Journal of Early Modern Studies

8-2019

Cover Luca Gullì

FIRENZE UNIVERSITY PRESS

UNIVERSITA' DEGLI STUDI DI FIRENZE

DIPARTIMENTO DI FORMAZIONE, LINGUE, INTERCULTURA, LETTERATURE E PSICOLOGIA

BIBLIOTECA DI STUDI DI FILOLOGIA MODERNA: COLLANA, RIVISTE E LABORATORIO

Volume Eight

Beyond Books and Plays Cultures and Practices of Writing in Early Modern Theatre

edited by
Raimondo Guarino and Lene Buhl Petersen

FIRENZE UNIVERSITY PRESS
2019

Journal of Early Modern Studies. -
n. 8, 2019
ISSN 2279-7149
ISBN 978-88-6453-852-5
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.13128/JEMS-2279-7149-8

Direttore Responsabile: Beatrice Töttössy
Registrazione al Tribunale di Firenze: N. 5818 del 21/02/2011
CC 2015 Firenze University Press

La rivista è pubblicata on-line ad accesso aperto al seguente indirizzo: www.fupress.com/bsfm-jems

The products of the Publishing Committee of Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna: Collana, Riviste e Laboratorio (<http://www.lilsi.unifi.it/vp-82-laboratorio-editoriale-open-access-ricerca-formazione-e-produzione.html>), financially supported by the Department of Languages, Literatures and Intercultural Studies until 2018 and the Department of Education, Languages, Intercultures, Literatures and Psychology of the University of Florence since 2019, are published in accordance with the agreement, dated February 10th 2009 (updated February 19th 2015), between the Department, the Open Access Publishing Workshop and Firenze University Press. The Workshop promotes the development of OA publishing and its application in teaching and career advice for undergraduates, graduates, and PhD students in the area of foreign languages and literatures, as well as providing training and planning services. The Workshop's publishing team are responsible for the editorial workflow of all the volumes and journals published in the Biblioteca di Studi di Filologia Moderna series. JEMS employs the double-blind peer review process. For further information please visit the journal homepage (<http://www.fupress.com/bsfm-jems>).

Editing and composition: Laboratorio editoriale Open Access (<laboa@lilsi.unifi.it>). Editorial trainees: Federico Carciaghi, Naiara Sandri, under the supervision of the Journal Manager and Managing Editor, Arianna Antonielli.

JEMS has been included by Clarivate Analytics (Thomson Reuters) to ESCI (Emerging Sources Citation Index) and accepted for indexing in ERIH PLUS (The European Reference Index for the Humanities and the Social Sciences).

The current issue of Jems is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution - Non Commercial - No derivatives 4.0 International, <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/it/legalcode>.

CC 2019 Firenze University Press
Università degli Studi di Firenze
Firenze University Press
via Cittadella, 7, 50144 Firenze, Italy
www.fupress.com
Printed in Italy

Editors
Donatella Pallotti, University of Florence
Paola Pugliatti, University of Florence

Journal Manager and Managing Editor
Arianna Antonielli, University of Florence

Advisory Board
Arianna Antonielli, University of Florence
Janet Clare, University of Hull
Jeanne Clegg, University of Venice Ca' Foscari
Louise George Clubb, University of California, Berkeley
Gabriella Del Lungo Camiciotti, University of Florence
Lucia Felici, University of Florence
Tina Krontiris, Aristotle University, Thessaloniki
Corinne Lucas Fiorato, Sorbonne Nouvelle-Paris 3 University
Adelisa Malena, University of Venice Ca' Foscari
Natascia Tonelli, University of Siena

Editorial Board
Arianna Antonielli, University of Florence
Luca Baratta, University of Florence
John Denton, University of Florence
Alessandro Melis, University of Florence
Donatella Pallotti, University of Florence
Paola Pugliatti, University of Florence

Arianna Antonielli, Luca Baratta, Federico Carciaghi, John Denton, Alessandro Melis and Naiara Sandri

Thanks awfully muchly
(James Joyce, *Ulysses*, 11.299)

Donatella Pallotti, Paola Pugliatti

Journal of Early Modern Studies, n. 8 (2019), pp. 5-6
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.13128/JEMS-2279-7149-24877

Contents

Editorial 7
Raimondo Guarino

PART ONE

INTRODUCTION

Beyond Books and Plays: A Nomenclature for the Cultures and Practices of Writing in Early Modern Theatre 19
Lene Buhl Petersen

PART TWO

CASE STUDIES

TEXT AND STAGE: (VERNACULAR) TRADITIONS AND AFTERLIFE

About French Vernacular Traditions: Medieval Roots of Modern Theatre Practices 33
Darwin Smith

Acting and Reading Drama: Notes on Florentine sacre rappresentazioni *in Print* 69
Paola Ventrone

Beyond the Bad Quarto: Exploring the Vernacular Afterlife of Early Modern Drama 133
Thomas Pettitt

Visions of the City in Seventeenth-Century Roman Popular Theatre 173
Roberto Ciancarelli

ISSN 2279-7149 (online)
www.fupress.com/bsfm-jems
2019 Firenze University Press

NEGOTIATING MEANINGS: TEXT AND STAGE RECEPTION

‘*Pawn! Sufficiently holy but unmeasurably politic*’: *The Pawns Plot in Middleton’s* A Game at Chess 191
Christopher Haile

An Eighteenth-Century mise en scène *and the Play of Refractions: Essayists, Critics, Spectators, and an Actor Negotiate Meanings* 225
Maria Grazia Dongu

IMPERMANENCE OF AUTORSHIP

The Diminution of Thomas Kyd 251
Darren Freebury-Jones

Contributors 279

Journal of Early Modern Studies, n. 8 (2019), pp. 7-16
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.13128/JEMS-2279-7149-24878

Editorial

This collection of essays is entitled *Beyond Books and Plays* precisely because its aim is to reflect on the relationship between performance cultures and practices of writing within and beyond the actual texts of the plays, or the material evidence of existing books. The attention to materiality that has emerged out of Textual Studies and the Sociology of Texts since the 1980s allows us – indeed requires us – to contextualize the production and transmission of texts within the specific context of early modern theatre.

Theatres are places for performance, and consequently represent points of contact between material traditions and immaterial legacies, between traces of written memory and practices in oral traditions. In medieval Europe, in a context of expansion and secularization of writing practices, adopting a written text for performances created a link between literary competence and traditions of entertainment or celebration. Darwin Smith's contribution, 'About French Vernacular Tradition' systematically examines French manuscripts of sacred and profane dramas performed between the thirteenth and the mid-sixteenth centuries. Smith's survey provides a glossary of terms used to classify manuscripts in terms of their form, content, and function. As 'theatre manuscripts' gradually became objects in their own right, they seemed 'to invade the complex process to performance through rehearsals and vice-versa: players' parts, books of prologues, conductor's books, sermons, panels for characters and locations on stage, reference books, lists of *secrets* (special effects), of players and characters – of which only a few still exist (30). Smith concludes by exploring the variations and 'performed layers' found in the writing processes of *Maistre Pierre Pathelin* and the *Mysteres des Trois Doms*. In the layers produced by performance processes, the *original*, between the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, served as a 'full text used as a reference book (*le livre*) in a definite place and time' (36). The same denomination – *original*, *book* – emerges from documents of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century cycles of English Mystery Plays (Mills 2007). The 'stage original', when used for rehearsals and performances, was transcribed in separate parts for the players. These parts had the characteristic size and shape of *rôles,* or *rolls*, like those used to perform the Passion in the Coliseum in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Rome, or like the Elizabethan scrolls, and the *papeles* for the actors of the professional

ISSN 2279-7149 (online)
www.fupress.com/bsfm-jems
2019 Firenze University Press

Spanish troupes (for this kind of manuscript see Lalou 1991; Palfrey and Stern 2007; for the *rotuli* used in the Coliseum Passion Plays, Wisch and Newbigin 2013; for *papeles*, Vaccari 2006). Texts that were dismembered to be given to the players to perform were often lost, as was the case in the plays used in Italian court festivals (Bortoletti 2008). Theatre manuscripts were tools, and as such they convey information about their use and users. They served as aide-memoirs, supporting the transmission of information both in the context of the performance and beyond. In many cases, as with the Umbrian confraternities, they help us situate performance activities within the cults and ceremonies of the communities that adopted them (Nerbano 2006). The fluctuation of writing practices between permanence and impermanence accompanied the transition and overlap between manuscript and print cultures (for the impact of printing on the textual tradition of French *Mystères*, Runnalls 1999).

The introduction of printing in the second half of the fifteenth century, allowed a text with an undefined readership to be defined. Paola Ventrone's essay 'Acting and Reading Drama' focuses on Florentine *sacre rappresentazioni* in print, analyzing how the development of printed text illustrated with woodcuts expanded and enhanced performances as spiritual experiences. Booklets were a shared *medium* which could be read out loud, or individually in silence. The relationship between text and woodcut added value to the written, memorized, and performed word.

> With the spread of printing, anyone could buy the illustrated books produced for a large public, including those who could not read or wanted to learn, since the illustrations provided a useful aid for recalling the words heard at the group reading and reliving them in the dimension of private devotion. (p. 92 in this volume)

Darwin Smith's work on French texts, and Paola Ventrone's on Florentine booklets, help us trace the origins of the many different paths that theatre texts followed. The phenomenon of printed plays, which has become the focus of debate over the last few decades in research on the history of the book, placed the printed work in a peculiar relation to the context and writing practices that gave rise to them (McKenzie 1986; Chartier 1999). Printing transplanted and transformed theatre texts, but at the same time preserved the processes of writing for performance. At the time Shakespeare was working, two important phenomena came together. The printing of playbooks tended to consolidate both the unity of the text and the author's identity, while, by contrast, the texts of playbooks were modelled on the requirements of production, the sharing out of collaborative copying and writing, the division into parts so that actors could learn their lines, the vagaries of aural memory on the scribe, who wrote and put together the copies ready for the censors, stage management, and the company's repertoires. The Elizabethan and Jacobean professional theatre system, it has been suggested, should be attributed to a 'collective mind' (Tribble 2011). There is no doubt some truth in this, with cognitive implications that become concrete whenever evidence of the texts' use can be found: textual transformations were, of course, the result of numerous transcriptions according to the frequency of performances. In addition, there was infinite potential for tension between a unified text and the variations that resulted from the practices and processes of memorization. There were many different factors to take into account: playwriting was prevalently a collaborative activity, copies transcribed and memorized were stratified, and a literary identity of the playwright became apparent only gradually after the introduction of printed plays. Surviving theatre manuscripts were not accounted for in a systematic way until relatively recently (Ioppolo 2006, Werstine 2012). Compared to preserved manuscripts, the old opposition 'foul papers vs prompt-books', and the very idea of prompt-books as operative texts, and tools for controlling the outcome of performances, has been circumscribed. They are now mostly labelled 'a manuscript of theatrical provenance' or as 'playhouse manuscripts' (Werstine 2012). Almost eighty years have not passed in vain from W.W. Greg's *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses* (1931) to Tiffany Stern's *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (2009). On the one hand, the range of text types (manuscript and print) has widened (plot-scenarios, bills, advertising, scrolls, arguments, para-texts, backstage-plots); on the other, these text types show the wide range of written culture that framed playwriting.

The outcomes and appearance of printed texts give rise to rather generalized views regarding transcription processes: 'Many different kinds of copies, foul papers, authorial or scribal fair copies, and previously printed Quartos were used during Shakespeare's lifetime to print Quarto editions of his plays' (Ioppolo 2006, 157). The stratification of the Quartos and the genesis of the First Folio made it 'immediately apparent that "Shakespeare" was a book whose text could not be definitively established' (Kastan 2001, 98).

