

Issues in Review

Elizabeth Tavares and Laurie Johnson (contributing editors), Roberta Barker, Emily MacLeod, Peter Kirwan, and Catriona Fallow

Playing in Repertory

Introduction: Repertory, Dramaturgy, and Embodiment

Elizabeth Tavares and Laurie Johnson

This introduction outlines the essays in the Early Theatre Issues in Review forum 'Playing in Repertory', placing them in the context of new movements in the study of early modern English repertories for contemporaneous and contemporary performance.

Whether engaged in swordplay, performing music, or presenting plays, the commercialized body comes into focus in the study of early modern performance repertories. This field has heavily invested intellectual energy in understanding how commodity culture shaped plays and playing. In his study of plays that 'shared the boards' of the Globe theatre from 1599 to 1609, Bernard Beckerman argued that while the repertory system had been 'invariably neglected', it was this 'business of presenting' plays that was the 'necessary step in working out' those 'patterns of performance' that enabled an 'acting company to market its wares'.¹ His invaluable survey sketches out the practices by which the monarch's troupe purchased plays, costumes, and licenses; hired theatres, actors, tire-men, and bookkeepers; and scheduled performances. Lucy Munro, in a recent and much-needed reappraisal of the King's Men, provides a company biography attuned to the 'authority, service, commodity and collaboration' of the company's practices,

Elizabeth E. Tavares (eetavares@ua.edu) is assistant professor of English with the Hudson Strode Program in Renaissance Studies at the University of Alabama.

Laurie Johnson (Laurie.Johnson@usq.edu.au) is professor of English and cultural studies at University of Southern Queensland.

demonstrating that they ‘shaped what we know as “Shakespeare”, in terms not only of our understanding of the player-dramatist’s career but also of the uses of his plays as theatrical commodities’.² This study expands Roslyn Knutson’s earlier work on the company, which focused on ‘the management of the repertory’ because it ‘was a dimension of a company’s commerce, its means of marketing plays’.³ Along such lines, the study of early modern repertory companies has involved consideration of ‘the features that were expensive but necessary to the financial success of a company as well as the features that enable a company to husband monetary resources over hard times’.⁴ The study of plays in repertory has been about following the money.

Where, then, is the place for the study of the repertory system’s effects on performance and on performers? Knutson was the first to demonstrate that the ‘repertory was a company’s most potent commercial instrument’, and such fiscal considerations have been the primary driver of repertory studies since the 1990s, as Tom Rutter lucidly and comprehensively detailed in a literature review covering the field up to 2008.⁵ William Ingram’s 1992 *The Business of Playing* continues to be an essential resource for the study of playing company business, contextualizing the economics that shaped ‘the early development of the adult professional theatre in Tudor London’, excluding boy companies, touring, and the day-to-day receipts from performances that provide some of the earliest repertory schedules.⁶ Ingram, Knutson, and others concur that the study of a company’s repertory means resisting authorship as a principle of inclusion in order to ‘pay attention to the full choir’, as Munro suggests, having explored the issue in her biography of the Children of the Queen’s Revels, emphasizing their negotiation and experimentation with genre.⁷ The study of repertories has been instrumental in the recovery of boy companies as significant competitors in the theatrical marketplace, whose unique pedagogical milieu demonstrates the flaw in assuming ‘a similarity in performance skills and practices’ with adult troupes, as well as understanding ‘profit as a common, simple motive for all developments’, argues Jeanne McCarthy.⁸ Mary Bly draws attention to the repertory of collaboratively-written Whitefriars plays as not only thematizing homoerotic desires through repertory-wide puns, but also ‘construct[ing] the male body as a site for the sensually celebratory appetite’.⁹ The deliberate similarity between the five collaboratively-written plays suggests a ‘fiduciary motive that drew novice playwrights to write such acutely similar plays, directed at a particular audience’ that ‘would understand the puns when they appeared, would grasp the second and third contexts, the snaky dance from innocent statement, to bawdy virgin, to desirous boy actor’.¹⁰

In these and other ways, the study of repertory has understood ‘play’ as the object of the play-text a company owned rather than the ephemeral performances for which the text can only offer a blueprint. This slippage between the value of a play-text and the marketable experience it represents perhaps explains the slim page dedicated to this system of playing in Siobhan Keenan’s excellent primer, *Acting Companies and their Plays in Shakespeare’s London*.¹¹ Following the money has to some extent sidelined the performances from which that income derived, particularly when publishing demands and page limits require scholars to narrow the focus of each new study.

