsome, then no Planets strike, / No Faiery talkes, nor Witch hath power to Charme', TLN 161-2. Henceforth all quotations from Shakespeare's folio will be provided from Charlton Hinman's *The Norton Facsimile: The First Folio of Shakespeare* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1968) using the through-line-numbering (TLN) of that edition

[11] W. B., *A Helpe to Discourse* (1623), 250. The misquoted 'tune' is repeated in all subsequent reprintings of the book.

[12] MS Bodleian Eng. Poet. D. 3, reproduced in *Shakespearean Extracts from Edward Pudsey's Booke*, collected by Richard Savage (Stratford on Avon: John Smith, 1888), 52: 'Against yt tyme wherin or saviors birth is celebrated yt cock singeth al night long; then no spirits dare stir abroad, the nightes bee wholesome; no planets, ffayries or witches hurt'.

[13] See Ben Jonson's Sejanus (1605). More on this subject can be found in Mark Bland, 'The Appearance of the Text in Early Modern England' in *TEXT*, 11 (1998), 91-127.

Plays, in other words, had the sense of the fragment in their very make-up and were to a certain extent written to be resolved into commonplace books. For a play that was not published, indeed, quotation was the way it was promulgated amongst the audience – and thus the mark of its success.

So the term 'play-patcher' simply confirms that some plays were understood not anyway to have been written as single complete entities. Beyond the commonplace-book aspect, a look at the printed layout of surviving texts raises the suggestion that some plays were transcribed, kept, learned, revised and even written, not as wholes, but as a collection of separate units to be patched together in performance.

A brief glance at almost any printed early modern play will reveal that certain of its sections are typographically different from others. Usually songs, for instance, are printed in different type from the body of the play; in addition they are frequently headed with a generic description, 'the song' or 'a song', even though what they are is perfectly clear from the context. So in the folio *Twelfth Night* TLN 939-41, the Duke's 'I prethee sing', is followed by an italic heading 'The Song.', followed by, also in italics, the actual song, 'Come away, come away death ...' Headings like 'the song' or 'the letter', which serve no useful purpose for a modern reader or actor, are generally removed by editors when preparing the text for publication. Sometimes, however, all that remains in the printed text is the heading: the body of the song no longer exists. John Marston's *What you Will* of 1607 (1.1) provides one such example:

Jacomo ... looke Sir heares a ditty.

Tis foully writ slight wit cross'd here and there,
But where thou findst a blot, their fall a teare.
The Song.
Fie peace, peace, peace, it hath no passion int.[14]

What was the song that Jacomo found so lacking in passion? And how can it have been lost from out of the play text? The 'lost song'

[14] John Marston, *What you Will* (1607), B1a. Other examples of 'lost songs' can be found in William Bowden, *The English Dramatic Lyric* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1951), 87- 94.

indicates something about the nature of the manuscript text that came into the printer's hands. What must have been the case with Marston's text is what the layout of the printed text of William Habington's *Queene of Arragon* (1640) reveals. For *The Queene of Arragon* on first appearance seems, too, to contain lost songs. Here is one song heading, again, without the attached text, from sig. D3a of that play:

Queen. Play any thing.
D*uring the Song, Enter Ascanio, Lerma, Sanmartino, &c.*
Ascanio. Cease the uncivill murmer of the drum.[15]

Yet the song in this instance is not in fact lost: it is printed at the back of the playbook together with the other song to be sung mid-play and the epilogue.[16] As the layout of Habington's text indicates, the manuscript playbook on which this text is based contained merely the song-heading; the actual songs were kept separately. That this was common theatrical practice is made clear by texts belonging to different companies that do the same thing. Heywood's *The Rape of Lucrece* (1608) for instance boasts on its title-page that it is printed 'With the severall Songes in their apt places'; when it comes to it, however, some of the songs are also gathered together in the back pages: the printer seems to have forgotten to distribute them through the play in time.[17] 'Lost songs' can be attributed to the fact that the words to the ditties were on other pieces of paper – perhaps with the music also inscribed on them – that have not survived.

In a world in which every actor had to hold in his head some forty-odd parts for the different daily plays in repertory, the advantages of not having to learn what can be read from a sheet of paper are obvious. There is every reason to think that some songs (and, indeed, some letters) were

[15] William Habington, *The Queene of Arragon* (1640), 2.1. D3a.
[16] William Habington, *The Queene of Arragon* (1640), I2b-I3a.
[17] *The Annals of English Drama 975-1700* ed. Alfred Harbage (Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1964) records that Rape was a Queen Anne's production and that *Queen of Arragon* was both performed by amateurs and the King's Men. Other plays with songs grouped aside from the main body of the text include Middleton's *Mad World* (1640 ed.), played by Queen Henrietta's Men, which has a single song at the back; Thomas Dekker's *The Shoomakers Holiday* (1600), an Admiral's Men play, which has the songs placed at the front of the text before the prologue; Philip Massinger and Nathan Field's *The Fatall Dowry* (1632), a King's Men's play, which also has the songs at the front, but has no prologue. A song is slightly misplaced within the text by the printer of *Love's Cure* in Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher's *Comedies and Tragedie*s (1647), 134; it, too, may be a King's Men's play.

