PARTS AND PARCELS: CUEING CONVENTIONS FOR THE ENGLISH MEDIEVAL PLAYER

Philip Butterworth

Audiences today expect all on-stage players to contribute to the life and purpose of the scene. Though the dialogue switches between the players, they all contribute to its extra-verbal life. This is possible because they all know the text of the play, their own parts, and at least the gist of those of their fellow players. Rehearsals help to confirm their understanding of the plot and its theatrical direction. We expect on-stage players to listen, react, and behave in a theatrically sensitive, complementary, and harmonious way to and with the current speaker. These observations are generally taken for granted in contemporary experience of theatre. Unfortunately, they are also often assumed to have been relevant in English medieval theatre. However, late-medieval players of the fifteenth and early sixteenth century who relied on their individually written *parts* or *parcels* and their *cues*, and not the whole text of the play, were unlikely to have been able to operate in this way.

In this paper I propose to examine the role of individually written *parts* or *parcels* for players and their implications for the nature of playing in the English medieval theatre. What were these *parts* or *parcels* and how did players use them? How were such *parts* used prior to performance? And how did preparatory processes to performance affect and condition actual performance? What was the significance of designating cues? I intend to investigate these questions by examining players' *parts* in manuscripts; evidence in records; the nature of learning or *conning* of *parts* in relation to their playing; notions and practice of *rehearsal*; and the possible evidence for stage action and playing delivery.

Fortunately, for present purposes, some hand-written parts or parcels remain extant, although in some cases it is not clear whether they are the actual ones used by players, or copies of them. The earliest of these English texts which are presented as parts with their cues have become known as the *Shrewsbury Fragments*. These are incorporated in a liturgical MS, and cannot have been the original player's part. They were first edited in modern times by W. W. Skeat in 1890.[1] The MS was written on paper in the early fifteenth century, and this section consists of players'

parts for the *iij*^{us} *pastor* ('Third Shepherd'), *iij*^{a} *m*^{a} (*tertia maria*, 'Third Mary'), and an unnamed character, conjectured by Skeat from internal evidence to be Cleophas, in an episode to be performed on *Feria ij*^{a} *in ebdomada Pasche* (Easter Monday). It is suggested by Young and Davis that these parts originate from Lichfield or its diocese. It may be further conjectured that the three parts were played by the same person in three distinct plays, entitled by Skeat, 'The Angels and the Shepherds', 'The Three Maries at the Sepulchre', and 'The Two Disciples going to Emmaus'. In all cases the cues are written separately to the right of the text and appear to be spoken respectively (though there is no indication of this in the MS) by the Second Shepherd, the Second Mary, and by Luke and Jesus.

A later fifteenth-century fragment contained in the Bodleian Library and known as *The Ashmole Fragment* offers one and a half stanzas spoken by *Secundus Miles*, probably to Caesar Augustus.[2] As with the *Shrewsbury Fragments* a short cue phrase is placed to the right of the text at the beginning of the stanza, thus indicating the last words of the previous speaker.

The extract known as *Dux Moraud* was written in the second quarter of the fifteenth century on a recycled court roll of the early fourteenth century, and seems very likely to be an actual *parcel*. It appears to be the script of the title character, each speech numbered and separated from the next by a line running across the page; but there are no cues. There are also two Prologues, known respectively as the *Cambridge* and the *Durham Prologue*, apparently to a play of *Theophilus*, which may be actor's parts, but are less useful for this argument as the Prologue does not interact with anyone.[3]

Another, yet later, sixteenth-century player's part exists in what has been titled the *Processus Satanae*.[4] A later inscription suggests that it came from Limebrook in Herefordshire. The part is that of God. The cues in this fragment are placed in the centre of the page immediately above God's lines. The other speakers are Christ, An Angell, Sathan, and Verity. The important point here is that the givers of the cues are identified.

There are two further extant English parts, from the very late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. The first is the 1594 copy of the part of Orlando from *Orlando Furioso*, the authorship of which is ascribed to Robert Greene.[5] This hand-written copy is believed to have belonged to Edward Alleyn. It can be compared with the printed quarto of 1599.[6] The

second example is a book of parts for a single actor in four plays performed at Christ Church, Oxford in the 1620s.[7]

There is also a sizeable sample of early-sixteenth-century actor's parts from the Continent which confirms that this format was not confined to Britain.[8]

All the above examples work to the same convention in their provision of speeches and cues. They also allow us to assume that the intended recipients could read. Whether the proposed reader was the player or someone from whom the part could be learned is not clear.[9] The range of subject matter contained in these parts extends beyond that conventionally associated with mystery plays to almost the entire range of theatrical genres. Although these remaining parts may be a serendipitous collection and thus not wholly representative of the accepted conventions employed between the early fifteenth century and the early seventeenth century, they show a consistency of layout that arises out of practical limitations; that is, the impracticability of supplying players with complete texts of their plays. The implication is that principal speaking players across the range of mystery plays, moralities, interludes, and saints' plays[10] made use of such written parts. Although this may have been a way of dealing with the impracticality of producing hand-written copies of complete texts for the principal players, it may also have been a matter of choice rather than purely a default procedure. Whatever the reason, it appears to have set up conscious or unconscious conditions which then created a particular style of playing modes.

Although, as indicated above, only a limited sample of individual scripts survives, there is considerable evidence in written records of payments for their provision. However, we need to distinguish between accounts that refer to *parts* and *parcels* as individual speeches copied out for individual players, and those records that use the words to refer to rôles undertaken by players.

References to *parts* as rôles occur as early as the fourteenth century. Chaucer, for example, refers to 'Jelousie' as an 'olde vekke' who 'Hadde lerned of loves art, And of his pleyes tok hir part'.[11] The Magdalen School Copy Book at Oxford (c1495) gives as a theme for translation into Latin:

> I remembre not þat euer I sawe a play þat more delityd me þan yesterdays. and All be it chefe prayse be to the doer þerof. yete ar none of þe players to be disapoyntede of þer praise. for euery mann plaid so his partes þat (except | hym þat plaide kynge Salomonn it is harde to say whom a mann may praise be fore other.[12]

William Horman uses the following sentence for English-to-Latin translation in his *Vulgaria* (1519): 'I am sent for: to playe well a parte in a playe'.[13] In the 1527 *Acts and Monuments of John Foxe* it is recorded that:

> there was a certeyne playe made by one master Roo of the same inne, gentilman, wherin partly ther was matter ageinst the Cardinall Wolsey. And where none durst take vpon them to playe that part which touched the saide Cardinall, this foresaid master fisher toke vpon him to do it.[14]

