Bourne, Claire M. L. "Typography *After* Performance." *Rethinking Theatrical Documents in Shakespeare's England*. Ed. Tiffany Stern. London: The Arden Shakespeare, 2020. 193–215. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350051379.ch-010>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 13:05 UTC.

Copyright © Tiffany Stern and contributors 2020. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

10

Typography *After* Performance

Claire M. L. Bourne

Are printed playbooks ‘theatrical documents’? They were, as far as we know, not typically used to facilitate performance in the commercial theatre before 1642, but determining the extent to which they preserve traces of theatrical practice, and even specific performances, has been the aim of early modern drama scholarship from the New Bibliographers to current Performance as Research (or, Research in Action) practitioners.¹ W. W. Greg, A. W. Pollard, John Dover Wilson and others spent their careers trying to establish just how much ‘theatrical’ residue had stuck to playtexts as they were transmitted – in varied, circuitous ways – among playwrights and theatre personnel and, ultimately, into the hands of publishers, printers, and (finally) readers. For the New Bibliographers, reconstructing elusive (illusive, really) authorial manuscripts involved not only lifting ‘the veil of print’ – eradicating the vagaries of type-setting – but also stripping the text of playhouse interventions. Printed playbooks were *too* theatrical. More recently, reconstructions of early modern theatres, such as the Globe and the Blackfriars, have made it easier for researchers to

experiment with simulating performance conditions and what that can teach us about how plays by Shakespeare and his contemporaries once inhabited those spaces. These experiments have entailed the reverse engineering of actors' parts, backstage plots, and other 'documents of performance' from published playbooks and, as such, have tested the potentials and limits of printed plays as scripts. In these cases, printed playbooks are often not theatrical *enough*.

Over the last two decades, though, book historians have insisted that printed playbooks, while they contain texts initially written for performance, were (and are) *books* designed to circulate in new, non-theatrical (although sometimes related) contexts from the embodied iterations of plays that readers might have seen on London stages. Viewed as independent, viable entities in their own right, playbooks are not 'theatrical documents' at all but rather objects made for the book trade.² They are neither 'contaminated' by the theatre nor created to function as records of past or scores for future performance. Instead, they are books of imaginative writing published to be bought, bound, and read alongside other print genres: from poetry to polemic, sermon to ballad, travelogue to newsbook, and so forth.

But how can a textual object designed to be enjoyed alongside other textual objects in the 'chamber-room at your lodging' be simultaneously 'theatrical'?³ One answer inheres in the term 'document', a word that derives from the Latin *docere* (to teach) and which was used in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries exclusively to mean a lesson or instruction.⁴ For all the inconsistencies and perceived messiness of moveable-type printing, printed plays were – and are – 'theatrical documents' insofar as they teach readers how to navigate and encounter the texts in front of them as *plays*. By the 1590s, the particular design characteristics of playbook *mise-en-page* evoked many of the extra-lexical, meaning-making effects of theatricality, most of which we assume to have been lost or erased or ignored in the process of repackaging playtexts made for one media environment (the theatre) to suit a different medium: the

printed book. Typographic arrangements that accounted for the visual, sonic, and emotional ‘energetics’ of performance (the term is borrowed from Marta Straznicky) were vital to the legibility of printed matter specifically as *play-matter*.⁵ These arrangements activated generic recognition, making it possible for readers (before reading a word) to know that what they were looking at was a play.⁶

The term ‘document’ did not come to refer to ‘something written or inscribed’ and, more specifically, something that could serve as material evidence for an external event or phenomenon until the early eighteenth century. Nevertheless, it has been widely adopted in modern scholarship – from Greg’s *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses* (1931) to Tiffany Stern’s *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (2009) to the present volume – to denote any one of the variety of texts, including actors’ parts, backstage plots, ‘free-floating’ songs and letters, and what Greg called ‘prompt books’ that enabled performance in the early modern theatre. Printed playbooks are certainly ‘documents’ in this anachronistic sense in that they are both physical texts (‘something written or inscribed’) *and* have been used as evidence – of authorial intention, of performance, of printing house practices. But what, exactly, do printed playbooks ‘document’?⁷