Application of the contemporary industry term dramaturgy may offer one framework by which to disentangle a company’s repertory from its material holdings. In *Dramaturgy: A Revolution in Theatre*, Mary Luckhurst locates the earliest use of the term in ancient Greek verb forms, ‘*dramatourg-eo* containing the idea of working on drama, and *dramatopoi-eo* the idea of “making” or “doing”, both of which are active so that ‘*dramatopoiou* literally invokes a “drama-maker”, a creator of plays who can imaginatively compose a drama and realise it on stage’.¹² We should understand dramaturgy, then, as not the writing of a play-text nor the activity of its individual performance, but rather the labour of devising a work whose meaning is made by a performance experience — perhaps containing dialogue, speeches, fight choreography, masques, songs — rather than by text alone. The term has some kinship with artificer, frequently ascribed to Inigo Jones, and may prove a useful analogue to understand the work of the master of the revels. ‘Using professional playing companies for most of his entertainments’, argues W.R. Streitberger, the Tudor master’s ‘traditional function as deviser and producer of in-house entertainment [moved] out of court and into a quasi-commercial environment, where he became a producer and director of works devised by professional playwrights’.¹³ Relative to the work of preparing court masques, interludes, and the Christmas holiday performance schedule that was the purview of the revels office, a dramaturge serves in the role of choreographer for story, akin to more specialized consultants for dance, fights, accent, and intimacy. The first official dramaturges appeared in the late eighteenth century, in part charged with the task of selecting pre-existing plays (often Shakespeare’s) to sit alongside new works as examples for developing national theatre agendas.¹⁴ Dramaturges took over the task of deciding who and what gets performed, a curatorial function that had been supplied by the repertory system, and would trade places with it at different points throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. For sixteenth-century England, the intentionality driving the selection of plays remained

distributed amongst a highly collaborative community of players, sharers, poets, landlords, and artisans rather than centralized within a single figure.

Attending to dramaturgy, understood as a troupe's curating of a sequence of plays that best leverages their resources for a variety of possible ends, enlivens our understanding of early modern repertoires beyond the ownership of texts and toward a phenomenology of performance sequences. As more company biographies have made their way into print, consideration of the potential significance of the affordances of repertory for performance, has been a growing, if not explicit, concern of repertory study. These projects follow the innovative model of Scott McMillin and Sally-Beth MacLean's *The Queen's Men and Their Plays*. Their chapter on 'Dramaturgy' takes as its focus the print history of the company's plays and their use of the term 'style' derives from this centrality of print, emphasizing patterns of versification and generic 'medley', while leaving performance trends as untheorized parody or part of the 'unwritten text of mime'.¹⁵ While this book offers some discussion of whether there was a literal need for a curtain or canopy, simultaneous staging, and disguise tropes, none are tracked systematically through the comparatively well-survived company repertory, nor considered in specific architectural contexts, such as Norwich Cathedral, Trinity College Cambridge, or Wollaton Hall, where the company performed in the year of its completion.¹⁶ Engaging the gap suggested by the print-based, readerly discussion of style is the edited collection, *Locating the Queen's Men, 1583–1603: Material Practices and Conditions of Playing*.¹⁷ Paired with a staging of three of the troupe's plays in repertory to test some of the arguments put forward by McMillin and MacLean, the contributors identify the many problems with using the Queen's Men as an exemplar and reveal a critical habit of employing repertory companies to explain the relationship among theatre, elite patrons, and the political efficacy of drama in this period. Brian Walsh more directly engages questions of performance in *Shakespeare, The Queen's Men, and the Elizabethan Performance of History*, pushing against assumptions of the history play as a genre vehicle for 'questions of national identity, kingly authority, and the interpellation of subject' only.¹⁸ In the context of performance, Walsh argues, the Queen's history plays draw attention to their dependence upon the living enacting the dead, borrowing time from the present in order to produce it onstage; their plays proposed 'a continuing if not commonly articulated model of historical consciousness, one that is structured by the dynamics of stage performance'.¹⁹

