

Peter Happé – *University of Southampton*

Shakespeare's Stage: The Theatre, The Globe, The Blackfriars ... and Zeffirelli

ph7@soton.ac.uk

I

This essay is a reprise of a talk I gave to students at the University of Urbino in April 2003. Its main objective is to pinpoint some of the preoccupations underlying Franco Zeffirelli's film of *Romeo and Juliet* (1968) with particular reference to the theatricality inherent in Shakespeare's work and Zeffirelli's respect for it. In order to do this I shall discuss some aspects of Shakespeare's theatres and the way his work reflects his use of them, together with ways in which Zeffirelli adapts the Shakespearean text to a film presentation. These two creative artists came from different backgrounds and the diversities of their professional experience and practices are reflected in their products. In each case we find an acute sense of how to manipulate the audience and to envisage theatrical effects. It must be admitted, however, that we are not here comparing like with like, so much as examining in the film an adaptation of a work whose entity is amorphous and Protean. *Romeo and Juliet* hardly exists as one substance. We have a text, in itself an uncertain concept these days, and we have a good deal of stage history. But the play is so well known and has been adapted to so many different cultural contexts that to define its essence is a very difficult task. It has been subject to the manipulation afforded a cultural icon, the interpretation of which may well be haunted by the image of the Mona Lisa wearing a moustache (What happens to the smile then?). Zeffirelli's film can perhaps therefore best be seen as one attempt to pin down a view of this large and changing phenomenon which we recognise as a Shakespeare play. Icons may look static, but in the light of cultural change their dynamism can be dizzying. Zeffirelli's version, now

somewhat out of date, invites comparison with that of Baz Luhrmann (1997) set in a garage forecourt and at a neon-lit pleasure beach and employing revolvers which in themselves can hardly escape the filmic imagery of the Western and the Chicago mobsters. We also notice that the changing status of icons may be subject to ideological influences, and ideologies, it is well known, may be in part the result of unconscious promptings, and partly the consequence of deliberate programming. Roman Polanski's discussion of the violence he portrayed in his film of *Macbeth*, makes clear that both the unconscious and the deliberate may work together (Polanski interview, 1999).

On the other hand, though there is no one satisfactorily comprehensive view of *Romeo and Juliet* likely to be universally accepted – it is now axiomatic that no reading is definitive – we can take certain steps which may bring us a bit nearer to what actually went on when the play was first performed. To that end I shall begin by summarising some historical detail about the theatrical environment and Shakespeare's apparent response to it. It is thought he wrote the play in 1594 or 1595, by which time the Lord Chamberlain's Men could draw upon nearly twenty years of experience at the Theatre, which had been built by James Burbage in 1576. This playhouse, arguably the first specially built public theatre, and managed as a professional business, stood outside the city of London, to the north, on leased land in Shoreditch. Unfortunately details of its construction are hard to find and we have to argue largely from a presumed similarity with the later Globe, which was supposedly constructed using some of the same timber. We can assume that *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Richard II* were also written for the Theatre at roughly the same time. But things moved on and the lease ran out in 1597. At this point the company rented the Curtain nearby, again a theatre whose details escape us, and they remained there until 1599, when they moved again, across the city of London to the newly constructed Globe on the south bank of the Thames. We do know a great deal more about this theatre, and we have to assume that the working practices there are a direct reflection of what was customary at The Theatre at the time of the creation of *Romeo and Juliet*.

We note that there was an anti-theatrical prejudice within the group of people who made up the governing body of the city of London (Happé 1999:187). This no doubt accounts for the placing of the four theatres for which Shakespeare wrote on the edge of, or just outside the boundaries of the city. At the time when the lease on the Theatre ran out, James Burbage also bought an indoor theatre, an upper room in an old monastic building, this time on the western edge of the city, quite near to St Paul's. This became known as the Blackfriars, but until 1608 the King's Men were unable to use this theatre because of objections from within the

city, probably associated with the prejudice I have mentioned. From that point onwards however, until the closing of the theatres in 1642 the company had two theatres at their disposal: the Blackfriars and the Globe and its successor on the south bank. It is worth noting here that Andrew Gurr points out that he has not been able to establish a marked difference in the staging arrangements between the indoor theatre and the outdoor ones (Gurr 1980:140). The modern reconstruction of the Globe, carried out as a result of much scholarly consultation, does give a good sense of the space within the original Globe and it can give a vivid sense of how Shakespeare's main theatre might have worked.