kept on separate pieces of paper to be handed over and read on stage when needed; this was in fact the way songs and letters were handled for the next couple of centuries. If, however, songs are textually different from the rest of the play, then they are obvious sites for revision and rewriting by other authors. Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece* offers one such example, for the songs already referred to as collected at the back of the play were 'written by the stranger that lately acted *Valerius* his part' as the title page also makes clear. Webster is less sanguine about other people's songs in his writing (which does not prevent their being put into his text). During proof correction of the quarto for *The Duchess of Malfi*, he appears to have demanded that a note be added next to the song 'Armes, and Honors, decke thy story', 'The Author disclaimes this Ditty to be his'.[18]

The 'separate song' offers one reason for the fact songs so easily go in and out of plays. Songs in the manuscript of the *Mayor of Queenborough* are not in its printed text; the 'Willow song' is absent from the 1622 quarto of *Othello* but present in the folio.[19] Indeed, in a note appended to his manuscript volume of six plays, William Percy tells 'the Master of children of Powles' specifically to remove songs if the text needs shortening:

if any of the fine and foremost of these Pasturalls and Comoedyes conteynd in this volume shall but overreach in lengh [sic] ... then in tyme and place convenient, ... let passe some of the songs.[20]

If songs are on different pieces of paper, then even the character to whom the song is given is potentially changeable. It is worth observing here that moments of textual difference often occur around songs; that the songs in *Twelfth Night*, for instance, seem to have been taken from Viola and given to Feste.[21] Here, then, is one clear line of fluid text:

[18] John Webster, *The Works* ed. David Gunty, David Carnegie, Antony Hammond and Doreen DelVecchio (Cambridge: CUP, 1995), 1: 527. My thanks to David Carnegie for pointing out this example.
[19] See Thomas Middleton, *Hengist, King of Kent; or the Mayor of Queenborough* ed. from the manuscript in the Folger Shakespeare Library by R. C. Bald (New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938), xxxiii. The 'Willow song' is absent from the Quarto of *Othello* (1622), though the surrounding text still suggests the expectation that it should be sung. For a provocative discussion of this textual crux, see E. A. J. Honigman, *The Texts of Othello and Shakespearian Revision* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 11-14.
[20] MS Huntington HM 4, fol 191.
[21] See F. W. Sternfeld, *Music in Shakespearean Tragedy* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963), 29, 173.

'songs' in general are more extractable, moveable, revisable units of play than other pieces of text. This may be connected, too, to the function of song as song. Even if removed, even if never sung on stage at all, the severed song easily becomes part of other contexts, either living in the aural world – Richard Ligon was struck by hearing in 1650s Barbados a tune out of Shakespeare's *Henry V* – or living in the world of poetry.[22] When Thomas Carew includes 'Songs in the Play' in his Poems of 1651, he gives his songs a different chance of survival from his plays, while suggesting, too, that songs belong as much to the generic type 'poem' as they do to 'play'.[23] How much a part of 'the play' is the song then? By including songs from Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Nice Valour* in his commonplace book, one anonymous writer at least shows that he was prepared to isolate songs as removable fragments of text like the sententiae already discussed.[24] Because of the way the play could exist as a divided text, certain definable sections of it easily fit in to different kinds of book.

What other bits of the play might sometimes have been written on separable pieces of paper? Again the clue is in the layout of printed texts. Prologues and epilogues in early modern printed texts are regularly placed where they do not textually belong; typically they follow on one from the other, both preceding the text itself (in performance, of course, if both are present, the one opens the play and the other concludes it). They, too, usually have a separate generic heading 'the prologue', 'the epilogue', they, too, are generally printed in different type from the main text. Again the suggestion is that they were not always written into the playbook itself. At the start of *Thorny Abbey* the Fool enters 'with a Paper in his hand for a Prologue'; he has a text on its own sheet.[25] While, for Beaumont and Fletcher's *Complete Works* of 1679, the printers give a

[22] Richard Ligon, *A true and exact History of the Island of Barbados* (1657), 12: 'Dinner being neere halfe done ... in comes an old fellow, ... and plaide us for a Noveltie, The *Passame sares galiard*; a tune in great esteeme, in Harry the fourths dayes; for when Sir *John Falstaff* makes his Amours to Mistresse *Doll Tear-sheet, Sneake* and his Companie, the admired fiddlers of that age, playes this tune, which put a thought into my head, that if time and tune be the Composits of Musicke, what a long time this tune had in sayling from England to this place.'

[23] Thomas Carew, *Poems, with a Maske* (1651), 83. For other varieties of textual disturbance around songs see Tiffany Stern, 'Letters, Verses and Double Speech-Prefixes in *The Merchant of Venice', Notes and Queries*, 244 (1999), 231-33.

[24] MS Huntington HM 116 L10-F3, fol. 125.