Shakespeare's texts and, more generally, theatre texts from Shakespeare's time that circulated in order to be performed, had a practical application. Freed from the conditioning and teleology of the 'editorial problem', these texts can be read as vehicles of memory and transformation. The title of Pettitt's contribution to this collection sums the issue up perfectly: 'Beyond the Bad Quarto'. Starting with twentieth-century Shakespearean philology, hypotheses regarding manuscripts and print books have given us concepts and categories that discriminate print versions that are considered 'suspect', or 'incorrect', simply because they conform less than other versions to the quality required of a literary text. Apart from the fact that these criteria for evaluating Quartos have generally been discredited, this discriminating view has changed: variations can equally be seen as being signs of generative processes; as tools for delving into the living tissue of the text, into the economy of transcriptions within theatre companies, and the interface between the written and spoken word on stage. It is essential to go back to thinking in terms of practical memory dictated by the demands of performing on the stage. Memorial reconstruction in professional theatres has been considered by the New Bibliography as a hypothetical process of generating 'bad Quartos'. Performing written plays requires a hybridization of written records and aural memory, which conditions the stratification of texts and the actual writing of the play. A strategy that adopts 'suspect texts' as crystallizations of deep processes concerning writing and performance draws inspiration from Pettitt's reading of Marlowe's 'formulaic episodes', discussed by Laurie Maguire (1996, 116) in her re-evaluation of memorial reconstruction. This research direction has been continued in Petersen's *Errant Texts*, examining the signs and processes 'of a much more wide-ranging notion of dramatic transmission' (2010, 139).

In 'Beyond the Bad Quarto', Thomas Pettitt discovers the paths that segments of written (manuscript or printed) texts followed from London theatres, through the fragmentation of the drolls – the fragments recomposed and performed by strolling players – on to the local festive traditions of the mummers' itinerant country performances. Tracing a relationship between bad Quartos and folk ballads, and other traditions of oral expression, started as an analogy of method. It has led, however, to a field where the dynamics of transformation and adaptation within the logic of the theatre, and in other performative traditions, have created important, lasting, and recurrent intercultural cross-pollination. This approach has led to consequences in other research areas. Studies on authorship and co-authorship, and on criteria for edition and interpretation, tend to have to deal with a more specific notion of 'instability', in the sense that a text functions within a living theatrical organism. An indication of authorship given on the basis of internal evidence cannot be completely separated from the idea of an environment where collaboration does not mean a sum of parts, and where actors' memories interacted with the craft of writing. New contours of disseminated or disintegrated authorship lend depth and definition to the profiles of Kyd, Marlowe, Peele, and Middleton. These recognitions require a more precise reconstruction of both the individual production of playwrights and the configurations of collective writing (Taylor 2017). The development towards recognizing 'secondary' figures supports the argument for a re-consideration (and a wider canon of works) of Thomas Kyd called for, in this collection, by Darren Freebury-Jones in 'The Diminution of Thomas Kyd', where the examination of internal evidence, and methodologies of attribution, are immersed in an environmental, concrete, interpersonal framework of imitation and influence around 1590:

> My evidence suggests that Shakespeare was deeply influenced by the phraseology of *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Soliman and Perseda*, *King Leir*, and *Arden of Faversham* (Shakespeare's verbal borrowings from *The Spanish Tragedy* and *King Leir*

> exceed *Arden of Faversham*), having perhaps seen or performed in these plays. Acknowledgement of Shakespeare's debt to Kyd can therefore offer an insight into the development of Shakespeare's dramatic language, and his aural, or 'actor's', memory of theatrical phrases. (p. 256 in this volume)

We are not in a no-man's-land, but, rather, in a recurrent situation of collaboration, which is far more important than the ability to attribute segments of text with certainty to one or another author. The quest to configurate an author within frames of collaboration in the late Elizabethan age, and other periods of Shakespeare's trajectory, generates illuminating close-ups on the process of textual sedimentation.

***

It is well known that the prevalent system for acting on stage and producing texts adopted by professional acting companies in Italy was the opposite of that adopted by commercial companies in England. The re-consideration of textual studies on Shakespeare and his contemporaries has its counterpart in research into the *Commedia dell'Arte.* For Italian actors, creating a structure for a play relied on putting together the actions catalogued in the repertoires of the *scenari* or *canovacci* (Testaverde 2007). By contrast, the actual acting of the parts relied more on the invention ('improvisation') of lines based on fixed conventions and *loci*, which were expressed freely, rather than based on the memorization of set, written scripts (on *parti libere* and *tipi fissi* , that is, 'free parts' and 'set roles', see Taviani and Schino 1982). It was another way of dealing with, managing, and publishing the relationship between stage craftsmanship and literary skill. The outcome was seen as a testament to the prestige and fame of the leaders and protagonists of the most successful companies (Marotti and Romei 1991). Research into these aspects has used sources and theatrical text types to contribute to a more valid reconstruction of the acting skills and writing habits of companies in Italy, as well as exploring their links with contemporary literary *élites*. Roberto Ciancarelli's crowded Roman landscape in 'Visions of the City' shows how the accumulation and contamination of stage inventions created a common ground for amateur and professional companies in seventeenth-century Rome. The seven-volume manuscript of the *Opere sceniche diverse in prosa* held in the *Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu*, from which Ciancarelli extracts the fragments published, is a depository of skills and identities, where texts are imbued with the practice of constant hybridization with carefully-wrought inlays. The dilemma between the permanence and impermanence of text would be purely speculative if it were not rooted in the way a text was put to use. It is vital to recognize what has gone into the breadth of the repertoires in order to appreciate how effective theatre culture was. Collections of manuscripts and printed repertoires provide different perspectives. The monumental bibliography compiled by Saverio Franchi between 1988 and 1997 in *Drammaturgia romana* is worth citing here, as it focuses on Rome. It is a portrait, in the form of a chronological catalogue of prints, of theatrical life in a European city between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; a portrait re-evoked and re-constituted literally comparing the events on stage to printed pieces and *libretti* for operas and oratorios, the booklets which aimed to synchronize theatre seasons with opportunities for reading. They are not documenting facts; they are facts in themselves, which can provide a great deal of information, owing to their breadth, dissemination, and intensity of their ties with festive and everyday life. It is not a question of linking text to performance. It is, rather, a matter of exploring networks of relationships, and constellations of behaviours, between the public sphere and material culture of entertainment, in what Ferdinando Taviani (2010) has labelled 'the literary space of the theatre'.

***

In research on the editorial definition of Shakespeare's texts around 1700, Kastan's observations concerning Lewis Theobald are often cited. In Theobald's single figure, 'can be seen the era's [i.e. early eighteenth century] schizophrenic relationship to Shakespeare, always admiring but, in one mode, presumptuously altering his plays for success on the stage, while, in another, determinedly seeking the authentic text in the succession of scholarly editions' (2001, 93). This 'schizophrenic relationship' was, in fact, inevitable in the contradiction and counterpoint between the stage life of texts and their printed history. A few examples might be useful at this point. Both hand-copied manuscripts and printed texts could well be destined for reading, but editions of plays for reading – as we might expect today – often became the means for actors to learn their parts, or for copies to be reproduced in the form of scripts. Shakespeare's Quartos and the 1623 Folio have been used as prompt-books, and they could well have been used as a basis for revisions and re-elaborations both of the text and performance – see, for example, the 1676 quarto of *Hamlet* annotated by John Ward in 1740s (Chartier 2015, but the chapter was first published in 2011, 201-212; and, in general, for the seventeenth century, Evans 1960-1996). The dialectic between printing of an author's text and alterations for the stage has led to entire collections of texts with glosses by actors written in the margins (Knight 2015), while scripts, alterations and acting versions were stabilized by means of their printing into 'performance publications'. The fate of texts that have given life to the theatre and then been transformed into books is not only a transformation in a work of literature; it is also a potential return to the stage of a play. In the junctures and discords between these two alternatives, the history of European theatre is mirrored in a history of theatre in print (for a collection of overviews, Forestier, Caldicott and Bourqui 2007; for Italy, Riccò 2008; for Spain, Profeti 1999). As the relationship between theatre life and book culture became more consolidated (see, in general, Peters 2000), the literary space of the theatre became an *n*-dimensional system, a ground of forking paths, where books – not just *playbooks*, but every other material manifestation of text – take on and multiply their potential uses. And where, similarly, actor/readers cross-over with writer/spectators and remodel the text according to the transactions and metamorphoses that have taken place in performances.

Christopher Haile's essay, ' "Pawn! Sufficiently holy but unmeasurably politic" ', searching for the identity of the White Queen's Pawn in *A Game at Chess*, surveys the parody of theatrical clichés that Middleton, playwright and Chronologer of the City of London, adopted as a tool for representing the history of the day. To the extent that the making of Shakespeare's First Folio was involved in the staging of the sacrificed pawn. In Middleton's view, theatre could either frame or disrupt the readability of the world, or of contemporary affairs, in as much as spectators and readers acknowledged that the text of the play linked the small world of the stage to the big world outside by means of interpretations and metaphors.

The way that theatre interprets texts from the past is to breathe fresh life into the repertory by renegotiating different points of view. Maria Grazia Dongu, in her essay 'An Eighteenth-Century *mise en scène* and the Play of Refractions', explores Garrick's *Macbeth* (in various productions from 1744 to 1768) challenging an issue that is methodologically tricky: how far should one accept the dictates of treatises or the testimonies of critics when analyzing the work of the actor? The language of description, and the values of theoretical perception, are considered from the actor and playwright Garrick's perspective. In this game of refractions, 'actors, critics and theatre goers negotiated the text into a collective, distinctively provisional rewriting of *Macbeth*' (p. 229 in this volume).

***

In the vortex of Shakespeare's work, in the endeavours of Italian actors in the *Commedia dell'Arte*, and the afterlife of repertoire modifications and the resurgence of playbooks, we are dealing with the things and voices that surround and underlie the text. There are different layers and different states of the spoken word that lead to – and lend life to – writing. In this dimension, the transitions – somewhere between imitations and variations – that take place in the transformation from speech, to text, to book, which are intrinsic to the theatre, are not linear paths but inter-textual and inter-cultural shifts. There is a lively, never-ending motion between listening, reading, and writing. This motion requires us to focus on a key-role, to which we now devote a brief conclusion. Who were the scribes, and what was their task in the production of texts for the theatre? The possible responses are as many as the functions and interpretations of the part. Even scribes known to have worked with the company of the King's Men, such as Ralph Crane and Edward Knight, played different roles. Knight was the playhouse book-keeper (employed by the troupe in 1620s/1630s), while Crane was a professional scribe, much debated in his role as 'First Editor' of some of the texts published in the 1623 Folio (Werstine 2015).

The role of scribes makes us wonder about their long-lasting influence and extreme importance: scribes were effectively men of letters who were present and active in professional theatres. The renewal of interest for the surviving manuscripts, which has reshaped our hypotheses about the lost manuscripts behind Shakespeare's Quartos, have put scribes right at the centre of the theatrical *scriptorium,* responsible for the reproduction of copies and the transition from playhouse to printers. Their liminal identities have further resonance. In Scarron's *Roman comique* (1651), the troupe of travelling actors welcomed Léandre, the boy escaping from the Jesuit College at La Flèche. They went on to offer him employment as *le valet qui écrit tous nos rôles* ('the servant who copies all our roles'; Scarron 1967, 254). As the author of *Roscius Anglicanus* (1708), the prompter John Downes is famously considered responsible for providing the first history of the London theatres after the Restoration. Theatre scribes, who were seemingly confined by the specialization of their task, actually responded to the various requirements of writing for the theatre. Their ability to negotiate their way between preserving and changing, which can be traced back to their book-keeper function in medieval performances, fulfilled several different duties: stage management, preservation of the dramatic repertoire, negotiations with censorship. Early modern theatre was organized on the basis of many different processes of reading and writing that influenced practical memory. Its unwritten traditions re-surface, emerge, and conflict with the physical evidence of acts of writing.

The phenomena that Thomas Pettitt observes as degeneration of textual fragments along the 'low road' of the 'little traditions' (a category that goes back to the origins of the very notion of cultural performance) were a transplant of symbolic values, from London productions to wider and peripheral contexts. Cheap prints and manuscript fragments, drolls and dialogues, revisions and transpositions: in all these states and processes, textual polymorphism was the result of continuous transactions between written transmission and performance practices which involved adaptations and agencies that were both professional and non. The flow of texts which played an active part in theatre practice are a vitally revealing and identifying element of the dynamics of writing in modern Europe.