To suggest that printed playbooks ‘document’ something external *at all* is to assert that they post-date (and are intrinsically linked to) previous events or phenomena. Yet they do not thoroughly describe performance, nor do they reproduce performance in a new medium. They do, however, ‘document’ a shifting set of distributed agencies – from company managers to playwrights to compositors. Their interventions are (together) evident on the printed page, but their individual contributions often cannot be isolated from the impacts of other hands, minds, bodies, machines, spaces, etc., that touched the text as it was – or the *texts* as they *were* – ultimately transmitted to readers. The typographic arrangements in most printed playbooks thus come *after* performance chronologically.⁸

Indeed, Francis Beaumont called the book a play's 'second publication'.⁹ It is tempting therefore to treat playbooks as backwards-looking or as 'souvenirs'. Title-page marketing claims – 'as it was acted' – moreover encourage this kind of reading. And we often take these claims at face value and use them to dismiss printed plays as emaciated or inferior surrogates, just as some early modern playwrights did.¹⁰ The book always already fails to capture the play 'as it was acted'.¹¹

Yet playbooks were initially designed not as proleptic textual archives of performance but as commercial objects for contemporary readers. Scholarship in the history of reading over the last two decades has pushed back against the performance-oriented criticism of the 1980s and 1990s, which insisted that performance was the dominant 'end' of playwriting. It might have been the first 'end', but early modern playbooks are now understood to have been viable and popular entertainments in their own right. D. F. McKenzie in the early 1980s suggested that playbook typography could 'bridge a gap' between play-going and play-reading¹²; in his wake, others have started taking seriously the typography – broadly conceived as the disposition of printed matter on the page – of the earliest commercial-theatre playbooks.¹³ Typographic reading as a method of inquiry comes *after* years of looking through the pages of playbooks to access something about performance. Only by understanding how early playbooks were designed to be read on their own terms and in their own moment can we start to understand how to read them as 'documents' of prior theatrical phenomena.

The typography of early modern playbooks, therefore, comes *after* performance both chronologically and methodologically (that is, as a valid object of study). But typography also comes *after* performance insofar as it correlates with performance and its effects. Instead of recording what happened on stage, playbooks document – to greater and lesser degrees – how a completely different medium (moveable-type printing) was mobilized to accord with theatrical effects. This rest of this chapter uses the earliest extant edition of

Love's Labour's Lost (1598) as a case study in typography that creatively accounts for those effects. Despite its title-page claim to present the play 'As it vvas presented before her Highnes this last Christmas', Q1 *Love's Labour's Lost* does not record an actual performance, nor prescribe future performances.¹⁴ Indeed, scholars and editors sometimes call it 'unactable' because it is full of textual infelicities: variable speech prefixes for the same characters, orthographic errors, possible 'ghost' characters, and an unattributed final line, among others.¹⁵ However, 'unactable' does not mean unreadable. In fact, the quarto contains an unusually varied range of typographic strategies that help 'vitalize' the play's non-verbal theatricality for readers. For a play whose plot turns on the (un)successful reading and performance of textual matter, it makes sense that Q1 positions readerly activity in the interstice between the idea of the play as a book and the idea of the play in performance. Q1 teaches readers how to see and hear the play's more complex theatrical moments and, in doing so, provides one of the best examples of an early modern playbook functioning as a 'theatrical document' for readers.

*

Q1 *Love's Labour's Lost's* *mise-en-page* is unusually attentive to moments of theatricality where the effect of an exchange *for audiences* would have been staked on non-lexical business. These moments include instances of simultaneous speech and action; changes in tone or addressee (especially quick transitions from public to guarded speech); and longer episodes that switch between different layers of performance, such as the reading aloud of sonnets and letters; the Muscovite masque; and the Nine Worthies pageant. Published in 1598, when English playbook page design was still highly experimental, Q1 demonstrates dramatic typography's ability to display (that is, re-present) theatricality before even Ben Jonson began to micro-manage the typographic minutiae of his earliest quartos.¹⁶

The edition of *Love's Labour's Lost* now referred to as Q1 was quite possibly the second printed edition of the play. Its title page advertises a 'Newly corrected and augmented' text, and its printer William White was hired almost exclusively for reprints. The nature of the 'exit manuscript' (John Jowett's catch-all term for the variety of texts that 'migrate[. . .] from the theatre to the printing house') used as copy-text for Q0 (if it existed) or Q1 (if there was no Q0) has been extensively debated.¹⁷ Whether set primarily from a working, possibly collaborative, draft of the play or a scribal transcript or an earlier printed edition set from one of these two kinds of manuscripts, Q1 is the material result of several agencies, and does not express the singular intention of playwright, scribe, publisher, printer, or compositor.¹⁸ Even if the *mise-en-page* of the exit manuscript behind Q0 or Q1 cued the typographic arrangements now evident on the pages of Q1, those arrangements would survive not as the unthinking residue of textual transmission, but as choices: decisions to reproduce copy-text. And whether these arrangements were set out in a copy-text or originated in the printing house, their effects would have been the same for readers.