William Tyndale in his *The Exposition of the Fyrst Epistle of Seynt John* (1531) claimed that 'Christ is no hypocrite or disguised that playeth a parte in a play and representeth a persone or state which he is not'.[15] The St Mary's Churchwardens' Accounts at Rye in Sussex record payment in 1552 'for a Coote made when the resurreccion was playde for hym that in playing represented the part of almighty god xij d'.[16]

There are also early records of the term *parcel* used to refer to a rôle. In *De Regimine Principum* by Thomas Hoccleve (c1412) the author addresses Favel: 'In lords courtes thow pleyest thy parcelle'.[17] The prologue of *The Castle of Perseverance* declares, 'Þese parcellys in propyrtes we purpose us to playe / Þis day seuenyt before ȝou in syth …' (lines 132–2), though it is uncertain whether this refers to rôles, or to episodes in the plot.[18]

However, at Chester, the term *parcel* was consistently used in the sixteenth century to refer to speeches copied out for individual players. The Smiths', Cutlers', and Plumbers' Accounts for 1560/1561 record payment 'for paper to Coppy out the parcels of the booke v d'.[19] The same guild records for 1566–1568 record a further payment 'for 2 parcells ij d'.[20] The Bowyers', Fletchers', Coopers', and Stringers' Accounts for 1571/1572 record 'In primis the herryng (*hearing*) of the players and leuerynge (*delivering*) of persells to the holle (*hall*) ys ix d'.[21] The same accounts for 1574/1575 record further payment: 'Item paied for wryttinge the parcels vj d.[22] The Painters', Glaziers', Embroiderers', and Stationers' Accounts record payment in the same year 'for the copynge of a parsell iiij d'.[23]

Accounts frequently refer to copying out individual parts, presumably from the complete text of the play. For example, at Exeter, Devon, it is recorded in the Mayors' Court Roll for 1413/1414 that *certi paiecti et panelli de ordinale ludis predicti extracti in scriptis quibusdam Iohanni Benet* ('certain pageants and sections extracted from the Ordinal of the aforesaid play [were delivered] in certain writings to John Benet [and others]') for the Skinners to perform; however, John Benet hung on to *diuersos panellos alias*

Speches ('various sections otherwise known as 'speeches') so that they were not in fact played, leaving the performance incomplete.[24] The *ordinale* (originally a liturgical term), the complete text of the play from which the speeches were copied, was also called the *originale*, anglicised as *Regenal*. It is referred to as the *regenal* in the records at Sleaford, Lincolnshire in 1480: 'Item payd for the regenal of the plays for the ascencon & the wrytyng of spechys & payntyng of a garment for God iij^{s} iiij^{d}'.[25]

The Smiths' Accounts at Coventry for 1496 record a payment to an unknown copyist 'for copying of the ij knights p*ar*tes & demons (blank)'.[26] Later at Coventry in 1547 the Cappers pay 1d 'for wrytyng ap*ar*te for herre p*ar*son'.[27] The Earl of Northumberland's *Household Book*, begun in 1512, gives the following job description: 'My Lordes Chapleyns in Householde vj Viz. The Almonar and if he be a maker of Interludys than he to have a Servaunt to the intent for Writynge of the Parts And ells to have non'.[28] The Chamberlains' Accounts at New Romney, Kent for 1554/1555 record payment 'to Iohn fforcett to bye paper for the writyng of part*es* of the play iij s. iiij d'.[29] Also, the Jurats' Record Book for the same year at New Romney provides considerable detail concerning receipt of 'partes' or 'spechys' written for players and their rôles in the *Passion Play*:

> And have receyvyd playres Speches or p*ar*tes in theseyd playe/ That is to saye the seyd Iohn Tyre the p*ar*te of Herrod/ George Gerrard & wyll*ia*m Brouker/ herod*es* knyght*es*/ [blank] herod*es* messang*er*/ Robert Edolf/ Clement Stuppeny Laurence Stuppeny/ Symon padyam/ Iames Grenewaye & Iohn Hollocke, Turment*ers*/ Edward Honey/ pylate/ Iohn ffyndall/ pylat*es* messanger & Cayphas messanger ⌜Robert davye Cayphas⌝ Iohn Plom*er*/ Annas & the Second Devyll & Iohn Crockey Annas handmayde/
>
> Yf they & eu*er*y of them do learne before theseyd feaste of pentecost theire p*ar*tes before lymytted, And be redye then to playe thesame; And further do At eu*er*y tyme of ye Rehearse of theseyd playe com to Romney aforeseyd & reherse theire seyd p*ar*tes w*i*thowten eny collusyon (god the kynge and quenes ma*ies*ties, And no Reasonable cause lettyng) That then this present recognysaunce shalbe voyde/ or ell*es* shall abyde in all his full strenght & vertue/.[30]

Not only is this New Romney 'recognysaunce' valuable in distinguishing the range of meanings of the term *partes* but it is also useful in establishing the way in which the 'lymytted' parts were used. The account requires the

players who 'com to Romney' to 'learne' their 'partes' before they arrive and to be prepared to rehearse them without any help or *collusyon* ('prompting') once they had arrived. So the stress placed by the *recognysaunce* was on the player learning, or 'conning' his part by heart. This was required to happen outside and before any rehearsal process. The player was seemingly considered to be ready to rehearse once he had committed his part to memory.

The same was required of players at York at the *Creed Play* in 1568. Here, the Chamberlains were asked to locate

> expert & mete players ... for the conyng handlyng of the seyd playe / than eu*e*ry of theym to haue ther part*es* fair wrytten & delyu*e*red theym ~~in tyme~~ soo that they may haue leysure to ku*n*ne eu*e*ry one his part.[31]

Players were required to 'ku*n*ne eu*e*ry one his part' outside and before any rehearsal process, for they were expected to have their parts delivered to them in good time so that they might *kunne* [*con*, 'learn', 'know'] them at their 'leysure'.

It seems that this learning was expected to happen very quickly. In *The Retvrne From Pernassvs: Or The Scourge of Simony*, a college play from St John's Cambridge, the Prologue is introduced by the Boy who says, 'Spectators we will act a Comedy' and then apparently dries (the stage direction is *non plus*). The Stagekeeper responds by saying, 'A pox on't this booke hath it not in it, you would be whipt, thou rascall: thou must be sitting vp all night at cardes, when thou should be conning thy part'. The Boy responds with a cheeky justification: 'Its all long on you, I could not get my part a night or two before that I might sleepe on it'.[32] The same conditions would presumably apply even in situations where the player did not learn his lines from a written part but learned them through imitation, instruction, or coaching by rote. Whichever way the player learned his lines, the answer to the question, 'Is he perfect in's part?' needed to be in the affirmative.[33] In other words, he was expected to be word-perfect.

