Early Modern Liveness

Mediating Presence in Text, Stage and Screen

Edited by
Danielle Rosvally and
Donovan Sherman

THE ARDEN SHAKESPEARE
LONDON • NEW YORK • OXFORD • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY

THE ARDEN SHAKESPEARE
Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
50 Bedford Square, London, WC1B 3DP, UK
1385 Broadway, New York, NY 10018, USA
29 Earlsfort Terrace, Dublin 2, Ireland

BLOOMSBURY, THE ARDEN SHAKESPEARE and the Arden Shakespeare logo are trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published in Great Britain 2023

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN: HB: 978-1-3503-1847-2
ePDF: 978-1-3503-1849-6
eBook: 978-1-3503-1848-9

Typeset by Deanta Global Publishing Services, Chennai, India
Printed and bound in XX

To find out more about our authors and books visit www.bloomsbury.com and sign up for our newsletters.

5

Alive in the (early) modern repertory

Elizabeth E. Tavares

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, scholars of early modern performance attuned their endeavours to how theatre was and is made. This has included explorations of the business of playing, theatre companies, and their personnel and training; the spaces of playing, performance venues, and their archaeology and reconstruction; and the materials of playing, such as props, costumes and cosmetics, and their makers. Deriving from this critical energy was an impulse to apply select historical practices (such as shared light) and materials (such as period costume) to new productions of early modern plays by William Shakespeare and his contemporaries. These experiments across the United States and the United Kingdom have practised an eclectic selection of period or 'original' practices in order to further economic goals constrained by a marketplace whose economics no longer closely align structurally or culturally with that of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England. Applying only select practices rather than a systematic ecosystem of performance conditions has likewise limited the extent to which the observations and results garnered from these tests can be replicated and theorized.

An especial factor impeding experimentation with early modern theatre has to do with its most fundamental structural and economic feature: repertory scheduling. Playing companies of the

late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries produced up to six different plays a week, distributing new and revised parts among a stable group of players. This system, emphasizing a variety of plays rather than players, inverts the current Anglophone marketplace, whose typical practice it is to hire a new cast and production team for several-month runs of a single play. The early modern production system makes room for the unpredictability, accident, improvisation and other affordances of 'liveness' that come with little rehearsal and much variety. The current production system prioritizes ostensibly perfect delivery of a text and a specific artistic vision, duplicated with as little variation as possible up to eight days a week. Employing players trained within this second system in short-lived or one-off experiments can cause anxiety as it is sometimes interpreted as asking professionals to un-train themselves, adding further variables to the exploration.

It is hardly a novel observation to say that part of what it meant to be live in the early modern theatre was to be in collaboration, to be playing with others. While 'original practice' (OP) and other performance-based research projects readily attest to this collaboration in the making ready of a single play for performance, a crucial next evolution is the study of players sharing a discrete ecosystem of co-dependent practices over an extended period of time. As Stephen Purcell and Rob Conkie have observed, 'specifically Shakespearean projects [have] tended to focus entirely on modern practice', or what contemporary practitioners might gain from period practices, rather than considering those practices regardless of applied utility.[1] While both aims are valuable, the results they can sustain vary and are limited by their economic contexts. It is significant that two crucial projects that come close to employing a repertory schedule – the Read Not Dead Project, which stages readings of all the surviving plays by Shakespeare's contemporaries, and Edward's Boys, which performs the repertory of the boy companies by players of comparable age, both operate adjacent to a subsuming organization: Shakespeare's Globe in London and King Edward VI School in Stratford-upon-Avon, respectively.[2] (As late as 2016, no experiments approaching an early modern repertory schedule have been recorded.[3]) The eclectic nature of the selection of practices for which there is historical evidence and the inability to test these practices in a repertory context introduce variables that impact what happens in performance. What might a project design

concerning early modern dramaturgy that identifies and traces a discrete practice or technique live in performance look like?

This chapter offers a case study of one company, the Original Practice Shakespeare Festival (OPSF) based in Portland, Oregon, which regularly employs a repertory schedule and dedicated company, and trains their cast in a fixed if eclectic selection of 'original practices' as standard practice. By charting a trend in their 2017 season with the prompter at its centre, I provide a snapshot from which one might derive the beginnings not necessarily of research questions but rather of research project designs for studying early modern drama in live performance – Shakespeare or his contemporaries, for then or now.

Practices

A key feature of medieval and early modern performance, the prompter 'ran' performances, argues Tiffany Stern and Simon Palfrey, by 'unit[ing] the actors with their separate parts, gestures, actions'.[4] The early modern prompter was responsible for text and action, directing players within the tiring house as well as 'those already on stage'.[5] Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century archives attest to the success of the prompter in offering 'ways in which separately prepared actors could be successfully brought together' and diminishing the 'need for over-much ensemble preparation before performance'.[6] In cataloguing several contemporary companies' experiments with 'First Folio techniques', Don Weingust observes two additional features of the prompter.[7] First, the job of the prompter 'would not have been to interfere with the progress of the play', such as correcting minor misspoken words, but rather to 'keep the play moving' and counteract any 'danger posed by a missed cue'.[8] The incorporation of a 'visible, aurally unmasked' prompter in performances by the Original Shakespeare Company (OSC) at Shakespeare's Globe in the late 1990s and early 2000s, and the later publication of Patrick Tucker's *Secrets of Acting Shakespeare: The Original Approach* (2002), would go on to have a significant, lasting impact on regional theatre companies. A rise in American universities sponsoring study-abroad trips to Shakespeare's Globe (London, UK) in the early 2000s particularly for undergraduate majors in English and Theatre, as well as the early popularity of

the venue as a destination for professional development, quickly normalized the practice of using an onstage prompter to these one-time and occasional playgoer-practitioners. The practice was also carried out by former members of the influential New England Shakespeare Festival (1994–2006) helmed by Demitra Papadinis, which used an onstage prompter and employed a variation on techniques promoted by Tucker.[9]

While OP would continue to be debated at major institutions such as Shakespeare's Globe and the American Shakespeare Center (ASC, Staunton, Virginia), many smaller regional theatre companies and Shakespeare in the Park community groups formed in the early 2000s and detached from these debates retained this approach. This regional emphasis on OP might be understood as a further evolution from the 1980s and 1990s critical ferment Jeremy Lopez identifies across literary criticism related to the advent of New Historicism, as well as popular re-investment in a range of re-enactment modes, from 'reconstructed' theatre spaces to the now well-known Civil War monument building boom of the late twentieth century.[10] The 'pervasive pedagogical language used by original practice companies', offering school visits and kid-friendly programming to low-income communities (as does OPSF), is deeply entwined with larger cultural shifts in the United States to find new ways of monetizing scholarship.[11] Festivals like OPSF are an 'influential phenomenon', argues Paul Prescott, representing the 'first meaningful live encounter with the plays of William Shakespeare and, for some, the time they see live Shakespeare – or theatre of any kind'; 'for tens of thousands . . . it's what they *do* every summer'.[12] It can be argued that since their rise in the 1960s, North American Shakespeare festivals have advertised something akin to OP in their venue architecture, costuming, approach to dialect or other features that position the theatre-going experience as somehow more 'authentically' Shakespeare than other modern theatres.