Love's Labour's Lost is undoubtedly a 'bookish' play. Its plot is animated by the circulation and 'miscarrying' of letters, as well as by the performance of lyric poetry not only from memory but also from papers brought on stage. The art of courtship is displayed by acts of inscription and reading. The King of Navarre's fellowship with his gentlemen companions is defined by their sworn commitment to book learning: they are called both 'bookmen' and 'book-mates'.¹⁹ And Holferness's pedantry derives from his use (and misuse) of schoolbooks and dictionaries. In this play, books create the conditions for exploring the limits of self and identity.²⁰ At several moments, the play also anticipates knowledge of publishing conventions. Most notably, the comically smitten Don Armado's gleeful declaration that he will write sonnets to fill 'whole volumes in folio' registers his excess to anyone who understood that a folio was a big book; to the most literate auditors and readers,

it also characterizes him as an incompetent lover, unaware that sonnets (and lyric poems, more broadly) were typically published in the smaller, more portable formats.

The overall conceit of *Love's Labour's Lost* – and Q1 is advertised as ‘conceited’ (witty *and* well-made) on its title page – concerns failed or interrupted performances within the play’s fictional world: the selective reading aloud of letters; the guarded recitation of love poems while others (unseen) overhear; the pre-empting of inset performances. It is at these specific moments of performance that the play’s dependence on theatricality – non-lexical business – to generate humour and tension intersects with its bookishness most explicitly *and* strains the capacity of print. But it is also at these moments that Q1 offers inspired typographic arrangements, which were completely novel to English playbook *mise-en-page* in 1598. Q1 is therefore at its most theatrical when it is at its most bookish.

The typographic treatment – and even presence – in printed plays of ‘free-floating’ texts (songs, letters, poems, proclamations) varies widely in play quartos of the 1590s. As Tiffany Stern has shown, these texts, many of which appeared or were represented in some physical form on stage (as was evidently the case in *Love's Labour's Lost* see Figure 10.1), often circulated apart from the ‘allowed’ book in the theatre. As a result, they did not always make it to the printing house with (or in) whatever kind of manuscript the publisher acquired. For instance, the lyrics of the song that Don Armado asks his page Moth to ‘warble’ are not present in Q1, which only supplies what seems to be its title: ‘Concolinel’.²¹ But elsewhere, letters and poems read aloud are carefully disposed on the page, none more so than the letter from the ‘magnificent [sic] Armado’ that Dull, the constable, and Costard (also called ‘Clowne’ in Q1) deliver to Ferdinand, the king, towards the beginning of the play.

(See Fig 10.1.) Before Ferdinand reads the letter, which reveals that Costard was caught consorting with the dairymaid Jaquenetta, Costard admits ‘The matter is to me’ (meaning, the

FIGURE 10.1 *A Pleasant Conceited Comedie Called, Loues labors lost* (London: Cuthbert Burby, 1598), A4v–B1r. By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.

letter concerns his behaviour), while Berowne anticipates the comic effect of the letter's 'stile' (it 'shall giue vs cause to clime in the merrines[s]').²² Having already mentioned Don Armado's penchant for 'fire-new words', Berowne is eager to hear *what* Armado has written. But just as critical as the letter's words is the 'stile' in which Armado wrote it – and, presumably, the 'stile' in which it will be performed by Ferdinand. The shift in tonal register from Ferdinand speaking in his own voice to his ventriloquising of Armado's voice is marked by a change in typeface.²³ The beginning of the letter – the superscription – is articulated with a dropped initial, and the inscribed words are in italics, in contrast to the roman of the dialogue. The different typefaces made it easier for readers to know when to 'hear' the king's voice and when to 'hear' him voicing Don Armado.