From this coalescing around the Queen's company, the study of English Renaissance repertoires turned to recovering theatre-makers, with company biographies focused on the names, labour, and finances of troupe collaborators. Eva Griffith

attaches the Jacobean Queen's Servants to their Red Bull venue in her biography, situating them in a detailed cultural and political context that fully realizes the world of factors in which their repertory would have incubated. Griffith employs discussion of the company's repertory to consider possible interrelation between the Red Bull and court performances, the 'flavour' of that repertory being 'one that relished spectacle, battle scenes, fireworks, song and special effects, as well as morally edifying thought' specifically centred on women.²⁰ The discussion of performance, however, is constrained to comparing Heywood and Shakespeare as the primary drivers of dramaturgical decisions.²¹

Lawrence Manley and Sally-Beth MacLean's study of Lord Strange's players pioneered the approach of centring performance rather than print or venue, tracking explicit trends in ideological theme and material staging for the first time in the company biography genre. Their chapter on repertory begins with a survey of authors, underscoring the paradox of literary critical training to read along the lines of individual producers when the historical context reveals a culture more invested in ensemble output. This study emphasizes generic hybridity and a penchant for recent global history in contrast to the Queen's staging of an English-only past, again emphasizing printerly concerns of genre and source texts. Like Griffith's Queen's Servants, Strange's style of 'emblematic staging' and 'pantomime' gets attributed to the 'play's authors who provided the actors with new techniques to go with new material' suggesting playwrights were making decisions about performance practice in advance and on behalf of players.²² Circularly, innovations such as 'spectacular effects and sensational events' merely 'suggest that the company was seeking to make full and innovative use of the features of the Rose', and so not specific or endemic to their habits of performance.²³

Most innovative about Manley and MacLean's study is the treatment of pyrotechnic dramaturgy and the immolation play, first explored in a 2001 *Issues in Review* contribution focused on reading Elizabethan acting companies. Manley persuasively demonstrates that endemic to Strange's repertory, 'in so far as we can reconstruct it and differentiate it from that of other companies, is that it was remarkably pyrotechnical', emphasizing 'fire, fireworks, the threat of fire, and above all the threat and the actual simulation of burning people alive'.²⁴ Tracking scenes in which storytelling relied on bodies making contact with fire, particularly in scenes of 'real or threatened judicial execution by fire', spotlights a new kind of relationship between the development of a company's dramaturgical strength and its potential resonance with the 'spectacular violence of the contemporary Elizabethan world'.²⁵ The argument ends in a focus on individual agents, hypothesizing a specific individual imbued with this technical skill and emphasizing

the contributions by Marlowe and Shakespeare.²⁶ Here we find an illustrative example of the occasion for that first forum on the topic, ‘the Elizabethan acting companies and how to read them’, where McMillin explicitly addressed the methodological fact that, as early modern drama specialists, ‘we have been trained to read playwrights, not acting companies.’²⁷ The injunction to read the company, with all of the emphasis on textuality that this verb entails, may therefore return us to the individual poet as a driver of a company’s dramaturgy, whereas Manley’s contribution on pyrotechnics offers an exciting model for studying how the text comes to life in the playhouse and resonates with the world beyond its walls.

By taking a company of theatre-makers as its point of focus, the repertory approach offers an inherent flexibility, as Rutter has argued, ‘a way of dramatizing texts that, although eclectic, is able to posit tangible relationships between plays and other aspects of early modern society.’²⁸ A methodology that ‘takes the company as its focus is working at the very point where drama and history — or, at least, the discourses and practices we think of as dramatic, and the discourses and practices we think of as historical — intersect.’²⁹ Andrew Gurr’s companion volumes *The Shakespeare Company, 1594–1642* and *Shakespeare’s Opposites* prescribe the formation of ‘distinct identities’ of the Admiral’s and King’s troupes in reaction to and competition with one another ‘in their general policy and in the audiences they aimed at.’³⁰ His discussion of repertory practices emphasizes genre attributions — ‘history’, ‘revenge’, ‘devil’, ‘disguise’, ‘citizen’, ‘humours’ — that presume the primacy of stereotypical characters.³¹

