

Sophie Chiari and John Mucciolo, eds. *Performances at Court in the Age of Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. Pp 278. Hardback \$99.99. ISBN: 9781108486675. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108761543>.

Jess Hamlet  
University of Alabama

This collection of sixteen essays organized in four sections looks at court performances in the Tudor-Stuart period, considering both plays and masques. Shakespeare's works are given primacy, but Jonson and Marlowe receive good attention as well. In their introduction, editors Sophie Chiari and John Mucciolo state their intent to build on the work of John H. Astington, Richard Dutton, and W.R. Streitberger. In order to fill the gap of knowledge around what we know about early modern playing companies and their court performances, the essays in this volume are designed to address two questions the editors identify as 'crucial': 'how did early modern court shows shape dramatic writing, and what do they tell us of the aesthetics and politics of the Tudor and Stuart regimes?' (1). The essays consider mostly court performances like plays and masques, but also music and dance.

The first section, 'Elizabethan Court Theatre', begins with Richard Dutton and W.R. Streitberger 'highlighting both the political and the economic conditions that fashioned the changing nature of aristocratic shows during Elizabeth's reign' (3). Dutton takes up Richard Edwards's lost play *Palamon and Arcite*. His fulsome analysis of the documentary evidence of the play's performance for Elizabeth I paints for us a picture of what Elizabethan court performances must have been like: full of spectacle and political posturing. Streitberger next explores the link between the Office of the Revels and professional playing companies, arguing that companies like the Lord Admiral's Men and the Lord Chamberlain's Men used public performances to rehearse for engagements at court. In the third chapter, Roy Eriksen makes a case for the lengthier B-text of Christopher Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* reflecting a revision for a performance for Elizabeth I. Janna Segal closes this first section with an essay on *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and convincingly argues that the mechanicals' court performance parodies Elizabethan antitheatrical concerns, but that the play's onstage court creates 'a pro-theatrical treatise in league with those by such court writers as Sir Philip Sidney' (65).

The volume's second section takes up Jacobean court performances, acknowledging James I's overarching disinterest in performance against his wife's and

children's fervour for it. This section opens with chapters which 'examine the socio-political implications of staging plays written during Elizabeth's reign and performed at King James's court' (6). Murat Ögütçü compares Shakespeare's Henry V to James I in a chapter considering *Henry V's* place in the 1604/5 Christmas season and how its status as the first English history play performed for James relied on its 'good example of how an ideal king defeats foes who try to kill him, wages a just war, and concludes peace' (80). Ögütçü also suggests the play's epilogue may have been in praise of James's fecundity and ascension to the throne when already in possession of an heir and a spare. Jason Lawrence follows Ögütçü with an essay on *Othello* and *Measure for Measure*, arguing that the King's Men sought court performances as their highest goal, and used limited public performances as final dress rehearsals for these court engagements. Lawrence suggests two late-1604 performances as indicative of shared topical concerns between Shakespeare and James. Next up is David M. Bergeron on Gerrard Herbert's 1619 letter detailing a court performance of *Pericles*. Bergeron goes back to the source rather than relying, as others have done, on J.O. Halliwell's nineteenth-century transcription of the letter, and as a result, determines the duke of Lennox was not, in fact, responsible for arranging the performance, though tradition has long held this notion. The Jacobean section of the volume concludes with Catherine Clifford reconstructing Jacobean spectatorship via Sir Henry Wotton's 1613 account of the performance of *All is True*, which resulted in fire at the Globe. Clifford argues that the 'invocation of places constructed to inspire national remembrance and veneration, such as royal palaces, invites early modern audiences into dialogue with their collective remembrances of history' (123). Clifford contends that the 'spatial commonplaces' of the play would have been more legible to audiences at court than at the Globe (123).

The volume then transitions to the third section: 'Reassessing the Stuart Masque'. Building on Tiffany Stern's work in *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (2009), this group of chapters considers the relationship between London's professional playing companies, drama, and masques. Anne Daye opens this third part of the text with a chapter arguing for 'the centrality of dancing to the English masque, and its expansion under James I to serve a new political regime' (137). Of particular interest is Daye's discussion of dance as a political tool useful for international relationships and the innovations made to masquing in the Stuart reign, including Anne of Denmark's leadership role in performances of *The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses* and Ben Jonson's *Masque of Blackness*, following the example of the French court. Martin Butler takes up the question of Jonson's influence on Shakespeare's masques in the following chapter, suggesting

that Shakespeare actually departs from Jonson's masquing style in *The Tempest*. Butler posits that while Shakespeare may have looked to Jonson for a masque template, the masque in *The Tempest* eschews the usual trappings of a masque (elaborate scenery, for one) and directs its focus not toward a figure of a king, but instead to exploring 'the aesthetic forms of kingship that had become de rigueur at Jacobean Whitehall' (152). Following Butler is Leeds Barroll examining the study of written records of masques to the exclusion of the 'flamboyant spectacle' of those masques (9). Barroll uses extant masque quartos to recreate 'an art form that would seem largely to be a fabric spun of poetry' and which gave courtiers an opportunity to show off in hopes of garnering royal notice (163). The final chapter in this section comes from Agnieszka Żukowska and furthers this exploration of the visual aspects of masques. Her focus is on the use of automatons in court masques, and she suggests that these automatons were often emblematic of 'the monarch's supernatural reach' (10).

The volume concludes with a section on 'the material conditions of performances at court' (191). The first essay in this final section comes from William B. Long, reminding readers of the fact that playing companies would not exist without the patronage of nobles, and framing public performances as elaborate dress rehearsals for engagements at court. He highlights the virtuosity of early modern players, pointing out their ability to memorize and retain enormous amounts of material and their expertise at adapting to new and varied performance spaces. John H. Astington follows Long with a piece on the first Jacobean Banqueting House and the myriad events held in that space — from drama and music to fencing and bear-baiting. Astington contends that the versatility of the Banqueting House space brought special challenges for those who performed within it. The penultimate chapter is from Chantal Schütz, demonstrating the political dimensions of music. She explores how performing music *with* the monarch could temporarily suspend hierarchy, while performing *for* the monarch served to advance courtier interests. In the final chapter, Rebecca Olson tracks the uses of painted cloth from domestic art form to primary scenic component in Stuart court performances. She reviews the use of painted cloths in the 1611/12 season, which may have included performances of *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*.

The editors' stated goal with this volume is 'to show that the expansion of early modern commercial playhouses and the rise of lavishly elaborated courtly shows were not isolated events, but interdependent phenomena, which enables the birth of proto-capitalist, public enterprises' (13). The breadth and depth of the collection certainly underscore this intent, and the text is successful as well in demonstrating the ways Tudor and Stuart drama was both textual and visual,

both diplomatic and aesthetic. As a contribution to the study of early modern performance, the culture of court performance, and the difference between court and public performance, this is a valuable new collection of knowledge.