But this episode of reading aloud also has an onstage audience whose interactions with the king's performance are rendered typographically, making lengthy descriptions of the encoded action unnecessary. In the course of Ferdinand's reading of the letter, Costard has nine lines in total. In three cases, he interrupts the king – the breaking off of the king's reading is signalled in two instances by colons and in one instance by a lack of punctuation.²⁴ In two other cases, the king tries to silence Costard so that he can continue to read. Even though each of these directives is followed by a full stop, Costard takes each one as the start of a longer syntactical unit: 'Peace.' / 'Be to me, and euerie man that dares not fight.' and 'No wordes.' / 'Of other mens secrets I beseech you.' The periods after the king's demands for silence signal that, at these moments, Costard is not interrupting.

Costard's other four lines are set inside parentheses and embedded in the text of the letter, an arrangement not used before, to my knowledge, in a printed commercial theatre playbook.²⁵ As Ferdinand reads Armado's account of witnessing the '*obseene & most propostrous euent*' that inspired him to write (sexual cavorting on the king's property), Costard slowly recognizes that the person Armado describes in the letter is he himself. Costard's parenthetical utterances,

where both speech prefix (in italic type) and words uttered (in roman type) are set between round brackets, suggest a quite different temporal, tonal, and even spatial dynamic between the king's performance and Costard's verbally annotated audition. Instead of being sequential like the prior series of interruptions, the king's act of reading aloud and Costard's utterances are simultaneous.

Parenthesis is both a rhetorical figure and a typographic arrangement.²⁶ In speech, as on the page (thanks to the two 'half moon' glyphs that circumscribed parenthetical content), parenthesis provided the means by which to 'peece or graffe' together what George Puttenham called 'larger information' in the middle of an otherwise grammatically complete sentence.²⁷ That 'parcell' could be removed 'without any detriment to the rest' but was nevertheless considered important to the matter being presented.²⁸ Parenthesis simultaneously subordinated *and* drew attention to the words inside the brackets. And those words had the power not only to supplement the sentence but also to offer vital context (which allowed writers and speakers to clarify their attitude to the main issue at hand) for the extra-parenthetical content. In particular, the use of typographic parentheses conveyed tone in early modern print. As Richard Mulcaster explained, parentheses 'warneth vs, that the words inclosed by them, ar to be pronounced with a lower & quikker voice, then the words either before or after them'.²⁹ Typographic parentheses invite readers to *hear* the words inside them differently.

Words contained inside typographical parentheses, according to Mulcaster, are neither 'impertinent' (i.e., irrelevant) to nor 'fullie concident [sic]' with the rest of the sentence: they indicate that the 'branch' of speech placed inside them is connected to the matter at large, while also distinguishing it in time, space, and quality. The parentheses around the text of Costard's reactions to the king's voicing of Armado's letter are designed to make Costard's reactions read as both unnecessary to but also not 'fullie concident' with the content of the letter. In other words, the letter itself is complete without them, but

the dramatic situation is not. The *typographic* parentheses indicate that Costard's *verbal* parentheses do not interrupt Ferdinand but show him reacting verbally *at the same time as* the king reads the bulk of the letter. Though directly related to the content of the letter, they leave open the possibility that Ferdinand, who is Costard's primary onstage auditor, does not hear these tiny outbursts as his italicized reading proceeds.³⁰ The king reads the catalogue of derogatory epithets Armado uses to describe Costard ('*low spirited Swaine*', '*base Minow of . . . myrth*', '*vnlettered smal knowing soule*', and '*shallow vassall*'), and after each one, Costard goes from vocalizing 'Mee?' to 'Mee?' to 'Still mee.' to 'O mee.' If Q1's question marks are meant to be read *as question marks*, then Costard might initially doubt that he is the one being arraigned in the letter, or feign innocence. But, if they are read as exclamation marks (a distinct possibility since question marks were often used in early print to indicate both '?' and '!'), then readers would get the sense that he has been eagerly waiting to recognize himself in the letter: *There I am!* The ambiguity of this arrangement means that it does not record or provide a score for performance – but it *does* convey the complex non-lexical business of this episode. The arrangement of Costard's reactions inside parentheses and embedded in the longer letter not only accounts for the stage's capacity to show two things happening at once; it also demonstrates that typography has the capacity to offer multiple interpretive possibilities at once.³¹