[25] Reproduced in *A Choice Ternary of English Plays*, ed. William M. Baillie (Binghampton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1984), 45.

grateful thank you to the 'gentleman' who has recently provided them with 'several Prologues and Epilogues, with the Songs appertaining to each Play, which were not in the former Edition'; somehow the gentleman has come by a sheaf of papers containing materials absent from the play manuscripts in the printing house.[26] By extension, stage orations, like songs, could easily have different authorship from the body of the play. James Shirley provides a list of the prologues he has written for Fletcher plays while in Ireland, while Richard Brome, defending the accusation that he had breached his contract with Salisbury Court, insisted that he worked hard and had made 'many prologues and epilogues ... songs, and one induction' for company plays.[27]

As with songs, stage orations flourished in books of poetry, sometimes even when 'lost' from their play. Once again, Th*e Mayor of Quinborough* furnishes an example. Two manuscripts for the play survive which predate its 1661 printed text. Of the differences between manuscripts and printed book (neither of the manuscripts were the direct source for the book), one is that the printed text lacks the printed songs, another is that it lacks the epilogue. Meanwhile a prologue for *Queenborough*, different from that in either printed or manuscript text, had already been separately published in *Wit Restor'd in severall Select Poems* (1658): 'Loe I the Maior of Quinborough Town by name, / With all my brethren saving one that's lame; / Are come ...' (actually, this passage opens the fourth act of the printed and manuscript plays).[28] As this shows, prologues and epilogues change more regularly than the play to which they are attached, and are also more regularly lost. Shakespeare's texts offer several examples of this. The 'bad' quarto of *Henry V* was printed in 1600 – within a year of first performance – without prologues, epilogues and chorus. Were they in fact subsequently written for the play, or had they already been detached from it?[29] The prologue for Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*, meanwhile, did not feature in either of the variant first (1609) Quartos of the text, nor was it part of the original folio setting of the play; it was acquired at the very last moment in the folio's publication process to fill

[26] Beaumont and Fletcher, Fifty Comedies and Tragedies (1679), A1a.
[27] Gerald Eades Bentley, The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1986), 257.
[28] Sir John Mennes, *Wit Restor'd in severall Select Poems* (1658), 162.
[29] The chorus' reference to Essex's projected Irish triumphs (present only in the folio 1623 text) would seem to date the inserts to between March and September 1599, suggesting early removal. See Andrew Gurr's introduction to his *Henry V* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), 7.

what had become, for other reasons, an empty recto.[30]

That prologues and epilogues were only ever impermanently attached to their plays is made clear in a variety of ways. One is the regularity with which they would be replaced – revised or revived plays usually have new 'revision' prologues.[31] Another is the regularity with which they would be lost altogether; many plays are printed without either that seem to have had at least one of them originally. 'Remember well,' enjoins Time in Winters Tale TLN 1600-02, 'I mentioned a sonne o'th'Kings, which Florizell / I now name to you', but as the play stands we have never met Time before and are in no position to remember what he has said. Reference to a lost prologue? Perhaps. Both Hamlet and *Othello* include jibes about the regularity with which a prologue precedes a tragedy; both plays are, themselves, published without. As ever, there is some suggestion that changes and revision are more likely to happen to prologues and epilogues than to other parts of the play text; but as with songs, stage orations, detached from the play, do not necessarily die – they often become part of some generically different text. Books of poetry frequently include prologues and epilogues, but even a jest book can provide a home for a prologue that is as much a joke as an introduction to a play. Here, for instance, is a prologue which survives in a book of 'bull's or quips; a prologue, moreover, that is named for its playhouse but not its play: there is no knowing the text of which this was once part:

> A Bull Prologu, to a foolish Audience.
>
> You who sitting here,
> doe stand to see our Play;
> Which must this night,
> be acted here to day.
> Be silent, 'pray,
> Though you alowd doe talke,
> Stirre not a jot,
> Though up & down ye walk ...[32]

Prologues and epilogues had a different rate of survival from the

[30] See Peter W. M. Blayney, *The First Folio of Shakespeare* (Washington, DC: Folger Library Publications, 1991), 21.
[31] For some examples of revised plays with new stage-orations, see Bentley, Dramatist, 137.
[32] A. S. Gent, *The Booke of Bulls* (1636), C4b-C5a.

rest of the text for a particular reason which is covered much more fully in an article.[33] Here it is in brief.

Whenever a special occasion occurred for which explanation or apology was necessary, a special prologue would be written: prologues survive in books of poetry for 'Ezekiel Fen at his first Acting a Mans Part'; and for 'A young witty Lad playing the part of Richard the third: at the Red Bull'.[34] These might be spoken and therefore written at any time during the life of the play but they seem to be for single performances (when Ezekiel Fen performs next it will no longer be the first time he has acted a man's part; the witty lad only performed *Richard the Third* once as a novelty). This variety of prologue and epilogue usually survives away from the text it flanked; printed plays tend to have prologues and epilogues 'for court' and prologues and epilogues for 'the play' (rather than a particular actor). Of these, court prologues are, like special-occasion prologues, for single performances, as plays were habitually given only once at court. In other words, every prologue and epilogue looked at so far is for one performance only.