Raimondo Guarino

Works Cited

Bortoletti Francesca (2008), *Egloga e spettacolo nel primo Rinascimento. Da Firenze alle corti*, Roma, Bulzoni.

Chartier Roger (1999), *Publishing Drama in Early Modern Europe*, London, The British Library.

Chartier Roger (2011), *Cardenio entre Cervantes et Shakespeare. Histoire d'une pièce perdue*, Paris, Gallimard.

Chartier Roger (2015), *La main de l'auteur et l'esprit de l'imprimeur*, Paris, Gallimard.

Downes John (1708), *"Roscius Anglicanus", or an Historical Review of the Stage: After it had been Suppress'd by means of the late Unhappy Civil War*, London, Printed and sold by H. Payford.

Evans G.B., ed. (1960-1996), *Shakespearean Prompt-Books of the Seventeenth Century*, Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia, 8 vols.

Forestier Georges, Edric Caldicott and Claude Bourqui, eds (2007), *Le Parnasse du Théâtre. Les recueils d'oeuvres complètes de théâtre au XVIIe siècle*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de Paris-Sorbonne.

Franchi Saverio (with Orietta Sartori) (1988-1997), *Drammaturgia romana. Repertorio bibliografico cronologico dei testi drammatici pubblicati a Roma e nel Lazio* (vol. I: *sec. XVII. 1280 testi drammatici ricercati e trascritti in schede*; vol. II: *1701-1750, Annali dei testi drammatici e libretti per musica pubblicati a Roma e nel Lazio dal 1701 al 1750, con introduzione sui teatri romani nel Settecento e commento storico-critico sull'attività teatrale e musicale romana dal 1701 al 1730*, Roma, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Greg W.W. (1931), *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses. Stage Plots: Actors' Parts: Prompt-books*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Ioppolo Grace (2006), *Dramatists and their Manuscripts in the Age of Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton and Heywood. Authorship, Authority and the Playhouse*, London, Routledge.

Kastan D.S. (2001), *Shakespeare and the Book*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Kidnie M.J. and Sonia Massai, eds (2015), *Shakespeare and Textual Studies*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Knight J.T. (2015), 'Shakespeare and the Collection: Reading Beyond Readers' Marks', in M.J. Kidnie and Sonia Massai (eds), 2015, 177-195.

Lalou Élisabeth (1991), 'Les rolets de théâtre. Étude codicologique', in *Théâtre et spectacles hier et aujourd'hui: Moyen Âge et Renaissance*, Paris, Éditions du CTHS, 51-71.

Maguire L.E. (1996), *Shakespearean Suspect Texts: The 'Bad' Quartos and Their Contexts*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Marotti Ferruccio and Giovanna Romei (1991), *La Commedia dell'Arte e la società barocca. La professione del teatro*, Roma, Bulzoni.

McKenzie D.F. (1986), *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, London, The British Library.

Mills David (2007), 'Brought to Book: Chester's Expositor and his Kin', in P. Butterworth, ed., *The Narrator, the Expositor and the Prompter in European Medieval Theatre*, Turnhout, Brepols, 307-325.

Nerbano Mara (2006), *Il teatro della devozione. Confraternite e spettacolo nell'Umbria medievale*, Perugia, Morlacchi.

Palfrey Simon and Tiffany Stern (2007), *Shakespeare in Parts*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Peters J.S. (2000), *Theatre of the Book, 1480-1880. Print, Text, and Performance in Europe*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Petersen L.B. (2010), *Shakespeare's Errant Texts. Textual Form and Linguistic Style in Shakespearean 'Bad' Quartos and Co-authored Plays*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Profeti M.G. (1999), *Nell'officina di Lope*, Firenze, Alinea.

Riccò Laura (2008), *'Su le carte e fra le scene'. Teatro in forma di libro nel Cinquecento italiano*, Rome, Bulzoni.

Runnalls Graham (1999), *Les mystères français imprimés*, Paris, Honoré Champion.

Scarron Paul (1967 [1651; 1657]), *Le Roman comique*, éd. par É. Magne, Paris, Garnier Frères.

Stern Tiffany (2009), *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Taviani Ferdinando (2010 [1995]), *Uomini di scena uomini di libro*, Roma, Officina.

Taviani Ferdinando and Mirella Schino (1982), *Il segreto della Commedia dell'Arte. La memoria delle compagnie italiane del XVI, XVII e XVIII secolo*, Firenze La casa Usher.

Taylor Gary (2017), 'Artiginality. Authorship after Postmodernism', in Gary Taylor and Gabriel Egan, eds, *The New Oxford Shakespeare. Authorship Companion*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 3-27.

Testaverde A.M., ed. (2007), *I canovacci della Commedia dell'Arte*, Torino, Einaudi.

Tribble Evelyn (2011), *Cognition in the Globe. Attention and Memory in Shakespeare's Theatre*, New York-London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Vaccari Debora (2006), *I* papeles de actor *della Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid. Catalogo e studio*, Firenze, Alinea.

Werstine Paul (2012), *Early Modern Playhouse Manuscripts and the Editing of Shakespeare*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Werstine Paul (2015), 'Ralph Crane and Edward Knight: professional scribe and King's Men's bookkeeper', in M.J. Kidnie and Sonia Massai (eds), 2015, 27-38.

Wisch Barbara and Nerida Newbigin (2013), *Acting on Faith. The Confraternity of the Gonfalone in Renaissance Rome*, Philadelphia, Saint Joseph's University Press.

PART ONE

Introduction

Journal of Early Modern Studies, n. 8 (2019), pp. 19-27
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.13128/JEMS-2279-7149-24879

Beyond Books and Plays: A Nomenclature for the Cultures and Practices of Writing in Early Modern Theatre

Lene Buhl Petersen
University of Southern Denmark (<lenebuhlpetersen@gmail.com>)

Abstract

This introductory essay constitutes a survey of the contributions gathered in this issue of *JEMS*. It begins with an overview of the volume's area of study and moves on to build a glossary for an academic field whose perimeters are perhaps not all that clear. The survey next dwells – in a little more depth – on the various perspectives offered and issues raised in the volume, concluding with an afterthought on where this collection of papers leaves us as a scholarly community wishing to continue to engage with a difficult interstitial field beyond books and plays and between cultures and practices of writing in early modern theatre.

Keywords: *Civic Drama, Early Modern Stage Products and Processes, Early Modern Theatre Media, Impermanence of Authorship, Vernacular Traditions*

You are about to read a collection of essays that address the major cultural phenomenon of the production of early modern spectacle, including the multiple practices, cultures, and uses of writing that underpin and surround that which was performed. This situates volume 8 of *JEMS* at the crossroads between textual studies, performance or theatre studies, cultural studies, authorship studies, and studies of orality vs. literacy. Venturing beyond any direct relationships between book and stage, as explored in studies of recent years, the topics covered here address textual practices both as sources and offshoots of contextual theatrical enterprises; the relationships between texts and performers' cultural environments in time and place, and the relationship between the popular professional theatre and a literary environment. If the production of text in theatrical practice from the late fifteenth to the seventeenth century (from printed canons to manuscript plays and fragments of plays onwards to variants of mummers' plays and the use of dramatic woodcut illustrations in printed performative genres) has your interest, then read on. This volume not only focuses on the contexts of major national

ISSN 2279-7149 (online)
www.fupress.com/bsfm-jems
2019 Firenze University Press

traditions (i.e. Elizabethan and Jacobean theatre, French theatre, Italian professional and popular theatre and their theatrical environments) but also on peripheral and lesser known domains.

The following papers accordingly explore the connections between printed texts and performances and, importantly, the (vernacular) afterlives of printed texts and performances, including popular, civic and religious representations and traditions of representation. It is our hope that this collection of articles will open up new horizons and allow you to ponder the syntheses and synergies between literary traditions and performance cultures in early modern Europe. These connections and synergies are first and foremost detectable through the critical vocabulary used across the volume, and as a co-editor I am indeed pleased to see a new vocabulary forming for the study of this field. Any academic realm arguably benefits from having its own glossary, both as inspiration for future studies and as a means for classification. Allow me therefore now, first of all, to highlight (cf. bold print below) some of the cross-cutting, analytical terminology used in the articles.

The very first paper, by Darwin Smith, speaks of 'the original book'/'full text' as the **crossroads** of all processes; the source of all other reading practices. 'The original text' remains a much-contested theoretical concept, and rightly so, but defining this document type as a **crossroads** makes a difference because of the very uncertainty and the multiplicity of choice embedded in the cross-roads both as notion and *topos*. In this way, Smith successfully resituates the concept of originality, turning it from something static into something highly dynamic.

The first paper importantly and in several ways also highlights the centrality of **textual variance** (due to performance processes and the extemporising practices of players), and introduces the notion that playtexts may be seen as **sediments in written circulation**.

Sediments, in Smith's interpretation, are **text tradition variations** that by definition are difficult to locate in the process between writing, performing and conserving. This gives rise to the first article's all-important introduction of the concept of the ***textus***. Here, specifically, the *textus* denotes a format or mediation tool of couplets designed for reproduction, but the concept can be more broadly applied, throughout the entire field of early modern studies, as a reminder that the dramatic canons that we study – if popular enough – are likely to have involved some type of memorized *textus* for each performance of a play which, when voiced 'live', remains **plastic in performance**.

The article moves on to introduce other very useful concepts and terminology, like the notion of a **dual writing-orality channel**, enabling the evolution of the performed material towards monumentality, facilitated by the ever-growing place of the written word. Smith's paper offers up terminology such as **formatted texts** and **formulas in texts**, reminding us that the **author is corporate as much as an individual**.

The second article, by Paola Ventrone, continues in the vein of cross-cutting practices, identifying a **transformation** of the spectacular from **performance action** to **container of memory**, through images fixed in woodcut book illustrations. We also hear of a **repeatable format fixed in print**, and of **literary forms with spectacular dimensions**, as Ventrone continually highlights the two-way channel that exists between the 'live' and static formats of theatre. Equally apt is the terminological nexus of the **representation in body/performative action** vs. **representation as object/container of mental images** (i.e. illustrations in book form). Last but not least, the second paper also emphasizes the important link between performance and **community**. That is to say, that (early modern) theatre almost always incorporates the tastes of a public/an audience, and as such by definition functions on an adaptive and multi-original basis.

The third paper, by Thomas Pettitt, introduces a nomenclature for the general and generically wide-ranging **vernacular afterlives** of early modern plays. After a play's stage history, Pettitt explains, follows a vernacular afterlife, borne out not only through regular actors, but also by the people involved in non-institutional, **extra-theatrical performance** traditions. Pettitt thus makes a case for the cross-media dissemination of verbal material over time, across both professional and folk trajectories, involving what Pettitt refers to as **textual degradation** during **re-contextualization** and **recollection from memory in performance**.

To our glossary Pettitt's essay adds further key terms like the ***Endform*** and ***Zielform***; terminology derived from the work of the Swiss folklorist Max Lüthi, but in Pettitt's scholarly *oeuvre* used more broadly than by Lüthi to denote an identifiable morphology that all kinds of transmitted performance material will tend towards.

Another significant term introduced in Pettitt's paper is the ***theatergram*** or **dramatic formula** (a notion first elaborated by Louise George Clubb), which enables 'new permutations of established common material in a broad and extended swathe of western drama from Greco-Roman theatre, through liturgical Easter Plays, German carnival interludes (*Fastnachtspiele*), French farces, and the *commedia dell'arte*, to the Elizabethan stage and beyond' (p. 136 in this volume). Thus defined, the **theatergram** is a familiar typology common to many forms of early theatre; and, to my mind, thus related to Darwin Smith's notion of the ***textus***. Pettitt also speaks of **artisanal re-versifying** strictly within the metrical system and rhyme scheme of an original text, making use of typecast 'masks' and the like - notions that match the related concepts of the ***textus/theatergram***.