These typographic parentheses probably cued readers to read for action as well as tone since, when the figure of parenthesis is explicitly evoked in dialogue of plays from the period, it is often used to describe (usually comic) action that dilates or breaks into speech. In Lodge's *Wounds of Civil War* (1594), for instance, the clown declares that he 'must make a parenthesis of this pint pot, for words make men dry'.³² Here, the act of drinking from 'this pint pot' creates a parenthesis in the clown's speech. In *The Fair Maid of the Exchange* (1607), Cripple describes Bowdler as a 'due fond humorist, a Parenthesis of iests': Bowdler's jests are both physical and verbal.³³ Parenthesis can play *and* read as visible,

antic digression. By presenting Costard's utterances embedded in the letter rather than set on their own lines, Q1 bifurcates the episode into two focal points. It is as much about Costard's comic self-incrimination as it is about Don Armado's hapless officiousness. The parentheses in Q1 *Love's Labour's Lost* supply both 'accent' (tone) and 'action' to produce an efficient textual arrangement that assumes readers' familiarity with typographical parentheses as signs of both subordination and significance.

*

In some of the play's other episodes of onstage reading, Q1 again signals the distinction between dialogue and text read aloud from a sheet of paper or performed in a different vocal register. Both Holferness's bawdy 'extemporal Epytaph on the death of the Deare' and the sonnet Longaville reads aloud as Ferdinand observes him unseen are inaugurated by glyphs that traditionally (that is, in printed plays and other genres) open new units of sense. Holferness's verse is introduced by a fleuron (¶), a symbol used in medieval manuscripts as well as early print to distinguish commentary from passages of main text, see Figure 10.2.³⁴ Holferness's poem indeed is a comment on the play's preoccupation with venery, both the hunting of animals and the pursuit of sex.

Then, in the scene that follows, Ferdinand (here, '*King*'), Longaville, and Dumaine – each believing himself to be alone – recite love lyrics composed for the ladies they are secretly pursuing. Modern editions typically specify that each man *reads* his poem, but Q1 specifies that only Longaville and Dumaine read theirs. There is no indication that the king speaks his sonnet from a paper. Instead, he recites it. And indeed the lines of the sonnet are set like normal dialogue – left-justified in roman type with no special typographic dispensation, see Figure 10.3. By contrast, the king states that Longaville enters '*reading*' and a stage direction details that Longaville '*reades the Sonnett*'. Furthermore, a pilcrow (¶) is situated at the start of Longaville's poem giving it a visual separation from his other

FIGURE 10.2 *A Pleasant Conceited Comedie Called, Loues labors lost* (London: Cuthbert Burby, 1598), E1r. By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.

dialogue, see Figure 10.4. Inspired by the long-standing practice of medieval scribal rubrication (where red ¶ symbols were used to divide manuscripts into discrete parts), pilcrows, which were known earlier as *capitula*, or heads, were deployed in a variety of sixteenth-century printed texts to mark new units of text. They were used frequently in sixteenth-century printed plays to articulate units of dialogue and in books of lyric poetry to begin new poems.³⁵ The pilcrow at the start of Longaville's poem, like the fleuron at the beginning of Holferness's, signals that the text of the poem is qualitatively distinct from the

FIGURE 10.3 *A Pleasant Conceited Comedie Called, Loues labors lost* (London: Cuthbert Burby, 1598), E2v–E3r. By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.

surrounding dialogue. In this way, the most abstract of typographic symbols teach readers to *hear* the poems in different vocal registers and to *see* their recitation as capsule performances inside a larger theatrical event.³⁶

Elsewhere, too, typographic strategies for differentiating kinds of theatrical speech make it easier for readers to navigate

FIGURE 10.4 *A Pleasant Conceited Comedie Called, Loues labors lost* (London: Cuthbert Burby, 1598), E3r. By permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.

the play's complex business in which onstage audiences interact with onstage performers. For example, Moth's struggle to deliver his learned speech at the beginning of the so-called Muscovite masque is clearly illustrated by the use of italics to indicate his words, where roman type is used for Berowne and Boyet's interjections, see Figure 10.5.

At the sound of a trumpet, Moth enters '*with a speach*', says the stage direction, which suggests he (the character) might have had the option to read the speech from a paper though he attempts to perform it from memory. No sooner has he spoken his first line ('*All haile, the richest Beauties on the earth*'), but Berowne asserts that the women's beauty is 'no richer then rich Taffata', i.e. not visible because they are wearing taffeta masks.