How often, then, were regular prologues and epilogues – the prologues and epilogues for public performance attached to plays – usually spoken? The prologue to Jonson's *Bartholomew Fair,* gives a hint: it makes articles of agreement between the spectators at the Hope theatre and the playwright on a specific day, 'the one and thirtieth day of *Octob*. 1614'.[35] As it stands, the prologue is relevant only for one performance. Bearing this in mind, the one-day nature of other stage orations becomes more apparent. There are prologues that, as with Shakespeare and Fletcher's *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, stress that the text they introduce is a virgin, unsullied by criticism; others simply broadcast their connection to the first performance: 'The DIVILL is an Asse, That is, to day, / The name of what you are met for, a new Play'; 'Wee promis'd you a new Play by our bill'; 'The worst that can befall at this new Play, / Is, we shall suffer, if we loose the day.'[36] As Christopher Brooke explains at the

[33] Tiffany Stern, '"A Small-beer Health to his Second Day": Playwrights, Prologues, and First Performances in the Early Modern Theatre', Studies in Philology, 101 (2004), 172- 199.
[34] Henry Glapthorne, Poems (1639), 28; Thomas Heywood, Pleasant Dialogues and Dramma's (1637), 247. Shakespeare's Richard III is published without a prologue.
[35] Ben Jonson, *Ben Jonson* ed. C. H. Herford and Percy Simpson, 11 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925-52), 6: 15.

opening to his 1614 poem *Ghost of Richard the Third, 'An Epistle* to the Reader is as ordinary before a new *Book*, as a *Prologue* to a new Play'.[37] Stage orations of the kind printed with plays, at least from roughly after 1600 (fewer survive from before then, and all are more generally written), seem to have been the preserve not of all performances but of first performances.

Why this may be relates to other facts about plays when they were 'new'. A new play's first performance appears to have been known as its 'trial'; what was being tried was not the actors, however, but the play itself. On the first performance the audience would judge the play and decide whether to give it approval for further performance or whether to damn it; if 'it liked not the multitude', it would not, generally, be played again.

Playwrights were terrified of the trial and many, as the induction to John Day's Isle of Gulls (1606) makes clear, would be sure to have 'a prepared company of gallants' present on the first day to applaud the play's best bits. 'Our Author ... is unfurnisht of ... a friendly audience' explains Day's Prologue. 'Then' is the answer, 'he must lay his triall upon God and good wits'.[38] From, again, some point after 1600, first performance trials are regularly referred to. 'That you should authorize [the play] after the Stages tryall was not my intention', writes Nabbes; Heminges and Condell maintain that whatever the reader of Shakespeare's folio plays thinks, the texts 'have had their triall alreadie' (A3a).[39] The large number of published play texts that insist that they have 'passed the censure of the stage with a general applause' or were 'the object of ... Commendations, ... being ... censured by an unerring Auditory' testifies to the importance of passing the trial in the life of the play.[40]

Epilogues usually also refer to the judgemental process, begging an

[36] Jonson, *Jonson*, 6: 163; Lodowick Carlell, *Arviragus and Philicia* (1639), A3a, James Shirley, *Poems* (1646), 149.
[37] Christopher Brooke, *Ghost of Richard the Third* (1614), 4πb.
[38] John Day, *Isle of Gulls* (1606), A2a.
[39] Thomas Nabbes, *Tottenham Court* (1636), A3b.
[40] Thomas Middleton, The Family of Love (1608), in *The Works* ed. A. H. Bullen, 8 vols. (London, 1886), 3: 7; Philip Massinger, *The City Madam* in *The Plays and Poems of Philip Massinger*, ed. Philip Edwards and Colin Gibson, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 4: 19.

unsure audience to approve or 'pass' the play by giving it a 'plaudite'. Indeed, the audience seem sometimes to have been asked at the end of the first day, not only to make their feelings clear by clapping or hissing, but also to shout 'ay' or 'no'; a process that continued until the nineteenth century. Dibdin explains how theatre audiences of the 1820s were asked at the end of first performance

> 'Ladies and Gentlemen, under the sanction of your kind approbation' &c. &c. The Ayes or the Noes generally interrupt the remainder; and the author is sent home, either over-elated at transitory success, or ... blamed, depressed, and ... ashamed.[41]

Just the same process seems to be taking place for the epilogue of Walter Mountfort's 1633 Launching of the Mary:

> Yf then this please (kinde gentlemen) saye so
> Yf yt displease affirem yt wth your No.
> your, I, shall make yt live to glad the sire
> your, No, shall make yt burne in quenchles fire.[42]

Any such prologue and epilogue, begging that the play be saved, fearing that it may be damned, has a very particular relationship to the text to which it is latched. Prologues and epilogues seem to exist to promote and protect the play in its minority, and to plead that the play should live. The uncertain survival of prologues and epilogues, then, may be traced to the fact that their connection to the play was a one-day one. Other stage orations make the immediacy of the one-day relationship clear, by highlighting the fact that the trembling playwright is actually present in the theatre on this special day, 'listening behind the arras, to hear what will become of his play'.[43] From his hidden position, he waits to hear what the audience conclude:

> You'd smile to see, how he do's vex and shake,

---

41 Thomas Dibdin, *The Reminiscences of Thomas Dibdin*, 4 vols. (London, 1827), 1:7-8.
42 Walter Mountfort, *The Launching of the Mary* [1633] ed. John Henry Walter (Oxford: OUP, 1933), 124. See also R. A., *The Valiant Welshman* (1615), I4b: 'Bells are the dead mans musicke: ere I goe, / Your Clappers sound will tell me I, or no.'
43 Shirley, *The Duke's Mistress* (1638) in *Dramatic Works and Poems of James Shirley* ed. William Gifford, 6 vols. (London, 1833), 4: 274.