Shakespeare's Globe and other international venues moved away from 'authenticity' as a central marketable feature throughout the early 2000s, relying instead on an axiology of the unexpected suggested by OP; 'OP' as a term Stephen Purcell argues 'recognizes that Globe practitioners hand-pick what is useful from historical performance in order to transform modern theatre practice'.[13] Smaller regional companies like OPSF, Back Room Shakespeare

Project (Chicago, Illinois), Shakespeare's Tavern (Atlanta, Georgia) and others have maintained this feature of their *institutional dramaturgy*, James Steichen's term for 'the practices through which an arts institution structures its patrons' experiences in the service of advancing its goals or articulating its identity'.[14] All of those features of the performance event beyond the recitation and enactment of a play's text, from pre-show speeches to Instagram marketing campaigns, work to 'stage an institution', positioning how playgoers should understand the personal value of attending and investing in a specific theatre company. US-based OP companies routinely rely on a simultaneous appeal of history instruction with what Purcell describes as 'a nostalgic image of a lost and better past' to cultivate returner audiences from low-income communities unable to access the more expensive or travel-dependent Shakespeare-oriented venues.[15] Weingust has similarly critiqued the 'selective nature of original practices as practised', suggesting endeavours like that of OPSF 'are more "performances of authenticity"' rather than '"authentic performances"'.[16] Large-scale projects with the potential infrastructure for repertory-scale explorations, such as the ASC, 'invoke historical authenticity as a means to an end' with 'strict adherence to the past in some respects and blithe disregard in others' as a marketing tool only: 'You'll come for the past, but you'll stay for the present'.[17] While the company has experimented with what they term the 'Actors' Renaissance' or 'Ren Run' season and a recent actor–manager pay-scale hierarchization, both still employ a dedicated pre-performance rehearsal period, most recently of a four-play rotating repertory not analogous with surviving schedules from the period. As Sarah Dustagheer outlines, early modern performance practices 'real or assumed . . . exposes the contradiction at the heart of much modern theatre between the intensely collaborative and the deeply hierarchical practices, as well as issues of interpretive power, singular or collaborative creative visions, artistic control and audience focus'.[18] Such choices are about 'sustaining the *conditions* in which performances of Shakespeare can thrive', observes Prescott, 'more to do with *organizational practices* than aesthetic choices'. Contemporary playgoers have been habituated to occasional theatre attendance through long runs of a single play. Occasional attendance habits do not support a repertory schedule designed to facilitate more regular, if not weekly or daily, attendance in order to be economically sustainable. Thus,

study of the effects of repertory on early modern performance practices stands at odds with a theatre's survival in the current marketplace.

Teleprompter

Since 2009, indicative of an OPSF performance has been the Prompter. The figure emblematizing OPSF's institutional dramaturgy of instruction combined with nostalgia was that of the Prompter. The role presents a period practice unfamiliar to playgoers based on previous theatre-going experiences that is also framed by the comfort of the familiarity of Shakespeare, resonating with at least the federally recommended Common Core for high school instruction.[19] The Prompter performed a live historical re-enactment while externalizing the acceptability not only for error but also for an invitation to improvisation and the unexpected – what Conkie has described in Shakespeare's Globe as 'aleatoric' effects where the unexpected prompts new avenues for inquiry.[20] After nearly a decade of experimentation and refinement of the Prompter as a part of performance, in OPSF productions the 'role' took on a level of virtuosity beyond what early modern archives attest and thus developed into a unique, company-specific practice. In a typical OPSF performance, the Prompter dressed in a black-and-white striped sports referee jersey with a field whistle (see Figure 5.1). After introducing the production title with a brief historical survey of their practice – describing scrolls as Shakespeare's 'teleprompter' – the Prompter would take a seat in the lawn stage-left with a folding chair, table and prompt book. The OPSF Prompter's role is to serve as a 'safety net' for the players when they 'fell out' enough so that cues for the next speaking part were missed, as well as for the playgoers, interjecting as to keep them clear on the plot and characters' motives. Prompters provided missed lines, missed entrances and supplemented the soundscape. For example, in *Macbeth*, the Prompter rattled a sheet of tin for thunder, slapped their thighs to mimic war drums and rapped on the Prompter's table to replicate knocking for the Porter's gate.[21] They provided cover for the unexpected, especially in the case of Shakespeare in the Park performances so marked by a public, shared environment. Playing in rep across several city parks gave

FIGURE 5.1 Romeo and Juliet, *Willamette Park, 21 July 2017. From left: Kaia Maarja Hillier (Juliet), Jonah Leidigh (Paris), Alec Lugo (Nurse), Joel Patrick Durham (Tybalt), Isabella Buckner (Prompter), accompanied by musicians Rachel Saville and David Bellis-Squires. Courtesy of the author with permission from the company.*

OPSF opportunities to experiment with new spaces and practice the skill of appropriating the features of landscape and architecture. That the company primarily travelled to perform in non-dedicated spaces could be understood as an 'original practice' given that, according to Siobhan Keenan, touring was a regular practice of playing companies, predating and continuing alongside the advent of dedicated venues.[22] For example, Willamette Park is also the site of a busy boat launch in southeast Portland. On a noisy afternoon, Prompter Beth Yocam, referring to the loud honking and party music coming off the river during a performance of *The Comedy of Errors*, asked Antipholus of Syracuse (Shandi Muff), 'There's a lot of boat stuff going on right now. Antipholus, could you tell us how you got to this island?' The show-stopping laughter that erupted to Muff's reply, 'Boat', was only accessible by performers and playgoers being live to the opportunity the environment made

available and evidenced playgoers' imaginations actively converting the hip-hop from a party speed-boat to merchant sailors singing as they pull in to Ephesus.

