Editorial

In this issue, we have two articles of major interest for early theatre history. Charlotte Steenbrugge's essay deals with two markedly similar conventional dramatic types that emerged in the sixteenth century: the Vice in the English moral interludes and the *sinnekens* in the Dutch *spelen van sinne*. Although scholars claim a possible Dutch influence on English drama, no thorough investigation has substantiated the interface of dramatic conventions from these two traditions. Steenbrugge argues that the Vice and *sinnekens* are substantially different and that they certainly do not support, and if anything argue against, a Dutch influence on English drama in the sixteenth century. Arata Ide's essay on John Fletcher straightens out the chronology of the playwright's life. By drawing attention to a previously unnoticed document, this paper clarifies the issues clouding the university career of John Fletcher of Corpus Christi College and suggests some difficulty in identifying this Corpus Christi man with John Fletcher of Rye, the bishop's son. This new evidence contributes to removing the confusion that has blighted previous efforts to establish his identity.

The other two other articles in this issue discuss sources and setting choices. Joanne Rochester traces the recurrence of the same story from the Digby *Mary Magdalen* to Shakespeare's *Pericles*. These plays provide the opportunity to compare the dramaturgical work of two periods: they present the same tale, told to two different audiences, in two different playing spaces to effect the representation of travel and locale. Lisa Hopkins's essay explores the Italian setting in John Ford's most famous play, *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*. Set in Parma, the play includes characters who have visited Livorno and Bologna, but one early scene shows us Soranzo, still a suitor for Annabella, alone 'in his study, reading a book', which he later tells us contains Jacopo Sannazaro's encomium on Venice. Soranzo apparently proposes a rewriting which would praise Annabella rather than Venice; however, Sannazaro was

in fact associated almost exclusively with Naples. This paper proposes some reasons for Ford's reference to Sannazaro in this context.

This issue also features two collaborative essays. The Review Essay offers an assessment of the Chester cycle performance in Toronto, May 2010, by a range of scholarly observers. Garrett P.J. Epp, one of our new editorial board members, collected the segments of this review article commenting on several notable play productions from that event; the authors include Mary Elizabeth Ellzey, Douglas W. Hayes, Erin E. Kelly, Heather S. Mitchell, and Dimitry Senyshyn. Together these pieces analyze some issues of performance, scholarship, and history that were raised by Chester 2010.

Tom Rutter, the contributing editor of Issues in Review, deals with the growing field of repertory studies. This segment outlines why critics and theatre historians have come to see a repertory-based approach as representing a productive way of thinking about early modern drama, and makes reference to recent developments in this area. The essays that follow respond to specific tensions within the methodology of repertory studies. Eleanor C. Collins writes about the Shrove Tuesday riot of 1617 when the newly built Cockpit playhouse was attacked by a band of 'lewde and loose persons, apprentices and others'. The uprising has been interpreted as a powerful expression of audience demand: the Red Bull audience's response to the transfer of their plays to a prohibitively expensive hall playhouse. Collins explores the centrality of the riot to repertory-motivated readings of the Red Bull, examining the connection in criticism between audience preference and repertory. Charles Cathcart examines two plays of the Lord Admiral's Men, *Englishmen for My Money* and *The Two Angry Women of Abingdon*, in which echoes of *Romeo and Juliet* appear. The first performances of both plays took place at the Rose in or very close to 1598. These echoes suggest a degree of integration into urban literary fashion, and exhibit the playwrights' knowing playfulness that was soon to characterize the repertory of the childrens' companies. Elizabeth Ford examines the famous stage direction, '*Enter Will Kemp*', unique to the 1599 second quarto edition of *Romeo and Juliet*, a direction that tells us much about how Shakespeare's composition habits were an amalgam of page and stage. If, as the direction clearly suggests, the renowned stage clown and sharer in the Lord Chamberlain's Men played the Capulet servant Peter in original performances of the play, it also indicates a moment where authorial agency is potentially overridden by the anarchic potential of comic extemporization. Kemp's presence in the text thus provides a way of reading the play as a problematical dialectic between the material form of the actor and

the author's creation of the illusory stage world of Verona — one that Kemp is able to disrupt. Finally, Clare Smout looks at the competition between the two established, commercially successful actor-playwrights, Shakespeare and Heywood. Scholars tend to ignore Heywood's position as sharer in Worcester's/Queen's Men and his many years spent writing for the same group of actors, while they celebrate Shakespeare as unique in his combination of roles. This paper draws attention to the parallels between the two dramatists and emphasizes the recognition Heywood received in his own time; it then takes up *A Woman Killed with Kindness, Measure for Measure*, and the circumstances of their composition to argue that Shakespeare appears to have been both aware of and influenced by his contemporary's work.

Helen Ostovich
Melinda Gough