

Myles O’Gorman and Bonnie Lander Johnson

Shakespeare’s Statuary Women and the Indoor Theatre’s Discovery Space

This article places three scenes by Shakespeare within a specific architectural history. It reads the statuary female bodies of Desdemona, Hermione, and Imogen as revered and desecrated objects within the niched spaces of the indoor theatre’s discovery space.

Three of Shakespeare’s plays (*Othello*, *Cymbeline*, and *The Winter’s Tale*) contain key scenes in which a still female body (either dead, sleeping, or presented as a statue) is revealed and displayed in the theatre’s discovery space. In each scene, the female body is viewed, described, and read for signs of life, love, or betrayal by a male voyeur circling around the fringes of the inner stage, and is in this way ‘objectified into art’.¹ These scenes create a dramaturgical trope that was made possible by the new conditions of the indoor theatre. The more intimate setting of the Blackfriars and its later rivals provided a series of enclosed stage spaces which, lit by candlelight and darkened by shadow, both framed and veiled the bodies presented within them, enabling a particular kind of spectacle that would have been impossible in the outdoor public playing spaces. However, as we will argue, these spectacles also provided audiences with a visual delight and emotional tautness — at once numinous and violent — which echoed certain liturgical events that had not been available to Londoners since the Elizabethan religious settlement.

At the end of *The Winter’s Tale*, a statue of Hermione is revealed to Leontes in Paulina’s private chapel sixteen years after Hermione ‘died’ following her husband’s condemnation. Leontes humbles himself in front of his wife’s image, questioning and venerating its lifelike appearance. Upon Paulina’s command, Hermione’s statue miraculously transforms into flesh. At the end of *Othello*, the Moor vows to kill his seemingly unfaithful wife. He declares that Desdemona’s ‘lust-stained’

Myles O’Gorman (mylesogorman@hotmail.co.uk) is a theatre director and co-artistic director of Helikon Theatre Company. Bonnie Lander Johnson (bcl24@cam.ac.uk) is a fellow and director of studies at Newnham College, University of Cambridge.

bed shall ‘with lust’s blood be spotted’ (5.1.38).² In the following scene, Desdemona is revealed in her bed and pushed on stage from the discovery space. Othello proceeds to venerate the image of his sleeping wife whom he describes ‘as smooth as monumental alabaster’ (5.2.5). Murder is still Othello’s intention but, having seen Desdemona’s body, he promises not to ‘shed her blood; / Nor scar that whiter skin of hers than snow’ (3–4). Once Desdemona wakes, Othello smothers her. In 2.2 of *Cymbeline*, Iachimo emerges from a trunk in Imogen’s room to note the ‘contents’ of Imogen’s body and her bedchamber in an attempt to win a wager against her lover, Posthumous. Like Othello, Iachimo venerates the body before him, describing it as ‘fresh lily / And whiter than the sheets’ (17–18). While Desdemona ‘excels the quirks of blazoning pens’ (69), Iachimo uses his ‘blazoning pen’ to write Imogen’s body and its details into his tables. All three of these male characters describe, deify, and desire to touch the still female body displayed in the discovery space.

Historicist literary criticism of the last two decades has done much to situate the drama of Shakespeare and his peers in a religious landscape that was, as Arthur Marotti describes it, a confessional ‘muddled middle’.³ While a degree of theological stability existed for those on the puritan and recusant extremes, most early moderns existed somewhere in-between. Though certain historical moments can be cited as turning points in the Reformation, the transition from Catholicism to the orthodox Protestantism of the national church was long, messy, and uncertain. James A. Knapp argues that ‘the rise of the popular stage at precisely the moment following the decline of medieval image culture suggests that the power of their visual spectacle was not simply removed from English channel cultural life; instead it was channelled to other outlets’.⁴ For Shakespeare and his generation, the Catholicism in which their parents were raised had not fully vanished, but remained as ‘a cultural phenomenon, an eclectic ensemble of objects, images, stories, practices and beliefs’.⁵ Frances Dolan has described the process by which these images and practices ‘returned’ in the literature and drama of the period as ‘undead’ hauntings. She cites the long-standing association between Catholicism and the feminine, arguing that the dead women of the early modern stage often embodied these moments of return.⁶ Huston Diehl also observes that ‘the violence against beautiful and beloved women that is repeatedly enacted’ in early modern tragedy may be informed by ‘iconoclastic violence against beautiful and beloved images’.⁷

Jennifer Waldron, however, opposes the critical tendency to view the public theatre as a form of compensation ‘for the loss of sacred Catholic belief systems by recuperating them within the domain of fiction’.⁸ She asks instead whether the

theatre might have been a true Protestant 'church' in that it 'offered imaginative and aestheticized versions of "justice" in place of efficacious Catholic rituals', positing whether the theatre was 'an inherently secular and secularising institution'.⁹ Waldren's questions about the professional playing houses as sites of reform are important since the theatre emerged, as a reformed practice, precisely out of one of early modern England's most controversial and widely-enjoyed public events: medieval biblical drama. And yet, Michael O'Connell's work has deepened our understanding of how incompletely the reformation of the theatre was achieved. Even decades after the official eradication of any Christological or biblical elements from the stage, the theatre continued to be associated with idolatry.¹⁰

Drawing on observations by Dolan, O'Connell, and Diehl, this article is concerned with the particularly potent traces of Catholic practice and belief that surrounded two associated and controversial areas of popular devotion: the Eucharist and statuary. We argue that the innovative stage technology developed for London's indoor theatres offered a dramaturgical experience that drew on architectural elements from playgoers' shared liturgical past. Much of this history is already well known to theatre historians. We intend to focus in particular on the statuary body and its relationship to two architectural features: the niches disappearing from church architecture and the 'discovery space' emerging onstage. Within this specific context, the feminized body, which in the new secular theatre of Elizabethan London belonged to narratives of desire, love, and loss, came to bear many fading signs of embodied divinity that were disappearing from public spaces of worship and devotion.

In the three scenes treated here, the female statuary body recalls the theological drama of the Eucharist through both its scriptural narrative of broken fleshliness and its subsequent violation at the hands of iconoclasts. Playgoers witnessed the 'return' of an exalted divine body — a body at once mortal and immortal, violated and inviolable, stone and flesh. The body is framed through the stage technologies surrounding it, and through the gesture and language of the male lovers who desire, adore, and violate it. Of course, Reformation controversy surrounding the Eucharist and the use of statues in devotion stemmed from two distinct doctrinal disagreements. The rejection of transubstantiation had a long and complex history that was formed largely out of reformist reinterpretation of the Lord's Supper as the phenomenon is described in the synoptic gospels. And iconoclast attacks on statuary were grounded in puritan belief that any visible and material objects of devotion were the graven images condemned in the second commandment. But the two controversies frequently dovetailed, especially in popular thought, due to their shared concern with Christ's fleshly body.

The kind of theatrical spectacle with which this article is concerned was built from a cluster of visual effects, emotional tones, gestures, and, primarily, a positioning of the statuesque body within an architectural arrangement and heritage that was dramaturgically innovative but liturgically reminiscent. The particular combination of these elements drew on cultural materials circulating in Elizabethan and Jacobean London, especially those associated with the desecrated body of Christ, and produced for playgoers an inverse sacramentalism. The adored and glorified Eucharistic body found its echo in the stage spectacle of a much-loved female body, violated, inspected for truth, mourned, and — in the case of Hermione and Imogen — ultimately restored to life and moral integrity.