FIGURE 10.5 *A Pleasant Conceited Comedie Called, Loues labors lost* (London: Cuthbert Burby, 1598), G3v–G4r. By Permission of the Folger Shakespeare Library.

Berowne's intervention distracts Moth, who makes a mistake in his next line calling the women '*the fayrest dames that euer turnd their backs*' – rather than 'eyes' – '*to mortall viewes*', After this line in Q1 is a stage direction set in roman type (the only one in the whole quarto) to distinguish it visually from Moth's italics: 'The Ladyes turne their backs to him.' Berowne corrects Moth ('Their eyes villaine, their eyes'), and Moth then corrects himself: '*That euen [sic] turnde their eyes to mortall viewes.*' He then begins the next line with the word '*Out*' but now Boyet interrupts him to make a joke: 'True, out in deede.'

(The lack of a period after the single word set on its own line suggests the interruption.) What Boyet means is that Moth has been put ‘out of his part’ by the actions (and words) of his audience. Feeling their ‘contempt’, Moth’s mistakes continue until he forgets his lines completely:

*Pag. Out of your fauours, heauenly spirites vouchsafe
Not to beholde.*

Berow. Once to beholde, rogue.

*Page. Once to beholde with your Sunne beamed eyes,
With your Sunne beamed eyes.*

As Moth (here, ‘Page’) repeats several words to jog his memory or cue Boyet to cue him, Boyet makes fun of the repetition, telling Moth that the ladies will not respond (‘answere’) to the ‘Epythat’ (epithet) ‘*Sunne beamed eyes*’ (and presumably turn back around) even if he repeats it: ‘You were best call it Daughter beamed eyes.’ Moth’s frustration comes to a head; he leaves his part completely. Here, his lines turn from italics to roman type: ‘They do not marke me, and that bringes me out.’ The ‘bringing out’ that results from the onstage audience’s mockery of Moth’s performance is made clear by this shift in typeface; the lack of subsequent italics indicates that the masque itself is over.

The much longer and frequently interrupted performance of the Nine Worthies pageant towards the end of the play uses the same system of typographic differentiation to indicate where Costard, Nathaniel, Holferness, and Moth are speaking their parts and when they are directly engaging with the barbs and reactions of their onstage audience. In this way, italics are used fairly consistently throughout the playbook both to teach readers what dialogue is (i.e., the lines set in roman type) and to mark speech that is read or performed by characters within the fictional world of the play. Actual actors perform in roman type. Fictive actors – characters performing within the fiction – perform in italics.

Love's Labour's Lost is a play that dramatizes women's capacity to 'turn tutor' to men (that is, to instruct them) in the ways of love *and* the capacity of documents to communicate first- and second-hand truths (that is, to teach) about suffering for love on behalf of male authors.³⁷ The play has been described (and sometimes dismissed) as a loose patchwork of episodes that lacks a plot. But as Stern has shown, it was the nature of early modern plays to be patched in the first place, and in *Love's Labour's Lost*, this patchiness is, in a way, the point. Free-floating poems, letters, and dramatic set-pieces are stitched into the fabric of the play, where they serve as plot devices. Information only circulates through texts and the points of the plot are only linked through the failed, miscarried, and interrupted performances of those texts. The typography of Q1 manages to articulate both the presence of these texts and some vital effects of their performance: typeface differentiation, the choice placement of glyphs, and the parenthetical embedding of one character's words inside another's all document the tone and action of episodes where bodies make meaning. In doing so, typography renders legible (and audible) key aspects of the play's multi-vocal and multi-perspectival – and decidedly theatrical – meditation on the limited potential of courtship rituals and, in turn, mitigates against the failure of transmitting a text that is also a play to readers. Q1 therefore serves as a test case for printed playbooks as theatrical documents. Instead of being designed to facilitate performance, it was designed to facilitate reading *after* – in accordance with the meaning-making effects of – the play's theatrical incarnations.

Notes

- 1 On the possibility that printed playbooks were used to mount performances before 1642 despite the lack of extant evidence for such a practice, see Leslie Thomson, 'A Quarto "Marked for Performance": Evidence of What?', *Medieval and Renaissance*

Drama in England 8 (1996): 176–210. Some pre-1642 printed folios and quartos were certainly used as prompt books for professional revivals after 1660. See G. Blakemore Evans, *Shakespearean Prompt-Books of the Seventeenth Century*, 8 vols (Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1960); and Edward A. Langhans, *Restoration Promptbooks* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1981).