Improviser

A few weeks into the summer season, OPSF launched its central fundraising campaign for the year, WIL Fest, whose initials stand for the three major Portland metro parks in which the company performed: Willamette, Irving and Laurelhurst. The aim is to demonstrate the virtuosity their unmemorized approach sponsors in a repertory setting, ideally garnering larger audiences, donations and potential school clients for in-class workshops during the academic year. In July and August of 2017, the company performed fifteen different plays by Shakespeare over a three-week period, either at 2:00 p.m. or 7:00 p.m., and on some days both. Each year the company adds two new Shakespeare plays to their repertory to be introduced during the WIL Fest. There was no rehearsal with the exception of what the company calls 'batting practice', or a separate rehearsal time for any music, fight or dance choreography. In late spring, the company held 'play sessions' to practice moving with scrolls in hand and improv techniques. The sports metaphors are of a piece with the framework employed by Edward's Boys; Harry McCarthy has observed that the 'company's approach runs parallel to the operations of a rugby team'.[23] Otherwise, players were provided with just the text of their individual part for the performance that day, which they each were asked to individually print and mount on a dowel to create their own scroll, usually held in place with elastic hair ties. The players were invited to review their individual parts in advance as well as decide on and provide their own costumes based on a contemporary dress unless a specific need, such as armour or a friar's robes, were required. Without a rehearsal period, the company paid players by performance, typically US$75 per show, which was funded through community sponsors and donations gathered after passing the bucket. While players could treat the performances as professional, résumé-building work, the lack of a rehearsal period made the company ineligible for regional theatre accolades, the Drammy Awards.[24] Individual performances regularly employed doubling, with casts ranging from thirteen to

seventeen members, including apprentices and interns, as well as one of three rotating stage managers. Company members participating in the WIL Fest performed in as many as eleven and as few as a single performance of the fifteen productions mounted between 21 July and 7 August.[25]

Well practiced as a company by the start of the WIL Fest, the Prompter's role had evolved from a 'safety net' into one that made creative opportunities out of unexpected interruptions to the action of the play, including regularly interrupting the action on purpose for such improvisations. Prompter interruptions were most frequently in the service of character development, suggesting the company's mindfulness of playgoers unfamiliar with Shakespeare. For example, prompting for a performance of *Romeo and Juliet*, Isabella Buckner made the most of a few extra seconds due to a slow entrance to ask: 'Hey Benvolio, what's your favourite band?' Noah Goldenberg (as Benvolio) replied, capitalizing on recent events: '3 Doors Down, until they played the inauguration'. The knowing laughter this produced in playgoers was commensurate with the larger scene in which Romeo, Mercutio and Benvolio prepare to infiltrate an elite party not unlike an inaugural ball. A challenge to creating the opportunity for such 'one-liners' seems in being keenly aware of the affective priorities of a particular moment in the world of the play; 'pitching' a player a brief open-ended question they can do something with; and possessing a honed awareness of pacing in order to take advantage of silences, delays and interruptions, the most frequent being passing planes flying in and out of Portland International Airport. During one such interruption of *Julius Caesar*, Joel Patrick Durham (as Prompter) asked Lissie Lewis (as Lucius), 'Why are you always so tired?', to which she immediately replied, 'Well, I have a new boyfriend'. Brutus's servant is routinely falling asleep in the Shakespeare text, which, while ultimately serving important dramaturgical goals later in the play, goes unexplained initially. Playing a male-identified Lucius, the improvisation not only inserted a quick moment of queer affirmation but also invented a reason for Lucius's hitherto unexplained sleep deprivation (see Figure 5.2). While the function of the Prompter was ostensibly that of safety net, in effect they did more work as a collaborator with the company and co-author of the Shakespeare hypotext.

The company comprised a rotating troupe of fifty-five members employing a policy to avoid casting players in the same role twice.

FIGURE 5.2 Julius Caesar, *Irving Park, 22 July 2017. From left: Beth Yocam (Brutus), Lissie Lewis (Lucius), and Joel Patrick Durham (Prompter). Courtesy of the author with permission from the company.*

There were and have since been certain exceptions for specialists needed for skills, such as Andrew Bray performing original live music as the many singing clowns, or accounting for race and gender equity, such as the regular performance of Jennifer Lanier, a local drag-king who identifies as multi-racial, in the title role of *Othello*. (Lanier would later become co-artistic director as part of the company's ongoing efforts to sponsor diversity and inclusion.) Players experimented with a wide range of parts that a lifelong career as a Shakespeare specialist at a major professional company may not necessarily afford. Female-identifying members frequently voiced the professional and personal importance of their being able to perform major roles that, in their experience, were rarely cross-gender cast, such as Macbeth or Benedick. The company benefited from developing a rapport, becoming familiar with one another's timing, movement preferences and improvisational habits

regardless of part. Ivo van Hove, artistic director of International Theatre Amsterdam (ITA), has employed a similar practice since 2001 of contracting players for a season to work across all of ITA's productions in order to benefit from 'develop[ing] deep working relationships with one another, and with directors, over many years'.[26] As Helen Lewis contends, the trust cultivated in these regular collaborators enables van Hove to 'create boundary-pushing productions' that confront issues such as self-harm, paedophilia and anti-Semitism.[27] OPSF's use of the repertory system similarly habituated performers to one another rather than individual performers to their individual roles.

These structural features of casting made available opportunities for Prompters to cultivate 'running gags' or repeated jokes within a single performance, as well as across performances. For example, when prompting for *Merry Wives of Windsor*, Muff interjected in the very first scene to get a sense of how the wealthy Windsor husbands, Mr Page (Tom Witherspoon) and Mr Ford (Keith Cable), proposed to their wives. As characters with few lines and little opportunity for development, it was a crucial moment to introduce themselves and help playgoers differentiate between them and the two kinds of marriages they represent. While his wife (Shani Harris-Bagwell) was performed as devoted, Ford's proposal was less than romantic:

FORD Wehavebeenseeingeachotherforawhilewouldyouliketo getmarried. There was a proposal. It was agreed to. It was a transaction. I don't know what you want!
PROMPTER How long have you been married?
FORD I don't know!

Mrs Page (Sarah Jane Fridlich) made clear in her own improvised aside that a happy marriage is one where you are at the 'top of the relationship food chain'. Later, the Prompter interjected to ask the same of Mr Page while speaking with Shallow (David C. Olson). Mr Page turned to Shallow, got on his knee and delivered a proposal so affecting it resulted in an impromptu make-out session. Asides about the quality of marriage proposals continued throughout the performance almost as if a parallel play or verbal footnotes. Any mention of love operated as an offer or cue from the context of the play on which players improvised, gradually increasing the stakes

over time. The production's use of text to warrant choices related to but beyond merely presenting the words captures W.B. Worthen's model for critically approaching Shakespeare in performance:

> Theatre is not a vehicle for textual transmission. Stage performance uses writing not to communicate with words to an audience, but to create those problematic performativities of the stage, the entwining of the fictive in the actual, the drama in the performers' *doing*, that animates (our appetites for) acting. The words of 'the text' (itself a manifest fiction: no performance, of Shakespeare or otherwise, uses a single text) may be spoken, but in a crucial sense actors don't deliver 'words' to their offstage auditors: they *do* things with them, entreat, condescend, wound, instrumentalize the verbal text as one of many means to creating acts in the event of performance.[28]

OPSF's repertory casting; material stage technologies of part, scroll, and backstage plot; travelling schedule; and onstage prompter might seem at first glance to centre a preservation of a supposed authentic or original text. In effect, these practices make the text readily and immediately available to players from which to improvise verbally or non-verbally, to '*do* things with them'. Local reviews emphasize simultaneously the improv and the collaboration as notable features of the company, spending more time considering these over OP elements. A 2016 Oregon ArtsWatch piece concluded, 'Original Practice Shakespeare players have a great talent for improv', which 'allows the audience and cast to work together, and the words to stand, as they can, on their own'.[29] So while the Prompter was present ostensibly to keep the company on book, the majority of their time was spent taking the company off-book, and were rewarded.