There already exists a rich corpus of scholarship on Hermione’s statue as dramaturgically built from various forms of Catholic residue,¹¹ and a well-established critical understanding of tragicomedy’s death-to-resurrection narrative as fundamentally Christological.¹² The more specific claim being made here is that those Shakespearean scenes built around the venerated statuesque body are relevant not just to Christian ontology but to specific historical moments in which the repercussions of Eucharistic controversy were imprinted onto the changing architectural experience of secular drama. In this respect, the example of Desdemona is distinct from the other two scenes. A tragic heroine, Desdemona dies — there is no resurrection of her body or reputation, as there is for Imogen and Hermione.

These three scenes provided spectacle through the use of the ‘discovery space’, a facet of stage architecture that was present in both of the early modern playhouses belonging to the King’s Men.¹³ The discovery space was a central, ‘recessed’¹⁴ opening in the *frons scenae*, covered by a curtain, that gave access to a rear, or ‘inner’, stage in the tiring house.¹⁵ When the curtain that covered the recessed areas was closed, the discovery space could be used to put new set pieces or props in place without interrupting the action on stage.¹⁶ The curtain could then be opened, enabling the audience to ‘discover’ the newly arranged scene or objects within.¹⁷ Of all the large props discovered in this space, beds were the most common.¹⁸ Although most scholars agree that beds would have been thrust out from the discovery space into the main playing area,¹⁹ the exact use of the discovery space is still in contention. Irwin Smith and E.K. Chambers both point to the example of Imogen’s bedchamber in *Cymbeline*, arguing that — especially in the indoor theatre — the bed may have remained stationary within the discovery space.²⁰ In 5.2 of *Othello*, Desdemona’s bed would have most likely been thrust onto the stage from the discovery space, enabling Othello access. In 5.3 of *The Winter’s Tale*, Paulina discovers ‘Hermione standing like a statue’ (23) before

finally welcoming her to step down and walk out of the discovery space toward her family gathered on the main stage.

While stage discoveries were common practice even in the outdoor theatre (through an actor drawing a cover or curtain or removing a costume) the technical innovation of the 'discovery space' flourished within the specific conditions of the indoor theatre. Although the outdoor Globe theatre contained a discovery space similar to the one in the Blackfriars, the advent of indoor theatre and its accompanying innovations necessitated a tonal and stylistic shift that, as Andrew Gurr and Farah Karim-Cooper put it, 'redefined theatre practice for centuries to come'.²¹ The 'discovery' of Hermione's 'statue' exemplifies this difference in tone, as the revelation certainly 'would have looked and sounded different at the company's two theatres'.²² Scholars often describe this scene as one of the most moving in Shakespeare's canon.²³ However, Simon Forman's contemporary eyewitness account, from a 1611 performance of *The Winter's Tale* at the Globe, gives no mention to the transformation scene.²⁴ Penelope Woods argues that perhaps 'the affective quality of the statue ... was very different when it was not experienced in the same condition of proximate, intimate voyeurism as the Blackfriars'.²⁵ In the Blackfriars, the revealing of Hermione's statue to her mourning family would have been within the half-enclosed recess of the discovery space in much the same way as early modern statues were routinely placed in niches, lit by candles that produced a movement of light and shadow thereby enhancing the uncanny sense of the statue as living body. Rather than simply being discovered in open shared daylight on the vast Globe stage, the innovations of the indoor theatre focused the gaze of the Blackfriars audience on Hermione's statue and helped to produce the statue's magical transformation from death to life.²⁶

The most influential change brought about by the indoor theatre was the smaller size of the stage. Mariko Ichikawa argues that the 'Blackfriars stage was about half the size of the Globe stage'; she also mentions that 'gallants sat on the stage itself, thus reducing the players' acting space'.²⁷ To Ichikawa, the Blackfriars ultimately represented a more 'enclosed' space than the outdoor Globe.²⁸ Certainly, the audience was much closer to the stage. Tiffany Stern describes the Blackfriars stage as 'crushed' and 'in the midst of spectators'.²⁹ Paul Menzer argues that 'the Blackfriars helped bring about an increase in spectacle' of which the 'cause was not decadence, but proximity'.³⁰ The Blackfriars was key in 'institutionalising intimacy'.³¹ *Cymbeline* is largely concerned with the language of 'diminution' and depth; Imogen describes how 'I would have broke mine eye-strings; cracked them' (1.3.22). In the smaller Blackfriars space, Shakespeare asks his characters and audience to squint and focus on the minute. The indoor

theatre’s very different use of lighting also contributed to the development of the new theatrical style. Martin White has done extensive restaging of plays in an indoor theatre modelled on Blackfriars with varying patterns of candlelight, and he describes the statuary waxwork figures revealed in the discovery space in John Webster’s *The Duchess of Malfi* (1614). White argues that candlelight would have been used to frame the bodies; a ‘torch’ was ‘no doubt’ used due to its ‘ability to focus the attention on a specific thing onstage’.³² The indoor theatre’s musical landscape also differed significantly from that of the Globe. Rather than the outdoor theatre’s loud trumpets and brass, the indoor theatre provided lighter and more airy instrumentation, which flowed down from the musician’s gallery above, underscoring the statue scene as a ‘magical miracle’.³³

When deployed in the three scenes with which this article is concerned, the indoor theatre’s dramaturgical innovations helped to produce the magical quality of the female statuary form and its particular kind of spectacle.³⁴ Stern suggests that ‘devices of the “close-up”, like facial expressions, came to be more meaningful in a Blackfriars play’.³⁵ In the indoor theatre, emphasis was thus placed on what critics now term the ‘static’ spectacle.³⁶ The discovery space plays a key role in this; the scenes that make full use of its architectural possibilities are designed as static tableaux, whose female bodies are revealed or entombed.³⁷ Each of these three scenes exemplify Shakespeare’s interest in illusions of stillness — an optic playfulness that demands onlookers question the reality of what they are seeing. The use of candlelight was central to the ‘deceptive nature’ of these spectacles.³⁸ Martin White explains that the ‘uneven flicker of the burning wicks of dozens of candles plays with the surfaces on which the light falls, softening them and giving life and texture’.³⁹ Leontes has to question ‘would you not deem it breathed? And that those veins / Did verily bear blood?’ (5.3.75–6). He plays the role of the questioning audience, in front of whom the statue suddenly — but perhaps not impossibly — moves into being. Karim-Cooper, agreeing with Richard Meek, asserts that ‘the statue scene materializes the deceptive nature of sight’.⁴⁰

Although *Othello* was written before the King’s Men moved to Blackfriars, its first recorded performance was held indoors at court in Whitehall. After Blackfriars was acquired, *Othello* became a staple of Shakespeare’s indoor theatre. Stern rightly argues that ‘too great a focus on dating ... has blinded us to the versions of his plays that actually survive’, and that the text is ‘haunted by the Blackfriars space too’.⁴¹ *Othello* is not, like *Cymbeline* and *The Winter’s Tale*, a tragicomedy, so we might forget that it contains a scene that is shaped by the same dramaturgical qualities that mark Imogen’s bedroom scene and Hermione’s statue scene. The arresting intimacy and violence of the scene played around Desdemona’s

sleeping — and later dead — body would have been most noticeable indoors. Woods cites an eyewitness account by Henry Jackson from a 1610 indoor performance of *Othello* at Corpus Christi Hall, Oxford. His account 'proposes a complex condition of private voyeurism instantiated at the indoor theatre'; for Jackson, Desdemona's 'static but "imploring" face' remained the 'compelling focus' of the scene.⁴² Jackson's account is shaped by a paradox made possible through the technological conditions of the indoor theatre. Desdemona's body was static — dead — but also continued to perform and 'do'. Candlelight and shadow paired with proximity and haunting music create movement on a still body, paradoxically shaping its static, indeed deathly, performance with the marks of life. Hillary Nunn suggests that Jackson's eyewitness account 'explicitly notes the "action" needed to play the role of the corpse effectively'.⁴³