Learning 'by heart' was not confined to players: it was an accepted technique in education. Students were expected to memorise useful facts and phrases. Nicolas Udall's translation of Erasmus' *Apophthegmes* (1542), in the preface 'unto a dukes soonne of his countree', suggests that the young recipient will naturally learn all the maxims in the book by heart:

> And I shall perhappes here after geue you thynges of more saigenesse and grauitee, when ye shall perfectely haue learned all

> this by herte. For these thynges must in any wyse bee cunned by herte, to thende that ye maye haue theim euer readie at hande.[34]

One of the examples in Palsgrave's English to French dictionary suggests the normal timescale for this: 'By that tyme that I haue repeted my lesson halfe a dosen tymes vpon the booke I haue it without booke'.[35]

Memory was one of the branches of the effective study of oratory, not merely a essential tool for the actor. Thomas Wilson in his *Arte of Rhetorique* (1553) outlines the means of encouraging an effective use of memory:

> Nowe the beste meane bothe to mende an euil memory and to preserue a good, is firste to kepe a diet, and eschewe surfittes, to slepe moderatelye, to accompanye with women rarelye, and laste of all to exercise the witte with cunnynge of manye thinges without Booke.[36]

Considerable stress is laid upon players being word-perfect. One of William Horman's sentences for translation into Latin in his *Vulgaria* (1519) is 'I have played my parte without any fayle' (*Aedidi operam procul omni lapsu / aut cessatione*).[37] If players did not achieve this goal in performance they were often spoken of as 'being out of their part', or just 'out'. *Miles Windsor's Narrative* concerning Elizabeth's visit to Oxford in 1566 records that:

> ⌜Trevatio⌝ beinge owte of his parte & missinge his kewe ⌜&⌝ offringe his servise to ye ladyes swearinge by ye masse or Gotes blutt I am owte ... Godes pitty saythe ye Quene what a knave it tis ....[38]

The need for players to be verbally perfect in their parts presumably included their remembering their cues. Since the player conned his part by himself, his memory of the cues provided the only link to other players and their remembrance of their parts. Not only was it the means of moving the performance forward, but it was also the means by which an emphasis on the individual could be converted to a focus on the interactivity between players. Even so, the dynamic of the part as the actor delivered it must have been conditioned by the way in which he had received and learned it. Intentionally or not, his performance may well have come across as self-contained and distinct from the others.

Modern directors often speak of the difficulty of re-orientating a player to fit in more purposefully to the overall scheme or direction of a production if he has learned his part before he comes to rehearsal. A part

learned prior to rehearsal becomes fixed in the player's imagination because of the private way he has gone about its learning. The player's understanding of his spoken words can become inflexible. Even if the player is willing in rehearsal to modify the way he delivers his speech, he is often blocked in his imaginative capacity to do this. If the same obtained in the earlier period, it could be considered a weakness by modern theatrical criteria.

This self-contained quality presumably put more stress on parts being delivered in the correct sequence and order. Cues inevitably acted as crucial signals to determine the limits of parts, their succession and organisation. Knowledge and memory of the cue was therefore critical to the progression of the play. Certainly, it is likely to have been much more important than in later and modern theatrical conventions. In present-day theatre where players have access to and knowledge of the complete text of the play, if a player misses a cue it is possible for other players to compensate for the error either by jumping from one part of the text to another or improvising their way out of or around the problem. Since the medieval player only had access to, knowledge of, and apparent responsibility for his own part, it may be that he was unable to operate in this way. This would have put considerable and unavoidable stress on the need to know and act upon cues. They represented pivotal and crucial stages in the development of performance. Memory and the recognition of cues could almost be said to have been more important than memory of the part, for without the player's response to the cue, both the part and the player were effectively marooned.

In its discussion of the derivation of the term *cue*, the *OED* casts doubt on some of the seventeenth-century theories of its etymology:

> ... in the 16th and early 17th c. it is found written Q, q,q., or qu, and it was explained by 17th c. writers as a contraction for some Latin word (sc. *qualis*, *quando*), said to have been used to mark in actors' copies of plays, the points at which they were to begin. But no evidence confirming this has been found. [39]

A word sometimes used as a synonym of the term *cue* is *antiloquie*, the English version of the Late Latin word *anteloquium* (possibly from a Plautine term *antelogium*, apparently constructed on the analogy of *praelocutio* and *prologium*). Sir Thomas Elyot in his *Dictionary* of 1538, Thomas Cooper in his *Thesaurus* of 1584 and Thomas Thomas in his *Dictionarium* of 1587 all define *anteloquium* as 'the first turn in speaking'.[40]

These definitions seem to refer to either a prologue of some sort, or to the first argument presented in a discussion. Although these sixteenth-century dictionary entries do not specifically refer to theatre, the phrase 'the first turn in speaking' shows how it could be adapted as a theatrical term. By 1623 when Henry Cockeram compiled his *English Dictionarie*, the Latinate *anteloquie* was defined as 'A terme which Stage-Players use by them called their Cue'. In the second part of his *Dictionary*, where he deals with 'vulgar' words for which a more elegant term is to be preferred, he defines *the Kew* as 'a tearme vsed by stage players. *Anteloqiue*'.[41] John Minsheu in his *Emendatio* (1625) repeated Cockeram's definitions.[42] Later seventeenth-century dictionaries such as the *Glossographia* by Thomas Blount (1656)[43] and the *New World of English Words* by Edward Phillips (1658) also treat *anteloque* and *cue* as synonyms. In addition, Phillips refers to the concept of the *turn*, in his definition of *anteloque* as 'a Term among stage players, signifying their turn or cue'.[44] Here, *turn* and *cue* are synonymous and/or interchangeable.

The notion of the *turn* is most interesting and seems appropriate to this discussion. Players could be said to take it 'in turn' to speak, and the speech and by extension the part itself might also be identified as a *turn*. This later of course becomes a technical term for a short individual stage performance, an item in a longer programme, as in music hall.[45]

Up to the point when the player had learned his part, there is no stress in the written evidence upon his words being transformed into action. So, how were privately learned parts turned into theatrical action? Stephen Gosson in his *Ephemerides of Phialo* (1579) says in a passing illustration that 'the Player so beateth his parte too him selfe at home, that hee giues it right gesture when he comes to the scaffolde'.[46] Either he practised gesture by himself at home, or this development took place at some sort of rehearsal.