Shepherd

The Prompter was also the cornerstone of the company's institutional dramaturgy: marketing themselves on programmes, flyers and social media with the tagline, 'Because Shakespeare should be a little dangerous!'[30] This was tied to both the unmemorized nature of performance, with parts in hand, and the Prompter that necessitated

it. While the Prompter is text centred, using the prompt book to track the action of the play, the other text they negotiated – both for warrants to performance and to ward off interruptions that might bring the production to a halt – was the outdoor environment (see Figure 5.3). The performance took place in busy public parks with heavy traffic, from walkers, runners, cyclists, pets and boat-owners during an increasingly hot summer; on 3 August, during the last week of the WIL Fest, temperatures peaked at 104ºF (40ºC). Unlike indoor theatres in the region, such as Portland Center Stage and Artists Repertory Theatre, where cellphones and candy wrappers are carefully policed, interruptions of all kinds were routinely invited, specifically as a source of improv in order to get

FIGURE 5.3 Much Ado About Nothing, *Irving Park, 23 July 2017. Attempting to use the audience as a substitution for the arbour to hide behind and overhear the other men, Brian Burger (Benedick) borrowed hats from individual playgoers stacked high on his head as a disguise. Kerry Leek (Prompter) would later collect and redistribute them back to their owners. Courtesy of the author with permission from the company.*

passers-by to stay, watch and donate. For example, the performance of *Twelfth Night* was set upon by a great number of cyclists using the nearby path on the edge of the lawn. Approximately thirty stopped to watch a scene featuring Viola/Cesario (Kaia Maarja Hillier), crowding the concessions and startling the group. The Prompter (Durham), a cyclist himself, paused the action: 'Woah, so many bikes! Cesario, would you, in a poem, invite them to join our show?' Hillier walked through the playgoers, up to the cyclists, opened her arms and improvised a first stanza of a sestina that was part explanation of the performance and part invitation to sit, which a few did. Advertising was facilitated by the Prompter role in both advance marketing and during performances.

The afternoon performances in the middle of weekends typically had the greatest ambient volume, such as ongoing basketball games, commercial planes flying over to the nearby airport and frequent off-leash visitors, including dogs, cats and squirrels. When, in *Julius Caesar*, a servant re-enters in act two and Caesar (Brian Allard) asks 'What say the augurers?', he addressed the question to a group of dogs rather than the servant. During one flyover that was too loud to really continue the text as written, the Prompter (Kerry Leek) asked Dogberry (Cable), 'Dogberry, if you ran the TSA, what would that look like?', to which he replied:

> *(To tied-up Borachio and Conrade)* What is your destination? Jail? Good. *(Gestured as if to guide them through a metal detector.)* Now Verges, typically if they had anything to declare they would do so before proceeding. That they proceeded without declaring proves they are innocent.

As illustrated here, interruptions by airplanes, boats or other vehicles were typically addressed through object work or other kinds of miming to either continue the scene unspoken or reiterate an aspect of plot. Usually, when a plane was too loud to perform, the Prompter cried out, 'It's a plane! Everyone make an SOS real quick!' The players would shout, jump and improv anything else one might do to get the attention of rescue, which was especially effective for narratives set on an island, such as *The Tempest* (see Figure 5.4). Doing so on multiple occasions worked to conscript the real world into the fiction of the play rather than trying to rigidly demarcate a difference between them. Similarly, during *Romeo and Juliet*, loud

FIGURE 5.4 Much Ado About Nothing, *Irving Park, 23 July 2017. From left: Sarah Jane Fridlich (Hero), Beth Yocam (Beatrice), Mara McCarthy (Margaret), and Kerry Leek (Prompter). Courtesy of the author with permission from the company.*

police sirens passed during a scene between Friar Lawrence (Allard) and Romeo (Ken Yoshikawa). The Prompter (Buckner) asked, 'Romeo, why are the cops after you?', to which Romeo responded by silently jumping and disappearing into the tent that served as the company's mobile tiring house. To this the Friar remarked, 'Trespassing'. Later, a thirty-second industrial barge horn overtook the scene when Juliet (Hillier) is impatient to hear news of her love from the Nurse (Alec Lugo). While the Prompter did try to ask a re-directing question ('Hey Nurse, how did you meet your husband?'), it was not possible to really hear or give an answer. Instead, as the cross-dressing Nurse, Lugo held up his skirts to feign a hoop-sized fart. Several other players joined in to fan and waft around him as if trying to dispel a pungent and loud passing of wind.

Oregon ArtsWatch interpreted the tagline of 'dangerous' as an invitation to 'throw out all the decorum that your blue-haired grandma worked so diligently to foster in you'.[31] Despite

FIGURE 5.5 Much Ado About Nothing, *Irving Park, 23 July 2017. From left: Kerry Leek (Prompter), Sarah Jane Fridlich (Hero), and Mara McCarthy (Margaret). Courtesy of the author with permission from the company.*

this claim to danger, in the three weeks of performances not a single case of falling out occurred where the performance had to be brought to a halt or major prompter intervention needed (see Figure 5.5). Friction lay elsewhere. In the WIL Fest performance of *The Taming of the Shrew*, Brian Burger demonstrated how performer knowledge of a play could impact the Prompter's performance, and even be resisted by the company. Having played Petruchio in the Mission Theatre performance the preceding April, he cued for improvisation frequently so as to draw attention to and at times satirize the play's structural misogyny. For example, when stopping Gremio (Cable) to ask, 'Gremio, what's your opinion on women's suffrage?', Cable replied, 'I don't think anyone should have to suffer, except maybe for love'. In a similar moment, as Prompter he took advantage of a delayed entrance to ask Petruchio (Michael C. Jordan) to 'give us your thoughts on Title IX'. The reply, 'I'm not a softball coach; I don't care',

began a trend for the improvisations that dismissed opportunities to engage with the play's sexism, although it could be argued that this was in the spirit of characterization warranted by the text. Despite Burger's good intentions to make explicit the sexual politics of the play, the other male-identifying cast members instead leaned into their characters in a move not typical of the general trend of cued improvisation during the 2017 WIL Fest. After Horatio (Lugo) had been beaten with his lute by Katherina (Jessica Hirschhorn), again the Prompter attempted to create an opportunity from a pause, asking 'Hortensio, what do you think of the recent transgender military news?' Lugo's sputtering reply, 'Why are we having this conversation?!' was commensurate with his character's need to nurse his physical wounds but not the broader trends of the company's reliance on pop culture and topical news. The distinction between Prompter and player blurred when Berger replied, 'Because I said so!' Rather than continue the engagement, Lugo found his next line as Hortensio and continued the scene anyway, dismissing the Prompter's direction. All three interruptions used a component of women's rights history to draw out the quality of the misogyny surrounding Katherina.