A number of more recent studies of the Admiral’s and King’s companies have responded by considering issues of staging amongst other concerns of company management. They have given a very light touch to the notion of ‘house style’ responding to an influential critique by Knutson.³² While not entirely dismissing the notion, Rutter usefully clarifies the ‘risk of circularity’ it poses as a research question: ‘if we go looking for characteristics of different acting companies in their extant works, there is a high chance that we will find them.’³³ Rutter substitutes ‘house style’ for authorial ‘influence’, however, treating the company’s plays as products of ‘authorial agency’ providing ‘instances of intertextuality’ based in genre convention, ideological themes, and character types (such as ‘Huntingdon’ versus ‘Stuckley’ plays) rather than the physical and material demands for which the company’s repertory may have consistently called.³⁴ The amorphous variable remains, as McMillin’s call to learn how to read these repertories implied, what counts as a company ‘characteristic’, to use Rutter’s term. What variables need be accounted for? To what extent might we be able to isolate repertories — by decade, year, or week? by venue? — in order to eliminate biases for printerly or

exclusively literary concerns and better illuminate affordances of particular bodies and dramaturgical technologies in specific spaces?

Sarah Dustagheer's *Shakespeare's Two Playhouses* marks an innovative shift that removes repertory as constrained to the page and positions it in space. Rather than a playwright's or company's style, her attention to early seventeenth-century uses of the Globe and Blackfriars venues persuasively opens up a frontier for exploring 'playhouse style, something that is expressed in a body of plays which share similarities not because they were written by the same playwright or for the same company, but because they were written for the same playhouse'.³⁵ Such an approach chimes with Laurie Johnson's *Shakespeare's Lost Playhouse*, which uses the repertory schedule of eleven days of playing recorded by Philip Henslowe as a springboard from which not only to identify the location and capacity of the building, but also the cultural milieu in which its micro-repertory traded.³⁶ In another exciting pivot, Will Tosh's *Playing Indoors: Staging Early Modern Drama in the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse* steps away from attempting to theorize Renaissance reception of these repertories, and instead attends explicitly to what the space of a 'reconstructed' indoor playhouse offers artists and audiences shaped by today's political and cultural concerns — by contemporary rather than contemporaneous training and aesthetic privileges.

A similarly careful negotiation 'between present practice and historical inference' is Harry R. McCarthy's company ethnography, *Performing Early Modern Drama Beyond Shakespeare: Edward's Boys*.³⁷ In exploring the rehearsal and performance practices of Edward's Boys, a school-based troupe specializing in early modern boy company plays, McCarthy is able to eliminate thematic variables to instead identify through observation, interview, and thick description key features of the company's house style based on this repertorial constraint. One example is 'the use of a non-verbal, often highly virtuosic, movement sequence at the very outset of the performance which sets the physical tone of the production'.³⁸ The slim volume is perhaps the clearest attestation to what collaborative decision-making for performance ends might look like in a repertorial context, characterized by problem-solving issues of prop use and body arrangements in order to deliver dialogue to the right characters in a specific space; group close-reading undertaken during table reading; and discovering staging options through experimentation, exaggeration, and defamiliarizing theatre-games typical of a (well-funded) rehearsal process today. Described as performance-based research and practice-as-research in the wider field of theatre studies, this increasing attention on the embodied aspects of repertory alongside the large number of playhouse archaeological investigations in the last decade (many still ongoing) may well drive the

next developments in field. For example, recent work by Sawyer Kemp and Nora J. Williams demonstrates what can be gained from holistic dramaturgy and what can be lost when left incomplete in the development processes of Shakespeare performance today.³⁹

An increasing consciousness of what dramaturgical potentials a company's repertory might activate brings two other interrogative strands into this field's orbit: critical race and memory studies. In his many books on the interrelationship between England, Islam, and the North African states, Nabil Matar has taken a kind of repertory approach to demonstrate how 'Moors on the Elizabethan stage were not ... a product of literary imagination' but 'a direct result of England's diplomatic initiative into Islamic affairs and of the negotiations and collusions that took place between Queen Elizabeth and Mulay Ahmad al-Mansur'.⁴⁰ This repertory method enables Matar to distinguish between the stage Moor, described as 'an African ... with unquestionable trustworthiness in defending the borders of Christendom' and 'heaven's agent against' Ottomans, while the stage Turk 'was the Muslim, moral enemy at the frontiers of Mediterranean Christendom' and 'synonymous with liar or deceiver'.⁴¹ In the first study of multiple, coterminous repertories, Mark Hutchings's *Turks, Repertories, and the Early Modern English Stage* emphasizes the 'spatial and temporal distribution of the Turk play' as well as its 'crosspollination ... across the theatre landscape'.⁴² While ultimately rehearsing authorial influence, such as Marlowe's 'footprint' in the character-oriented 'Turk motif' adopted, as he argues, by Shakespeare, Hutchings considers the ways in which costumes associated with the Rose (as well as, in a separate article, trapdoors) may have participated in race-making on the early modern stage.⁴³ As Imtiaz Habib demonstrates in *Black Lives in the English Archives*, that a substantial population of Black people can be documented as living in ninety percent of 'the very same neighborhoods in which English theatrical figures were present, and during the peak years of the English popular theatre, indubitably posit[s] an empirical awareness in the latter of the former', the consequences of which would constitute 'the as-yet unrecognized imprint of black people on the cultural life of the best-known period in Anglo-European history'.⁴⁴