So, what was the purpose of rehearsal? Was it to recite, from memory, the words written in the part? Was it to read from the part in order to aid the actor's memory of remembered or partially remembered words? Is there any point at which the player held and referred to his written part in rehearsal?[47] Or did he simply use it to learn his part outside of the rehearsal? Was it to rehearse action? Some answers to these questions may be suggested by what was understood at the time by the terms *rehearse* and *rehearsal*.

Fifteenth and sixteenth-century word-books and dictionaries define *rehearse* and *rehearsal* in ways different to those understood today. They

come into the semantic fields of 'recitation', 'remembrance', 'recapitulation', and 'telling'. This has a far wider scope than just that of play rehearsals.[48] If play *rehearsals* were indeed primarily concerned with these notions, then their purpose appears to have been to make sure that individual players had committed their parts to memory by going over them 'without book'. Evidence of this kind of focus may be seen in the Chamberlains' Accounts at New Romney for 1568. Those players selected for rôles who have been given 'parts' are to sign a bond to perform with the Town Council,

> otherwyse ev*e*ry player having ... ⌜p*artes*⌝ shall p*re*sently surrender all their p*ar*tes vpp ... ⌜agayne⌝ in to the hond*es* ~~of~~ ~~of~~ arthure bee & so to be no more spoken of, or [*before*] any more repetic*i*on & rehersall thereof had & made'.[49]

Here, 'repetic*i*on' appears to have been a key function of 'rehersall'. This would suggest that the actors were indeed running through their words.

However, where group rehearsals took place, and there is some evidence of this kind of rehearsal, then the focus might appear to be less on the testing and checking of memorised parts, and more on the cues and transitions between them. The need to develop the player's consciousness of the emergent sequences within the play presumably required them to concentrate on this task. An approach sometimes employed today in rehearsal is that known as 'topping and tailing'. The purpose of the technique is to enable the player to absorb and understand the order and sequence of events of the play. The player starts his speech and then cuts to the last line or two in order to cue in the next speaker or action. The bulk of the speech is omitted, and the company concentrates the transitions of sequence.

Both individual and group rehearsals appear in the accounts at Chester. The accounts of the Cordwainers, Smiths, Bowyers, Fletchers, Coopers, Stringers, and Painters all record payment towards an event known as the 'general reherse'.[50] This implies a rehearsal involving all or most of the players. Additionally, the Smiths', Bowyers', Fletchers', Coopers', Stringers', and Painters' accounts each record payments for a 'first reherse' and a 'second reherse', with the Coopers' records citing a 'third reherse'.[51] Each of these rehearsals appear to precede the 'general reherse' where payment is also recorded for the provision of refreshments.[52]

Further payments are recorded by the Smiths and the Painters for rehearsing before the mayor.[53] It is interesting that these accounts record payment for *rehearsing* and not performing; they might indicate a late-stage rehearsal of the kind that today might be termed a 'preview'. The mayor was responsible for the overall performance of the plays, and could determine when the plays were played and by whom they were to be enacted. He also held the 'Original' or the complete text of the plays.[54] A late rehearsal would presumably have enabled him to check the accuracy of the spoken text against the 'Original'.

'Hearing of' the players is recorded in the accounts of the Smiths and the Coopers: 'hearinge of the Docters & litle God 4d' and 'herryng of the playeres'.[55] Was this for audition purposes or checking the progress of the player's recall of his part?

Even though the focus was evidently upon listening to the player, it is unlikely that this could have been achieved without also 'watching' the player. However, none of the accounts concerned with 'hearing' mention 'watching'. It is the player's vocal, verbal, and memory skills to which attention is given.

The Smiths' accounts separate payment for 'hearinge of the Docters & litle God' from 'chosinge of the litle god'.[56] The 'chosinge' sounds like an audition; 'hearinge' was presumably checking on the accuracy of and extent to which the parts had been memorised. This may well have been involved in the first, second, and third rehearsals; by the 'general reherse' they were probably expected to be word- and cue-perfect.

At Chester some rehearsals were held at guild members' houses. The Smiths rehearsed at 'Io*hn* huntingtons' house in 1560/1561.[57] The Painters in 1567/1568 held their 'first Rehersse at oure Aldermans' and another at 'master hankyes'.[58] The Smiths record payment for 'our first reherse at Alderman skruenors' in 1567/1568.[59] The Bowyers', Fletchers', Coopers', and Stringers' accounts for 1571/1572 record payment for 'the seconde Rehers in the stuardes lenekers'.[60] The presumably limited space available at these locations points towards the kind of rehearsals that did not need a lot of room. This could imply that rehearsal of action was not involved. If so, this may not have occurred until the 'general reherse', though there is no evidence for this.

At Coventry, payments related to rehearsals are recorded in the Smiths', Cappers', Weavers', Drapers', and Mercers' accounts. The Smiths' and Drapers' accounts record as many as three rehearsals.[61] The Cappers' and Weavers' accounts usually record two.[62] One record of the Smiths

(1576) refers to 'hearing' players at rehearsal: 'Spent on the companye after we had hard þe second Reherse ij d'.[63] Like the equivalent records at Chester, these accounts do not refer to the players 'playing' at rehearsal. Again, this suggests a concentration on the words of the parts and the extent to which they may have been memorised.

Rehearsals which focussed on listening to players reciting their parts could well have taken place in someone's house. Both the Smiths and the Cappers record payments for rehearsals which took place in the houses of guild members. Between 1548 and 1553 the Cappers conducted both their first and second rehearsals at 'borsley's house'.[64] In 1576 and 1579 they also rehearsed at 'good man ashburnes' house.[65] In 1572 they record expenditure '... ye same mornynge [as the 'first rehears'] at mr waldens of certayne of ye company which came to the reherse'.[66] This implies that this particular rehearsal involved either individuals or a small group.

None of the above refers to rehearsal of action in ways that might be recognised in modern rehearsals. An isolated item in the Chamberlains' Accounts at New Romney for 1555/1556 points in the opposite direction: 'Item payd to Iohn Stephans for making of A fauchen to rehearse the playe with viijd'.[67] Here, the faulchion was clearly necessary to rehearse a choreographed fight. Later, the Jacobean and Caroline Revels Accounts cite 'Diverse properties vsed at Rehersalle', which implies rehearsal of action.[68] And of course Peter Quince approves of the 'marvellous convenient place for our rehearsal' in the wood because of its layout, so that they can 'do it in action as we will do it before the duke' (*Midsummer Night's Dream* Act 3 Scene 1); presumably this is the 'general reherse'.