Romeo and Juliet comes from the first few years of Shakespeare's writing life. By the time he came to write it, learning how to use the Theatre had made some progress, and yet those working there were still finding out, and I suggest that Shakespeare was a contributor to this process, which we might regard as to some extent experimental. So there might be a parallel with the new art of Shakespeare on the films, one which is being developed by a new set of entrepreneurs, film directors like Zeffirelli and Polanski. They too are finding out about their medium and their investigation may well be one of our most effective ways of approaching Shakespeare's play. The theory of criticism brings us the view that there cannot be one reading of a specific play. We cannot get back to the state of mind and expectations of the Tudor or Jacobean audiences. Cultural changes, the development of language and alterations in social and political outlook all render accessibility increasingly difficult. Perhaps putting actors on a stage in our own times to find out how to use the space, and also seeing the dramatic activity through the culturally determined eye of cameras which themselves cannot be objective, might nevertheless be significant steps. But we are always going to be guessing to a large extent. We are always re-interpreting something which cannot be absolutely reinterpreted.

By 1595 or 1596, then, there was something like twenty years experience of how to use the Theatre and that must have helped to determine how Shakespeare wrote his play. I now move to the application of historical detail which I have briefly summarised. This falls into three parts: structures, acting styles and staging resources.

Structures

How does this theatre affect what Shakespeare thought it appropriate or effective to write? We can best approach this by considering what is common in Shakespeare's dramatisations. There is a deep interest in the unfolding of a

narrative, the telling of a story in its simplest terms. At this time dramatists could and did draw upon a vast range of narratives; classical, medieval (especially Boccaccio), and a wide range of contemporary story-tellers. I want to suggest that the structure and presumed shape of the Theatre was very good for this purpose. Notice that in many instances the dramatic interest is directly upon the unfolding of a narrative. The process was well invoked in the film *Shakespeare in Love* (John Madden, 1998) where the great big audience is seen utterly transfixed as the story is revealed to them. This is not diminished by the fact that Shakespeare usually made existing stories, often well-known ones, the starting point for his own plot. The fascination of the audience would be a compound of the compelling strength of the familiar with the innovation and variation Shakespeare imposed. A case in point would be the basic outline of the story of *King Lear*, which had appeared in a number of poetic and dramatic forms before Shakespeare took it up: yet none of the known versions pursues the final destruction and disaster as intensively as his does.

The place on the stage, the area for performance is also interesting. It is neutral and open, with large dimensions. There is not much scenery, and so you have to create the dramatic interest by the way you conduct yourself in this large space and by what you say about it. The latter can be of great importance, as at the beginning of *Hamlet*, for example, when the actors have to create the atmosphere of a frozen battlement at midnight, in the middle, perhaps, of a warm summer afternoon. I shall return to this below. Setting up something which has to take place on a neutral space is part of the way scenes unfold, and for certain scenes this can have high priority. Next, arriving and departing is very important because it changes things. But in this theatre you don't pull the curtains and have a coffee break when you want to change the location. The action runs continuously and movements are interjected into this flow, so that manipulation of pace becomes a factor. There was frequent emphasis upon spectacles: things like processions and battles. It is noticeable how many sword fights there were. At the end of *Hamlet* the duel is spectacular, and it is played against a very large amount of information which the audience possesses about the conspiracy and Hamlet's own feelings.

We suspect, without great certainty, that the pace of the plays was fast. At the beginning of *Romeo and Juliet*, Shakespeare mentions the "two-hours' traffic of our stage". You cannot cram the surviving text(s) of *Hamlet* into two hours: the playing time for the fullest text is about four and a half hours in a modern theatre. I notice that the first Quarto of *Romeo and Juliet* is thought to have been generated by the memories of a number of actors and it is considerably shorter than the second Quarto, which is much closer to what Shake-

speare actually wrote. Perhaps though, the shorter text is a reflection of the speed at which the play was performed. It is likely that there were no act divisions in the Globe. But at the indoors Blackfriars, where there was insufficient natural light, candles were used, and it was necessary to stop the action in order to trim the wicks. Possibly act division came in as a convenient response to this. Unlike the classical theatre, which was popularised from distinctly academic origins using five-act division in the Tudor period, Shakespeare's plays depended upon texts which were meant to run continuously, from setting to setting, event to event, with comings and goings. This makes for a fluidity in the texture of the plays, and for the development of the skill of managing pace.