In the fourth paper, Roberto Ciancarelli writes of the public or city theatre, where a whole city is performing in groups and associations, introducing the term **theatre as community** (unwittingly echoing Ventrone). In Ciancarelli's paper, we are reminded of the collaborative dramatic mechanics of '**commune**

masks', and of the **stock figures** or **masked types** from the *commedia dell'arte*; and it is highlighted how an audience is always already an integral co-producer of meaning/significance in public and popular theatre. To our critical glossary, we can thus add Ciancarelli's concept of city theatre's assembly of **recognizable gags**, where the whole **city serves as *spectaculum*** and the masks as **vessels for spectacle**; concepts that incidentally also echo Ventrone's point about the important ability of early modern theatre to **act out topicality** – in this case a *comical* commentary on life as lived in early modern Rome.

The fifth essay, by Christopher Haile, investigates a single play that seems to have been dependent on a particular **public *locale***, London, to function. More specifically, Haile explores how the seventeenth century play *A Game at Chess* operates as a vessel for a specific message or as a 'learning' contract reliant on a specific type of culture that was widespread in (and likely spatially limited to) Jacobean London. Haile goes on to expand this notion and suggests that the very nature of early modern theatre is a **spatially limited cultural form** that every single audience member needs must have been familiar with in order for the enterprise to function. The terms or notions we gain from Haile's contribution are important in the sense that they highlight the implicit contract between stage and public that enables the reception of the performed material. Haile further adds to our glossary the concepts of the **public theatre as allegory**, **theatre as topical code to be decoded**; **theatre as a paraphrase** of life as lived, **spectacle as coded message** about actual real events (here involving specific political events) – all notions that are reminiscent of the arguments also presented elsewhere in this volume by e.g. Smith, Ciancarelli and Dongu. Finally, the **systematic use of clichés** for specific communicative purposes, and the **use of parallelisms** in plays in cahoots with the audience to 'discuss' something topical/political are equally relevant concepts to add to our glossary.

The sixth article, by Maria Grazia Dongu, introduces the pertinent concept of **the text/performance complex**, providing us with new terminology for the live/living text and its (re)generative energy. We are reminded of the **distinctly unstable** Elizabethan playtext, born from the **cooperative act of a playwright and his company coming up with a text**, which is then **corrected during rehearsals and adjusted for new audiences and historical contingencies over time**. It is highlighted how the text shares **the transience** of its theatrical performances – and here Dongu ventures the extremely apt term **a text *in situ***, with all that this entails of impermanent linguistic and stylistic constituents. The **text *in situ*** at the same time functions as a warning against the consolidating trends manifested by many 'canon-makers' of recent years, and can as such be seen as a methodological antidote to overly author-centric attribution studies and editorial practises alike. Dongu's paper likewise reinvokes concepts like the '**Urtext**' and **metatext fragments**, concepts that remain relevant if scholars are to come to terms with the **paradox** of the early modern theatrical text's **re-emerging fluidity**.

Dongu finally mentions the **interdependence** of **eye** and **ear** in the making of theatre, in the sense that **spectators perceive polysensorically**. These dimensions remain essential to theatre studies, but the principle risks being neglected when scholars try to fit stagecraft into singularly literary rubrics. Granted that the written formats of early modern theatre were intended for polysensoric reception, these formats will from their very inception have been **co-dependent on the bodies of actors** who would enact the words (in Dongu's words, the actor's body is transformed into a readable book composed of iconic signs) and use their voices to transform recognizable visual signs into recognizable oral/aural output to transmit what Dongu calls the **energy of the text**.

The seventh and final article, by Darren Freebury-Jones, is a study of canonicity and authorship, which naturally avails itself of the hallmark terminology of attribution studies. But Freebury-Jones' paper fuses the methodological terminology of statistics, metrics and linguistics with a deeper glossary of cross-cutting, interstitial terms like **parallels of thought**, **verbal matches**; **parallel phraseology**, **shared repetitions**, and **corresponding plot features** – all of which are essential to authorship studies as well as to the extra-authorial aspects covered in this volume, and as such germane to the glossary we are compiling. The notion that one play '**echoes** another' or that a given play may **echo all parts of an author's work** is central to Freebury-Jones' argument, although it remains to be determined whether it is the authors who are influenced by other authors or the words that influence other words, as it were. Thus, a collaborative nexus remains central also in Freebury-Jones' paper because collaboration and co-authorship, in the broadest sense of those words, constitute the very foundation of authorship studies.

***

Highlighted in bold above we have heartening evidence of a critical vocabulary for the study of the many intermediate aspects between playtexts and performances, cultures, and practices of the early modern stages.

The glossary ties the contributions of the volume together and offers inspiration to scholars working or wanting to carry out work in this same field. However, the essays also contain specificities worth dwelling on because of the original research they offer and as a pointer to the exciting new perspectives made available through this volume. The final part of the Introduction therefore offers a taste of what is fully unfolded in the essays, which means that the eager reader may now choose to simply move on to the essays themselves or dwell a little longer on the aspects of the articles that I as a co-editor find particularly pertinent or enlightening.

With his study of the writing processes surrounding theatrical performances in medieval France, Darwin Smith positions the *original full text* ('the Book', 'le Livre', 'les originaux') as the conceptual and material basis from which all ensuing forms, modes and copies were produced for *different* reading practices – entertainment, meditation, devotion, teaching, learning – identified by specific content, layout and material features. We may rank Smith's case studies of *Maistre Pierre Pathelin*, a late fifteenth century comedy, and the *Mystère des Trois Doms*, an early sixteenth century urban play, as excellent new studies of textual variation, dependent on the extemporizing practices of professional players and resulting in co-occurring so-called sediments in written circulation. Moreover, Smith importantly positions his work within the scholarly practice of *codicology:* the study of manuscripts as cultural artefacts for historical purposes. By doing so, he reminds us that theatre manuscripts are not so *in and of themselves*, but rather textual incarnations of practices of copying and making books, which belonged to widespread cultural activities and not theatre in particular. Smith also brings to our attention that the texts in the French medieval theatre do not distinguish themselves from other literary genres, but are basically composed as a *textus* of octosyllabic couplets – a practical tool highly efficient for transmedial circulation (i.e. memorising, performing, writing) of all manner of early genres. Later on, the theatre texts gain formal and functional generic qualities of their own, but the root principle or mechanism is a *textus*. Smith's main contribution is thus his timely reminder that the author of early modern theatre, *qua* the *textus*, is as much corporate as individual. Finally, the documented extemporizing practices of professional players, from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century, may well be key to understanding the origins not only of early French theatre or the Italian *commedia dell'arte*, but also more generally the beginning of modern professional theatre practices in Europe.

Paola Ventrone's research into acting and reading drama in the Florentine *sacre representazioni* highlights and offers evidence for the transformation of a performative action into a container of memory images, fixed through printed book illustrations in the form of woodcuts. As Ventrone reminds us, the woodcuts function like staged drama to portray real-life situations in recognizable contexts that are either realistic or meta-real in the sense of stock dramatic references or *theatergrams* (to use a glossary term). These woodcut images might also be topical (recognizable Florence settings) as they become re-readable in print and as such merge coeval popular communication with the dissemination of received religious teaching.

Woodcuts, in short, are also readings/representations/media and communicative forms. They 'travel' in tradition like other spectacular material and, as Ventrone points out, gain afterlives of their own in other works far from where they originally appeared, bridging genres and, potentially, communicative purposes. This is somewhat akin to what Pettitt notices when phraseology or character names or stock types reoccur across time and place in unrelated plays/Mummers' plays. Incidentally, but related to Ventrone's commentary on dramatic illustration, woodcuts also form part of the parallel traditions of stage plays in early English popular culture, particularly in printed ballad texts. Although not all early modern English ballads contain images, a majority are designed to include woodcut illustrations and many sixteenth and seventeenth century broadside ballads do. The woodcut illustration published with the 1663 broadside ballad of *[The] complaint and lamentation of Mistresse Arden of [Fev]ersham in Kent* is a case in point. The ballad text and its woodcut illustration clearly lie beyond what Freebury-Jones seeks to cover in his paper on the canon of Thomas Kyd, who Freebury-Jones cautiously defends as the author of the 1592 stage play *Arden of Faversham*. It would nevertheless be interesting to hear how an attribution scholar would relate the ballad-*cum*-woodcut dramatization of the 'real' story of the murder of Arden of Faversham to the interplay between authorial canons, given Freebury-Jones' observation that the oral/aural memorial repository of theatrical phrases in one canon is more than capable of crossing over into another.

With his new case studies for this volume of *JEMS*, Thomas Pettitt has provided an extraordinarily well-founded and textually oriented study of the relationship between folk drama and early English theatre. Pettit's five case studies all juxtapose an original text of an early English stage play (or other dramatic genre) with documentation of a 'vernacular' performance decades or centuries later of that same item or dramatic material extracted from it. In each case, it is known which is the original version, and which is the derivative. In some cases, Pettitt acknowledges, the vernacular or folk text may also have functioned as a script for up-coming performances, while in all cases the vernacular text qualifies as a transcript documenting anterior performances. In this way, Pettitt's analyses of textual discrepancies show in phraseological detail *what* has happened to that original text, 'deliberately or unconsciously, before performance, between performances, during performance' (p. 167 in this volume), through a particular strand of a given play's vernacular afterlife. This means that we, through Pettit's new work, gain access to a 'recording of the most recent production of a given Elizabethan stage play in the latter's theatrical afterlife' (p. 151 in this volume) – an entirely exhilarating notion and a fresh insight into exactly which dramatic elements appear to survive extensive transmission.

Roberto Ciancarelli's paper on 'self-referential theatre' (involving citizens, amateur actors and authors, and depicting clear images of milieus, conventions and habits of a city, in this case Rome) describes how students, teachers, artisans, traders, soldiers and also writers and academics, painters, musicians, courtesans, notaries, judges, lawyers, doctors, surgeons and even priests join efforts to become a 'whole performing city'. Ciancarelli crucially provides a valuable new example of a fragment of such a city comedy, outlining a web of recognisable masks and an assembly of comic gags whose interpretation relies on the collaboration of a city, or *locale*, and not so much on collaboration between the separate categories of performers and audiences. Ciancarelli's research thus confirms the use of communicative vessels like the *textus/theatergram* and adds important further documentary evidence to the volume's formative case studies.

Christopher Haile's essay on Thomas Middleton's allegorical play *A Game at Chess* provides a necessary and relevant re-visitation of a special play. A play that the London audiences had the upper hand in interpreting through their intense familiarity with the several theatres in operation within and without the city. Haile uses *A Game* to exemplify how an early modern play may tell its story through a *systematic use* of parodies of famous scenes of other plays, adding further weight to the self-referential aspects explored by Ciancarelli and others in this volume. Haile's examples of distinct parallelisms between *A Game* and *Measure for Measure* shows how the play and its performers are in cahoots with the audience to 'discuss' something topical/political. The hypothesis that interlinked plots of various plays/performative products could be used to convey a new message sits rather well with this volume's overall focus on moving beyond *the* text or any *one* text. What happens in the complex between play/performance/text/audience/time, Haile thus reminds us, is that *parallel thematics* and their use is as interesting as parallel phraseology (as discussed by the majority of the authors in this volume) when trying to grasp the interconnectedness of the products and productions of the early modern stages. Allegory is by necessity 'more than meets the eye' - more than one text or meaning - which is another reason why Haile's paper fits well in his volume, which focuses on what lies beyond and between.

Maria Grazia Dongu's excellent discussion of eighteenth-century *mise en scène* as collective and negotiable creations of meaning shows how actors, critics, and theatregoers knowingly negotiated texts into collective, distinctively provisional rewritings. With *Macbeth* as a case study, Dongu illustrates how the *mise en scène* function as a dynamic process triggered by multiple and diverse readings of Shakespeare's plays, provisionally ended by the performers, the spectators and the eighteenth-century reviewers. As the material resurfaced in eighteenth-century essays on acting and acting techniques, a parallel or metatextual analysis of anterior performances came into being. This 'debate', enacted by actors and audiences, shows that the co-dependent stakeholders were 'fully aware of their role as active participants in producing the performance, as testified in their letters' (p. 244 in this volume). With Dongu's evidence of the *conscious* cooperation of writers, actors, and audiences in the intermedial and cross-medial field of theatre-making, we have a valuable foundation for further work on the collaborative nature of early modern playwrighting, including the intermediate afterlives of such plays.