The final example is perhaps the most effectively nefarious where Hortensio (as Cambio) resists the direction of the Prompter, suggesting that he believed the rules of the game quite literally do not apply to him. None of the female-identified players or players in women's roles were provided similar cues to improv, so the disjunction between the male-identifying prompter and male-identified players produced the sense that only men were having conversations about and dictating the gender politics of the world of the play, which could be read as either satirizing the misogyny of the play or replicating it. It was a surprising contrast to the performance of the same play with the same company three months earlier that incorporated pink knit 'pussyhats', recently a feature of #MeToo political marches in Washington, D.C., and across the United States. That production had been prompted by Lauren Saville, a company member and professional therapist who used expressive arts therapy praxis to organize the playgoers' processing of the play both during and in a seventy-person talk-back afterwards.[32] The two performances in relatively close succession suggest the impact the Prompter role has in leveraging improv to divergent political positions.

One challenge *Shrew* poses to cuing has to do with the fact that improvisation is culturally habituated in the United States to serve humour as compared to other kinds of affective response. For example, when prompting for *The Tempest*, Lugo frequently cued to establish the island setting (aided by the nearby busy Willamette River) and character development. The company seemed primed to respond to opportunities to evolve their characters in context. This frequently was located in the body or in costumes that, in the speed of an improvised moment, relied on fat-shaming and possibly racially derogatory stereotypes. For example, Falstaff (Bellis-Squires) of *Merry Wives* was 'on the Atkins Diet, the South Beach Diet, and four or five others . . . I don't think you're supposed to do them all at once'. By contrast, in a performance of *The Comedy of Errors* improvisation is leveraged to the opposite effect. When Dromio of Syracuse (Buckner) described the kitchen maid as 'spherical, like a globe; I could find out countries in her', Antipholus of Syracuse (Muff) broke from character to directly address playgoers: 'Strap-in, folks, we have some serious fat-shaming coming up. Triggers'. The desire to inject humour into every serious or threatening moment of *The Tempest* came most often at the expense of Caliban, such as in a cued exchange that included players of colour:

PROMPTER Can you guys do a fashion show and discuss the clothes you've found?
CALIBAN These are clothes. I wear them like a man do.
STEPHANO These are the latest in island fashion. I am the best model on this island!
PROMPTER How about you, Trinculo?
TRINCULO I was feeling pretty good until the others went and now I'm just sad.

The communal effects of improvisation are apparent here, where each player was provided an opportunity to clarify how their character's attitude was different from their immediate peers. The political risks of non-scripted performance (as opposed to technical risk, where the work of acting comes to a full stop) were similar to *Shrew*. Caliban was performed with incorrect grammar even in this extratextual moment, making him seem not only the least fashionable but the least articulate of the group. The intended rhetorical error of 'do'

for 'does' was not an emulation of an indicative rhetorical pattern for the character warranted by the Shakespeare text but an entirely new strategy of derogatory portrayal of a piece with nineteenth- and twentieth-century US minstrelsy conventions, inserting a mode of contemporary rather than contemporaneous racism. There were a few occasions when players used improvisation to counteract the normalizing effects of repeating un-remarked racist portions of the text live in performance, such as when Benedick (Burger) gave the line, 'Then I am – dammit Shakespeare – a Jew!' Such interjections were more infrequent as compared to the inverse.

As these examples suggest, the company also experimented with casting. Having routinely cast female-identifying players in the role of men, and vice versa, this season was the first to incorporate an added sensitivity. Individual players were also asked to decide what gender they were going to present their character as, indicated to the company in a pre-show circle warm-up for each performance. Pronouns were to be amended live to follow suit; playgoers were not notified but left to discover this as part of the performance. For example, in a performance of *Henry IV, Part One*, Buckner played Hotspur and also chose to perform the role as a woman. (That same summer the Oregon Shakespeare Festival cast Alejandra Escalante as Hotspur and emphasized the homoerotics made available in scenes with her wife; Ashland, Oregon, is approximately a five-hour drive from Portland.) While male-identified players seemed unable to engage gender politics in moments of improvisation with *Shrew*, the opposite was true in this performance where Hotspur, his wife, Hal and the Prompter were all performed by female-identifying players. For example, interrupting the first scene in the play between King Henry IV and Hotspur, who was refusing to turn over hostages, the Prompter (Muff) asked Hotspur, 'What makes you so hot?':

> HOTSPUR Well, they told me I had to wear a dress for this.
> PROMPTER So, you went looking for a white pantsuit?
> HOTSPUR Exactly.

The moment draws attention to the 2016 US presidential election the previous year and the historical fact that became popularized in relation to the Hilary Clinton campaign: women senators were unable to wear pants on Capitol Hill until the 1990s.[33] Commenting on

the costume underscored Hotspur's difficulty not only with obeying the authority of his king but with inequitable social codes generally. Further facilitating this interpretation of Hotspur as resisting both political and gendered social codes then and now was the maintaining of Lady Percy's (Sullivan Mackintosh) gender identity so that they were a same-sex couple. As Prompter, Muff recycled a cue for improvisation from earlier in the season by asking for engagement stories:

> PROMPTER Lady, how did she propose?
> LADY PERCY Over waffles, milkshakes –
> PROMPTER Was there bacon?
> LADY PERCY We were having waffles but not bacon. I'm a vegetarian. When I was drinking my milkshakes, well, there was a ring at the bottom. Points for creativity, but it was all sticky!
> HOTSPUR She's missing the part where (*mimes*) I took it out of her hand, popped it in my mouth (*mimes rinsing in mouth*), and (*mimes putting it on Lady Percy's finger*) plop!

Aside from building out the backstory of the Percys, who have little stage time otherwise, the moment comically humanized the otherwise odd pairing of personalities. By dramatizing their proposal story as had been done for heterosexual couples in other performances during the festival, playgoers were given a chance to catch up on their dynamic as well as affirm queer identity in a season otherwise centring heteronormativity.

In these variations over an intensive repertory festival featuring three weeks of back-to-back performances, and some twice daily, prompting had the capacity to expand beyond its function as a safety net and into an engine for improvisation and co-composition. If the Prompter was attempting to establish a meta-commentary with which the rest of the company were not commensurate, or was more invested in providing opportunities for improvisation than the story, a performer was more likely to fall out. The Prompter as a performance technology first served players, keeping them on text and on entrance, before facilitating any innovations. The Prompter sutured figuratively the backstage world of the personnel and the tiring house with the world of the play, as well as provided 'bandages' live in performance, to do things with the text while waiting for a missed cue or entrance. As a final example, the unpredictability not of the many passing bicyclists or boat horns but the player's body

threatened to derail a *Twelfth Night* prompted by Durham. Late in the play, Lewis as Sir Andrew Aguecheek entered having acquired an abrupt case of the hiccups:

> PROMPTER Wait, wait, wait. Do you actually have the hiccups?
> AGUECHEEK I literally just got the hiccups.
> PROMPTER Would you explain to our audience how you got them?