> Speakes naught but if the Prologue does but take,
> Or the first Act were past the Pikes once, then –
> Then hopes and Joys, then frowns and fears agen.[44]

All of this relates to (or brings about) another theatre possibility that, again, informs the nature of the play text. If the audience were the judges of the first performance 'trial', then they could potentially get the text changed and altered to suit them, blackmailing the author to make the alterations they requested rather than have his play damned altogether. Much as a film is screened to a trial audience whose criticisms affect the cut eventually released to the general public, so early modern hissing and mewing may itself have revised certain plays after the first performance: *Every Man Out of His Humour* 'had another *Catastrophe* or Conclusion, at the first Playing: which ... many seem'd not to rellish ...; and therefore 'twas since alter'd'; Cowley's hastily mounted The Guardian was reworked 'After the Representation' and the author 'changed it very much, striking out some whole parts, as that of the Poet and the *Souldier*'.[45] A play in its first performance really might be longer or rougher than that same play in any subsequent performance (one explanation for Gurr's 'maximal' and 'minimal' texts is that 'maximal' were given at first performances and were cut by audience approval and disapproval into 'minimal' for subsequent performances).[46] Hardly surprisingly, a first performance cost more to get into, the audience, presumably, paying for the extra power they would have over this specific variety of text.[47]

The whole relates to another fact, as ever, hard to date. By the 1630s

---

[44] Prologue to *The Scholars* in Francis Beaumont, *Poems by Francis Beaumont* (1653), 75. See also Brome, *English Moor* in *Dramatic Works*, 3 vols. (London, 1873), 2: 86, who wants no one to claim he 'skulks behind the hangings ... affraid / Of a hard censure'; Jonson and Brome who stand together 'behind the Arras' to watch the reception of the 'new sufficient Play', *Bartholomew Fair*, Jonson, *Ben Jonson*, 6: 13, 15, Henry Glapthorne who, in *Ladies Privilege* (1640), J2b, is described as standing 'pensive in the Tyring-house to heare Your Censures of his Play'. For other examples and more on the subject, see Tiffany Stern, 'Behind the Arras: The Prompter's Place in the Shakespearean Theatre', Theatre Notebook (2001), 110-18.

[45] Jonson, *Ben Jonson*, 3: 602. Abraham Cowley, Poems (1656), (a)1b.

[46] Andrew Gurr, 'Maximal and Minimal Texts: Shakespeare v. The Globe', *Shakespeare Survey*, 52 (1999), 68-87.

[47] For inflated first performance charges see, for instance, Jasper Mayne's poem on Ben Jonson in *Jonsonus Virbius* (1638), 31: 'when thy Foxe had ten times acted beene, / Each day was first, but that 'twas cheaper seene'. For more on first performance admission prices before the interregnum see Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, 2: 532; entrance charges for new plays during the Restoration period are referred to in Samuel Pepys, *The Diary*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews, 11 vols. (London: Bell and Hyman Ltd, 1970- 1983), 2:234: 'to the Opera ... and it being the first time, the pay was doubled'.

prologues and epilogues for most plays make clear that at least part and perhaps all of the author's payment depends on receiving a portion of the revenue from the second or third day of playing, the so-called 'benefit' performance. By that time, too, many prologues describe themselves as preceding a second performance: 'Every labour dyes, / Save such whose second springs comes from your eyes', maintains *The Costly Whore* in 1633; Jasper Mayne's 'unbought Muse did never feare / An Empty second day, or a thinne share'.[48] But the epilogue to Armin's *Valiant Welshman*, published much earlier, in 1615, also expresses the worry that the play may be sent to its tomb, and voices the hope that he, the Bardh-epilogue will instead be allowed to give 'second birth' to the work.[49] One reason, then, why the playwright might have meekly accepted the ignominy of critical judgement from an audience is, as a 1632 epilogue explains, '[the poet's] promis'd Pay / May chance to faile, if you dislike the Play'.[50] Play-revision occurring after the first performance probably relates to the financial necessity of a play's survival to a second performance; the advent of benefits is, however, frustratingly hard to date. The earliest clear contemporary reference to a benefit is 1611, when a Dekker prologue jibes at a playwright who is only concerned that 'he Gaines, / A Cramd *Third-Day*'.[51] Years later, in *Playhouse to Be Let*, Davenant was to state that playwrights 'in the times of mighty *Tamberlane*, / Of conjuring Faustus, and the *Beaumchamps* bold, / ... us'd to have the second day', and there are Henslowe accounts that may (but may not) indicate benefit performances taking place in 1601.[52]