One way of understanding the influences that helped to shape the illusions made possible in the indoor theatre is to consider similar developments taking place in the visual arts. Leslie Thomson has recently situated the discovery space and its broader dramaturgical traditions of revelation and truth-telling within the long history of painted, printed, and sculptural alcoves and curtained spaces.⁴⁴ Nunn argues that bodies in the discovery space appear 'within a frame' similar to ones 'used to facilitate perspective painting'.⁴⁵ She suggests that plays written for the indoor theatre 'began to manipulate more overtly these marks of seeing, calling upon perspective painting's means of creating the illusions of depth'.⁴⁶ Shakespeare's interest in visual illusions influenced later Jacobean dramatists, for whom the statuary style developed by Shakespeare became a common form of tragic art.⁴⁷ The manipulation of perspective was also central to Restoration theatre design that called on the continental baroque style led by figures such as Serlio.⁴⁸ *The Winter's Tale* most clearly hints towards this developing continental interest in painted optics and deception by referencing the contemporary Italian artists who, in Paulina's deceit, formed and painted Hermione's statue.⁴⁹ In *The Winter's Tale*, Shakespeare explicitly recognizes the power of the indoor theatre to deceive the audience in its staging of seemingly static spectacle.

Bart van Es suggests that there is a need in Shakespeare's late plays to 'assert the truth of what [the characters] are seeing'.⁵⁰ Similarly, Shakespeare's acknowledgement of illusionary optics invites the audience to examine the truth of the body: living or dead, statuary or moving? Ultimately, the primary function of the discovery space invites the audience to discover a visually rich scene, built from illusion, and to question and interpret its reality. A curtain is opened, giving the audience access to a privileged realm housing the secrets of the female body. Both Nunn and Neill suggest that the female body itself is a space of discovery that

‘existed to challenge the curious gaze, as if it were there to be opened’.⁵¹ As Woods argues, the Blackfriars was a theatrical space ‘permeated with erotic possibility’.⁵² The audience is thrust into the roles of Othello, Iachimo, and Leontes as they interpret the statuary female body, examining it for life and ‘breath’ and reading it for signs of chastity. In each of these three scenes, a sexual secret is uncovered and displayed for ‘judgement’.⁵³ The wonder and uncertainty experienced by the male onlookers is undoubtedly shaped by the dramaturgical arrangement of the statuary women they adore. Crucially, this arrangement was predicated on the Blackfriars’s long and complex architectural history.

The Blackfriars’s Architectural Heritage as Catholic ‘Haunting’

On 5 November 1623, eighteen years after the Gunpowder Plot, the upper floor of Hunsdon House collapsed in London’s Blackfriars precinct during a sermon given by Robert Drury. Drury was a popular Jesuit preacher at the time and the room was packed with a recusant congregation, numbering around two or three hundred. The medieval foundations of the house could not support their weight; halfway through Drury’s sermon, the floor beam suddenly broke. The collapse of Hunsdon House, memorialized as the ‘Fatal Vespers’, served as a stark reminder that Blackfriars was an area of London composed and built from the recycled parts of London’s most significant medieval priory.⁵⁴

The Blackfriars began its architectural life as a Dominican friary in either 1276 or 1278.⁵⁵ It originally occupied a large, nine-acre area of land that, due to its monastic independence, was a self-governing ‘liberty’ of London.⁵⁶ It nonetheless maintained strong royal connections. The first major benefactor was Edward I. Surviving records confirm its status as one of the largest halls in medieval London.⁵⁷ The crown claimed the great hall in the upper frater as a space for state affairs as early as the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.⁵⁸ Parliament was held in the hall three times between 1450 and 1529; it was also the site of several privy council meetings and home to the Royal Chancery from 1315. Its most famous event was the divorce trial between Henry VIII and Katherine of Aragon in 1529.⁵⁹ Henry VIII then built Bridewell Palace next door to the friary, in the hope that the two precincts could become a new ‘royal capital’.⁶⁰

The most destructive period in the Blackfriars’s history came after the dissolution of the monasteries in 1538 when Thomas Cawarden, the master of revels, acquired the liberty (as it still was) in 1550.⁶¹ He ‘proceeded forthwith’ to tear down the main priory church and repurpose its stone to build houses elsewhere on his land.⁶² By 1552, the innards of the monastic site had been removed, leaving

a shell filled with its recycled and repurposed stone.⁶³ By 1571, the eastern upper frater had been split into four rooms while the west was divided into three, making 'seven great upper rooms' in total.⁶⁴ Although Cawarden's involvement as master of revels initiated the Blackfriars's establishment as a theatrical venue, his primary role was to turn this once grand sacred space into compartmentalized living quarters for the gentry. The Blackfriars became a residential precinct run by an independent community, perhaps spear-headed by the puritan Elizabeth Russell.⁶⁵ The area became associated with the 'hotter sort' of Protestant.⁶⁶

The establishment of the first Blackfriars playhouse coincided with the area's residential development. In 1576, Richard Farrant built his playhouse in the friary's old buttery, next door to the upper frater (the two shared a staircase). In 1596, James Burbage acquired the Blackfriars site from Sir William More for £600 in order to turn it into a 'new playhouse'.⁶⁷ This included the hall in the upper frater (at that time 'seven great rooms'), the 'vaults and cellars' beneath the hall, and the northern end of the building (including the 'great winding stairs' situated between the old buttery and upper frater).⁶⁸ Burbage had time to tear down the partitioned rooms in the upper frater before the puritan neighbourhood successfully petitioned the privy council to stop the development of Burbage's new indoor theatre.⁶⁹

After an initial residency by the Children of the Chapel in Burbage's upper frater, the King's Men finally occupied the theatre in 1608, with performances beginning in 1609 or early 1610. The great hall in the upper frater — first a priory, then a hall for parliament, and then private apartments — now housed the second indoor theatre at Blackfriars.⁷⁰ Burbage's theatre stripped Cawarden's added layers and partitions away. While the upper frater now contained spatial arrangements and technologies specific to the indoor theatre (seating, a stage, a tiring house), the hall's medieval shell was visible once again.⁷¹ The audience, sitting in the Blackfriars, encountered the 'walls, windows and roof' of the medieval upper frater.⁷²

Stern argues that the second Blackfriars playhouse not only slotted into this 'ancient space', but that it was also 'reliant on its ancient fabric'.⁷³ She suggests that the audience would have encountered the site's monastic prehistory by entering the playhouse via the 'great winding stairs', owned by Burbage to the north of the upper frater.⁷⁴ Although Stern acknowledges the temporal commingling of the early modern playhouse with its spatial prehistory, she also emphasizes that this kind of architectural 'return' would have been more likely to signal to playgoers the memory of the upper frater as courtly space and parliament chamber, not as priory.⁷⁵ Shakespeare does certainly reference the Blackfriars's parliamentary

prehistory in *Henry VIII*. In this play, Shakespeare restages Katherine of Aragon’s divorce trial on the very site that it originally took place.⁷⁶ As Dustagheer argues, in the historically soaked space of Blackfriars, ‘time collapses’ and the audience ‘occupy both Parliament hall and theatre’.⁷⁷