- 2 See Zachary Lesser, *Renaissance Drama and the Politics of Publication* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Jeffrey Todd Knight, *Bound to Read: Compilers, Collections, and the Making of Renaissance Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013); Aaron T. Pratt, 'Stab-Stitching and the Status of Early English Playbooks as Literature', *The Library*, 7th series, 16.3 (2015): 304–328; and Adam G. Hooks, *Selling Shakespeare: Biography, Bibliography, and the Book Trade* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).
- 3 Thomas Middleton and Thomas Dekker, *The Roaring Girle* (London: Thomas Archer, 1611), sig. A3r.
- 4 Lisa Gitelman, *Paper Knowledge: Toward a Media History of Documents* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014), introduction.
- 5 Marta Straznicky, 'Plays, Books, and the Public Sphere', in *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and Readers in Early Modern England*, ed. Straznicky (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006), 19.
- 6 On generic recognition see Knight, 'Economies of Scale: Shakespeare and Book History', *Literature Compass* 14.6 (2007).
- 7 For a particularly rich analysis of what printed playbooks do not document, see Richard Preiss's chapter 'Undocumented: Improvisation, Rehearsal, and the Clown' in this volume.
- 8 On this model of chronology, see, for example, Roslyn L. Knutson, *The Repertory of Shakespeare's Company, 1594–1613* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1991), 10–11. Masques, which were sometimes printed ahead of the performance event, are one obvious exception, as are William

Davenant's interregnum entertainments, which were printed with advertisements for performance.

- 9 Francis Beaumont, 'To my friend Maister *Iohn Fletcher*', in *The Faithfull Shepheardesse* (London: Richard Bonian and Henry Walley, [1610?]), sig. ¶4v.
- 10 For evidence and discussions of this phenomenon, see Stephen Orgel, 'The Poetics of Spectacle', in *The Authentic Shakespeare and Other Problems of the Early Modern Stage* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 49; Laurie Maguire, *Shakespearean Suspect Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 56; and Jeffrey Masten, *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 115.
- 11 This does not mean that printed playbooks have nothing to offer about early modern performance practices. Theatre historians have shown that printed playbooks preserve the contours of crucial localized moments and broader theatrical protocols. But treating playbooks as failures for proffering 'unactable' texts or texts that interfere with the scholarly aim of reconstructing performance ignores the status of printed plays as texts designed for reading.
- 12 D. F. McKenzie, 'Typography and Meaning: The Case of William Congreve', in *Buch und Buchhandel in Europa im achtzehnten Jahrhundert*, ed. G. Barber and B. Fabian, *Wolfenbüttler Schriften zur Geschichte de Buchsewens* 4 (1981): 83.
- 13 They include Linda McJannet, 'Elizabethan Speech Prefixes: Page Design, Typography, and Mimesis', in *Reading and Writing in Shakespeare*, ed. David M. Bergeron (Cranbury: Associated University Presses, 1996), 45–63; Zachary Lesser, 'Typographic Nostalgia Play-Reading, Popularity, and the Meanings of Black Letter', in *The Book of the Play*, 99–126; Holger Schott Syme, 'The Look of Speech', *Textual Cultures* 2.2 (2007), 34–60 and 'Jonson, Marston, and the Theatrical Page', *English Literary Renaissance* 38.1 (2008): 142–171; Claire M. L. Bourne 'Dramatic Pilcrowes', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 108.4 (2014): 413–452; and Laurie Maguire, 'Typographical Embodiment: The Case of Etcetera', in *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Embodiment: Gender, Sexuality, and Race*, ed. Valerie Traub (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 527–548.