The attention repertory study has paid to identifying individual apprentices and actors might be well be leveraged in the pursuit of artisans like the Southwark silk-weaver, John Resonable, a 'blacman', who may have contributed to the costuming of plays at the Rose.⁴⁵ Geraldine Heng argues:

'Race' is one of the primary names we have — a name we retain for the commitments it recognizes — that is attached to a repeating tendency ... to demarcate

human beings through differences among humans that are selectively identified as absolute and fundamental, so as to distribute positions and powers differentially to human groups. In race-making, strategic essentialisms are posited and assigned through a variety of practices. This suggests that race is a structural relationship for the management of human differences, rather than a substantive content.⁴⁶

This same quality of repetition — of plays, bodies, props, costumes, cosmetics, pyrotechnics — is a kernel of the early modern repertory system, and that which activates its dramaturgical and financial capability. Unlike printed plays, plays in repertory transmit, ensconce, and ‘harden’ social norms by virtue of reiteration, or ‘twice-behaved behavior’.⁴⁷ The archives of early modern company repertories evidence embodied, as opposed to written, knowledge transmitted through what Diana Taylor calls scenarios: ‘sets of possibilities, ways of conceiving conflict, crisis, or resolution’ that ‘unlike *trope*, which is a figure of speech ... does not rely on language to transmit a set pattern of behavior or action’.⁴⁸ Understanding repertory as a ‘system of learning, storing, and transmitting ... embodied practice/knowledge (i.e., spoken language, dance, sports, ritual)’ provides a framework to understand how these acts of repetition could (and can) have racializing consequences.⁴⁹ For example, in his examination of the recycling of altar scenes across the King’s Men repertory, John Kuhn demonstrates how the company re-embedded a set-piece comprising ‘a combination of props and ritualized action’ into ‘new plays regardless of author or genre’.⁵⁰ In so doing the company participated in the shaping of popular knowledge ‘around the nature of “pagan” ritual and its practitioners’, ‘translating the boom of antiquarian scholarship about the religions of the ancient world into performance’, and thus helped to forge a ‘conceptual category’ intertwined with England’s seventeenth-century colonial project.⁵¹

What Richard Schechner calls the ‘twice-behaved behavior’ of performance implies the work of memory, recognizing that the action is not the first but a duplicate, reiteration, adaptation, or variation. As Linda Hutcheon accordingly theorizes, in adaptation ‘both the pleasure and the frustration ... is the familiarity bred through repetition and memory’ where consumers ‘need memory in order to experience difference as well as similarity’.⁵² While ‘knowing’ audiences are able to recognize the repeating element and activate memory’s cognitive opportunities, there will always be ‘unknowing audiences’.⁵³ Reliance on repertorial memory undergirds Ferruccio Marotti’s notion of *theatregram*, the ‘units, figures, relationships, actions, *topoi*, and framing patterns’ repeated in a seemingly infinite number of combinations in Italian *commedia grave* (not to be confused with *commedia dell’arte*) later tracked by Louise Clubb in plays by Shakespeare.⁵⁴ Attending to

repertory in terms of memory seems to invite this modular rhetoric of unit and building-block, and so most influential has been the work of Marvin Carlson, carefully articulating the ways in which repertory provides ‘opportunities for an audience to bring memories of previous uses to new productions’ through ghosting.⁵⁵ For example, ‘the recycled body of an actor’, as would certainly have been the case of the sharer-actors of the Elizabethan repertory companies, ‘will almost inevitably in a new role evoke the ghost or ghosts of previous roles if they have made any impression whatever on the audience’.⁵⁶ The ‘ghosting of a sequence in a particular production by memories of a sequence or sequences in other productions’, such as a ‘pagan’ altar scene by the King’s Men, the immolation of an actor’s body by Strange’s Men, or the upcycling of a chariot prop by the Admiral’s Men, ‘is especially common when a group of actors continue to perform together over a significant period of time’, according to Carlson.⁵⁷ The potential for these repetitions to form part of the company’s work routine and training regimen is explored in studies that apply the concept of ‘distributed cognition’ to early modern playing companies, with Evelyn Tribble’s work leading the way.⁵⁸