Blackfriars had a complex architectural history, being repeatedly adopted for religious, political, royal, civic, and artistic purposes. But the religious history of its architectural translations was particularly marked. It housed the country’s most significant divorce hearing. Henry VIII’s divorce of Katharine of Aragon was a crucial turning point in the English break from Rome. The building underwent a series of reconfigurations, each exposing and concealing the religious fabric of its foundations as it was claimed by crown and parliament, by commerce, and ultimately by London’s most fervent puritans, and, later, by the ‘Fatal Vespers’. The Blackfriars’s re-emergence as London’s first indoor theatre drew directly on this complex history. In the early modern period, Londoners were surrounded by repurposed and recycled architectural spaces, but Blackfriars was an architectural space especially ‘haunted’ and its eventual use as a theatre articulated this haunting.⁷⁸ We could say that the Blackfriars’s architectural ghosts required performance to be fully recognized: through the process of dramatization and the innovations required to repurpose a space for playing, the Blackfriars’s ghosts were staged and thereby coaxed out of their historical shell.⁷⁹

One of the Blackfriars’s architectural features that underwent a specific transformation at the hands of reformers, but which was central to Shakespeare’s use of the indoor theatre in the three scenes analyzed here, was the niche. A niche was a recessed, shallow space that often contained a statue or other decorative object. They were prevalent in church architecture, with most containing the statues of saints and reliquaries. In the thirteenth century, niches were placed on the floors of the church, chapel, or shrine but by the fourteenth century they had moved upwards to enable a kneeling penitent to lift their eyes to the statue enclosed within.⁸⁰ Statues and relics took on an increasingly elaborate function in popular prayer within these spaces. Devotees brought votive cards, bones, gifts, money, flowers, and prayer cards, placing them inside the enclosed spaces in acts of gratitude and appeals for intercession. Often lit from within, the statues took on a life-like quality, their features painted with increasingly sophisticated techniques to produce for those kneeling beneath a sense of consciousness and response. In this way, prayer niches encouraged a more interactive relationship between devotee and the architectural fabric of worship spaces.⁸¹

Niches were also central to developments in statuary. Tomb sculptures and funerary monuments were the most popular form of sculpture in medieval and

early modern England.⁸² Churches, from small chapels to the country's largest cathedrals, increasingly featured galleries housing funerary monuments that were placed in niches under gothic canopies and triumphal arches.⁸³ Tombs were usually placed horizontally in long niches, but the body was sometimes depicted as standing.⁸⁴ In this way, monumental sculpture, placed under a canopy, invited interpretation and comparison with the familiar image of a saint standing in its sacred niche.⁸⁵

The post-Reformation funerary monument, occupying the same sacred and elevated space as a medieval saint statue, functioned as a sign of lost popular devotions.⁸⁶ But it also signified the secularizing process by which the divine body in medieval statue art was replaced by the body of mourned loved ones. Towards the seventeenth century, the fashion of monumental sculpture began to change; even greater emphasis was placed on the 'simulation of the living form'.⁸⁷ The already 'theatrical' funerary monument, speaking to the 'viewer' like a 'pageant device or stage mansion', became even more lifelike.⁸⁸ Funerary monuments created a 'fantasy of animation'; their three-dimensional mimesis could only be bettered by drama.⁸⁹ Central to this fantasy of animation was the alabaster from which funeral monuments were made: a material whose translucence most recalled white skin, especially under candlelight. However lifelike alabaster was, the material remained a little too white to truly depict life; for this reason, it recalled both the death through which those memorialized in stone had been transformed, and also, like the material's frequent association with 'pearl', offered an idealized image of fleshly purity.

Alabaster was one of the staples of English industry prior to the Reformation; the material was central to the creation of altarpieces and various devotional images. Francis Cheetham argues that waves of early modern iconoclasm were so severe that the English origins of the alabaster industry were forgotten. Tomb sculpture, a funerary art acceptable to iconoclasts since it memorializes the mortal and does not represent the divine, offered the alabaster industry a space in which it could survive.⁹⁰ In Shakespeare's London, 'alabaster', a word frequently deployed on stage by lovers describing the beauty and whiteness of the female body, recalled a particular moment in the history of statue art. The disappearance of sacred statuary, and its replacement with funerary monuments, transposed long-standing devotional impulses at the feet of 'alabaster' into mourning practices. The erotic possibilities of 'alabaster' as a description of the naked female body drew on a cluster of widely-held associations between violence, longing, loss, and the sacred.

The niche and statue were, like the long history of changes to the Blackfriars itself, crucial architectural elements from which Shakespeare’s statuary scenes were built. These scenes draw on the devotional impulses that haunt the new technologies of the indoor theatre to frame the body in such a way as to produce in the onlooker a sense of wonder and a desire that is bound up with the reality of fleshly and iconoclastic violence. These same devotional impulses were also enabled by the new theatre’s recollection of the rood screen and its spatial dynamics. By the mid-fifteenth century nearly every English parish had a rood screen.⁹¹ These were wooden screens (usually painted with images) that stretched across the church, separating the main nave from the sacred chancel, behind which sat the high altar. The rood screen belonged to the area of the church owned by the laity; they were objects cared for by parishioners and became a source of great pride.⁹² Each rood screen was unique to its parish. They provided opportunities for local craftsmanship, contained personalized niches for different guilds and families and, like tomb sculpture, they stood as a monument to those who funded their creation and maintenance.⁹³ The rood screen was nevertheless seen to protect the consecrated host by keeping the laity out.⁹⁴

While the rood screen’s localized and practical role in the parish community emphasized its function to distinguish between the sacred space of the chancel and the more secular nave, it simultaneously offered a ‘window-frame through which the congregation watched the principal Masses celebrated in church’.⁹⁵ The rood screen invited the congregation to gaze on in wonder and watch the elevation of the consecrated host beyond the screen. Eamon Duffy points to the example of ‘elevation squints’ in the lower part of the rood screen at the eye level of the kneeling congregation.⁹⁶ The practice of looking through the screen to see the host became known as the ‘Catholic squint’.⁹⁷

Sarah Blake McHam argues that the rood screen created a community that engaged in a visual narrative when offered a glimpse of the Eucharist.⁹⁸ This narrative exerted itself constantly in the rood panel paintings depicted on the front of the screen. Paul Binski suggests that the rood screen should not be defined as a barrier or non-barrier, but that the screen is most importantly an ‘eloquent, crafted surface’.⁹⁹ The rood screen was composed of paint, wood, and alabaster and contained not just single images, but rather groups of images structured in a narrative sequence.¹⁰⁰ Candles situated in front of the screen and in the rood loft (sometimes called a ‘candlebeam’) gave the ‘flicker’ of life to the figures painted on the rood panels.¹⁰¹ Jacqueline E. Jung compares the experience of the rood screen to that of a ‘modern movie screen’.¹⁰² The rood screen turned the mass into

a theatrical affair, in which the kneeling congregation were invited to read, watch, and interpret both the narrative on screen and the elevation of the host beyond it.

During the Reformation, many of the rood panel paintings were defaced and destroyed. The rood screen itself, however, survived in large numbers.¹⁰³ During the reign of Edward VI, the positioning of altars behind a screen came under attack. The unofficial destruction of altars, legally required by Elizabeth's reign, began in 1548; meanwhile the 1552 communion rubric ordered that communion tables should be placed in the body of the church.¹⁰⁴ The compartmentalized church turned into an open space.¹⁰⁵ The first Elizabethan religious settlement in 1559 nevertheless supported a division, like the rood screen, between the choir and the nave. One of the indoor theatre's most prolific architects, Inigo Jones, would even go on to design the choir screen at Winchester Cathedral.¹⁰⁶

The Catholic 'Return' in *Othello*, *Cymbeline*, and *The Winter's Tale*

The Shakespearean scene that makes the fullest use of these architectural features is the statue scene in *The Winter's Tale*. Paulina very specifically keeps her 'statue' of Hermione in a private chapel and invites Hermione's mourners to view it within the recess of the discovery space. This quite precise staging recalls the devotional image of both a candlelit statue in its sacred niche and the Eucharist revealed and gazed upon beyond the rood screen. When Paulina commands Hermione to awake, she implores

Music, awake her; strike!