The sparseness of evidence on rehearsal of action does not, of itself, mean that rehearsal of action did not take place but it does leave it in question. The absence of such evidence, placed alongside the other evidence about hearing, listening, reading, reciting, remembering, recapitulating, and telling suggests different priorities in rehearsal and the subsequent performance. How might this rehearsal focus translate into performance? Emphasis on the task of memorising speeches before rehearsal suggests a performance convention which puts stress on the delivery of the spoken word; where the player, in response to his cue, stepped forward, and delivered his privately learned *turn*.

How far does the evidence we have suggest that medieval players used action to relate to each other, or to forward the narrative? There is no clear answer, but there are some indications in medieval play texts about the type of relationship which is expected between word and action. This

bears an interesting resemblance to the kind of applied action suggested by Roman oratorical handbooks, but whether this is through direct influence or because they approached performance from the same direction is a very complex historical study which cannot be entered into here. Basically, the Roman orator expected to strengthen his performance (*actio*) with appropriate gestures (*gestus*). However, it was to be of a specific kind:

> *non hic verba exprimens scaenicus, sed universam rem et sententiam non demonstratione sed significatione declarans … manus autem minus arguta, digitis subsequens verba, non exprimens …* [69]
>
> not those used on stage, which depict the individual words, but gestures that indicate the content and the ideas as a whole, not by imitating them, but by clarifying their meaning … The hands should not be too expressive, with the fingers accompanying rather than depicting the words …

This suggests that gesture was to be emotive or rhetorical rather than mimetic (which is identified as theatrical), and indeed Cicero goes on to describe the rôle of the eyes in effective delivery. But in any case, gesture was to be the servant of the words in a solo performance, not detached from them or used to create relationships between characters. Gosson's 'the Player so beateth his parte too him selfe at home, that hee giues it right gesture when he comes to the scaffolde' (see above) suggest that creating and practising these gestures might also be a private affair.

The *locus classicus* is the well-known stage direction at the beginning of the Anglo-Norman *Jeu D'Adam*. Here, careful and precise instructions are given as to what was expected of the player who played Adam and of the other players:

> *et sit ipse Adam bene instructus, quando respondere debeat, ne ad respondendum nimis sit velox aut nimis tardus. Nec solum ipse, sed omnes persone sic instruantur, ut composite loquantur et gestum faciant convenientem rei, de qua loquunter; et, in rithmis, nec sillabam addant nec demant, sed omnes firmiter pronuncient, et dicantur seriatim que dicenda sunt. Quicunque nominaverit paradisum, respiciat eum manu demonstret.*[70]
>
> And Adam should be well trained not to answer too quickly nor too slowly, when he has to answer. Not only he, but all the actors shall be instructed in such a way as to speak in a coherent manner, and to make their actions appropriate to the matter they speak of;

> and, in speaking the verse, not to add a syllable, nor to take one away, but to enunciate everything distinctly, and to say everything in the order in which it is to be spoken. Whenever anyone shall speak of Paradise, he shall look towards it and point it out with his hand.

It is noticeable that the bulk of this instruction is about verbal delivery: 'not to answer too quickly or too slowly', 'speak in a coherent manner', not to destroy the rhythm of the verse, 'enunciate distinctly', say everything in the right order. The recommended gestures are also linked closely to the words: 'make their actions appropriate to the matter they speak of', when speaking of (the Earthly) Paradise, point to it with the hand.

The same attention to correctness and order of speech is demonstrated in the rubrics of the thirteenth-century *Cyprus Passion Cycle*. Here too, it is stipulated that the players should

> take good care that the one not hasten the other's speech nor interrupt his words so as to create confusion; but everyone, in his appointed place, whenever thou desire it, shall speak, ask, or answer with attention and in no other wise ...'[71]

Here there seems to be a particular concern with taking up cues correctly.

Sir Thomas More in his *Utopia* speaks metaphorically of 'philosophye' as a player who

> thereafter orderynge and behauynge herselfe in the playe that she hathe in hande, playethe her parte accordynglye wyth comlynes, vtterynge nothynge owte of dewe ordre and fassyon.[72]

Whatever extra features *comlynes* implies, here the important thing seems to be that she shall utter 'nothynge owte of dewe ordre and fassyon'. *Fashion* is difficult to interpret, but 'due order' suggests an attention to cue-taking and giving as well as to the progress of the argument. More's concern for this 'order' in a play is also demonstrated through his acknowledgement of potential disorder if the original script is disrupted:

> For they that sometyme step vp [*audience members*] and playe w^{t} them [*players*], when they cannot play their partes, they disorder the play & do themselves no good'.[73]

As A says to B in *Fulgens*, when he offers to 'step vp' from the audience: 'Be God, thou wyll destroy all the play!'[74]

There is no surviving external evidence of medieval rehearsal and performance that concentrates upon the kinds of interrelated action and relationships demanded by later naturalistic conventions. Such medieval evidence as exists is found within the narrative. The spoken word appears to have conveyed the force of the imagined action. Clearly, there is more medieval evidence of concern for correct process, order, and sequence of verbal delivery than there is for synchronicity between word and action. Perhaps this should not be too surprising given the importance of the cue. The cue was the crucial pivot upon which 'dewe ordre and fassyon' was regulated. The symbiotic relationship between *order* and the *cue* appears to have conditioned all else in performance.

The practical skills of the orator as outlined by Cicero (and Quintilian) appear also to have been practised by the English medieval player. However, even though the Roman oratorical handbooks demonstrate the importance of synchronisation between word and action for both the orator and the player, available medieval evidence does not indicate how the player developed further action from his individually learned part. Gosson alludes to this process but does not explain how it happened. Nor do the records at Chester and Coventry indicate how action was developed or what might have been its nature. There is no evidence for rehearsal of action. The implication of the privately learned part is that action was limited and based on gesture. The part as delivered by the player was effectively self-contained and ordered. The simplest of beckoning or invitational gestures presumably sufficed to implicate or 'bring in' other players into the imagined world created by the words of the player. Under such an arrangement the 'spent' speaker might well have stepped back, out of or away from focus, enabling the subsequent player to take over as the focused speaker, and to pick up his cue, come forward, and deliver his *turn*.

University of Leeds

NOTES

Since the original version of this paper was delivered at one of two sessions in honour of David Mills in July 2007 at the International Medieval Congress, University of Leeds, an extensive work that investigates the similar issues in the later work of Shakespeare was published in October 2007. See Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern *Shakespeare in Parts* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007). See also: <http://imc.leeds.ac.uk/imcapp/SessionDetails.jsp?SessionId=2133&year=2007>.