The essays in this issue of *Early Theatre* offer different avenues for expanding and enriching the study of repertories through embodied, performance-oriented approaches. Drawing from a 2020 Shakespeare Association of America seminar, we invited archival, practitioner, and theoretical explorations of the ways in which performing ‘in rep’ conditions the early modern performance event. We wondered: How did the rep system influence enskillment in players? The playgoer experience? What is its role in Shakespeare festivals today? Or in video-on-demand services? We anticipated that, in focusing on the system for playing rather than the plays themselves, participants might pursue lines of inquiry outside the usual parameters of a single play-text, single playwright, company biography, or topical thematic concern, perhaps even enlivening conversations about hitherto scarcely considered companies, more than fifty of which were active in this period according to the Records of Early English Drama (REED). Both Peter Kirwan and Catria Fallow implicitly gesture to strategies other disciplinary contexts term institutional dramaturgy, James Steichen’s coinage for strategies by which professional theatres build a narrative — tell a story — about what they envision their work to do for the public (ie, what theatre is good for, as rhetorically envisioned and marketed by the company).⁵⁹ Since that virtual meeting held about a month after a worldwide quarantine in the wake of the coronavirus pandemic, the streaming of theatre events has made, to a certain extent, more transparent some of the ways in which theatre companies negotiate the curation of programming schedules and marketing of those offerings.

Thinking about performing in repertory from 1601 through 2020, these contributions produce connections and shared interest across the scholar-practitioner divide more richly than we imagined. Emily MacLeod traces the self-conscious, racialized parodying of adult performance by the Children of the Queen's Revels in their seventeenth-century Blackfriars repertory. Thinking of specific boy actors as part of the adult company, Roberta Barker examines how the acquisition of new plays into a company repertory and the cultivation of 'restricted roles' illuminates new directions in the study of enskillment for boy actors, attending specifically to *The Winter's Tale*, *The Maid's Tragedy*, and *Othello* among other King's Men plays. Threading us to the present, Fallow considers the rhetoric around the development of new plays at the Royal Shakespeare Company and Globe theatres, and the dissonances produced in such institutional contexts. This analysis is extended with a specific case study of new work development by Kirwan, where the repertory system demonstrates its potential to be leveraged for political aims in the sequencing of Christopher Marlowe's *Edward II* with Tom Stuart's *After Edward* at the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse in 2019. These new studies demonstrate the richness that the field of repertory studies continues to offer by keeping bodies and their positionalities in mind.

Notes

The germ of these essays evolved from a seminar held as part of the 2020 meeting of the Shakespeare Association of America, conducted virtually due to the global coronavirus pandemic. We are grateful for the rigour and generosity of the participants, including Douglas Arrell, Meredith Beales, Paul Brown, Roslyn Knutson, Kevin Quarmby, Andrew Reilly, and Charlene Smith as well as the contributors to this issue. Our respondent at the seminar was the late Rebecca Munson, to whose memory we dedicate this collection.