He was prepared to make use of very short sequences comprising only a few speeches to establish a piece of information or a particular tone, or to generate a change in the flow of the action. On the other hand and for different purposes, he used prolonged sequences of action, with complex interplay of narrative detail. In some long scenes very complicated dramatic exchanges took place. So if the pace was fast, the performance was not just a matter of a quick blur of events: there were points of stillness, pausing places, and subtle contrasts of emphasis within the continuity.

Acting Styles

First we may notice two relatively minor but persistent aspects which might help us to visualise what went on in the theatres. There was an abundance of fools and fooling, spurred on no doubt by a number of highly resourceful and popular individual performers throughout Shakespeare's working life in London. One of the mysteries here is the question of improvisation. Shakespeare, through the mouth of Hamlet, does suggest that they were inclined to make things up themselves beyond the conception of the author, and needed restraint (*Hamlet* III.2.34-40). This may have been in part a matter of words, but there was also a strong tradition of physical fooling, falling about, tumbling and juggling. We also find plenty of music in the plays – dancing as well as singing. Some scenes, as in II.1.70-132 of *Much Ado*, consist of a dance in which a series of couples who talk as they dance, and as others dance round them. We are familiar with this through the camera's eye, but it is quite surprising to find it taking place on the much larger perspective of the Elizabethan stage. How do you manage the balance of sound, including the band, in the theatrical circumstances we have been talking about? Experience of the

stage in the New Globe suggests that there was ample room for dancing.

Shakespeare uses soliloquies in many plays and there is no doubt that he was building upon and exploiting a widespread theatrical practice which no doubt had its precedents in the medieval drama. I suggest that we might think of the performance of these as being rather like an aria in an opera. When you listen to an aria you want to hear it again. It generates an interest in how it is performed. You may indeed be moved by the emotion or the thoughts expressed, but you are also intrigued by the heights of the performer's skill. One of the strongest physical aspects of the Elizabethan theatre was the facility by which the actor could stand at the front of the apron stage, virtually encompassed by three thousand people, all concentrating upon the next word. This is a performance peak which attracted Shakespeare. Look, for example at the different ways he used this kind of speech, and there is also the intriguing question as to why for some plays it seemed to him a fundamental means of expression, whereas for others, like *King Lear*, it attracted him much less. In *Romeo and Juliet* we have one of the most famous of them all as Juliet speaks on the balcony (II.1.75-91): but I shall come back to that later.

We believe he wrote for particular actors, tailoring parts to individual strengths and capacities. In *A Midsummer Night's Dream* there is fun about a tall girl and a short one. Probably this reflects and refers to a visual difference between the heights of the two boy actors, one perhaps junior to the other. In *Twelfth Night* Maria is spoken of as "the youngest wren of nine" (III.3.57). Shakespeare was thus interested in individual actors, and this was no doubt true for Richard Burbage, who became the star actor for the major leading parts at the Globe. The use of soliloquies may well be related to this. But because the audience was so near, suddenly speaking to one person among them could also be most effective. In another, somewhat similar device, the aside – by which the active participation of the audience is stimulated – is exploited in a number of important ways.

The summary of what I want to suggest about the acting styles is that it puts a premium upon the presence of the actor: who he is and what he does in the particular circumstances of the enactment. One feature of this, to judge from our own habits at the theatre and the cinema, is to notice other roles which key actors have played – today Burbage is Hamlet, but last week didn't we see him as Richard III? A part of your mind, and a recurring sense of being in the theatre, is an appreciation of what the favoured and favourite actor is doing today. I suggest Shakespeare could have exploited this as a means of approaching his audience. There is even the possibility that rivalry between Burbage and Edward Alleyn, who frequently acted at the Rose Theatre, was a factor.

Staging Resources

I have already mentioned the neutrality of the stage, but there were some standard features. For *Romeo and Juliet* we must assume that there was a balcony. Since this play was first done in the Theatre, we may conclude that there was one to be found there. Besides being the place from which Juliet speaks while Romeo overhears her, the action depends upon his ascending it and descending from it. This evidences a vertical dimension, and there is not doubt that Shakespeare made use of it elsewhere, as in the battlements scenes in *Richard II* (III.3) and *Henry V* (III.3). The acting area would also have comprised a thrust stage, which comes out among the audience, giving a number of different perspectives upon the action on the stage. This means that an actor could hardly play only to those in front of him, but he needed to be aware of those on either side, and indeed almost behind him. It was not quite a circular theatre, but it was very nearly so. There was something called a "heavens", partially a roof above the stage and it probably had stars painted upon it. It was supported upon two substantial pillars, which no doubt were useful in themselves for eavesdropping. On the floor of the stage there was a trap which could be opened. The space it covered could be used for a grave, or you could put an unseen Ghost in it. Access from and to the understage was palpably useful.