In October 2006 the Toronto-based Queen's Men mounted an experiment 'Shakespeare and the Queen's Men' which aimed to reconstruct the theatrical

practices of Shakespeare's time in performances of plays by his immediate predecessors: *The Famous Victories of King Henry V*, *King Leir*, and *Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*. This project tackled many of the questions touched on in this article. Archive material and discussion can be accessed from

< http://tapor.mcmaster.ca/~thequeensmen/ >.

1. Walter W. Skeat 'Fragments of Yorkshire Mysteries' *Academy* 37 (1890) 10–11 and 27–8; see also *Non-Cycle Plays and Fragments* edited Norman Davis *EETS SS1* (1970) xiv–xxii and 1–7.
2. Davis *Non-Cycle Plays and Fragments* cxviii–cxx 120.
3. See Davis *Non-Cycle Plays and Fragments* for the texts of *Dux Moraud*, *The Reynes Extracts*, *The Durham Prologue*, and *The Cambridge Prologue*. Each of these fragments is similar to other extant parts but without cues.
4. *Malone Society Collections 2:3* edited W. W. Greg (Oxford: Oxford UP for Malone Society, 1933) 239–250.
5. *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: The Battle of Alcazar & Orlando Furioso* edited W. W. Greg (Oxford: Oxford UP for Malone Society, 1922) 125.
6. *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements* 142–201.
7. *Malone Society Collections 15* edited N. W. Bawcutt (Oxford: Oxford UP for Malone Society, 1993) 113–169.
8. See for example Graham A. Runnalls 'The Medieval Actors' Roles found in the Fribourg Archive' *Pluteus 4–5* (1990 for 1986–1987) 5–67; 'Towards a Typology of Medieval French Play Manuscripts' in *The Editor and the Text* edited P.E. Bennett and Graham A. Runnalls (Edinburgh UP, 1990); 'An Actor's Role in a French Morality Play' *French Studies 42* (1988) 398–407; 'Actors' Roles from Medieval France' on line at <www.byu.edu/~hurlbut/fmddp/roles>.
9. For examples of some ways in which players were helped to learn their parts or be prompted in them see my publications: 'Book-Carriers: Medieval and Tudor Staging Conventions' *Theatre Notebook 46:1* (1992) 15–30; 'Jean Fouquet's "The Martyrdom of St Apollonia" and "The Rape of the Sabine Women" as Iconographical Evidence of Medieval Theatre Practice' *Essays in Honour of Peter Meredith* edited Catherine Batt *Leeds Studies in English NS 29* (1998) 55–67; 'Prompting in Full View of the Audience: A Medieval Staging Convention' in *Drama and Community: People and Plays in Medieval Europe* edited Alan Hindley (Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe; Turnhout: Brepols, 1999) 231–47; 'Prompting in Full View of the Audience: The Groningen Experiment', *Medieval English Theatre 23* (2002 for 2001) 122–71; 'Richard Carew's Ordinary: the First English Director' in *The Narrator, the Expositor, and the Prompter in European Medieval Theatre* edited Philip Butterworth (Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe; Turnhout: Brepols, 2007) 329–45.

10. *Malone Society Collections 11* edited David Galloway and John Wasson (Oxford: Oxford UP for Malone Society, 1980) 144; *REED: Shropshire* edited J. Alan B. Somerset, 2 vols (University of Toronto Press, 1994) *1* 184. See also 183.
11. Geoffrey Chaucer *The Riverside Chaucer* edited Larry D. Benson (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987) 732. The word *pleyes* does not necessarily imply a theatrical context.
12. *REED: Oxford* edited John R. Elliott Jr and Alan H. Nelson (University), and Alexandra F. Johnston and Diana Wyatt (City), 2 vols (University of Toronto Press and London: British Library, 2004) *1* 37. See also William Nelson *A Fifteenth Century School Book* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956) 26–7.
13. William Horman *Vulgaria uiri doctissim Guil. Hormani Cæsariburgensis* (London: Richard Pynson, 1519) 281r.
14. John Foxe *Actes and Monuments of these latter and perilous dayes* (London: John Day, 1563) 448.
15. William Tyndale *The exposition of the fyrste Epistle of seynt Jhon with a Prologge before it* (Antwerp: M. de Keyser, 1531) sig. Er.
16. *REED: Sussex* edited Cameron Louis (Toronto: University of Toronto Press and Turnhout: Brepols, 2000) 94. See also William Holloway *The History and Antiquities of the Ancient Town and Port of Rye, in the County of Sussex. With incidental notices of the cinque ports* (London: John Russell Smith, 1847) 491.
17. Thomas Hoccleve *Works Volume 3: The Regement of Princes and Fourteen Minor Poems* edited F.J. Furnivall *EETS ES 72* (1975 reprint of 1897 edition) line 3055, page 110.
18. *The Macro Plays* edited Mark Eccles *EETS 262* (1969) 7.
19. *REED: Cheshire including Chester* edited Elizabeth Baldwin, Lawrence M. Clopper, and David Mills, 2 vols (Toronto: University of Toronto Press; London: British Library, 2007) *1* 106.
20. *REED: Cheshire* 118.
21. *REED: Cheshire* 137.
22. *REED: Cheshire* 163.
23. *REED: Cheshire* 166.
24. *REED: Devon* edited John M. Wasson (University of Toronto Press, 1986) 83.
25. *Malone Society Collections 8: Records of Plays and Players in Lincolnshire 1300–1585* edited Stanley J. Kahrl (Oxford: Oxford UP for Malone Society, 1972) 86.
26. *REED: Coventry* edited R. W. Ingram (University of Toronto Press and Manchester: UP, 1981) 86.
27. *REED: Coventry* 175.
28. *The Antiquarian Repertory: A Miscellaneous Assemblage of Topography, History, Biography, Customs, and Manners. Intended to illustrate and preserve several*

valuable remains of Old Times compiled Francis Grose and Thomas Astle, 4 vols (London: Edward Jeffrey, 1807–9) *4* 61. See also 199.