As Lewis turned her back to start speaking, Durham crept up slowly behind her, quickly grabbed her shoulders, and 'scared' the hiccups out of her. Because the Prompter never leaves their chair, it was unexpected and worked to cure the hiccups while also upending a sense of reliability in the Prompter. Aguecheek moved over to Sir Toby Belch (Yocam) to whimper at her friend, so that the Prompter replied, 'Do you not feel safe anymore? I'm sorry, I'll take care of you'. A mild non-verbal antagonism between the two continued for the rest of the performance, producing comic results. Durham recovered his credibility as Prompter when veteran Fridlich (Olivia) had a faulty stretch in her scroll that was missing the better part of a scene. For a moment she leaned over the Prompter's shoulder to read from the prompt book and then resorted to taking it with her to finish the scene. Meanwhile, Durham wound through her scroll, located a cue line for her to re-enter, and handed it off during a pause. So while the Prompter had a dual role as part 'shepherd' and part creative contributor, it would seem that within this practice one could not sacrifice the shepherd status for the merits of a comic payoff. The Prompter here was protecting the cohesion of the show by startling Lewis out of her hiccups, but interestingly still needed to regain their position of safety net and did so through improvisation.

Live in repertory

In this chapter I have tried to track some of the effects of one OP technique, an onstage prompter, that manifested over three weeks of performing Shakespeare plays within a repertory schedule. What can be drawn from these observations about prompters is limited given that this variable was used within an eclectic set of 'original practices', although uniquely using a repertory schedule and a group of professional players habituated to this system and to one

another. It suggests the co-dependent nature of certain historical practices, which creates an additional challenge to testing their effects. As scholar-playwright Emma Whipday recently remarked:

> I also hope that work informed by (and itself feeding into) theatrical-historical research . . . will continue to develop; I worry when these kinds of experimental work that challenge models of directors' theatre [are] too easily characterized as staid or backwards looking, when in fact they can be at once historically informed and radical, in challenging the prevalent models of twenty-first century theatricality.[34]

And surprise they can when accounting for repertory, as there is much to be learned from the affordances of sequencing. In *Romeo and Juliet,* OPSF had to solve for the lack of a balcony. Yoshikawa (Romeo) came up with the solution to dress as Where's Waldo?™ and sit among the crowd while speaking 'upwards' to Juliet, who maintained her position of merely standing in the playing place, strongly implying the hierarchy of their separation without architectural levels. The next day Yoshikawa performed as Fenton, suitor to Anne Page in *Merry Wives*, which summoned memories of him from the previous evening and attached them to this new romantic persona. Both Romeo and Fenton are young men desperate for their loves and blocked by mothers who have specific economic motivations about who the lady should marry. Rather than seek counsel from a friar or friends like Romeo, Fenton instead seeks help from the Host, played by Allard, who also played Friar Lawrence, another lover-boy's aide, the previous night.

Yoshikawa as both Romeo and Fenton suggests two models of what it might look like to be a romantic suitor. As Fenton, he came up with an ingenious repurposing of his part scroll to help narrate the complex abduction plan to the Host. Yoshikawa employed an old table-reading exercise, literally drawing out each of the steps in his plan to abscond with Anne on the back of another scroll using the same dowel strategy (see Figure 5.6). Timing the unrolling to match his thirty-six-line speech from act four, the innovation made a difficult text clear in addition to furthering his earlier claim that while her 'father's wealth was the first motive that I woo'd', it is now 'the very riches of [her]self' that was his aim. Both Romeo and Nym (also played by Yoshikawa in the run)

FIGURE 5.6 Merry Wives of Windsor, *Irving Park, 22 July 2017. From left: Brian Allard (Host) and Ken Yoshikawa (Fenton). Courtesy of the author with permission from the company.*

can be suspected of ulterior motives, the former perhaps aware of Juliet as sole inheritor of her father's wealth and the later having recommended to 'deal with poison'. That Romeo and Fenton were performed by the same player in close succession underscores these juxtapositions, implications of typecasting and historically situated lines of business. Both characters go for the marry-now-apologize-later tactic. Fenton does not attempt to secure his love alone, however, but works with his community, the opposite of Romeo's approach. The juxtaposition summoned questions live in real time, including: What kind of lover are you? What kind of lover do you have? What kind of lover do you want, or want to be? To get at the sorts of exciting opportunities that recycling in repertory affords, perhaps part of asking what the work of live performance might suggest means first performing more systematic work of asking.

Appendix

Original Practice Shakespeare Festival 2017 WIL Fest performances.

Date	**2017-07-21**	**2017-07-22**	**2017-07-22**	**2017-07-23**	**2017-07-23**	**2017-07-28**	**2017-07-29**
Time	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**
Location	**Willamette Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Willamette Park**
Title	***Romeo and Juliet***	***Merry Wives of Windsor***	***Julius Caesar***	***Much Ado About Nothing***	***Tempest***	***Macbeth***	***Taming of the Shrew***
Total Cast	**14**	**17**	**16**	**14**	**16**	**13**	**16**
Allard, Brian (11)	Friar Lawrence	Host	Julius Caesar, Cinna the Poet	Borachio	Prospero	King Duncan, Porter, Doctor	Lord, Vincentio
Andersen, Amanda (2)					Antonio		
Ashenbrenner, Kelsea (6)							Nicholas
Bachrach, Hailey (4)							
Bellis-Squires, David (7)	Sampson, Musician, Friar John	Falstaff	Casca, Dardanius			Prompter	
Bray, Andrew						Witch, Angus	
Brown, Stan (5)		Sir Hugh Evans					
Buckner, Isabella (8)	Prompter		Caius Cassius		Stephano	Malcolm	
Burger, Brian (7)				Benedick			Prompter
Butler, Bryn (1)					Miranda		

2017-07-29	2017-07-30	2017-07-30	2017-08-04	2017-08-05	2017-08-05	2017-08-06	2017-08-06
7:00 PM	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**
Willamette Park	**Willamette Park**	**Willamette Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**
Comedy of Errors	***Twelfth Night***	***Henry IV, Part 1***	***Richard III***	***As You Like It***	***Hamlet***	***All's Well That Ends Well***	***Midsummer Night's Dream***
13	**14**	**15**	**17**	**14**	**14**	**13**	**15**
	Antonio	Henry IV, Glendower	Buckingham			Reynaldo, Interpreter	
		Prince John, Francis, Sheriff					
Officer, Balthazar, Messenger	Sailor	Traveler, Lady Mortimer		Audrey, Amiens, Le Beau		Gentleman 1, Lord 2	
			Rivers, Cardinal, Scrivener	Jacques	Ophelia		Snug, Moth
			Sir Stanley	Touchstone	Prompter		
		Blunt, Peto		Corin, Hymen, Clown 2, Page	Bernardo, Player, Messenger, Gravedigger	Lafeu	
Dromio of Syracuse		Hotspur	Richard III				Titania, Hyppolita
	Orsino	Falstaff	Henry VI, Rotherham, Henry VII			Parolles	Bottom