Several Shakespearean prologues and epilogues seem to refer to some of the issues covered in this argument. Epilogues that suggest they do not yet know whether the play has 'taken' or not include 'I charge you (O men) for the love you beare to women ... that betweene you, and the women, the play may please', *As You Like It* TLN 2788-2791, ''Tis ten to one, this Play can never please / All that are here', *Henry VIII*' TLN 3450-1. 2 *Henry IV*, in addition, goes on to promise that 'our humble

[48] *The Costly Whore* (1633), H4b; Jasper Mayne's *The City Match* (1639), B1a.
[49] R. A., *The Valiant Welshman* (1615), I4b.
[50] Richard Brome, *Novella in Works*, 1: 179.
[51] Thomas Dekker, *If This Be Not a Good Play, the Devil Is In It* (1612) *in The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, ed. Fredson Bowers, 4 vols. (Cambridge: CUP, 1953), 3: 121.
[52] William Davenant, T*he Dramatic Works of Sir William Davenant*, ed. James Maidment and W. H. Logan, 5 vols. (London, 1872), 4: 31. Henslowe gave a financial gift to Day 'after the playing of the second part of Strowd' – see Bentley, *Dramatist*, 131.

Author will continue the Story (with Sir John in it) ... unlesse already he be kill'd with your hard Opinions', TLN 3344-47. There is even, perhaps, the suggestion that the author is prepared to countenance revision in the light of audience-criticism in *A Midsummer Night's Dream's* 'Gentles, doe not reprehend. / If you pardon, we will mend,' TLN 2214-15.

Here the point is simply to raise more questions about the fragmentary and changeable text. While many critics have promoted the idea of the 'fluid' play text, and many others have argued against that idea (would the actors really be prepared to learn and relearn a different text for the same play?), identifying lines of fluidity – songs, prologues, epilogues – at least gives revision a logic. It also raises some fundamental questions about textuality. If a play sometimes existed as separate sheets that only came together in performance itself, and even then, only on certain specific performances, then what is the 'whole' play: what is written, what is played, what is performed the first day, or what is performed on subsequent days?

To confuse the subject yet further there is another, different, piece of paper that also related loosely to the playtext. This paper was probably, like the others, kept with the play but, unlike them, was seldom spoken. It also seems uniformly not to survived – or at least, not in original form. It is the playbill.

Often ignored because it was not part of the spoken performance, the bill nevertheless has some claim to be part of 'the text' of a play, depending on what the text is taken to be. Giving details such as title, venue, 'lure', and, sometimes, authorship, the bill is as much a product of the play as the title page; indeed, there is every reason to believe that some of the more lurid title pages for plays are made out of the content of the bill. Is the title page/playbill 'part' of the play? Modern editing shows some ambivalence towards the question. A concern with whether the audience knew the name of the author and whether the title was, for instance, *Henry VIII* or *All is True*, contrasts strangely with a willingness to confine actual information provided by title pages to textual notes. '*The Tragedie of King Richard the third. Conteining, His treacherous Plots against his brother Clarence: the pitiful murther of his innocent Nephewes: his tyrannicall usurpation: with the whole course of his detested life, and most deserved death*' is not a summary of the play that most editions

broadcast.[53] Yet this may well have been what early modern Londoners who were literate read: it may have drawn them to the theatre, and, later, made them buy the printed quarto; it may have been what some of them thought the play was 'about'.

The bill was the first and sometimes only form in which a passer-by might encounter a play; as it was printed (the stationers' register includes the names of the four men who had the successive right to print players' bills from 1587-1642: John Charlewood, John Roberts, William [and Isaac] Jaggard, Thomas [and Richard] Cotes), all plays visibly belonged to the world of the printing house. And, as all plays for all playhouses had their bills printed by the allowed bill-printer, so advertising for all plays is likely to have looked similar: the printing house may well have been the place that brought the separate companies and playhouses together.

Even more than songs, prologues and epilogues, the bill had a full life away from the stage as a variety of non-play literature. Playbills were advertisements, and their context was the world of other advertisements. Together with lawless 'siquises' (so called because they usually began 'si quis ...', 'if anyone ...'), libels, and with the title-pages to books that were also hung as advertisements, playbills clung to the doorposts of the houses of London, bringing the theatre visibly into the heart of the very city that had rejected it.[54] Indeed they were so present and so predictably a part of London life that Breton's hour- by-hour account of what happens in the morning of a London day includes the fact that by 'Nine of the Clocke' the 'Players Billes are almost all set up'.[55] Bills were varieties of text that embraced a mixture of permanence and changeability in their nature. Guessing from the one surviving English rope-dancing bill printed by the printers of the players' bills, and from the earliest surviving French playbill, it seems probable that bills were printed with 'gaps' for variable information. They were, that is to say, fixed and fluid, again, along definable lines. The rope-dancing bill, for instance, which appears to be for travelling players, has blanks for the

[53] William Shakespeare, *The Merchant of Venice* (1600), title-page.
[54] For the hanging of book title-pages see R. B. McKerrow, 'Booksellers, printers, and the stationers' trade, in *Shakespeare's England*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916), 2: 212-39 (231). More on this subject and the subject of playbills will be provided by Tiffany Stern, 'On each Wall / And Corner Poast': Playbills, Title-pages, and Advertising in Early Modern London', *English Literary Renaissance* 36 (2006), 57-85.
[55] Nicholas Breton, *Fantasticks: Serving for a Perpetuall Prognostication* (1626), E4b- F1a.