29. *REED: Kent* edited James M. Gibson, 3 vols (University of Toronto Press and London: British Library, 2002) *2* 777, see also 778. *Malone Society Collections 7: Records of Plays and Players in Kent 1450–1642* edited Giles E. Dawson (Oxford: Oxford UP for Malone Society, 1965) 136.
30. *REED: Kent 2* 780. *REED* transcription conventions slightly modified. See also *Malone Society Collections 7* 202–3.
31. *REED: York* edited Alexandra F. Johnston and Margaret Rogerson, 2 vols (University of Toronto Press and Manchester UP, 1979) 353.
32. *The Retvrne From Pernassvs: Or The Scourge of Simony. Publiquely acted by the Students in Saint Iohn's Colledge in Cambridge* (London: G[eorge] Eld for Iohn Wright, 1606) sig. A2r. See also John Gee *New Shreds of the Old Snare* (London: Robert Mylbourne, 1624) 18: 'I will be so kinde as to answer for them in case of *Tautologie*, or want of varietie, with that advice which was once given to an *Orator*, who being to make an Oration before a curious Auditory, and belabouring his memory with often conning it by heart, at length loathed his owne worke by often hearing it, and therefore distrusted the Auditories acceptation; Whereto his Friend made answer; *Though you by often repeating it are weary, yet to them it will be fresh enough, because they shall heare it but once*'.
33. George Chapman *The Widdowes Teares* (London: John Browne, 1612) sig. G1v: '*Thar[salio]* Is he perfect in's part? has not his tongue learn'd of the *Syluans* to trip ath' Toe? *Arg[us]* Sir, beleeue it, he does it pretiously for accent and action, as if hee felt the part he plaid …' See also Chapman's *The Gentleman Vsher* (London: V. S. for Thomas Thorppe, 1606) sig. B2r; Bassiolo asks 'Are all our parts perfect?'; Thomas Elyot *The Dictionary of syr Thomas Eliot knight* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1538): sv *Memoriter* 'parfitely by hart, or with good remembraunce'.
34. Desiderius Erasmus *Apophthegmes* translated Nicolas Udall (London: Richard Grafton, 1542) Preface ***iii. See also John Baret *An Aluearie or Triple Dictionarie, in Englishe, Latin, and French …* (London: Henry Denham, [1573]) 'to Cunne or learne perfcetly *Ediscere*. A booke worthie to be cunned by harte. *Ediscendus ad verbum libellus*' no. 614 under **C. ANTE V.**
35. John Palsgrave *Lesclarcissement De La Langue Francoyse 1530* (London?: Richard Pynson/Iohan Haukyns, 1530) fol. 338v.
36. Thomas Wilson *The Arte of Rhetorique, for the vse of all suche as are studious of Eloquence* (London: R[ichard] Grafton, 1553) sig. Ff1v.
37 Horman *Vulgaria* 281v.

38. *REED: Oxford 1* 129. See also *REED: Oxford 1* 355, 357, 392; *REED: Herefordshire/Worcestershire* edited David N. Klausner (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990) 136.

39. *OED cue* n^2. One of the sources to which the *OED* seems to refer is John Minsheu *Emendatio, vel à mendis Expurgatio seu Augmentatio sui Ductoris in Linguas, The Guide into Tongves. With their agreement and consent one with another, as also their Etymologies... in ... nine languages ...* (London: Iohn Haviland, 1625) column 592. An early reference (quotation from a document of the reign of Queen Mary Tudor) to the representation of *cue* as *q* appears in John Strype *Ecclesiastical Memorials* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1822) *3:2* 208: 'Wher as also *Amen* must be answered to the thanks gevyng, not as to a mans q in a playe, but by one that preyeth, whereunto he maketh hys answer'.

40. Elyot *Dictionary* (1538); Thomas Cooper *Thesaurus linguae Romanae et Britannicae* (London: H[enry] Wykes, 1565); Thomas Thomas *Dictionarivm Lingvae Latinae et Anglicanae* (Cambridge: Thomas Thomas, 1587). The term *anteloquium* is not classical Latin: Lewis and Short record two meanings: '1. The right of speaking before another; 2. A proem, preface'. The first of these meanings accords with the definitions given by Elyot, Cooper, and Thomas. The second meaning seems to be taken from that of an earlier hybrid word, *antelogium*, from *ante* 'before' and *logos* 'word'. Lewis and Short define this as 'a prologue or preamble': Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879).

41. H[enry] C[ockeram] *The English Dictionarie: Or, An Interpreter of hard English Words* (London: Edmund Weaner, 1623); *Antiloquie* sig. $B5^v$ in *The First Part of the English Dictionary*, which contains the 'choicest' Latinate words; *the Kew* sig. D3 in *The Second Part of the English Dictionary*, which contains the 'vulgar words' with their more elevated synonyms.

42. Minsheu *Emendatio*, column 188.

43. T[homas] B[lount] *Glossographia* (London: Thomas Newcomb, 1656).

44. E[dward] P[hillips] *The New World of English Words: Or, a General Dictionary* (London: E. Tyler, 1658) sv *anteloque*.

45. More than one meaning of the word *turn* in the *OED* relates to its use in this paper. One relevant meaning is: '25.a. A spell or bout of action, a 'go'; spec. a spell of wrestling; hence, a contest (quot. 1829). Now often associated with sense 28.' Sense 28. a. is defined as follows: 'The time for action or proceeding of any kind which comes round to each individual of a series in succession; (each or any one's) recurring occasion of action, etc. in a series of acts done, or to be done, by (or to) a number in rotation'. It seems possible, although the link is not made by the *OED*, that the self-contained notion of the 'turn' as used in this paper is the theatrical precursor to the eighteenth and nineteenth-century *OED* definition: 29. b. *Theatr.* 'A public appearance on the stage,

preceding or following others' (Farmer *Slang*); an item in a variety entertainment; also *transf.* applied to the performer'.

46. Stephen Gosson *The Ephemerides of Phialo* (London: Thomas Dawson, 1579) 74.

47. The French equivalents to *parts* and *parcels* were known as *roole*, *rollet*, *roullet* and *rôles*. Graham Runnalls' careful account of the extant *rôles* in the Fribourg Archives describes individual pieces of paper that had once been fastened together and formed into rolls. According to Runnalls, 'They were rolls or scrolls of paper which the actor unrolled as the play progressed'. He further suggests that the *rôles* were 'designed for use at rehearsals (and perhaps even at the performance)'. However, he does not indicate the purpose of this action. Was it to read from the roll? Was it to act as an aid to the player's memory? Presumably, such rolls needed to be held by two hands. Was it possible to hold the roll with one hand, and retain the player's place, if action demanded it? The content of the rolls was much the same as their English equivalents, although a number of them contain directions to the player in the form of instructions as to movement around the playing area. See Graham Runnalls 'The Medieval Actor's Rôles in the Fribourg Archives' *Pluteus 4–5* (1986–7) 5–67.

48. The *Promptorium Parvulorum* edited A.L. Mayhew *EETS ES 102* (1908) translates *rehersynge* (noun) as *Recitacio* (col. 369); *rehercyn* (verb) as *recito*; and *rehercyn a3en, or doyn a thyng a3en* as *Itero, recito* (col. 383).