Date	**2017-07-21**	**2017-07-22**	**2017-07-22**	**2017-07-23**	**2017-07-23**	**2017-07-28**	**2017-07-29**
Time	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**
Location	**Willamette Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Willamette Park**
Title	***Romeo and Juliet***	***Merry Wives of Windsor***	***Julius Caesar***	***Much Ado About Nothing***	***Tempest***	***Macbeth***	***Taming of the Shrew***
Total Cast	**14**	**17**	**16**	**14**	**16**	**13**	**16**
Cable, Keith (7)		Mr Ford		Messenger, Dogberry		Seyton	Gremio, Nathaniel
Davis, Jefferson (2)							
Dixon, Elise (3)			Trebonius, Varro		Boatswain, Francisco		
Driesler, Amy (4)	Prince, Peter		Cobler, Portia, Octavius				
Durham, Joel Patrick (8)	Tybalt		Prompter		Trinculo	Macduff	
Fridlich, Sarah Jane (7)		Mrs Page		Hero			
Goldenberg, Noah (5)	Benvolio						
Harris-Bagwell, Shani (4)		Mrs Ford	Calpurnia, Lepidus			Banquo, Siward	
Haynes, Megan (4)		Fairy			Mariner, Spirit		
Hershberger, Tara (1)							
Hillier, Kaia (5)	Juliet		Mark Antony		Ariel	Witch, Murderer, Lady Macduff	

2017-07-29	2017-07-30	2017-07-30	2017-08-04	2017-08-05	2017-08-05	2017-08-06	2017-08-06
7:00 PM	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**
Willamette Park	**Willamette Park**	**Willamette Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**
Comedy of Errors	***Twelfth Night***	***Henry IV, Part 1***	***Richard III***	***As You Like It***	***Hamlet***	***All's Well That Ends Well***	***Midsummer Night's Dream***
13	**14**	**15**	**17**	**14**	**14**	**13**	**15**
			Hastings, Messenger	Oliver	Polonius		
					Ghost, Player, Sailor, Fortinbras	Gentleman 2, Lord 1	
							Helena
Antipholus of Ephesus							Quince
	Prompter	Poins, Douglas			Hamlet		Oberon, Theseus
Luciana	Olivia		Elizabeth	Rosalind		Helena	
	Feste		Ratcliffe		Laertes		Prompter
Adriana							
		Bardolph	Guard, Messenger, Oxford				
Solinus							
	Viola						

Date	2017-07-21	2017-07-22	2017-07-22	2017-07-23	2017-07-23	2017-07-28	2017-07-29
Time	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**
Location	**Willamette Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Willamette Park**
Title	***Romeo and Juliet***	***Merry Wives of Windsor***	***Julius Caesar***	***Much Ado About Nothing***	***Tempest***	***Macbeth***	***Taming of the Shrew***
Total Cast	**14**	**17**	**16**	**14**	**16**	**13**	**16**
Hirschhorn, Jessica (4)							Katherina
Hoback, Nik (5)				Don Pedro	Ferdinand		
Jordan, Michael C. (3)							Petruchio
Kane, Colin (2)							
Kirkpatrick, Erin (1)							
Landmann, Emilie (3)							Sly, Pedant
Leek, Kerry (6)		Pistol, Caius		Prompter	Caliban	Ross	Tranio
Leidigh, Noah (9)	Abraham, Paris	Fairy		Verges			Servant, Curtis
Lewis, Lissie (6)			Lucius		Sebastian		Biondello, Philip
Lipsey, Mkki (4)					Gonzalo		
Lugo, Alec (7)	Nurse, Montague	Slender		Balthasar, Watch	Prompter		Hortensio
Mackintosh, Sullivan (5)			Marullus, Metellus Cymber, Pindarus				Grumio, Widow
McCarthy, Mara (2)			Cinna, Lucillius	Margaret			

2017-07-29	2017-07-30	2017-07-30	2017-08-04	2017-08-05	2017-08-05	2017-08-06	2017-08-06
7:00 PM	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**
Willamette Park	**Willamette Park**	**Willamette Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**
Comedy of Errors	***Twelfth Night***	***Henry IV, Part 1***	***Richard III***	***As You Like It***	***Hamlet***	***All's Well That Ends Well***	***Midsummer Night's Dream***
13	**14**	**15**	**17**	**14**	**14**	**13**	**15**
		Mistress Quickly				Diana, Lord 3	Starveling, Cobweb
		Henry V			Rosencrantz, Servant	Bertram	
					Claudius	King of France, Soldier 2	
			Prompter				Flute, Pease-blossom
	Sailor						
Angelo	Maria						
				Adam			
		Mortimer, Vernon	Brakenbury, Prince Edward	Silvius, Clown 2	Voltemand, Priest		Lysander
Aemilia, Merchant	Aguecheek		Margaret, Ely				
Aegeon, Doctor Pinch		Northum-berland, Traveler	Duchess of York, Blunt				
				Orlando		Prompter	
Dromio of Ephesus		Westmore-land, Lady Percy	Catesby				

Date	2017-07-21	2017-07-22	2017-07-22	2017-07-23	2017-07-23	2017-07-28	2017-07-29
Time	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**
Location	**Willamette Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Irving Park**	**Willamette Park**
Title	***Romeo and Juliet***	***Merry Wives of Windsor***	***Julius Caesar***	***Much Ado About Nothing***	***Tempest***	***Macbeth***	***Taming of the Shrew***
Total Cast	**14**	**17**	**16**	**14**	**16**	**13**	**16**
Mounsey, Tom (1)						Macbeth	
Muff, Shandi (9)	Lady Capulet	Prompter		Don John, Watch, Sexton		Lady Macbeth	
Neeko, Jurnee (7)		Anne Page, Rugby	Commoner, Plebian, Soldier		Shipmaster, Adrian	Fleance, Young Macduff	
Olson, David C. (2)		Shallow		Leonato			
Passolt, Barbara (2)							
Ruckman, Megan (2)		Mistress Quickly					
Saville, Lauren (6)	Mercutio		Decius Brutus	Claudia, Watch		Witch, Murderer, Gentlewoman	Bianca, Gregory
Shier, Madeline (1)							
Streeter, Michael (2)	Lord Capulet		Soothsayer, Messala				
Van Buecken, Beth (3)							
Whiteside, Emma (9)	Gregory, Apothecary, Watch	Bardolph, Simple, Robert	Flavius, Artemidorus, Titinius	Conrade, Priest	Mariner, Spirit	Donalbain, Young Siward	Host
Witherspoon, Tom (5)		Mr Page			Alonso		Baptista, Tailor
Yocam, Beth (7)			Marcus Brutus	Beatrice			
Yoshikawa, Ken (7)	Romeo	Fenton, Nym, John					Lucentio