- 1 Bernard Beckerman, *Shakespeare at the Globe, 1599–1609* (New York, 1962), 1–2.
- 2 Lucy Munro, *Shakespeare in the Theatre: The King's Men* (London, 2019), xxi, xiv, <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474262606>.
- 3 Roslyn L. Knutson, *The Repertory of Shakespeare's Company, 1594–1613* (Fayetteville, 1991), 19, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv2s0jdpz>.
- 4 Ibid, 19
- 5 Roslyn L. Knutson, *Playing Companies and Commerce in Shakespeare's Time* (Cambridge, 2001), 56, <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511486043>; Tom Rutter, 'Repertory Studies: A Survey', *Shakespeare* 4.3 (2008), 336–50, 339, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450910802295484>.
- 6 William Ingram, *The Business of Playing: The Beginnings of the Adult Professional Theater in Elizabethan London* (Ithaca, 1992), 13, <https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501736766>.
- 7 Lucy Munro, 'Early Modern Drama and the Repertory Approach', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 42 (2003), 1–33, 28; Lucy Munro, *Children of the Queen's Revels: A Jacobean Theatre Repertory* (Cambridge, 2005), <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511486067>.
- 8 Jeanne H. McCarthy, *The Children's Troupes and the Transformation of English Theater 1509–1608: Pedagogue, Playwrights, Playbooks, and Play-Boys* (New York, 2017), xiv, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315390826>.
- 9 Mary Bly, *Queer Virgins and Virgin Queens on the Early Modern Stage* (Oxford, 2000), 2.
- 10 Ibid, 26, 23.
- 11 Siobhan Keenan, *Acting Companies and Their Plays in Shakespeare's London* (London, 2014), 100, <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781472575692>.
- 12 Mary Luckhurst, *Dramaturgy: A Revolution in Theatre* (Cambridge, 2006), 5, <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511486050>.

- 13 W.R. Streitberger, *The Masters of the Revels and Elizabeth I's Court Theatre* (Oxford, 2016), 154, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198719670.001.0001>.
- 14 Luckhurst, *Dramaturgy*, 28. In his introduction to an Issues in Review on dramatists, playing companies, and repertories, Tom Rutter provides with clarity and grace a distillation of the repertory study's relationship with Shakespeare; see Rutter, 'Introduction: The Repertory-Based Approach', *Early Theatre* 13.2 (2010), 121–32, 126–7, <https://doi.org/10.12745/et.13.2.843>.
- 15 Scott McMillin and Sally-Beth MacLean, *The Queen's Men and Their Plays* (Cambridge, 1998), 166, 131.
- 16 *Ibid*, 176–7.
- 17 Helen Ostovich, Holger Syme, and Andrew Griffin, eds, *Locating the Queen's Men, 1583–1603: Material Practices and Conditions of Playing* (Burlington, 2009), <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315592893>.
- 18 Brian Walsh, *Shakespeare, The Queen's Men, and the Elizabethan Performance of History* (Cambridge, 2009), 2.
- 19 *Ibid*, 39.
- 20 Eva Griffith, *A Jacobean Company and Its Playhouse: The Queen's Servants at the Red Bull Theatre* (Cambridge, 2014), 262, <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781107323537>.
- 21 *Ibid*, 126.
- 22 Lawrence Manley and Sally-Beth MacLean, *The Lord Strange's Men and Their Plays* (New Haven, 2014), 182, 186, <https://doi.org/10.12987/yale/9780300191998.001.0001>.
- 23 *Ibid*, 191.
- 24 Lawrence Manley, 'Playing with Fire: Immolation in the Repertory of Strange's Men', *Early Theatre* 4.1 (2001), 115–29, 116, <https://doi.org/10.12745/et.4.1.615>.
- 25 *Ibid*, 120, 119.
- 26 *Ibid*, 124.
- 27 Scott McMillin, 'Reading the Elizabethan Acting Companies (Introduction)', *Early Theatre* 4.1 (2001), 111–5, 111, <https://doi.org/10.12745/et.4.1.615>.
- 28 Rutter, 'Repertory Studies', 347.
- 29 *Ibid*, 344.
- 30 Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespeare Company, 1594–1642* (Cambridge, 2004); Andrew Gurr, *Shakespeare's Opposites: The Admiral's Company, 1594–1625* (Cambridge, 2009).
- 31 Gurr, *Shakespeare's Opposites*, 183, 192, 194, 196, 197.
- 32 Roslyn L. Knutson, 'The Start of Something Big', in *Locating the Queen's Men*, eds. Helen Ostovich, Holger Syme, and Andrew Griffin, 99–108, 102.