On the other hand, apart from such fixed items as these, individual features could be brought on to the stage – a throne, a bed, a table, a tree, a tomb. Shakespeare wrote scenes which took place around such items and depended upon their presence. The throne room was a particularly useful setting. By using such moveable objects, the stage environment could be changed somewhat. There was thus a controlled use of individual pieces of furniture.

The constraints of the open air meant that the actors had to perform in the afternoon, and they could not rely upon artificial light. They had to make the audience accept that this was now the coast of Bohemia, or a dark moment in a wood infested with fairies, as well as the freezing Elsinore battlements noted above. Notice that *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, by definition, nearly all takes place at night. You could see what was going on, but you were constantly reminded that theatrically you could not quite see. Your mind was being divided between what you saw and what you could imagine. The play took place between these two states of mind. There was a difference between what you saw and what you might interpret. This formed a particularly potent aspect of Shakespearean theatre.

In a more realistic mode they had plenty of sounds at their disposal.

They had thunder, as for the storms in *King Lear* and *The Tempest*, and cannons as for the cannonade saluting Othello as he approaches Cyprus. We also find plenty of drums, trumpets, horns and bells which all made appropriate noises. These were not simply accompaniments to the plays, but rather parts of the action.

There was a considerable interest in costumes. The evidence from Henslowe's Diary, though relating to a theatre other than Shakespeare's, show that he spent a great deal of money upon costumes. The neutral space could thus be inhabited by richly dressed people. Such costumes could suggest their social role or occupation, or their rank in society. Particular situations like a ball, the presence chamber, or a funeral could be enhanced by the way that what the actors wore gave meaning to it. We need to remember too that boys were playing the female parts. Imposing very striking costumes upon a boy might enhance his capacity to suggest the opposite sex, even though we cannot quite forget that he is a boy. Making the boys look good in their female roles enhances the experience of the stage for the audience.

But finally, all the time we are being reminded that this is a play. There are many ways of doing this and it happens repeatedly and consistently. Sometimes a character says something like "I would never have believed this, if I'd seen it in a play". The account of the discovery at the end of *The Winter's Tale* seems particularly pointed as it describes the gestures and actions of the participants as though they were enacting them (V.2.10-16, 42-4). But in fact we don't see the scene at all. This motif keeps coming back through Shakespeare's works. Perhaps it was in part a form of self-defence on a bright summer afternoon when the temperature was seventy-five degrees. We have to be persuaded that though we may not really be at Elsinore, we need to pretend that we are. He continually reminds us that what we are seeing is not real but something made up – a 'fiction' – in your mind. The constraints thus become opportunities to explore what happens when an audience watches and hears a play.

II

I now turn more specifically to Zeffirelli's film, applying some aspects of what I have been discussing. Let us look at some of the changes he made, though in doing so I am well aware that it is almost impossible to be fully comprehensive about this. Some of the changes I shall discuss are relatively minor ones,

but they do illustrate the process of adaptation and the policies underlying it. He cut down the part of Friar Laurence very considerably. He omitted the Friar's foresight, and much of the opening soliloquy (II.2.1-22). The Friar is Shakespeare's own addition to the story he took over, and this presumably means he was especially interested in what he has the Friar do. Zeffirelli cuts down the Friar as he does Rosaline, Romeo's earlier love. Perhaps these cuts should be seen as part of a need to shorten the original to the length usually accepted in the cinema. In actual fact the running time is two hours and twelve minutes on the video edition. He also changes the way in which Romeo finds out about the effect of the sleeping draught (but not of course the apparent result of the Friar's device). I leave it to you to decide what the importance of these items may be, but it seems to me this has an intriguing impact on the tragic circumstances surrounding the end of the play. The importance here for us is that they show that Zeffirelli was interested in making some changes, however weighty.