While most of the other papers of the volume occupy the realm of the text-performance nexus, Darren Freebury-Jones, in the final paper, focuses on the professional theatre as a literary environment, where authors write plays and in so doing amass what critics were later to call canons and have proceeded to study as works of authorial origin. What makes Freebury-Jones' paper relevant to this volume is first of all its insistence that canonicity is also something that lies beyond books and plays; an aspect of the afterlives of the texts produced for the early modern stage.

Freebury-Jones not only reminds us that the Elizabethan stage was supplied with material by a choir of playwrights who laboured to earn money and presumably fame in competition and collaboration with each other. He also incorporates the notion that actor-playwrights' (aural) memories might result in the migration of phraseology or patterns of phraseology across canons. Freebury-Jones' paper makes a case for a more expansive Kyd canon, based on recent scholarly practices of computational authorship attribution, but in so doing he also highlights how one playwright (Shakespeare) might have been influenced by the phraseology of a series of popular stage plays: *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Soliman and Perseda*, *King Leir*, and *Arden of Faversham*, with more verbal borrowings from *The Spanish Tragedy* and *King Leir* and less from *Arden of Faversham*. This, Freebury-Jones proposes, might be related to Shakespeare himself having seen, heard, or performed in these plays and not in *Arden*, thus accepting an element of oral/aural/memorial transmission that is not usually incorporated into attribution studies. Freebury-Jones likewise emphasizes that Kyd was a scrivener's son, acknowledging that any given playwright might also be influenced by extra-authorial, artisanal practices. It is always revitalising when one scholarly field enters into dialogue with another, and thus Freebury-Jones' paper is refreshing in more ways than one as it concludes this volume by adding further (no less quantifiable or documentable) dimensions of early modern English dramatic production to those usually explored in literary/linguistic/stylometric attribution studies.

***

This survey has been an invitation to expand notions of theatrical production, introducing a series of studies that engage with a difficult realm beyond and between early modern text and performance. By offering these fresh perspectives on the visual, oral/aural, multi-generic, corporate, communal and cross-medial capacities of early modern plays and playtexts, along with a critical nomenclature to go with it, we hope to at least assist in inspiring further research that reflects the practices beyond the playtexts themselves.

PART TWO

Case Studies

Text and Stage
(Vernacular) Traditions and Afterlife

Journal of Early Modern Studies, n. 8 (2019), pp. 173-188
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.13128/JEMS-2279-7149-24886

Visions of the City in Seventeenth-Century Roman Popular Theatre

Roberto Ciancarelli
Sapienza University of Rome (<roberto.ciancarelli@uniroma1.it>)

Abstract

The extraordinary circulation of comic scripts (texts, manuscripts, scenarios and *zibaldoni*) in seventeenth-century Rome allows us to observe the profiles of a 'self-referential theatre' that involved citizens, amateur actors and authors, and depicts clear images of milieus, conventions and habits of the city.

Keywords: *Amateur Actors and Authors, Aspects of City Life, New Masks, Rome, 'Whole Performing City'*

Countless printed and manuscript editions of comedies, tragedies, and operas, an immense repertoire of disparate fragments and scenic scripts, the richest existing repository of materials for *teatro all'improvviso* (not only the collections of *canovacci* and *scenari* deposited in the Corsiniana and Casanatense libraries, but also the folders of *zibaldoni* and *generici* that progressively emerged from research in the city archives)[1] record both an impressive dramaturgical production and a feverish theatre activity that took

---

[1] The reference is to the collections of Basilio Locatelli, *Della scena de' soggetti comici di B. L. R. Parte Prima. M.D.C.XVII.*, Biblioteca Casanatense, Rome, Ms. F. IV. 12, Cod. 1211 and *Della scena de' soggetti comici et tragici di B. L. R. Parte Seconda. M.D.C.XX.*, Biblioteca Casanatense, Rome, Ms. F. IV. 13, Cod. 1212, to the *Raccolta di Scenari Più Scelti d'Istrioni Divisi in Due Volumi*, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rome, Racc. Corsiniana, Mss. 45.G.5 published now in Hulfeld 2014, to Ciro Monarca, *Dell'Opere Regie*, (sec. XVII), Biblioteca Casanatense, Rome, Ms. 4186, or to those housed in the Biblioteca Vaticana, Codice Vaticano Latino 10244 and Codice Barberiniano Latino 3895, all partially edited and transcribed (Testaverde 2007) to which reference is made with regard to the bibliography. To this list we must add the collection entitled *Motti e detti faceti per diverse persone. Miscellanea componimenti drammatici detti berneschi idea degli antichi istorici*, Archivio Doria Pamphilj, Fondo Archiviolo, Tome XX, busta 122 (121), cc. 464 (cc. 414-465) edited by Ciancarelli (2008, 163-219) and the *Generico* relating to the part of the Captain of Anonymous, *Bravure da Capitano*, Archivio di Stato di Roma, Cartari-Febei, vol. CXV cc. 374v-375v; 376r-380v; 383r-383v, ed. by Luciano Mariti (Ciancarelli and Mariti 2015, 246-255).

ISSN 2279-7149 (online)
www.fupress.com/bsfm-jems
2019 Firenze University Press

place in seventeenth-century Rome, involving 'the whole performing city' (Ciancarelli and Mariti 2012; Ciancarelli and Mariti 2015).

The passion for theatre, which was cultivated as a pedagogical discipline by boarding school students and accompanied citizens during their whole existence, diffused throughout the century, despite Papal prohibition policies. The endemic pervasiveness of Roman theatre at the time can therefore be considered the result of an action of conquest of abandoned lands. Theatre appeared as a citizens' space for action and intervention and was destined to be the true connective tissue of the community. Over the years, as citizens gathered in groups and associations (from the most prestigious academies to the *conversazioni*, which functioned as social outposts and theatre workshops), the role of theatre as a 'public space' was progressively consolidated and strengthened. Even if it was under the surveillance of political power, Roman theatre was entrusted to citizens and protected by academics and intellectuals; thus, it became an instrument of immediate socialization, a true 'public theatre' that was open to the manifestation of the most varied talents, a competitive alternative to professional theatre.

Among the stacks of manuscripts preserved in the Roman archives, a series of documents recently discovered gives an adequate account of the 'whole performing city' phenomenon. In the view of Luciano Mariti (2013, 93-104; 125-135), first of all it is worth mentioning the *Index* written by Giovanni Briccio, one of the most renowned protagonists of the Roman theatre of the time, which proves, in a circumstantial manner, the presence of actors practising theatre *all'improvviso* in Rome during the first decades of the seventeenth century (1630-1645). They are catalogued according to skills deriving from natural qualities, artistic knowledge, crafts and life experiences. The one hundred actors mentioned by Briccio were not professionals and their social identity reflected the city's complex organization: they were students, teachers, artisans, traders, soldiers, and also writers and academics, painters, musicians, courtesans, notaries, judges, lawyers, doctors, surgeons and even priests. But there are even more high profile figures that could not be mentioned, because, as Briccio suggested, it does not seem suitable 'fare il nome dei tanti uomini nobilissimi, e Prencipi, che hanno in compagnia nostra privatamente recitato ne' loro Palazzi' (Mariti 2013, 135).[2]

The images of the 'whole performing city' can be related to other images that, by way of unpublished sources, testify to the regularization of the Roman theatrical calendar. They regard the phenomenon of the progressive transformation of halls and warehouses (those in which Giudiate floats were set up during Carnival) into theatrical spaces with well-defined and permanent functions. This process originated in consortiums and associations of layabouts, idlers or modest traders and craftsmen who were connected to the protagonists of the most infamous Roman Carnival masquerades. They were groups of young people able to gradually increase their range of action and put on a regular repertoire of farces and comic entertainments in small city theatres, such as the *conversazione* of Rotonda at the Pantheon or the Botticella in Trastevere (Franchi 1988, 720), which inaugurated the first real year-round Roman theatre seasons (Ciancarelli 2014, 112-114).

---

[2] 'To name the noblest men, and Princes, that privately performed with us within their Palaces'. Unless otherwise stated, all translations are mine.

The chronicles of the time allow us to approach the contexts in which the city theatre grew and developed. They also provide significant information on the phenomenon of the theatrical *conversazioni*, which can be described as a heterogeneous set of environments comprising different resources and distinct specializations. The *conversazioni*, which reflected the complex and stratified social organization of the city, could consist of meetings of ladies and gentlemen held in aristocrats' palaces or gatherings of humble traders and artisans, but were also connected to the enterprises of some of the most renowned artists of the time, such as Gian Lorenzo Bernini, Salvator Rosa or the Cavalier d'Arpino, who were all engaged in continual experimentation linking theatre and painting.

Moreover, chronicles help us to reconstruct the accounts of these theatrical environments, which were able to sustain impressive theatrical productions and functioned as theatrical workshops where new schemes of comedy and unusual comic types developed. The result of these theatrical and dramaturgical experiments is tangible if we think of the Roman assimilation of the masks of Pulcinella and Pantalone, but also of the invention of comic masks such as those of 'The Jew' and 'The Frenchman', the *Villano* Moccicone and the *Norcini* Baciocco, Ciampicone, Ciraglio and Tizzone, of the crowd of young servants and Roman boys, and dumb, playful Don Pasquale.

These inventions shaped a theatre staging the city stories, relationships and protagonists in a game of resonances whose effectiveness was guaranteed by a self-referential context.[3]

---

[3] Images of the city could materialize throughout the re-contextualization of conventional spaces such as the taverns. Real places like 'Il Cavalletto', 'La Scrofa', 'Il Turchetto' and 'La Vacca' (which were located between 'Via Panico' and 'Porta Settimiana', between the Banchi and Torredenona prisons, between Borgo and Capo le Case, between the springs of Tor Sanguigna and Campovaccino up to the meadows of Valletta della Caffarella) are often mentioned in Roman farces and transformed into settings complete with traps, pitfalls and all kinds of dangers. Further significant resonances arise from the mention of characters and figures gravitating towards specific city settings: the 'pellicciaro ['furrier'] from Regola', 'Patoccia il Ciavarino ['key maker'] poet in Campo Marzio', the 'ricottaro ['cheese maker'] Tartaglia' with their friends: 'salsicciari, lupinari, nociari, cicoriari' ('sausage sellers, lupin sellers, walnut sellers, chicory sellers'; Ciancarelli 2015, 76). Other resonances arise from city life glimpses, materialized in the names of places (which could even help to reconstruct a detailed toponymy of ancient Rome) or from the recollection of habits of pleasant pastimes such as the Sunday trip to the 'Valle della Caffarella' ('Caffarella Valley'). There, in a comedy of the time (Lorenzani 1692), the brat Ciurlo is described while he is occupying the place for

This theatre staged real or legendary facts, those Bragaglia defined as 'popular gossip', and 'gushes of living local blood' (1958, 121) that had resonance and clamour, as in the case of the allusions to the vicissitudes of the irresistible political rise of Donna Olimpia Pamphili (sister-in-law of Pope Innocent X) in the decade from 1644 to 1655, of her decline and subsequent rehabilitation. The theatrical primacy of Donna Olimpia is intertwined with important Roman political events, such as the hostilities between the faction she headed, which supported Spain, and the one connected with the Barberini family, who supported France. The staging of the play *Il Principe balordo*, commissioned by Donna Olimpia in 1646, refers to the marriage of her son Camillo to the princess of Rossano, which she opposed. The echo of her power even spread to the English court, where the play *Marriage of the Pope* (Ciancarelli 2008, 59-60), staged in 1650, satirically alluded to her hypothetical marriage with the Pope.