[*music*]

'Tis time: descend; be stone no more; approach;

Strike all that look upon with marvel. Come,

I'll fill your grave up: stir, nay, come away,

Bequeath to grave your numbness, for from him

Dear life redeems you. You perceive she stirs:

[*Hermione comes down*]

(5.3.120–5)

Through this scene's use of the indoor theatre's new technologies, the statue 'transforms into flesh'.¹⁰⁷ In this way, the scene's dramaturgical 'miracle' recreated for its audiences a familiar sensory and emotional experience of seeing a funerary statue appear as though it were living, through tricks of light, paint, and proximity. This same miraculous transformation between the inanimate and animate loved body was also, through the elaborate staging of the rood screen, potentially an experience of the 'miracle of transubstantiation'.¹⁰⁸

Duffy cites the example of Eucharistic miracle stories in which a deviant ‘doubter’ is ‘restored to the company of believers ... by a shocking revelation of the fleshly reality of the Sacrament’.¹⁰⁹ In particular, Duffy’s description of late-medieval Easter liturgies, with their focus on the Passion sequence and the Resurrection, recall much of the tone of *The Winter’s Tale’s* statue scene. Duffy describes the ceremonial burial of Christ, in the form of consecrated host, in the Easter sepulchre at the end of the Good Friday liturgy.¹¹⁰ The sepulchre was usually made of a timber frame and, during the ceremony, covered with rich cloths.¹¹¹ Congregants would watch by candlelight throughout the night and then on Easter morning the church would be lit brightly and an incensed procession led to the sepulchre. The host was then removed and placed in the hanging pyx above the main altar. The crucifix was paraded around the church before it was placed on the north altar, as people venerated the space by ‘creeping towards it’.¹¹² The sepulchre was often a permanent feature in the north wall of the chancel or in the north side of the high altar, which could take the form of a canopied niche.¹¹³ Bruce Smith argues that Hermione takes the form of a funerary monument, whereas Catherine Belsey likens her more specifically to an effigy.¹¹⁴ However, placed in the context of this Easter ceremony and its architectural surroundings of niches, rood screens, and candlelight, Hermione’s statue is more like the consecrated host in the sepulchre, waiting to be revealed and brought back to life in front of a gathered congregation.

This particular liturgical echo is not as immediately apparent in the scenes from *Othello* and *Cymbeline*. Unlike the scene in Paulina’s private chapel, these two do not take place in a space designated for worship. Instead, both Desdemona and Imogen are displayed as statuary bodies asleep in bed. The audience must follow the gaze of the male characters as they cross the threshold of a private, domestic space. But both bedrooms nonetheless suggest the private devotional practices common to the domestic sphere. Where Imogen prays to the ‘gods’ for ‘protection’ before she sleeps (2.2.10), the first thing Othello asks Desdemona is if she has ‘prayed tonight’ (5.2.26). Most importantly, the opening of the discovery space frames the statuary bodies in the niched space of the rear stage. And both Desdemona and Imogen are likened to funerary monuments. Iachimo implores ‘sleep’ to ‘lie dull upon’ Imogen like ‘death’ so that she may become ‘a monument / Thus in a chapel lying’ (2.2.33–5). He likens her skin to a ‘fresh lily / And whiter than the sheets’ (17–18). Othello describes Desdemona’s body as ‘monumental alabaster’ and ‘whiter ... than snow’ (5.2.5, 4). In this way, the literary description of translucent and fleshly whiteness, alongside the likely painting of the boy actor’s face with ‘pearl’ cosmetic,¹¹⁵ reproduces the experience of gazing

upon a sacred alabaster statue, lit by candles and situated in a niche. Iachimo and Othello deify the still, white bodies framed in the discovery space, turning them into objects of devotion before violating them.

In these scenes, the simultaneous responses of devotion and violence are articulated through the male characters' impression of the statuary women as devotional art objects. But in the specific context of the Blackfriars and its recessed discovery space, the searching gaze with which the men observe, interpret, and desire the women recalls a wonder and fear drawn also perhaps from the drama of the rood screen and its particular framing of the loved body, at once violated and perfect. This possibility is suggested also in the scenes' emotional tone. When Hermione's statue is unveiled, Leontes falls silent. Paulina interprets his response as 'wonder' (5.3.25). When Leontes speaks, he explains that the statue is 'so much to my good comfort, as it is / Now piercing to my soul' (39–40). The statue powerfully, indeed violently, affects a pained response of humility and self-reproach in the penitent king. He deifies and desires the statue, asking to 'kiss her' (95) and imploring Paulina not to 'draw the curtain' (69). His passion is produced by an awareness that the art object before him is so perfect it has conjured his wife's living presence: 'We are mock'd with art' (80). Leontes is keenly aware that his wondrous experience is a staged, artistic fallacy; his disbelief prompts Paulina to advise 'It is required / You do awake your faith' (114–15).

While Iachimo and Othello similarly adore the statuary female body as a work of supreme art, both are compelled to violate the monumental sleeper entombed in the discovery space. The most explicit danger in *Cymbeline* comes from the scene's parallels with the rape of Philomel. Imogen reads a book in bed before she asks her serving woman, Helen, to 'fold down the leaf where I have left' (2.2.6). The book's matter is left unsaid and the audience only learn its contents when Iachimo picks it up: 'the leaf's turned down / Where Philomel gave up' (47–8). By reading and touching the folded leaf, Iachimo interrupts and inserts himself into the close relationship between serving woman and noblewoman. In this moment he joins the ranks of Tarquin and Tereus, but he fulfils the imagined literary role of rapist without crossing into the realm of action. Imogen still remains asleep in bed. Iachimo's violation of Imogen's body takes place on a described 'symbolic' field rather than a physical one.¹¹⁶ Imogen undergoes a literary dissection as Iachimo's blazon violently writes the 'notes' of her body into his tables (30). Iachimo (and Shakespeare) writes Imogen into a literary and mythological canon in which she performs, on paper, the same role as Philomel and Lucrece. Imogen's 'static body enables her to be re-created as a meta-character' as she is framed by and subsumed into the arras hanging in her bedroom and the folded book beside

her.¹¹⁷ The audience are invited to read Imogen’s body as raped and destroyed, if only symbolically. In the scene itself, however, she remains chaste and sacred. Like Hermione, Imogen awakes and is restored to virtue both after this scene and, more explicitly, in 4.2 when her seemingly dead body is resurrected on stage.

Othello’s emotional response to Desdemona’s sleeping body also seeks to negotiate his dual impulses of love and violence. When he deifies Desdemona as ‘monument’, he promises:

Yet I’ll not shed her blood;
Nor scar that whiter skin of hers than snow,
And smooth as monumental alabaster.
Yet she must die

(5.2.3–6)

Othello ‘must’ murder Desdemona but he cannot break her body. He smothers her instead, then laments that he ‘must weep, / But they are cruel tears’ (20–1). The sight of Desdemona’s body compels Othello to deify and worship it, but his perceived duty to murder his wife means that he, unlike Iachimo, crosses into action. Like the ‘statues’ of Imogen and Hermione, Desdemona’s dead body comes back to life when, thirty-six lines after her murder, she cries ‘O, falsely, falsely murdered!’ (136). However, Desdemona has time to speak only four lines before she bids ‘farewell’ twice and dies (144–5). Her resurrection is tauntingly and unsustainably brief.