'changeable information', here, place of performance. The blanks can be filled in manuscript; the rest is permanent. The rope- dancing bill reads:

[ms: At 9 a Clok]

At the *[ms: Rose in winestreet]*

this present day shall bee
showne rare dancing on the
Ropes, Acted by his Majesties
servants, wherein an Irish Boy of eight
yeares old doth vault on the high rope,
the like was never seene: And one Mayd
of fifteene yeares of age, and another
Girle of foure yeares of age, doe dance on
the lowe Rope; And the said Girle of foure
yeares of age doth turne on the Stage,
and put in fourescore threds into the eye
of an Needle. And other rare Activityes
of body, as vaulting and tumbling on
the Stage, and Egges dancing upon a
Staffe, with other rare varietyes of
Dancing, the like hath not beene seene in
the realme of England. And the merry
conceites of Jacke Pudding.

If God permit.

Vivat Rex.[56]

Stock playbills could, too, have had gaps around the lure or the title: a variety of fixity and fluidity is a hallmark of a text of this kind.

So now to the whole play as it might have existed in the box of

[56] Reproduced in William Van Lennep, 'Some English Playbills', *Harvard Library Bulletin* 8:2 (1954) 235-241, where it is wrongly attributed to Jaggard's printing-house.

playhouse 'books'. It may have been made up of a loosely tied bundle of papers, consisting of a book of dialogue (or several if the play were submitted piecemeal as some of Daborne's were),[57] some separate sheets containing songs and letters, other separate papers containing prologues and epilogues (unless kept elsewhere as no longer relevant), and finally, perhaps, a separate bill/title-page providing the lure that attracted the audience. That is not to say that all plays existed like this. After all, some kind of 'complete' text was submitted to the Master of the Revels – though what kind and at what stage is queried by the argument. Nevertheless, substantial bits of play seem to have existed as separate but definable fragments, each raising the possibility of different authorship, and each capable of having other existences in other books, other places, and other contexts, being as much poems, jests, and advertisements as they were sections of the play. Even as bits of play text they may have differed in their level of permanence. Most permanent was, perhaps, the dialogue of the play, least permanent, perhaps, the prologue and epilogue. So plays could also have, internally, different levels of fixity.

The last point to be made is to do with the treatment of the 'book' by the playhouse. For though the full dialogue may have existed in one place, that is not what actors were given. Plays were disseminated as fragments: what actors had to learn from were called 'parts' the very word drawing attention to the fact that they were 'not whole'. These parts were made up of the speeches the actor was going to say with a 'cue' consisting of the one-to-three words preceding each speech. The speaker of the cue for professional productions was not generally named, and the length of the gap between one speech and another was not indicated. The actor, then, received his character as a roll or book of connected fragments, providing him with everything he would say but nothing that would be said to or about him beyond the cues. Of course, performance filled those gaps, but again that makes the play the 'thing performed' rather than the 'thing learned'; as parts were learned in full before group rehearsal, what the actor committed to memory was a context-limited fragment. Even for the actors, then, the play was fragmented, but along standard lines; indeed, if a play were never printed, then the only way that it was ever 'published' (in the sense of broadcast) was as 'parts'

[57] Daborne letter to Henslowe, 25 June 1613: 'J have took extraordynary payns wth the end & altered one other scean in the third act which they have now in parts', in W. W. Greg, *Henslowe Papers*, 3 vols. (London: A. H. Bullen, 1907), 3:73.

rather than as a whole.

A look at some surviving professional theatre 'parts' from the early modern period, the Restoration and eighteenth century, shows just what an actor characteristically had to work with. The later examples confirm the normality of the surviving early modern professional 'part' and show the consonance of professional theatre parts over time. Questions about the fixed and changeable nature of a play's dialogue will relate, of course, to the nature of the text the actor learned from.

Here follows a section from the part of 'Orlando' from Robert Greene's *Orlando Furioso*. It is the earliest surviving British professional theatre part and dates from the 1590s; damage to the left of the text has rendered the part harder to read than it was originally.

——————————————— Angelica
ah. my dear Anglica
syrha fetch me the harping starr from heauen
Lyra the pleasant mystrell of the s[h]phears
that J may daunce a gayliard wth Angelica
r<u > me to Pan, bidd all his waternimphes
come wth ther baggpypes, and ther tamberins.
——————————————— for a woeman howe
fares my sweet Angelica?
———————————————for hir honesty
Art thou not fayre Angelica
s
<w>hos<e >browes a[re] faire as faire Jlythia
that darks Canopus wth her siluer hewe
——————————————— art Angelica
Why are not these, those ruddy coulered cheekes
wher both the lillye, and the blusshing rose
syttes equall suted, wth a natyue redd[58]

The part of 'Ignoramus' (1662) is similar. Again, the piece is for

[58] MS Dulwich College I, Item 138. Reproduced as facsimile with transcript in W. W. Greg's *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouse*, 2 vols. (Oxford: OUP, 1969), 2, and against the text of the 1594 Quarto to Orlando Furioso in Greg's *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements* (Oxford: Malone Society, 1922).