2017-07-29	2017-07-30	2017-07-30	2017-08-04	2017-08-05	2017-08-05	2017-08-06	2017-08-06
7:00 PM	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**	**2:00 PM**	**7:00 PM**
Willamette Park	**Willamette Park**	**Willamette Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**	**Laurelhurst Park**
Comedy of Errors	***Twelfth Night***	***Henry IV, Part 1***	***Richard III***	***As You Like It***	***Hamlet***	***All's Well That Ends Well***	***Midsummer Night's Dream***
13	**14**	**15**	**17**	**14**	**14**	**13**	**15**
Antipholus of Syracuse		Prompter		Duke Frederick, Phoebe	Horatio		Puck
Merchant, Cortezan	Sailor, Officer, Priest						Hermia
		Worcester					Egeus
					Marcellus, Player, Gravedigger, Osric		
			Lady Anne, Murderer				
				Celia			
			Guard, Priest, Norfolk	Duke Senior		Widow	
	Curio, Fabian						Demetrius
	Malvolio						Snout, Mustardseed
Prompter	Belch			Prompter	Gertrude	Countess, Mariana	
			Clarence, Mayor	Charles	Guildenstern-Servant	Clown, Soldier 1	

Notes

1 Stephen Purcell, 'Practice-as-Research and Original Practices', *Shakespeare Bulletin* 35, no. 3 (2017): 428.

2 For a survey of the first twelve years of the important Read Not Dead Project along with its repertory schedule, see James Wallace, '"That Scull Had a Tongue in It, and Could Sing Once": Staging Shakespeare's Contemporaries', in *Shakespeare's Globe: A Theatrical Experiment*, ed. Christie Carson and Farah Karim-Cooper (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 147–54, 243–52. For an ethnography of the working practices and processual knowledge cultivated by the Edward's Boys repertory, see Harry R. McCarthy, *Performing Early Modern Drama Beyond Shakespeare: Edward's Boys* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020).

3 Don Weingust, 'Original Practices', in *The Cambridge Guide to the Worlds of Shakespeare*, ed. Bruce R. Smith and Katherine Rowe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 1476–77; Don Weingust, 'Authentic Performances or Performances of Authenticity? Original Practices and the Repertory Schedule', *Shakespeare* 10, no. 4 (2014): 403.

4 Tiffany Stern and Simon Palfrey, *Shakespeare in Parts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 73.

5 Ibid., 74.

6 Ibid.

7 Don Weingust, *Acting from Shakespeare's First Folio: Theory, Text and Performance* (New York: Routledge, 2006), 98.

8 Ibid.

9 For a summary of practices variously adopted by these companies, see Don Weingust, 'Rehearsal and Acting Practice', in *A Companion to Renaissance Drama*, ed. Arthur F. Kinney and Thomas Warren Hopper (Hoboken: Wiley Blackwell, 2017), 250–67.

10 Jeremy Lopez, 'A Partial Theory of Original Practice', *Shakespeare Survey* 61 (2008): 304.

11 Ibid., 306–7.

12 Paul Prescott, 'The Event: Festival Shakespeare', in *The Arden Research Handbook of Shakespeare and Contemporary Performance*, ed. Peter Kirwan and Kathryn Prince (London: Bloomsbury, 2021), 47.

13 Ibid., *Shakespeare in the Theatre: Mark Rylance at the Globe* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 24.

14 Ibid., 27.

15 Ibid., 24.

16 Weingust, 'Authentic Performances or Performances of Authenticity?', 405.

17 Paul Menzer, *Shakespeare in the Theatre: The American Shakespeare Center* (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 219–20.

18 Sarah Dustagheer, 'Original Practices: Old Ways and New Directions', in *The Arden Research Handbook of Shakespeare and Contemporary Performance*, ed. Peter Kirwan and Kathryn Prince (London: Bloomsbury, 2021), 62.

19 Peggy O'Brien, *Declaration on Common Core State Standards*, Folger Shakespeare Library, 28 January 2015, https://www.folger.edu/sites/default/files/CCSS1.28.15.pdf.

20 Rob Conkie, *The Globe Theatre Project: Shakespeare and Authenticity* (New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 2006), 121.

21 See Appendix 5.i for a complete list of dates, times, locations and cast list for each of the performances discussed here.

22 Siobhan Keenan, *Travelling Players in Shakespeare's England* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 2–3.

23 McCarthy, *Performing Early Modern Drama Beyond Shakespeare*, 57.

24 The distinction between amateur and professional company is complex; see Michael Dobson, *Shakespeare and Amateur Performance: A Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

25 The mode number of performances for an individual company member was two, with the average being four to five performances. Forty-eight of the fifty-five company members who serve as performers participated in the 2017 WIL Fest. Early afternoon performances typically limited scheduling for those whose other employment conflicted.

26 Helen Lewis, 'Broadway's Dirty Secret: Ivo van Hove's Success Shows How Much American Commercial Theater Relies on European State Funding', *The Atlantic*, 6 November 2019, https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2019/11/ivo-van-hove-and-broadways-secret-reliance-state-funding/601219/.

27 Ibid.

28 W. B. Worthen, 'Intoxicating Rhythms: Or, Shakespeare, Literary Drama, and Performance (Studies)', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 62, no. 3 (2011): 333.

29 Christa McIntyre, 'Stormy Weather: A "Tempest" Erupts', *Oregon ArtsWatch*, 5 July 2016, https://archive.orartswatch.org/stormy-weather-a-tempest-erupts/.

30 As of this writing, the tagline remains prominent on the company webpage, https://www.opsfest.org.

31 McIntyre, 'Stormy Weather'.

32 Elizabeth E. Tavares, 'Review of *The Taming of the Shrew* (Original Practice Shakespeare Festival 2017)', *Scene: The Journal of the Internet Shakespeare Editions* 1, no. 2 (2017): 66–72.

33 Juliet Linderman, 'A Look at Women's Advances over the Years in Congress', *PBS NewsHour*, 4 November 2017, https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/a-look-at-womens-advances-over-the-years-in-congress.

34 C. K. Ash and Nora J. Williams, curators, "Hot Take: Emma Whipday (Playwright, Director and Academic)', in *The Arden Research Handbook of Shakespeare and Contemporary Performance*, ed. Peter Kirwan and Kathryn Prince (London: Bloomsbury, 2021), 263–4. For details of Whipday's performance-based research, see Jensen Freyja Cox, et al. 'The Disobedient Child: A Tudor Interlude in Performance', *Shakespeare* 16, no. 1 (2020): 60–7; and with Lucy Munro, 'Making Early Modern "Verbatim Theatre", or, "Keep the Widow Waking"', in *Loss and the Literary Culture of Shakespeare's Time*, ed. Roslyn L. Knutson et al. (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020), 233–49.