It is therefore evident that the Roman theatre collected and expressed the voices, insinuations and slanders spread throughout the city. An example is the case of Salvator Rosa, who was accused by Gian Lorenzo Bernini and Ottaviano Castelli of the infamous crime of robbing some silver candlesticks from a church, as we can still read in a fragment from the coeval rhymed controversy repertoire between Bernini, Castelli and Salvator Rosa, which comprised invectives that soon degenerated into accusations of dishonourable actions (Passeri 1772, 178; Molinari 1999, 221-229). Later on, this cruel insinuation would often be recalled in Roman dramaturgy of the time, as for example in the manuscript of a comedy entitled *Osteria del Gallo*, where, in a quarrel scene, Coviello-Pascariello (a character who was inextricably linked to the theatrical training of Salvator Rosa) is apostrophized as 'quel furbo che rubbò un candeliero alla Pace' ('that clever man who stole a candlestick from Peace').[4] Progressively, the

---

his masters since dawn 'in quel paradiso dove, nei giorni di festa, si balla, e si canta e c'è chi alza la vetrina, chi sbalbisce, chi tira di poveta, chi il cavo legno sona, chi gioca le ciambelle, chi rompe l'ova toste' ('in that paradise where, during the holidays, everybody dances, sings and plays...') and all sorts of untranslatable games.

[4] *Osteria del Gallo* ('The Cock's Inn'), of which a transcription of some scenes appears in the appendix, is part of a collection of seven volumes of manuscript texts held in the Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu, identified by the signature of *Opere sceniche diverse in prosa* (399, II, cc. 1v-63v). The collection of the Archivum, which includes 41 scenic works, of which 4 are pseudonymous and 22 anonymous, is a heterogeneous miscellany of comedies and tragicomedies, moral and Pulcinella operas, of translations and re-elaborations of the French and Spanish repertoire. Arlecchini who harrassed holy women, Zanni disguised as philosophers, wise men transformed into shepherds, Pulcinella in the roles of servant or king, Covielli, Pasquarielli and Norcini coexist with Corneille's *Orazio* translated for young Roman seminarians, while dialogues written for the 'cathecumeni' children are conserved next to a scenario of a tragicomedy or a spiritual representation for the school girls of a Roman convent (Ciancarelli 2008, 65-71). The lists of this collection include unknown authors, authors that hid their identity under pseudonyms (such as in the cases of Filarete, of the so called 'Commentator of Hurania' or of the Neapolitan Reginaldo Sgambati, who signed his works with the false name of Vincenzo) or to protect themselves behind anonymity. Alongside unknown beginners

references to Salvator Rosa dimmed, but the episode, reformulated and turned into a farce, would even affect the honour of Pulcinella in the manuscript

and debutants in the art of comedy, obscure lawyers, parish priests and teachers, who are all occasional authors, there are more accredited names of academics, actors and writers often mentioned in the dramaturgical repertoires and theatrical chronicles of the seventeenth century. They are, for example, the companions of theatrical adventures of Salvator Rosa, as is the case of Giovan Battista Ricciardi, the Pisan writer who invented, inspired by the scenic improvisations of Salvator Rosa, Trespolo, a vile and ignorant comic character. Among the manuscripts of the Archivum collection there are *La Forza del Sospetto* (*Opere sceniche diverse in prosa,* 403, VI, cc. 278v-334v) and *Amore, Medicina e Veleno degli Intelletti* (*Opere sceniche diverse in prosa,* 403, VI, cc. 216v-273v) which turned out to be versions for the Roman public of texts written by Ricciardi that had been circulating for years in other theatrical contexts. These two comedies were composed by Ricciardi in Florence between 1641 and 1649 and were part of the theatrical repertoire of the 'Accademia dei Percossi' ('Academy of the Beaten'), founded by Salvator Rosa during his stay in Florence. *Amore, Medicina e Veleno degli Intelletti* was known as the *Trespolo tutore* and under this title was published in Bologna in 1669, while *La forza del sospetto* would be printed in Ronciglione by Francesco Leone, in 1674 (*La Forza del Sospetto overo Trespolo hoste*; Di Muro 1999, 145-193). Traces of the significant tradition of the theatre of the *Siglo de Oro*, of the 'Italian-Spanish' repertoire, made familiar in Rome also through translations made by the writers of passing Spanish companies, appear in the collection of the Archivum. This is the case of *Tanto fa la Donna, quanto vuole con il Laberinto intrigato d'amore* by a Spanish Company, 1659 (*Opere sceniche diverse in prosa*, 398, I, cc. 204r-222v) which testifies to a text for performance in the city theatres either by a Spanish troupe or mixed troupes of Spanish and Roman actors. It appears to be the Italian version of *Las manos blancas no ofenden*, a rare remake of the palatine comedy by Calderón of 1640 (Ciancarelli and Mariti 2015, 224-243; Ciancarelli 2016, 83-86). In this work the masks of Pantalone and the Doctor appear alongside a list of Spanish characters and document the overlapping of different theatrical traditions. Spanish theatre became known in Rome especially by way of translations, re-workings, adaptations and plagiarism of works already known and published. In this collection, *Il segreto palese* (*Opere sceniche diverse in prosa*, 400, III, cc. 345v-394v) appears as an anonymous work, but it actually is an adapted version for the Roman public of *Il segreto in pubblico* by Giacinto Andrea Cicognini, that, in turn, comes from Calderón de la Barca. The interest of this collection lies in the information it provides on the Roman theatre of the time. Unpublished portraits of theatrical habits emerge from *L'Onore riacquistato* (*Opere sceniche diverse in prosa*, 400, III, cc. 4v-100r), an anonymous work that recalls evening pastimes in a Roman theatre, with the intrigues of love of an ambiguous singer who performs in her house to lure wealthy suitors. This play deserves to be mentioned because it recalls an unknown image of a seventeenth-century Roman *conversazione*. This is what also emerges from *La Verità nella favola (Opere sceniche diverse in prosa*, 402, V, cc. 6v- 81r), a comedy which describes the preparations of a show made by a *conversazione* 'alla rotta di Panico' ('close to the Panico's Route'), in an apartment converted into a theatre during Carnival. The audience is supposed to access the apartment on payment of a fee, thus Philadelphus, who has been chosen to set up the show, spares no expense and prepares a performance which is out of the ordinary, 'un misto di serio e ridicolo fatto per incontrare la diversità degli humori' (*Opere sceniche diverse in prosa*, 402, V, c. 15v; 'a mixture of the serious and facetious to suit different moods'). But a crowd of intrusive visitors and spectators who try to attend the play without paying, disturbs the rehearsal. They recall with nostalgia the repertoire of 'little *bagatelle* and old comedies', or the performances of 'autori che si fanno uscì una commedia di testa in quattro dì' ('authors who write a comedy in four days'), alternating with the improvisations of poets of octaves accompanied by the music of archlute players. They insolently turn to Philadelphus insisting on giving advice and proposing solutions for the show. They discuss the choices of the author and they especially disapprove opera *Le nozze dei Baroni durano poco overo Le fortunate Prosperità infelici di Pulcinella ò Le Allegrezze sognate a occhi aperti* (*Opere sceniche diverse in prosa*, 399, II, cc. 65v-102v), in which Pulcinella steals the candlesticks surrounding the catafalque of the King of England, while watching over his corpse. In a theatre that incorporated and shaped the relationship with its spectators, the theft of the candlesticks became a comic paradigm, a game of echoes continually repeated and varied.

Alongside these examples we find a sinister image of Rome, which is depicted as a sordid and violent city, fascinated by horrible and frightful stories and obscene bloody narrations, as documented by the endless catalogue of macabre *lazzi*, that fill the collections of the Roman *scenari*. The catalogue of comic horrors, especially in the collection of Ciro Monarca, *Dell'Opere regie,* includes beheadings, suicides, impalements, uxoricides, infanticides, amputations, sadistic executions and even the desecration of a corpse (in *La Vittoria cacciatrice. Lo scherno delli favolosi dei antichi con le metamorfosi amorose di Zaccagnino creduto Apollo e Spinetta Diana* there is a description where Silvio is 'condotto legato dai pastori, che l'hanno trovato à far essagerazioni sopra d'un cadavero d'una donna in campagna, mà tanto lacerata, sfigurata e smembrata che non si puole ne meno più conoscere solo che si vede esser morta di fresco'; Monarca, c. 51v),[5] or ethnic massacres: in *La Ninfa del Cielo tradita nell'honore con la forza del pentimento*, Magnifico and Dottore announce the decision of the Duchess to exterminate all the inhabitants of Neapolis and Messina who will walk down the street (c. 182v), while in *La casta e costante Ipsicratea con i trionfi di Pompeo nel regno di Ponto nella Farsaglia*), 'si vede il Rè ... l'anello in bocca stratato alla peggio in terra, la Regina col petto ignudo insanguinata stratata anch'essa su la sedia, e pugnale in mano in altra posizione, i consiglieri in diverse positure morti alla tavola anco apparecchiata, e Zenonima e l'altre dame tutte in diverse maniere

---

of his decision to assign the female parts to 'giovani che sono tanto grandi che per parlargli all'orecchio ci vuole una scala di trent agradini' ('boys who are so big that to talk to them in the ear a ladder of thirty steps is needed'). The allusion to boys cast as female characters is very significant, because it certifies the tradition of proscriptions and prohibitions of women on stage, which lasted in Rome for two centuries (from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century). Bans and ostracisms, that can only be seen as a clear sign of isolation and closure (if compared with the theatre of the time elsewhere), in some cases, and in an unexpected way, functioned as an intriguing reference for some excellent spectators. This malpractice can also be perceived as an original characteristic of Roman theatre. Goethe, a spectator of Goldoni's *Locandiera* in Rome in 1778, was to provide a different interpretation of this anachronistic convention, turning it into a potential resource for the Roman theatrical system.

[5] 'Brought tied up by shepherds, who found him in a field while he was raping the corpse of a woman; and the woman was so torn, disfigured and dismembered that it was impossible to recognize her; you can only see that she has just died'.

anch'esse morte dal veleno' (cc. 31v-32r).[6] Masks too are hanged (as is the case of Bertolino, in *Il fratricida, crudele, e le finte caccie*, (c. 158v), throttled (as happens to Finocchio, in *La giustizia catalana*, (Monarca, c. 96r) or impaled (as is the fate of Pulcinella in *Baldovino e Carlotto*, c. 91v).

Attempts at rape and bloody sacrifices fill the 'devotional' plays that were very successful in Rome from the beginning of the century and that are centred on figures of saints and martyrs, of heroes and sinners, and virgins converted to Christianity. Contaminated by the presence of comic characters, once incorporated and assimilated into comic repertoires, they were gradually transformed into ridiculous caricatures and parodies of the original models. Among many possible cases of comic characters accompanying the torments of martyrs and saints, the silly servant Bambacione, who appears in the *opera sacra* of Giuseppe Berneri *Susanna vergine e martire* (1675), can be given as an example of the complete coexistence of antithetical registers. The chaste Susanna, animated by an unshakable faith, manages to defend herself from the traps of an endless line of suitors who desire her alive or even dead (an angel with an unsheathed sword must intervene from the sky to protect her).

As a part of this catalogue of 'comic horrors', it is worth mentioning the so-called 'pellecchia' ('*lazzo* of the cuticle'), which appears in *La Mula*, in the collection of the Locatelliani of the Casanatense Library. The list of stage *Robbe* includes '8 candelette, 8 cappelli gialli, 8 bavarole, bacile, bocaliera, coltello grande per la circoncisione' (Locatelli, 44,1212, c. 349r),[7] that are meant to ridicule Jews. It is a sad and miserable example of an anti-Semitism that spread relentlessly during the seventeenth century in Rome, in the theatre and dramaturgy of the time.

The comic type of the Jew provides unmistakable clues of the most disturbing and degraded aspects of city life. In Rome, at Carnival, year after year, the ritual of the *pallium* ordered that Jews should run naked at breakneck speed while stones and mud were thrown at them. Another brutal tradition would force them to roll, shut up in a barrel, from the top of the Campidoglio or Monte Testaccio. Such shameful episodes are recalled in *mascherate* and find complete expression in the *Giudiate*, the ferocious parodies written in music and to be seen on the floats during Carnival (Crescimbeni 1702, 99).