While Iachimo’s violation of Imogen’s bedchamber is a grave affront by our own standards, in the early modern context Iachimo might instead appear restrained. Having created an opportunity to violate Imogen in physical terms, he instead leaves her body untouched. He does so precisely because of the wondrous effect that her statuary body has on him. With all of the invocation of Philomel and Lucrece in this scene, Iachimo’s restraint comes as something of a surprise. Each of the three bedroom scenes detailed here hold in suspension a voyeuristic male gaze and a religiously inflected impulse to venerate rather than destroy: Othello is moved ‘almost’ to not kill Desdemona due to the purity of her image, Iachimo does not do the violence he intends, and Leontes does not touch or kiss, thereby heeding Paulina’s rebuke. Othello may indeed act on this impulse but *Cymbeline*’s bedroom scene instead highlights the experience of awe that is most realized in Hermione’s statue scene: Iachimo’s inability to destroy or alter Imogen’s body in any way. Imogen’s physical form overpowers the intruder in a way that is exactly opposite to Tarquin’s response to Lucrece.

The dramaturgical arrangement of these three scenes combines with Shakespeare’s liturgically resonant language to recall an earlier form of Catholic worship

and its accompanying emotional responses. The female body is described, staged, and displayed as an alabaster monument, flickering under candlelight like a devotional statue. It compels from both character and audience a feeling of wonder. In the niche of the discovery space, the bodies of all three women are kept holy and separate, like the high altar beyond the rood screen, from the main space occupied by male voyeur and audience. Othello cannot 'shed' Desdemona's blood (5.2.3), Iachimo only 'might touch' Imogen (2.2.18), and Leontes must 'forbear' (5.3.96). These scenes offer a new inverted sacramentalism in which the secularized female body and its narrative of sexual desire, lust, and loss is inserted into the indoor theatre's sacred history — its history of holy desire and righteous violence. All three characters desire to kiss the displayed female body. Othello 'kisses' Desdemona twice (5.2.16–19). Iachimo asks for a 'kiss, one kiss' and then describes Imogen's lips as 'rubies unparagoned' (2.2.19). Leontes exhibits a similar desire but Paulina acts as intercessor, unambiguously stopping him from touching the statue. These statuary female bodies can be seen, worshipped, and sexually interrogated, but not irrevocably destroyed. Othello's tragedy is precisely that he crosses this boundary when he touches Desdemona and commits uxoricide.

In the prologue to Ben Jonson's *The Magnetic Lady* (1632), Mr Probee jokes that the house (the Blackfriars theatre) is filled with 'oblique caves and wedges'.¹¹⁸ As in Shakespeare's *Henry VIII*, Jonson acknowledges and unfolds the hidden layers of prehistory at the site of his play's performance. Ultimately, we must remember that early moderns lived, worked, and entertained themselves amongst these layers every day.¹¹⁹ Dramatic performance makes the habitually invisible visible. Stern suggests that 'sometimes the temples [in Shakespeare's plays] hover off stage, as though a functioning religious site is just behind a wall, on the other side of the *frons scenae*'.¹²⁰ The opening of the discovery space collapses the stage's threshold, thrusting this 'functioning religious site' on stage. In these three scenes, the religious foundation of Blackfriars's medieval priory is coaxed out of its shell as the female body, and the discovery space it decorates, becomes a site for an earlier form of devotion, worship, and wonder. The playhouse restaged and resurrected its own sacred past via the discovery space in the middle of Protestant London.¹²¹ Most importantly, the scenes with which this article is concerned recreated the illegitimate experience of pre-Reformation worship for the early modern Blackfriars audience. Like the penitents who raised their eyes towards the saint's shrine in its canopied niche or the congregation who crept towards and venerated the elevated host beyond the rood screen in the Easter vigil, the Blackfriars audience gazed on the displayed female statue with a sacred wonder. The opening of the discovery space invited playgoers to read and

deify these women as alabaster monuments, but also to squint and question their fleshly reality and sexual integrity. Secular narratives of sexual betrayal, desire, and loss consumed and subverted the playgoers’ past experience of devotion to Christ’s fleshliness and the more recent reality of iconoclast destruction. While the discovery space opened a brief doorway to the Blackfriars’s monastic history, its framing of a loved and violated statuesque body ultimately invited the audience to experience the Catholic ‘return’ in new and uncomfortable ways.

Notes

- 1 Farah Karim-Cooper, ‘Paddling Palms and Pinching Fingers’, in the program to the 2016 production of *The Winter’s Tale* at the Sam Wanamaker Playhouse.
- 2 William Shakespeare, *Othello*, in *William Shakespeare: The Complete Works*, ed. Jonathan Bate and Eric Rasmussen (Basingstoke, 2007). All quotations from *Othello*, *Cymbeline*, and *The Winter’s Tale* are taken from this edition and will be referenced in the body of the text.
- 3 Arthur Moretti, ‘Shakespeare and Catholicism’, in *Theatre and Religion: Lancastrian Shakespeare*, ed. Richard Dutton, Alison Findlay, and Richard Wilson (Manchester, 2003), 219.
- 4 James A. Knapp, *Image Ethics in Shakespeare and Spenser* (New York, 2011), 35, <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230117136>.
- 5 Frances E. Dolan, ‘Hermione’s Ghost: Catholicism, the Feminine, and the Undead’, in *The Impact of Feminism in English Renaissance Studies*, ed. Dympna Callaghan (Basingstoke, 2007), 214.
- 6 Ibid; Catherine Gallagher and Stephen Greenblatt, *Practicing New Historicism* (Chicago, 2001), 141.
- 7 Huston Diehl, ‘Bewhored Images and Imagined Whores: Iconophobia and Gynophobia in Stuart Love Tragedies’, *English Literary History* 26.1 (1996), 113, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6757.1996.tb01485.x>.
- 8 Jennifer Waldron, *Reformations of the Body: Idolatry, Sacrifice, and Early Modern Theater* (New York, 2013), 1, <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137313126>.
- 9 Ibid, 2.
- 10 Michael O’Connell, *The Idolatrous Eye: Iconoclasm and Theater in Early-Modern England* (Oxford, 2000).
- 11 Ruth Vanita, ‘Mariological Memory in *The Winter’s Tale* and *Henry VIII*’, *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 40.2 (2000), 311–37, <https://doi.org/10.1353/sel.2000.0021>; O’Connell, *The Idolatrous Eye*; Phebe Jensen, ‘Singing Psalms to