John Palsgrave *Lesclarcissement De La Langue Francoyse 1530* (London?: Richard Pynson/Iohan Haukyns, 1530) translates 'I Recyte I make rehersal of ones saying' as *Je recite*; his next English sentence is 'He hath a synguler memorie he recyted al our hole comunycacion and myssed nat a worde' (fol. 334r); 'I Reherce a thyng that hath ben sayd' is translated as *Ie recite, & ie reporte* (fol. 335v); and 'I Repete I reherce my lesson or a thynge that I haue herde' as *Ie repete*, with the example: 'By that tyme that I haue repeted my lesson halfe a dosen tymes vpon the booke I haue it without booke' (fol. 338v).

Elyot's *Dictionary* (1538) defines *Memoro* as 'to remembre, somtyme to tel, or expounde, to recite or reherse'; under *Subicio* he gives the sentence *Si meministi quod olim dictum est, subijce*, translated as 'If thou doest remembre, what was ones spoken, reherse it'. He further defines *Recito* as 'to reade that other maye here and vnderstande: to recite or tell eftsones'.

Richard Huloet *Abecedarium Anglico-Latinum* (London: Gulielmi Riddel, 1552) translates *Rehersall* as *repetito*, and *Reherse* as *memorio, repetitio, subijcio*, and *repeto*. John Baret's *Aluearie* gives the following range of meanings: 'to Rehearse or tell some thing: to put in remembrance: to mention or speake of' as translatable by Latin *Memoro, Commemoro*, with subsections 'Recited or rehearsed ... *prolata*. To rehearse or repeate often. *Recitare identidem ... Renarrare ... Iterate verbis*. A reciting, telling or rehearsing of benefites. *Meritorum relatio, vel recitatio*'.

Thomas Thomas *Dictionarium Linguae Latinae* (1587) defines *Iteratio* as 'A repeticion, a reiteration, a rehearsing againe, a doubling of: a renewing. a beginning againe'. *Memoro* is defined as 'To remember, to bring in remembrance: to tell or rehearse, to report, to saie, to make mention, to recite, to vtter and speake'. *Recito* is defined as 'To read out a lowde something that other may heare and vnderstand: to rehearse, to tell by hart or without booke, to recite'.

John Florio *A Worlde of Wordes, Or Most copious, and exact Dictionarie in Italian and English, collected by Iohn Florio* (London: Arnold Hatfield for Edw. Blount, 1598) seems to be the first to put *rehearse* in a theatrical context: he defines *Recitare* as: 'to recite, to rehearse, to relate, to report, to read out aloude that others may heare and vnderstand', but then goes on 'to tell by hart or without booke, as players do rehearse their plaies or comedies. Vsed also to play a comedie or tragedie'.

49. *REED: Kent 2* 798.
50. *REED: Cheshire including Chester 1* 92, 106, 126, 140, 142, 163, 167.
51. *REED: Cheshire including Chester 1* 106, 122, 126, 137, 138, 140, 163.
52. *REED: Cheshire including Chester 1* 92, 106, 126, 140, 142, 164, 167.
53. *REED: Cheshire including Chester 1* 118, 142, 166.
54. David Mills *Recycling the Cycle: The City of Chester and its Whitsun Plays* (Toronto, Buffalo & London: University of Toronto Press, 1998) 109, 183, 221; *REED: Cheshire including Chester 1* xxxiv, xxxv.
55. *REED: Cheshire including Chester 1* 118, 137.
56. *REED: Cheshire including Chester 1* 118. See *Records of Early English Drama: Norwich 1540–1642* edited David Galloway (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984) 292.
57. *REED: Cheshire including Chester 1* 106.
58. *REED: Cheshire including Chester 1* 122.
59. *REED: Cheshire including Chester 1* 126.
60. *REED: Cheshire including Chester 1* 138.
61. *Records Early English Drama: Coventry* edited R. W. Ingram (Toronto: University of Toronto Press; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981) 217, 220, 223, 237, 246, 250, 251, 256, 259, 264.
62. There are many examples throughout *REED: Coventry* but see for example: 27, 139, 150, 153, 156, 160, 161, 163, 165, 169, 171, 175.
63. *REED: Coventry* 281.
64. *REED: Coventry* 178, 181, 184, 186, 190, 193.
65. *REED: Coventry* 267, 277, 291.
66. *REED: Coventry* 260.

67. *Malone Society Collections: Records of Plays and Players in Kent 1450–1642* edited Giles E. Dawson (Oxford: Oxford UP for Malone Society, 1965) 137; *Records of Early English Drama: Kent* edited James M. Gibson, 3 vols (Toronto: University of Toronto Press; London: The British Library, 2002) 2 778;
68. *Malone Society Collections 15: Jacobean and Caroline Revels Accounts, 1603–1642* edited W. R. Streitberger (Oxford UP for Malone Society, 1986) 78, 84, 92, 98, 106, 112, 117, 124, 135, 141.
69. Marcus Tullius Cicero M. *Tvlli Ciceronis scripta quae manservnt omnia. Fasc. 3 De Oratore* edited Kazimierz F. Kvmaniecki (Lipsiae: B. G. Teubner, 1969) III lix 220, pages 357–8; Cicero: *On the Ideal Orator (De Oratore)* edited and translated James M. May and Jakob Wise (Oxford University Press, 2001) 294, translation slightly adapted.
70. *Le Mystère D'Adam: An Anglo-Norman Drama of the Twelfth Century* edited and translated Paul Studer (University Press, Manchester, 1918) 1; *Medieval French Plays* edited and translated Richard Axton and John Stevens (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971) 7, translation slightly adapted. This stage direction also implies use of an instructor figure to coach the player who plays Adam.
71. *The Cyprus Passion Play* edited and translated August C. Mahr (Publications in Mediaeval Studies: Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame, 1947) 125.
72. *A fruteful and pleasaunt worke of the beste state of a publyque weale, and of the newe yle called Utopia: written in Latine by Syr Thomas More Knyght* translated Raphe Robynson (London: Abraham Vele, 1551) sig. Fv^{v}.
73. Thomas More *The workes of Sir Thomas More Knyght, sometime Lorde Chauncellour of England, written by him in the Englysh tonge* (London: Iohn Cawood, Iohn Waly and Richard Tottell, 1557) 66.
74. *The Plays of Henry Medwall* edited Alan H. Nelson (Cambridge, D.S. Brewer, 1980) 41; *Fulgens and Lucres 1* line 363.