According to one count only about one third of Shakespeare's text remains in the film. But all the lines that are included are indeed Shakespeare's, and as far as I can see he has added nothing of his own. He lets the words speak for themselves. Thus there is a measure of fidelity to the original even though there is a significant intervention. Changes of emphasis are notable, however, in making the Mercutio-Tybalt episode rather more of a game. He idealises, and perhaps idolises the young lovers. They are very young, beautiful and sexy in a rather romantic way, and these effects are achieved by the bright colours and the generally "sunny" camera work. Such beautiful young people highlight the generation gap. Emphasis upon this aspect may indeed be one of the reasons why *Romeo and Juliet* so often finds its way into the syllabus for young pupils. Such an audience or readership may indeed identify readily with the doomed lovers, whose parents contribute so palpably to their destruction. This seems to me a significant development in Zeffirelli's version.

The film also immensely enlarges the visual aspects: the reality of the streets, the costumes, the gestures. It also seems to me that he has intensified the "Italian-ness" of the play. But is this really Italy, or is it a kind of fantasy, a glorification of the past in which they all wear very clean costumes? The colours are beautiful; and it is all a bit polished. This raises the question of whether it is authentic reconstruction, or is it romanticised, made juicy for our delectation of the past. This is perhaps another kind of fiction.

Turning to what he has added. There are two long sequences: one about the fighting, and the other is the dance. I've already noticed the popularity of fighting sequences, but Zeffirelli has added to them, giving them a spectral

resonance which enhances our awareness of violence in the film. The dance has built into it specially composed music which sounds authentic for the period. But this is really a musical score, typical of the film idiom: it is not integrated into the text in the way I mentioned earlier. He superimposes the music – and I do not mean that to be pejorative – he places the music on the text. I particularly note the repetition of the love theme whenever things are going well. It is an invention, which approaches the audience by a different means than the text itself. It is perfectly legitimate, no doubt, but it is in fact quite a feature of how we respond, especially in emotional aspects. In adding a wedding ceremony to the original he also uses this love theme, and this I think points up the filmic nature of what is being presented. Similarly there is added a funeral scene, not found in the text, which also incorporates the music. Another change is the presence of real females into the film including nudity. So that to an extent he is using the familiar visual language of the cinema to make his point.

However I want to say something about, and indeed to emphasize what I think are positive achievements of the film. In what I have been describing about changes I have not been trying to belittle the film but to give indications of the kinds of changes that are made. In short I am trying to hypersensitize us to changes and to why Zeffirelli made them. He certainly urges us believe that these two people loved one another: the romanticisation and the sexuality makes us think of the two lovers in a very credible and sympathetic way. He has provided a very striking number of opportunities for actors and actresses to perform. He has two new relatively unknown youngsters for the two leads, and developed them very carefully so that although we sense their inexperience we appreciate their commitment. He has strengthened and focused upon the role of the Nurse, inviting a beautifully sustained performance throughout the film. We listen to her most intensely, and she acts with great resource. Zeffirelli is aware of the power of the performer, in a way which recalls Shakespeare. The presence of the actor is given full scope. Zeffirelli also retains some of the dialogue in a remarkable crisp and faithful way. The interaction between characters on the stage in language, movement and gesture, backed up by the camera is highly effective and he has been most careful not to obliterate or obscure this. Examples of this are especially convincing around the character of the Friar who interacts sensitively with Romeo, Juliet and the Nurse at different times. We should add too that the film, in spite of the romantic gloss I have suggested, manages to bring out a palpable realism in many details.

For the last part of my piece I want to consider three very short pas-

sages: and for these, *pace* Matthew Arnold, I want to invoke the idea of touchstones. Possibly these are indications of the kinds of changes Zeffirelli makes and they might be used or extended over a larger range of material as we seek to ascertain how Zeffirelli has approached his original. These passages may indeed be ways of testing what has been done.

The first is Romeo's speech in which he describes the paradoxes of love:

Here's much to do with hate, but more with love.
Why then, O brawling love, O loving hate,
O anything of nothing first create;
O heavy lightness, serious vanity,
Misshapen chaos of well-seeming forms,
Feather of lead, bright smoke, cold fire, sick health,
Still-waking sleep, that is not what it is! (I.1.168-74)

We do not find this passage in the film. Possibly the wordplay was felt to be unacceptable to cinema audiences. Such a passage is, however, theatrical in as much as the accumulation of these paradoxes is effective in performance, since it challenges us to see the contrasts. I have no doubt that the passage is an example of the ways in which Shakespeare was sensitive to performance values, and gave opportunity to an actor to demonstrate his rhetorical skill in the speech.