- Horn-Pipes: Festivity, Iconoclasm, and Catholicism in *The Winter's Tale*, *Shakespeare Quarterly* 55.3 (2004), 279–306, <https://doi.org/10.1353/shq.2005.0012>; Darryll Grantley, “The Winter's Tale” and Early Religious Drama, *Comparative Drama* 20.1 (1986), 17–37, <https://doi.org/10.1353/cdr.1986.0037>; Julia Reinhard Lupton, *Afterlives of the Saints: Hagiography, Typology, and Renaissance Literature* (Stanford, 1996); David Kaula, ‘Autolykus’ Trumpery’, *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 16.2 (1976), 287–303, <https://doi.org/10.2307/449769>; David N. Beauregard, ‘Shakespeare Against the Skeptics: Nature and Grace in *The Winter's Tale*’, in *Shakespeare's Last Plays: Essays in Literature and Politics*, ed. Stephen W. Smith and Travis Curtright (Oxford, 2002), 53–72; Aaron Landau, “No Settled Senses of the World Can Match the Pleasure of That Madness”: The Politics of Unreason in *The Winter's Tale*, *Cahiers Élisabéthains* 64.1 (2016), 29–42, <https://doi.org/10.7227/CE.64.1.5>; Velma Bourgeois Richmond, *Shakespeare, Catholicism, and Romance* (London, 2000), <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474285285>; C.L. Barber, ‘The Family in Shakespeare's Development: Tragedy and Sacredness’, in *Representing Shakespeare: New Psychoanalytic Essays*, ed. Murray M. Schwartz and Coppélia Kahn (London, 1980), 198; C.L. Barber and Richard P. Wheeler, *The Whole Journey: Shakespeare's Power of Development* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1986), 333.
- 12 See Mimi Still Dixon, ‘Tragicomic Recognitions: Medieval Miracles and Shakespearean Romance’; Verna Foster, ‘Ford's Experiments in Tragicomedy: Shakespearean and Fletcherian Dramaturgies’; Lois Potter, “‘True Tragicomedies’ of the Civil War Period’; and Nancy K. Maguire, “‘The Whole Truth’ of Restoration Tragicomedy’, all in *Renaissance Tragicomedy: Explorations in Genre and Politics*, ed. Nancy Klein Maguire (New York, 1987). See also Robert Henke, *Pastoral Transformations: Italian Tragicomedy and Shakespeare's Late Plays* (Newark, 1997); Gordon McMullan and Jonathan Hope, eds, *The Politics of Tragicomedy: Shakespeare and After* (London, 1992); Rosalie Littell Colie, *The Resources of Kind: Genre-Theory in the Renaissance* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1973).
- 13 Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage: 1574–1642*, 4th edn (Cambridge, 2009), 4, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511819520>. Leslie Thomson's magisterial *Discoveries on the Early Modern Stage* (Cambridge, 2018), <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108590488>, was published as this article was in development. It offers a timely overview of stage discoveries and an appendix summarizing the scholarly debate around the discovery space.
- 14 Andrew Gurr and Mariko Ichikawa, *Staging in Shakespeare's Theatres* (Oxford, 2000), 113.
- 15 E.K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols (1923; rpt Oxford 2009), 3.85.
- 16 *Ibid.*, 3.83.

- 17 Martin White, *Renaissance Drama in Action: An Introduction to Aspects of Theatre Practice and Performance* (London, 1998), 118, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203298749>.
- 18 Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, 3.65–6.
- 19 Ibid, 2.541, 3.111; Irwin Smith, *Shakespeare’s Blackfriars Playhouse: Its History and Its Design* (London, 1966), 366; White, *Renaissance Drama in Action*, 173; Mariko Ichikawa, ‘Continuities and Innovations in Staging’, in *Moving Shakespeare Indoors: Performance and Repertoire in the Jacobean Playhouse*, ed. Andrew Gurr and Farah Karim-Cooper (Cambridge, 2014), 85, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139629195>.
- 20 Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, 3.111, 120; Smith, *Shakespeare’s Blackfriars Playhouse*, 351.
- 21 Andrew Gurr and Farah Karim-Cooper, ‘Introduction’, in *Shakespeare’s Blackfriars Playhouse*, ed. Gurr and Karim-Cooper, 12.
- 22 John H. Astington, ‘Why the Theatres Changed’, in *Moving Shakespeare Indoors*, ed. Gurr and Karim-Cooper, 28.
- 23 James M. Dutcher suggests that the ‘statue scene at the end of the play is perhaps the most spectacular in the Shakespearean canon’ in *Reference Guide to English Literature*, ed. Daniel L. Kirkpatrick, 2nd edn, 3 vols (Chicago, 1991), 3.1947; Derick R.C. Marsh likewise describes the scene as ‘one of the most moving ... in the whole Shakespearean canon’ in *The Recurring Miracle: A Study of Cymbeline and the Last Plays*, 3rd edn (Sydney, 1980), 159.
- 24 Penelope Woods, ‘The Audience of the Indoor Theatre’, in *Moving Shakespeare Indoors*, ed. Gurr and Karim-Cooper, 166; Karim-Cooper, ‘To Glisten in a Playhouse: Cosmetic Beauty Indoors’, in *Moving Shakespeare Indoors*, ed. Gurr and Karim-Cooper, 198.
- 25 Woods, ‘The Audience of the Indoor Theatre’, 166.
- 26 In the 2016 production of *The Winter’s Tale* at the indoor Sam Wanamaker Playhouse, Hermione was discovered in the candlelit rear stage. Compare this to all productions at Shakespeare’s Globe (1997, 2005, 2008, 2012), in which Hermione was more openly discovered behind curtains in the middle of the outdoor stage. Video recordings provided by Shakespeare’s Globe Library & Archive. Also see White, *Renaissance Drama in Action*, 149.
- 27 Ichikawa, ‘Continuities and Innovations’, 80.
- 28 Ibid, 87.
- 29 Tiffany Stern, ‘Taking Part: Actors and Audiences on the Stage at Blackfriars’, in *Inside Shakespeare: Essays on the Blackfriars Stage*, ed. Paul Menzer (Selinsgrove, 2006), 46.
- 30 Paul Menzer, ‘In the Event of Fire’, in *Moving Shakespeare Indoors*, ed. Gurr and Karim-Cooper, 175.

- 31 Ibid, 169.
- 32 White, *Renaissance Drama in Action*, 150; Martin White, "When torchlight made an artificial noon": Light and Darkness in the Indoor Jacobean Theatre', in *Moving Shakespeare Indoors*, ed. Gurr and Karim-Cooper, 135.
- 33 Sarah Dustagheer, 'Acoustic and Visual Practice Indoors', in *Moving Shakespeare Indoors*, ed. Gurr and Karim-Cooper, 142.
- 34 Woods, 'The Audience of the Indoor Theatre', 154.
- 35 Stern, 'Taking Part', 46.
- 36 Woods, 'The Audience of the Indoor Theatre', 157.
- 37 Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage*, 185.
- 38 Karim-Cooper, 'To Glisten', 200.
- 39 White, "When torchlight made an artificial noon", 135.
- 40 Karim-Cooper, 'To Glisten', 197.
- 41 Tiffany Stern, "A ruinous monastery": The Second Blackfriars Playhouse as a Place of Nostalgia', in *Moving Shakespeare Indoors*, ed. Gurr and Karim-Cooper, 99.
- 42 Woods, 'The Audience of the Indoor Theatre', 156.
- 43 Hillary M. Nunn, *Staging Anatomies: Dissection and Spectacle in Early Stuart Tragedy* (Aldershot, 2005), 64, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315242521>.
- 44 Thomson, *Discoveries on the Early Modern Stage*, 81–118.
- 45 Nunn, *Staging Anatomies*, 114–15.
- 46 Ibid, 115.
- 47 See *The Lady's Tragedy* in Thomas Middleton, *The Collected Works*, ed. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford, 2010), <https://doi.org/10.1093/actrade/9780199580538.book.1>; *The White Devil* in John Webster, *The Duchess of Malfi and Other Plays*, ed. René Weis (Oxford, 2009).
- 48 John Orrell, *The Theatres of Inigo Jones and John Webb* (Cambridge, 1985), 186.
- 49 B.J. Sokol, *Art and Illusion in The Winter's Tale* (Manchester, 1994), 65.
- 50 Bart van Es, 'Reviving the Legacy of Indoor Performance', in *Moving Shakespeare Indoors*, ed. Gurr and Karim-Cooper, 237.
- 51 Michael Neill cited in Nunn, *Staging Anatomies*, 115.
- 52 Woods, 'The Audience of the Indoor Theatre', 162.
- 53 Nunn, *Staging Anatomies*, 87.
- 54 Stern, "A ruinous monastery", 100. See also Alexandra Walsham, "The Fatall Vesper": Providentialism and Anti-Popery in Late Jacobean London', *Past and Present* 144 (1994), 36–87, <https://doi.org/10.1093/past/144.1.36>.
- 55 Stern, "A ruinous monastery", 99; Sarah Dustagheer, *Shakespeare's Two Playhouses: Repertory and Theatre Space at the Globe and the Blackfriars, 1599–1613* (Cambridge, 2017), 12, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316996874>.