Alongside these cruel amusements, compositions that recovered and actualized these degraded traditions proliferated and were accepted in some performances that included punishments for the Jews, such as beatings and death sentences of the cruellest kind.

---

[6] 'The king, with his ring in his mouth, is lying on the ground, the Queen, with her breasts uncovered and covered with blood, is lying on a chair, with a dagger in her hand, the counsellors, in different postures, are dead on the set table; even Zenonima and the other ladies are lying poisoned'.

[7] '8 little candles, 8 yellow hats, 8 towels, basin, jug, big knife for circumcision'.

Together with these images of a gloomy Rome, of a city involved in crime, brutality and violence of all kinds, that seems to be populated only by vagabonds and litigants of every sort, graceful theatrical depictions of more reassuring, even light-hearted and peaceful aspects of city life can also be found.

A crowd of rascals swarming through the streets of Rome, a colourful company of Roman servants and boys who seem to be catapulted out of the city's alleys, throng the Roman theatre of the time. They are impertinent rascals who spend time mocking girls, lazing around, playing all day long at different games like '*alla lippa, a cavacece, al trent'uno, al quaranta, o al chiamare, o al carlino*' (Ciancarelli 2014, 88). Their favourite pastimes consist of some ingenious and imaginative pranks, real works of art that involve complex strategies conceived to take advantage of their victims' naivety.

The mask of Norcino is an easy prey for this bizarre comic company. He is the villain who arrives in the city to sell his garden products and becomes a victim of all kinds of deception. Prototype of the troublemaker and the *cafone* ('peasant') unable to adapt to the city rules, Norcino is always grappling with exorbitant and ruthless lawyers and notaries. His theatrical fortune is linked to his special comic language that contaminates different dialects, studded with contumelies, cripples, vulgar tones and curses (Cruciani 1995).

Among the crowds of foreigners and commuters, implanted in a city that boasts of being the 'comune ricetto di tutte le nazioni del mondo' ('common shelter of all nations of the world'), the French character makes his way through a whole repertoire of comic prodigies. Victim of ruthless parodies that combine stereotypes and characteristics of the stubborn and presumptuous type, refined and vain, The Frenchman realizes comic masterpieces consisting of obsessions that arise every time his nationalist pride or his disproportionate sense of honour merge with his fear of being the victim of betrayals. Such obsessions materialize when he talks compulsively, when he insists upon a concept, when he tortures and cripples the meaning of words, or performs inconclusive philosophical tirades.

Next to this list of characters we find Don Pasquale. After his first appearances in the Carnival performances in 1632 (Bouchard 1976, 141) he soon became successful in the Roman comic repertoires of the time. He represents the 'first true Roman character', the emblematic caricature of an aristocrat's behaviour. A young gentleman, hilarious and lazy, a comic mixture of malice, ingenuity and dazed madness, always somewhere between ridicule and pathos, capable of uncontainable and unpredictable extravagance.

If the strength of the rooting of the theatre in the city context and the image of Rome as a significant melting-pot of theatrical models, practices and cultures, as a 'città-teatro' in which everything tends to be spectacular was confirmed and consolidated by these stage inventions, it is right to entrust the claim of its many primacies to a mask, to a 'Roman' Pulcinella that celebrates the city with these words: 'qua ce fioccano da ogni banne, li virtuosi, non solamente dell'arte comica, ma in tutte l'autre scientie, e professioni, perché qua li virtuosi so premiati, e so conosciuti, à dispetto delli maligni, e dell'ignoranti…'[8] (Verucci 1628, p. 7).

Appendix

The document that is presented below is a fragment of a seventeenth-century Roman manuscript comedy: *Osteria del Gallo* by Anonymous, ms. in *Opere sceniche diverse in Prosa*, Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu, Opp. N.N. 399, volume II, cc. 1v-63v. The text, of which here we offer a transcription limited to the first two scenes of Act I and the third scene of act II, presents a list of characters that comprises the most famous masks of seventeenth-century Roman theatre. Its plot is an example of a typology that is widespread in the comic texts of the period: a slender thread (the transformation of a house into an improvised inn to attract and rob patrons) is developed randomly through a series of facts and an assembly of comic gags with no organic connection. It is worth mentioning the significant presence of the character of Pasquariello/Coviello, the mask that refers to the theatrical adventures of Salvator Rosa.

Act One

The work opens with the young Fantino, Ascanio and Camillo. Lionetto mentions the 'trick' against Varrone by Lionetto and the loss to gambling of Ascanio (son of Tiburzio) while he was with Camillo (son of Metello). Ascanio asks Fantino how he can pay off his debt. While they are talking, Zan Caldara (servant of Pantalone) arrives loaded with luggage. Zanni is looking for an inn. Fantino asks him why he is in Rome and what he is doing there; Zanni replies that he is looking for the 'Osteria del Gallo' on behalf of his master, and in the meantime he discovers that he spilled some broth on himself and that he needs to get changed and eat.

He is angry with his master who treats him as a servant, although he is very rich: as a matter of fact, he has a purse full of money around his neck. Fantino plots the prank and invites Zanni to enter the house. Fantino tells Ascanio he found a way to make money: they will pretend that the house is the 'Osteria del Gallo' and they will deceive the rich Pantalone. They will also change their identities: Ascanio will pretend to be Zampino and Fantino will pretend to be Raspa. Lionetto is also involved in the prank. In the meantime, Zanni is eating and drinking. Doctor Varrone (speaking ridiculously in Latin) enters the house and Zanni confuses him with a thief. Moccicone (an ignorant peasant), the servant of Camillo, enters the house insulting Zanni. Meanwhile, Fantino, Lionetto and Ascanio managed to transform their father's house into the 'Osteria del Gallo' (they even found the sign). Zanni, who was asleep, is woken up by Ascanio; as he comes downstairs he meets the French Risciardet, philosopher and alchemist, who is also looking for an inn. There are many misunderstandings between the two, because of their languages. Then The Spaniard arrives: he is Don Guan of Cardon de Cardona, and he is looking for an inn as well. Pantalone enters with Zanni in the fake 'Osteria del Gallo'. Coviello speaks with Varrone about Tiburzio. As soon as they arrive at Tiburzio's home they realize that it has been transformed into the 'Osteria del Gallo'.

---

[8] 'Everybody comes here: people who stand out not only in comic art, but also in all the other sciences and professions, because in this place virtuous people are awarded and renowned, despite malicious and ignorant fellows…'.

Act Two

Ascanio is worried because Tiburzio is coming home and he has not managed to steal the jewel box from Pantalone yet. He talks about it with Fantino and together they devise a new strategy: they will disguise themselves. Meanwhile Metello (a judge), father of Camillo, asks Moccicone why his son does not want to talk with Varrone. Tiburzio arrives in front of his house (that is now transformed into an Osteria) and asks who had the audacity to alter his house in such a way. Fantino, disguised, begins to stutter to avoid being recognized and replies to Tiburzio that he cannot help him; Tiburzio recognizes him despite his stuttering. Fantino asks The Frenchman for help to prevent Tiburzio from entering; Coviello comes to Fantino's defence, Zanni does the same; Tiburzio threatens him, Pantalone defends him. They pull out daggers and knives, even The Spaniard intervenes, in a feast of dialects and theatrical languages. Fantino decides to bring Tiburzio to the judge for the offense received and goes away with Pantalone. Meanwhile, inside the inn, Ascanio and Lionetto pretend that the 'Osteria' is on fire to make everyone flee. Pantalone returns, he claims he has been cheated because instead of going to the Judge Fantino escaped. Zanni understands that his master no longer has a penny; he then decides to let him sit in a wheelbarrow, which they will use to go around and ask for charity. Pantalone is ashamed, but Zanni convinces him. Meanwhile Tiburzio and Ascanio argue: Tiburzio accuses him, Ascanio denies everything and asks for the comfort of Fantino, who blames Varrone. Tiburzio, angry, says for the first time that Ascanio is not his son. Ascanio faints. Tiburzio decides to go to Varrone to clarify what has happened. Varrone, urged by Tiburzio (who wants to send him to jail), asks Norcino to help him to disguise himself.

OSTERIA DEL GALLO

[cc 3r – 6r]

Atto Primo Scena P.ª
Fantino Camillo et Ascanio

Fantino O come è riuscita pur bene la trappola, che hoggi hà fatto Lionetto à questo D. Marrone spaventachio de stornelli. Ascanio ha comesso li errori e il Pedante vi hà fatta la penitenza li argenti han servito per pagare i creditori di Ascanio, et il bastone per le spalle di questa bestia salvatica. Ma i sbirri che vi hà detto messer Tiburzio che faccia venire acciò siano tirate le reti avanti ch'il tordo eschi fuor della machia chi li chiamerà? Ti so dire che mi fa a proposito trattar con sbirri; fuggo la Corte più che il gatto la quaresima

Asc. Sig. Camillo traditore se presto non fuggivo in verità che col mantello ci lasciavo ancora la vita. Mà li 90 scudi che vi hò perso, d'onde li caverò? Son disperato almeno trovassi Fantino. Ò eccolo a punto. Fantino son perduto se non m'aiuti

Fan. È un pezzo che vi perdeste nel giuoco, ed onde volete cavi io questi denari dagl'occhi? Hora ritiratevi in Casa, e non abbaiate più alla Luna lasciatemi fare qualche Incantesimo

Asc. Mi getto tutto nelle tue braccia

Fant. Hor che me l'havete tagliate, aspetate ch'io vedo da lontano un fachino carrico di robbe chi sà che la fortuna non ce lo mandi? Sapete che fate portate giù quel piatto di macherroni con un buon pezzo di cagio parmeggiano del prosciutto, e del buon vino. Miettetevi dentro alla porta si che questo Zanni balordo vi possa vedere perché questa è l'unica e potente calamita di tirar questa sorte di [gh]iottoni.

Asc. Lasciate pur fare à me.

Scena Seconda
Zanni e Fantino

Zan. Venga ol cancher al primo pensir che vegni in tel mazzuch de messer Pantalù mi Padrù d'andar peregrinand pel mod', à son pur statol gran merlot' à lassar metermi sto gharg'adoss che mi hàdislombà tutt'una spala.

Fau. Ecco l'esca da pigliare il pesce.

Zan. Mò che diavol de piazza le stà questa d'isti zon al zert che messir zove ol dif haver fatt di ogni banchett. Al ghe versat tanta la brod della cuxina de sovra via che l'è un subiss', olme par d'esser stat mess int'un bugat tant son bagnad de tutt' band'. Mò cancher ai architett d'esto Paese el non han fatt' ne anch' un hosteria chillo e dis pur ol proverb che Rom ghe la cuxina de meior boccon del mond.

Fan. O pover Zan Caldara e quant'è che tu sei venuto à Roma? Chi t'hà fatto far questo viaggio con tanta carrica adosso?

A.

el ghe port all col
un cassetin de zoie
e de zechin. Mocancher
mi hò scovert il
secret del Padrù

Zan. Al mi son vegnù adess' adess', quel che mi cargò d'esta maniera senza discrettion ol vegnirà despò de mi. **A**. Ma carolin messir dezif un pog' quella là che stà chilò di chi l'è
Fan. È la nostra perché
Zan. Mò non vedi che collù se manza el formai
Fan. Lascialo mangiare che vuol dire che tu ti gratti la gola?
Zan. Ol patis d'un zerto mal messir che com' i veg qualch'ozzett' manzator massem quand mi ho fam ol me sent un brussor al gorgoz
Fan. Che robbe stanno in questo sacco è? M'hanno cera di panni.
Zan. Si pur ch'ei son pan' che messer Pantalù l'è mercant de pan. Mò Diavol stà i n zervell che colù ol te manza el presut fa
Fau. Fa molto bene; o come è bagnata questa Scrittura
Zan. Mò s'è piovud e se se bagna i homen non vole che se bagna la Scriturazz'.
Fan. Mò perche tu dovevi portarla in petto
Zan. Ma de si i pulez i zimez e che soi mi qualch'alter che fa viaz co mi havrif rosegat tutt' i litter. Mo al corp d'un sanguinoz che colù se bef tutt'elzervel.
Fan. In questa Casa il Padrone hà caro che i servi sguazzino
Zan. Non potref piar anche mi per servitor?
Fan. Entra pure e mangia allegramente; Sig. Ascanio lasciate mangiar questo galant'huomo.