professional performance, again, the cues vary from one to three words; again, their speaker is not, typically, named:

——————————————— persona.
oh how they linger! I must not let him pass
nor know I how to keep him while she come;
'save you Sir
——————————————— mittimus.
a poore man sir, spent my whole estate in law,
——————————————— away.
I beseech your councell.
——————————————— legem pone.
this greedy Cerberus must have a morsel,
and I have nothing left, but one poore souz.
perhaps he may fasten on't –
indeed sir I am a very poore man.
——————————————— nihil dicit
a slender fee sir, I beseech your councell.
——————————————— the case[59]

Finally, here is a section from the opening of a part for Scrub in Farquhar's *Beaux Stratagem.* Dating from the 1730s, this particular part belonged to the great eighteenth century actor Macklin:

Act 2[d]
Enter L.D.P.S. [Left Door Prompt Side]
at ——————————————— Scrub
Sir! ———————————————Week is this
Sunday, an't pleasure your Worship.
———————————————Scrub.
Sir!
———————————————of your Razor {Exit[60]

That plays were learned in this form seems to have affected the way

[59] Part of 'Ignoramus' for Ferdinando Parkhurst's play *Ignoramus or The Academical- Lawyer* in the Houghton Library. Title continues 'Acted at the Cock-pitt in Drury Lane; And also before ... The King and Queen ... on ...1st of November 1662'.
[60] Macklin's part of Scrub in George Farquhar's *The Beaux Stratagem,* Harvard Theatre Collection (TS 1197.54.5) for Drury Lane, 9 May 1738?

they were revised and is likely also to have affected the way they were written. Revising fully over an entire text will have been the least desirable of all methods of revision – for that will then have obliged the prompter to recall each separate actor's part, and rewrite it, before asking the actor to learn all over again what he had already committed to memory – but in a slightly different form. A look at Shakespeare's *Hamlet* in 'good' quarto (1604/5) and in folio reveals a different attitude to revisions. The cuts and changes made to *Hamlet* between the earlier (quarto) text and the later (folio) one are not made to all parts – so not all parts have to be returned to the prompter or relearned. In fact only eight parts are altered: Hamlet, Gertrude, Claudius, Horatio, Laertes, Rosencrantz, Guildenstern, Osric (the five leads and the three clowns). The first point, then, is that revision in *Hamlet* seems to have happened along 'strands' in a play rather than over the whole text. If songs, prologues and epilogues can be seen as 'strands' in a text too, then another picture of just what a play is emerges. Rather than being one entire text, a play appears to have a rope-like linear structure: it is made up of different independent threads each of which can be pulled or removed.

Another part-based element of the revision in *Hamlet* is that almost all alterations are within-speech, as in the example below.

O throwe away the worser part of it,
And leave the purer with the other halfe,
Good night, but goe not to my Uncles bed,
Assume a virtue if you have it not,
That monster custome, who all sence doth eate
Of habits devil, is angel yet in this
That to the use of actions faire and good,
He likewise gives a frock or Livery
That aptly is put on refraine to night,
And that shall lend a kind of easines
To the next abstinence, the next more easier:
For use almost ean change the stamp of nature,
And either the devil, or throwe him out
With wonderous potency: once more good night,
And when you are desirous to be blest,
Ile blessing beg of you, for this same Lord
I doe repent; but heaven hath pleasd it so

To punish me with this, and this with me,
That I must be their scourge and minster,
I willb estowe him and will answere well
The death I have him; so againe good night
I must be cruell only to be kinde,
This bad beginnes, and worse remaines behind.
On word more good Lady. (Q2, I4a-b; F 2540-55)[61]

Within-speech cuts do not disturb cues; other actors' parts are thus not affected by the alteration (and so do not have to be called back or relearned). Play revisions often take this form, happening in small fragments throughout the speeches of a play, rather than, as a modern reviser might expect, over entire scenes. If cued parts offer the explanation for this, then they also offer a new way of conceiving the 'solidity' of a text for, by implication, a speech is more changeable in its middle than in its cue-line.

Plays, then, should not always be regarded like epic poems in which each bit of text has the same worth. Rather, each variety of fragment could have a different anticipated life- span, and a different relationship to the full text: the play could be made up of patches of varying fixity and, as has been said, the audience listened to the play partly with an ear for its 'reusable' bits. The fragments that make up a text and which a text resolves into shape the way it is written, revised, learned and affect the way it survives. Larger questions, too, attend on the patchiness of the play. In a play that can be, as I have argued, at its root fragmentary rather than whole, where is the author – and, perhaps, more disconcertingly, where is – and what is – the text?

[61] Other within-speech cuts occur at 1.2.60; 2.2.210; 2.2.393; 2.2.320; 3.2.205; 3.4.72; 3.4.73; 3.4.190; 4.1.39; 4.7.88; 4.7.99; 5.1.100. For more on the subject of parts and revision in Hamlet, see Tiffany Stern, *Rehearsal from Shakespeare to Sheridan* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 106-10.