- 56 Dustagheer, *Shakespeare’s Two Playhouses*, 12.
- 57 Ibid, 13; Smith, *Shakespeare’s Blackfriars Playhouse*, 99.
- 58 Stern, “A ruinous monastery”, 104; Dustagheer, *Shakespeare’s Two Playhouses*, 13.
- 59 Smith, *Shakespeare’s Blackfriars Playhouse*, 20.
- 60 Dustagheer, *Shakespeare’s Two Playhouses*, 32.
- 61 Smith, *Shakespeare’s Blackfriars Playhouse*, 37.
- 62 Ibid, 119.
- 63 Ibid.
- 64 Ibid, 91.
- 65 Dustagheer, *Shakespeare’s Two Playhouses*, 70.
- 66 Christopher Highley, ‘Theatre, Church and Neighbourhood in the Early Modern Blackfriars’, in *The Oxford Handbook of the Age of Shakespeare*, ed. R. Malcolm Smuts (Oxford, 2016), 616, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199660841.001.0001>; Dustagheer, *Shakespeare’s Two Playhouses*, 70.
- 67 Dustagheer, *Shakespeare’s Two Playhouses*, 12.
- 68 Ibid; Astington, ‘Why the Theatres Changed’, 23.
- 69 Astington, ‘Why the Theatres Changed’, 23.
- 70 Smith, *Shakespeare’s Blackfriars Playhouse*, 17.
- 71 Dustagheer, *Shakespeare’s Two Playhouses*, 13.
- 72 Ibid, 13, 124.
- 73 Stern, “A ruinous monastery”, 97–8, 101.
- 74 Ibid, 102. See also Smith, *Shakespeare’s Blackfriars Playhouse*, 168.
- 75 Stern, ‘Taking Part’, 48.
- 76 Dustagheer, *Shakespeare’s Two Playhouses*, 34.
- 77 Ibid, 157.
- 78 Ibid, 143; Stern, “A ruinous monastery”, 98.
- 79 Dustagheer, *Shakespeare’s Two Playhouses*, 165.
- 80 John Crook, *English Medieval Shrines* (Woodbridge, 2011), xiii, 260.
- 81 Ibid, 178; also see Xavier Bray, *The Sacred Made Real: Spanish Painting and Sculpture 1600–1700* (London, 2009).
- 82 Bruce Smith, ‘Sermon in Stones: Shakespeare and Renaissance Sculpture’, *Shakespeare Studies* 17 (1985), 2. Also see Catherine Belsey, *Shakespeare and the Loss of Eden: The Construction of Family Values in Early Modern Culture* (Basingstoke, 1999), 90, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-15047-2>.
- 83 Smith, ‘Sermon in Stones’, 2–3. See also Nigel Llewellyn, *Funeral Monuments in Post-Reformation England* (Cambridge, 2000).
- 84 Catherine Belsey, *Shakespeare and the Loss of Eden*, 114.
- 85 Ibid.

- 86 Smith, 'Sermon in Stones', 9.
- 87 Belsey, *Shakespeare and the Loss of Eden*, 97.
- 88 Smith, 'Sermon in Stones', 3.
- 89 Kenneth Gross, *The Dream of the Moving Statue* (University Park, 2006), 7, <https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501734892>; Smith, 'Sermon in Stones', 21.
- 90 Francis W. Cheetham, *Alabaster Images of Medieval England* (Suffolk, 2003), 5.
- 91 Lucy Wrapson, 'Towards a New Methodological Approach for Interpreting Workshop Activity and Dating Medieval Church Screens', in *The Art and Science of the Church Screen in Medieval Europe: Making, Meaning, Preserving*, ed. Spike Bucklow, Richard Marks, and Lucy Wrapson (Suffolk, 2017), 46.
- 92 Simon Watney, 'Foreword', in Audrey Baker, *English Panel Paintings, 1400–1558: A Survey of Figure Paintings on East Anglian Rood Screens*, ed. Ann Ballantyne and Pauline Plummer (London, 2011), vii.
- 93 Ibid, vii, viii; Richard Marks, 'Framing the Rood in Medieval England and Wales' in *Art and Science of the Church Screen*, ed. Bucklow, Marks, and Wrapson (Suffolk, 2017), 9.
- 94 Sarah Hamilton and Andrew Spicer, 'Defining the Holy — The Delineation of Sacred Space', in *Defining the Holy: Sacred Space in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Sarah Hamilton and Andrew Spicer (Aldershot, 2005), 15, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315258294>; Richard L. Williams, 'Forbidden Sacred Spaces in Reformation England', in *Defining the Holy*, ed. Hamilton and Spicer, 96.
- 95 John Gordall cited in Watney, 'Foreword', vii.
- 96 Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580*, 2nd edn (London, 2005), 107.
- 97 Annabel Ricketts, Claire Grapper, and Caroline Knight, 'Designing for Protestant Worship: The Private Chapels of the Cecil Family', in *Defining the Holy*, ed. Hamilton and Spicer, 127.
- 98 Sarah Blake McHam, 'The High Altar at the Santo: Movement, Materials, and Meanings', in *Making and Moving Sculpture in Early Modern Italy*, ed. Kelley Helmsstutler Di Dio (Surrey, 2015), 18.
- 99 Paul Binksi, 'Introduction', in *Art and Science of the Church Screen*, ed. Bucklow, Marks, and Wrapson, 5.
- 100 Richard Marks, 'Framing the Rood', 21, 24.
- 101 Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 156; Baker, *English Panel Paintings*, 6.
- 102 Jacqueline E. Jung, 'Moving Pictures on the Gothic Choir Screen', in *Art and Science of the Church Screen*, ed. Bucklow, Marks, and Wrapson, 177.
- 103 Watney, 'Foreword', vii.

- 104 Nicholas Tyacke and Kenneth Fincham, *Altars Restored: The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700* (Oxford, 2007), 23, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198207009.001.0001>.
- 105 Baker, *English Panel Paintings*, 7.
- 106 Hamilton and Spicer, ‘Defining the Holy — The Delineation of Sacred Space’, 15.
- 107 Woods, ‘The Audience of the Indoor Theatre’, 165.
- 108 Diana Webb, ‘Domestic Space and Devotion in the Middle Ages’, in *Defining the Holy*, ed. Hamilton and Spicer, 39; Williams, ‘Forbidden Sacred Spaces’, 112.
- 109 Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 112.
- 110 Ibid, 54.
- 111 Ibid.
- 112 Ibid.
- 113 Ibid, 55.
- 114 Belsey, *Shakespeare and the Loss of Eden*, 114.
- 115 Farah Karim-Cooper, ‘To Glisten’, 193.
- 116 Ann Thompson, ‘Philomel in Titus Andronicus and Cymbeline’, in *Shakespeare and the Classical World*, ed. Kenneth Muir, *Shakespeare Survey* 31 (1979), 24, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL0521220114.003>.
- 117 Nathalie Rivere de Carles, ‘Performing Materiality: Curtains on the Early Modern Stage’, in *Shakespeare’s Theatres and the Effects of Performance*, ed. Farah Karim-Cooper and Tiffany Stern (London, 2014), 62–3, <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781408174654>.
- 118 Ben Jonson, *The Magnetic Lady, or Humours Reconciled*, in *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Ben Jonson*, ed. David M. Bevington, Martin Butler, and Ian Donaldson, 7 vols (Cambridge, 2012), 6.Ind.24.
- 119 Dustagheer, *Shakespeare’s Two Playhouses*, 141.
- 120 Stern, “A ruinous monastery”, 103.
- 121 Ibid, 101.