The second passage concerns the Nurse's appealing tale about the young Juliet, aged three, who fell and cut her brow. The Nurse's husband picked her up:

"Yea," quoth he, "dost thou fall upon thy face?
Thou wilt fall backward when thou hast more wit,
Wilt thou not, Jule?" And by my halidom,
The pretty wretch left crying and said "Ay". (I.3.43-6)

This last line is repeated by the Nurse, with slight variations, another three times:

And, pretty fool, it stinted and said "Ay". (50)
To think it should leave crying and say "Ay". (53)
It stinted and said "Ay". (59)

The texture of the story is enriched because the Nurse, in her garrulous way, keeps telling us what the little girl had said. The passage is a triumph of narrative embellishment. Zeffirelli leaves in only the first reference, and, in spite of

his interest we have noted in the Nurse, he leaves out the other three. Thereby he makes the story crisper, but he removes the way the little comedy is recounted, or indeed enacted. Perhaps the detail of the Nurse's speech is again sacrificed for brevity, but one might also think that something essential to the use of language in the play has been lost. Nevertheless what is retained does echo a point I made earlier about the abiding interest in the performance value of story telling encapsulated in Shakespeare's texts.

For my third touchstone I turn to Juliet's speech from the balcony. It is a kind of soliloquy in as much as she does not know she is being overheard. She speaks intimately and with frustration, within the convention of the soliloquy, about her predicament because Romeo is who he is and she laments the impossibility of their love. But here Shakespeare employs in addition a device he uses repeatedly throughout his work: having someone watch somebody else, and the watcher is Romeo. I want to draw attention to the ways in which Romeo interrupts this quasi-soliloquy. The device here is undoubtedly meta-theatrical as it makes us aware of the theatrical device itself. Romeo makes four interjections and each in different ways seems to point to his own position as a listener and one who might interrupt the flow of her soliloquy, but it is some time before he actually comes to do it.

She speaks. Yet she says nothing. (II.1.54)
'Tis not to me she speaks (56)
She speaks
O, speak again, bright angel. (67-8)
Shall I hear more, or shall I speak at this? (79)

This tense situation, as we wait to see how they will make contact, is inherently theatrical when it comes to performance. Zeffirelli keeps the whole passage intact in his version. We should note too the camera work which controls how we see the passage. He begins with very long shots, giving a sense of the distance between Romeo and Juliet. Gradually this is modified until at the end they are together in the same frame. He is thus using this prompting of the intervention by Romeo as a way of pacing the camera work. We can perhaps go so far as to say that the text has given the lead to the camera here, and I feel that this is a good example of the way in which the text may be translated to the cinema.

So these three passages, chosen as touchstones, may help to indicate how Zeffirelli goes about adapting his material for his film work and to draw attention to the different ways he does it. They comprise exclusion, partial incorporation and complete fidelity, and decisions relating to these may have

arisen from an infinite variety of objectives. No doubt it would be possible to enlarge upon them with many more examples, perhaps teasing in themselves, but my purpose has been to show how keenly Zeffirelli has attended to the original and how he may respond to it in markedly different ways. The text, I suggest, is something for negotiating. It is not something to which utter fidelity is possible, partly because of its Protean nature, and partly because a film practitioner in the twentieth century had different objectives and contexts from Shakespeare's. What we have in the film is a reading of the text which depends upon a sort of exchange of approaches. I hope we may interpret the film as a negotiation between someone who could perceive filmic opportunity and able to develop it, and the text itself, which embodies theatrical possibilities in the context of Shakespeare's own practice and that of his contemporaries. There is an interaction between this sense of the possibilities, not to mention practicalities of film, and what we can reconstruct about Shakespeare actual practice in his live theatres. I suggest that Shakespeare and Zeffirelli are thus mutually illuminating.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Gurr, Andrew (1980), *The Shakespearean Stage, 1574-1642*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Happé, Peter (1999), *English Drama before Shakespeare*, Harlow, Longman.
- Greenblatt, Stephen *et al.* (eds, 1997), *The Norton Shakespeare*, New York and London, Norton.
- Polanski, Roman (1999) interview on videotape: *Shakespeare: Text and Performance* Video 4: Macbeth/Hamlet, Milton Keynes, The Open University.