- 33 Tom Rutter, *Shakespeare and the Admiral's Men: Reading across Repertories on the London Stage, 1594–1600* (Cambridge, 2017), 12, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781139924870>.
- 34 Ibid, 6, 9.
- 35 Sarah Dustagheer, *Shakespeare's Two Playhouses: Repertory and Theatre Space at the Globe and the Blackfriars, 1599–1613* (Cambridge, 2017), 172, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316996874>; see also Andrew Gurr and Mariko Ichikawa, *Staging in Shakespeare's Theatres* (Oxford, 2000).
- 36 Laurie Johnson, *Shakespeare's Lost Playhouse: Eleven Days at Newington Butts* (Routledge, 2017), 11, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315098012>.
- 37 Will Tosh, *Playing Indoors: Staging Early Modern Drama in the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse* (London, 2018), 196, <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350013858>.
- 38 Harry R. McCarthy, *Performing Early Modern Drama Beyond Shakespeare: Edward's Boys* (Cambridge, 2020), 69, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108893848>.
- 39 Sawyer Kemp, 'Transgender Shakespeare Performance: A Holistic Dramaturgy', *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 19.4 (2019), 265–83, <https://doi.org/10.1353/jem.2019.0047>; Nora J. Williams, 'Incomplete Dramaturgies', *Shakespeare Bulletin* 40.1 (2022), 1–22, <https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2022.0000>.
- 40 Nabil Matar, *Britain and Barbary, 1589–1689* (Tampa, 2005), 13. See also Roslyn L. Knutson, 'A Caliban in St. Mildred Poultry', in *Shakespeare and Cultural Traditions: The Selected Proceedings of the International Shakespeare Association World Congress, Tokyo, 1993*, ed. Tetsuo Kishi (Newark, 1994), 110–26; Roslyn L. Knutson, 'Elizabethan Documents, Captivity Narratives, and the Market for Foreign History Plays', *English Literary Renaissance* 26.1 (1996), 75–110.
- 41 Matar, *Britain and Barbary*, 28–9.
- 42 Mark Hutchings, *Turks, Repertories, and the Early Modern English Stage* (Cham, 2017), 195, <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-46263-3>.
- 43 Ibid, 118, 110–15; Mark Hutchings, 'Titus Andronicus and Trapdoors at the Rose and Newington Butts', *Shakespeare Survey* 71 (2018), 221–31, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108557177.023>.
- 44 Imtiaz Habib, *Black Lives in the English Archives, 1500–1677: Imprints of the Invisible* (Burlington, 2008), 268–70, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315569468>.
- 45 Imtiaz Habib, 'The Resonables of Boroughside, Southwark: An Elizabethan Black Family Near the Rose Theatre', *Shakespeare* 11.2 (2015), 135–56, 140, <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450918.2013.766633>.
- 46 Geraldine Heng, *The Invention of Race in the European Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2018), 3, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108381710>; emphasis ours.

- 47 Richard Schechner, *Between Theatre and Anthropology* (Philadelphia, 1985), 36, <https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812200928>.
- 48 Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Durham, 2003), 13, <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822385318>.
- 49 Ibid, 16, 19.
- 50 John Kuhn, 'Sejanus, the King's Men Altar Scenes, and the Theatrical Production of Paganism', *Early Theatre* 20.2 (2017), 77–98, 92, <https://doi.org/10.12745/et.20.2.2952>.
- 51 Ibid, 77–8.
- 52 Linda Hutcheon, *A Theory of Adaptation* (New York, 2006), 21, 22, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203957721>.
- 53 Ibid, 120–2.
- 54 Louise G. Clubb, *Italian Drama in Shakespeare's Time* (New Haven, 1989), 6, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt211qz0b>.
- 55 Marvin Carlson, *The Haunted Stage: The Theatre as Memory Machine* (Ann Arbor, 2003), 8, <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.17168>.
- 56 Ibid, 8.
- 57 Ibid, 110; Kuhn, 'Sejanus, the King's Men Altar Scenes'; Manley, 'Playing with Fire'; E.E. Tavares, 'Super Troupers; or, Supplemented Playing before 1594', *Shakespeare Studies* 45 (2017), 77–86.
- 58 See Evelyn Tribble, *Cognition in the Globe: Attention and Memory in Shakespeare's Theatre* (London, 2011), <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230118515>; Evelyn Tribble, *Early Modern Actors and Shakespeare's Theatre: Thinking with the Body* (London, 2017), <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781472576064>.
- 59 James Steichen, 'The Metropolitan Opera Goes Public: Peter Gelb and the Institutional Dramaturgy of The Met: Live in HD', *Music and the Moving Image* 2.2 (2009), 24–30, 25, <https://doi.org/10.5406/musimoviimag.2.2.0024>.