- 14 *A Pleasant Conceited Comedie Called, Loues labors lost* (London: Cuthbert Burby, 1598), [t.p.].
- 15 Georg Brandes, *William Shakespeare: A Critical Study*, vol. 1 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1898), 48; and G. R. Hibbard, ed., *Love's Labour's Lost* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1990), 65. The 1623 Folio text redistributes speech prefixes and assigns the play's final line, but also replicates some of Q1's arrangements.
- 16 On the shifting conventions of playbook typography in the sixteenth century, see T. H. Howard-Hill, 'The Evolution of the Form of Plays in English During the Renaissance', *Renaissance Quarterly* 43.1 (1990): 112–155; Bourne, 'Dramatic Pilecrows'; and Tamara Atkin, 'Playbooks and Printed Drama: A Reassessment of the Date and Layout of the Manuscript of the Croxton "Play of the Sacrament"', *Review of English Studies* 60.244 (2009), 194–205.
- 17 John Jowett, 'Exit Manuscripts: The Archive of Theatre and the Archive of Print', *Shakespeare Survey* 70 (2017), 119.
- 18 For an overview of textual transmission theories, see Henry Woudhuysen, ed., *Love's Labour's Lost*, The Arden Shakespeare (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1998), Appendix 1.
- 19 *Loues labors lost* (1598), sigs. C3r and D3v.
- 20 Charlotte Scott, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Book* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 57; and Carla Mazzio, 'The Melancholy of Print: *Love's Labor's Lost*', in *Historicism, Psychoanalysis, and Early Modern Culture*, ed. Mazzio and Douglas Trevor (New York & Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2000), 189–190.
- 21 *Loues labors lost* (1598), sig. C3v. See Tiffany Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 122.
- 22 *Loues labors lost* (1598), sig. A4v.
- 23 On the typographic articulation of letters in plays, see Claire M. L. Bourne, 'Dramatic Typography and the Restoration Quartos of *Hamlet*', in *Canonising Shakespeare: Stationers and the Book Trade, 1640–1740*, ed. Emma Depledge and Peter Kirwan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017); and Seth Lerer, 'Hamlet's Poem to Ophelia and the Theater of the Letter', *English Literary History* 81.3 (2014): 841–863.

- 24 See Woudhuysen, “‘Dead, for my life’: Stopping, Starting and Interrupting in Love’s Labour’s Lost”, *Actes des congrès de la Société française Shakespeare* 32 (2015): 2–3. On the use of colons, as well as a lack of punctuation, to mark interruption, see Percy Simpson, *Shakespearean Punctuation* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1911), 71–74 and 98–99.
- 25 This observation is based on an original survey of typographic arrangements in playbooks printed in England from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries.
- 26 John Lennard, *But I Digress: The Exploitation of Parentheses in English Printed Verse* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 37; Jonathan Lamb, ‘Parentheses and Privacy in Philip Sidney’s *Arcadia*’, *Studies in Philology* 107.3 (2010); and Jenny C. Mann, ‘Sidney’s “Insertour”: *Arcadia*, Parenthesis, and the Formation of English Eloquence’, *English Literary Renaissance* 39.3 (2009): 460–498.
- 27 George Puttenham, *The arte of English poesie* (London: Richard Field, 1589), sig. T4v.
- 28 Puttenham, *English poesie*, sig. V1r.
- 29 Richard Mulcaster, *The First Part of the Elementarie* (London: Thomas Vautroullier, 1582), sig. T3r.
- 30 Q1 *Love’s Labour’s Lost* features an extraordinary (for a playbook printed in the 1590s) number of parentheses, many of which could signal guarded speech or shifts in tonal register. Later, the King’s Men scribe Ralph Crane would use parentheses more abundantly – and to similar effect – in his dramatic manuscripts. See Amy Bowles, ‘Dressing The Text: Ralph Crane’s Scribal Publication of Drama’, *Review of English Studies* 67.280 (2016): 418–423.
- 31 Syme describes Jonson’s varied strategies for articulating in print theatrical simultaneity in ‘Unediting the Margin’.
- 32 Thomas Lodge, *The Wovnds of Ciuill War* (London: John Danter, 1594), sig. G3r.
- 33 *The Fayre Mayde of the Exchange* (London: Henry Rocket, 1607), sig. I2r.
- 34 Malcolm B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993), 181.

- 35 Bourne, 'Dramatic Pilcrow's'.
- 36 On the next page, there is no glyph to introduce Dumaine's poem, but each line is indented to differentiate it visually, and a stage direction notes that Dumaine '*reades*'.
- 37 Kathryn Moncrief, "'Teach Us, Sweet Madam': Masculinity, Femininity, and Gendered Instruction in Love's Labor's Lost', in *Performing Pedagogy in Early Modern England: Gender, Instruction and Performance*, ed. Kathryn Moncrief and Kathryn Read McPherson (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2011), 214; and Mazzio, 'Melancholy of Print'.