(Atto secondo)

Scena Terza
Tiburzio Fantino Francese Pasquarello (Coviello) Zanni Pantalone Spagnuolo Ascanio

Tib. Pur troppo comincio à credere à quel che m'hà detto Varrone se ben tardi. Io non so siamo in Roma opure in Baccano. Io non so vedere d'onde mi possa venire un ingiuria così rilevata. Basta comunque sia questi sono assassinamenti vituperosi, io voglio gridare.
Fan. Qua qua quale insolenza mi è sta sta stata fatta homomomo da bebene
Tib. Onde è uscito questo quagliotto di settebatute
Fant. Vovoglio aiuiutarmi cocon questo foforcocone
Tib. Chi t'hà dato licenza d'entrar in casa mia come hai preso quel forcone dalla mia stalla

Fant. Chi sesesete vovostra mamaesta tututu che voi usurpapapare l'hosteria del Gagagallo
Tib. Tanto havessi mai tu fiato che questa è la casa di mastro Tiburzio
Fant. Non ci sono tatacaborse qua su
Tib. Levati di qua vituperoso
Fant. Li merciai sososono taccaboborse nono li hosti
Tib. Corpo del Cielo che questa e la voce di Fantino come io sono Tiburzio costui è Fantino
Fant. Rumores fuge ò messer francese non lasciate entrar costui
Fran. Chi essere quelle sfasciate che vole fare l'insolente contre le hostelerie delle Galle
Tib. Questa sì ch'è scaltra. Con che licenza sei tu entrato nella casa di messer Tiburzio
Fran. Non son queste le sciase di messere tiralebuffe andate per le fatte vostre che altramente tirarete le buffettone se non basta le buffe
Tib. Mira presunzione lasciami dico entrare in casa mia forfantone insolente
Fran. State lontane che altramante io vi taglio le nase con queste forbiscie d'Alchimie
Tib. Hai ben viso d'Alchimista. Non dubitare che ne pagherai la pena
Fran. Scesone le pene in queste paese, à quelle che esserscitano l'Alchimie? Caparascie ie non voli intrighe, o quelle xentilhomine Napolitane non lasciate entrare all'hostellerie queste forfantonascie
Tib. E che essercito di forfanti s'è accampato nella casa del misero Tiburzio
Cov. Che tira bolge o tira balige intienne buono che te dico naso de taratufolo affrittelato dintro nò sputachio di goliatto: se non parti da loco dall'hosteria dello Gallo vi ha senz'autre bolge, o balige collo viatico di cinquecіento stilletate te faccio fare lo pelegrinaggio delli farisei all'hospetale de satanasso
Tib. Eh che non hò io un manicho di scopa alle mani per accompagnarti infino all'hospedale de pazzarelli
Cov. Tirate di reto non t'accostare piezzo de carne rostuta metto mano alla spata che mò te boglio sventrare, sfegatare, sponzionare, trittare de muodo che lo piezzo chiù grande sia lo dito piccirillo dello pede mancino
Tib. Per mia fe che costui alle fattezze è quel furbo che rubbò un candeliero d'argento alla Pace
Cov. O che pozzi essere impiso colle cauze a braghe, semo conosciuti pe ladri, lassame fuire dintro che non pozza piggiare la stampa d'esta mia faccia zanne ò zanne vorria che tu mandasse a Diavolo questo spione
Zan. Laghè pur far à mì che i vo' co stò spedazzar stòfegadel' senza set'
Tib. Mira quest'altra fantasma ceffo d'Asino levate davanti à quella porta
Zan. Cosa volivù da sta porta messer non vi riguarda vù vis de polancha veccia. Fatevi lardare e poi vegni nello spedon
Tib. Ti torno à dire che la casa e di messer Tiburzio vattene in mal'hora
Zan. Chi e sto messer trit'l'orz'? se voli tritate l'orz andè in qualche stalla de mulater; e nù che volessi tritar i pollaster' starem' all'Hosteria del Gallo
Tib. Sguattaro puzzolente da qua quello spidone e te va all'Hosteria del Gallo ecco la strada
Zan. Oi de podè oh' messer spa[ra]gnol vegni sus che te vegnia ol cancher; ti non voi sentir

Pant. Che rumorxe questo. Fermev' quel zentilhom' lasce star al mio servidor ch'all' cospetazz dell'ostreghe vegniremo al quibus in zinqua Deis

Tib. Questo metter inanzi le mani per non urtar le forze non vi gioverà che pensate di star a Venetia qui farrò ben io vedere che cosa e la giustizia di Roma

Pant. Ma questo xe quello che si desidera perche dunque vegnite con stà insolenza in casa d'altri?

Tib. Che insolenza; che insolenza e la vostra ad occuparmi la casa con tutto quello che è dentro

Pant. Veddi quomod' el sa finzer mettege un pogo il dito in bocca a stò fantolin

Tib. Si può ritrovare il maggior affronto di questo sotto la Luna vecchio sfacciato levatevi da quella porta

Pant. Ma pian co le male crianze messer zovan porte zuzu quella zinqua Dea veni zuzu con l'armi

Cov. Non hai fatto lo testamiento ancora e dove sono li beccamorti fa venire momò le cannele che te boglio scippare l'interiora, e po far portare lo fegato, e Polmone alla Tavola de Iuda, e Pilato

Fran. Per manfoi per manfoi con queste pistolese voler tagliare in buone pezze, e fare une belle pastiscie

Zan. A vis de cavial al te vol sfrissar il mazzuch' co stò cortelaz de molina

Tib. O questo si che è un assassinamento alla strada hora hora voglio dar la querela

Pant. Ande in t'una mal hora bestiazza

Fran. Se ie non tirave queste mane riverse incontra le nase non si partive in utte le sciorne

Zan. Se Zan Caldara non ghe minazzava sto ferr'in tol mazzuch à non se n'andava fin a nott

Spag. Dove sono quei vigliaccos che pretendea far [----] alla pollienta de D. Cardon de Cardona?

Fran. Ad esse sciongono le gravite spagnolesche

Pant. Ben vegnuo el soccorso de Liga

Zan. Ol ghe stad' aspettand' la risposta dal consciole spagnù

Spag. In verdad che à pena arrivado totos s'è rapacificados

Zan. À doved' esser sudad vù messer sparagnol per mi havi fatt'un gran combatter'

Spag. Basta à nos con la propria presienza mandar in fuga lo nimigos

Fant. Sig. Pantalone questo non è tempo da perdere **F** ritiriamoci noi.

FV.s. non sa l'usanza
di questo paese M. Tiburzio
hà fatto il primo l'insolenza
et è il p.mo a darmi la que-
rela; e necessario dunque
se V.S. non vuol restar
di sotto che ancor che
la dij che vi farò ac-
compagnare da un garzon

Works Cited

Manuscript Sources

Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu, *Opere sceniche diverse in prosa*, Opp. N.N. 398-404, vols I-VII.

Biblioteca Casanatense, Roma, Ms. F. IV. 12, Cod. 1211, Basilio Locatelli, *Della scena de' soggetti comici di B. L. R. Parte Prima. M.D.C.XVII.*

Biblioteca Casanatense, Roma, Ms. F. IV. 13, Cod. 1212, Basilio Locatelli, *Della scena de' soggetti comici et tragici di B. L. R. Parte Seconda. M.D.C.XX.*

Biblioteca Casanatense, Roma, Ms. 4186, Ciro Monarca, *Dell'Opere regie*.

Printed Sources

Berneri Giuseppe (1675), *Susanna vergine e martir*e, Roma, Michele Ercole.

Bouchard J.-J. (1976), *Journal I. Les confessions, voyage de Paris à Rome, Le carneval à Rome*, ed. by E. Kanceff, Torino, Giappicchelli.

Bragaglia A.G. (1958), *Storia del teatro popolare romano*, Roma, Colombo.

Ciancarelli Roberto (2008), *Sistemi teatrali nel Seicento. Strategie di comici e dilettanti nel teatro italiano del XVII secolo*, Roma, Bulzoni.

Ciancarelli Roberto (2014), *Teatri di Maschere. Drammaturgie del comico nella Roma del Seicento*, Roma, Bulzoni.

Ciancarelli Roberto (2015), 'A dispetto dei Santi. Frammenti comici, commedie da fare, tipi da farsa nei teatri romani del Seicento', in S. Carandini, ed., *La farsa. Apparenze e metamorfosi sulle scene europee*, Pisa, Pacini, 169-187.

Ciancarelli Roberto (2016), 'Vestire e adornare i testi, separare "aurum e sterquilinio". Annotazioni su rielaborazioni e adattamenti del repetorio spagnolo a Roma', in F. Antonucci and A. Tedesco, eds, *La Comedia nueva e le scene italiane del Seicento. Trame, drammaturgie, contesti a confronto*, Firenze, Leo S. Olschki, 77-89, <https://iris.uniroma1.it/retrieve/handle/11573/929818/341814/R.%20Ciancarelli%2C%20Vestire%20e%20adornare%20i%20testi%2C%20separare%20%C2%ABaurum%20e%20sterquilinio%C2%BB.%20Annotazioni%20su%20rielaborazioni%20e%20adattamenti%20del%20repertorio%20spagnolo%20a%20Roma%2C%20in%20Leo%20S.%20Olschki%20Editore%2C%20Firenze%202016.pdf>, accessed 10 January 2019.

Ciancarelli Roberto and Luciano Mariti (2012), 'Roma capitale invisibile del teatro del Seicento, Dossier 1', *Teatro e Storia* 33, 81-123, <http://www.teatroestoria.it/pdf/33/dossier_ciancarelli.pdf>, accessed 10 January 2019.

Ciancarelli Roberto and Luciano Mariti (2015), 'Roma capitale invisibile del teatro del Seicento, Dossier 3', *Teatro e Storia* 36, 213-267, <http://www.teatroestoria.it/pdf/36/TeS%202015_Ciancarelli_Mariti_Roma%20capitale%20invisibile%20del%20teatro%20del%20Seicento.pdf>, accessed 10 January 2019.

Crescimbeni G.M. (1702), *Comentarj del canonico Gio.Mario Crescimbeni custore d'Arcadia, intorno alla sua Istoria della volgar poesia*, vol. I, Roma, Antonio de Rossi.

Cruciani Gianfranco (1995), *Il Norcino in scena*, Perugia, Quattremme.

Di Muro Noemi (1999), ‘Il teatro di Giovan Battista Ricciardi (1623-1686). Il linguaggio comico del Trespolo’, *Biblioteca Teatrale* 49-51, 145-193.

Franchi Saverio (1988), *Drammaturgia romana. Repertorio bibliografico cronologico dei testi drammatici pubblicati a Roma e nel Lazio*, vol. I (sec. XVII), Roma, Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Hulfeld Stefan, ed. (2014), *Scenari più scelti d'istrioni. Italienisch-Deutsche Edition der Einhundert Commedia all'improvviso-Szenarien aus der Sammlung Corsiniana*, Vienna, Vienna University Press.

Lorenzani G.A. (1692), *La Caffarella o vero La canterina volubile*, Roma, per il Buagni.

Mariti Luciano (2013), ‘Roma capitale invisibile del teatro del Seicento. Dossier 2’, *Teatro e Storia* 34, 75-142, <http://www.teatroestoria.it/pdf/34/roma_capitale.pdf>, accessed 10 January 2019.

Molinari Isabella (1999), ‘Il teatro di Salvator Rosa’, *Biblioteca Teatrale* 49-51, 195-248.

Passeri G.B. (1772), *Vite de' Pittori, Scultori e Architetti, che anno lavorato in Roma. Morti dal 1641 al 1673*, Roma, Gregorio Settari.

Testaverde A.M., ed. (2007), *I canovacci della Commedia dell'Arte*, Torino, Einaudi.

Verucci Virgilio (1628), *La Colombina*, Foligno, Agostino Alteri.