Early Theatre
A Journal Associated with the Records of Early English Drama

Volume 4 | Issue 1 Article 15

1-1-2001

Book Review: Walter Hodges, *Enter the Whole Army: A Pictorial Study of Shakespearean Staging, 1576-1616*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Roslyn Knutson
University of Arkansas, RLKnutson@ualr.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/earlytheatre

Recommended Citation
Knutson, Roslyn. 'Book Review: Walter Hodges, *Enter the Whole Army: A Pictorial Study of Shakespearean Staging, 1576-1616*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.'. *Early Theatre* 4.1 (2001): 165-7 (paper). Article 15.
Available at: http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/earlytheatre/vol4/iss1/15

Copyright © 2001 by Early Theatre. This Book Review is brought to you by DigitalCommons@McMaster. It has been accepted for inclusion in Early Theatre by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@McMaster. For more information, please contact scom@mcmaster.ca.

example, that 'the two parts of *Tamburlaine* do not stage inscription and reception' (81) is to ignore the literary models filling Tamburlaine's head. But a scholar so capable of enacting a sustained critique of the Faustian project should never be confused with a cabaret performer.

JUDITH WEIL

C. Walter Hodges. *Enter the Whole Army: A Pictorial Study of Shakespearean Staging, 1576–1616*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999. Pp xii, 180. Illus.

Enter the Whole Army by C. Walter Hodges is both a book of pictures and an exploration of Elizabethan staging. As a book of pictures, it is unparalleled. Hodges has brought together more than fifty of his drawings made in the 1980s to accompany volumes in the series, *The New Cambridge Shakespeare*. He gathers them now into one volume in order to suggest more comprehensively 'the structure and management of the stage Shakespeare had worked with' (viii). Following introductory chapters, Hodges addresses specific features of the stage and staging: the music (or lords') room, procession scenes, the stage posts, beds and other furniture, special effects such as traps and descent machinery, and playing outside of the commercial playhouses in London. He acknowledges that, illustration to illustration, there are inconsistencies such as the presence or absence of a low railing around the stage and the position of a curtained space, but he justifies these as 'exploratory variations' that permit him to imagine alternatives. That focus on alternatives is key. Hodges repeatedly points out that his stagings are conjectural; at one point, he observes that '[w]e know the methods by which the Elizabethans might have achieved … [a particular] effect, but their actual interpretation of them is another matter' (48). However, the drawings are so beguiling that they have the effect of fact.

Consider, for example, fig 15, which depicts a moment in Mark Antony's funeral oration in *Julius Caesar*. Hodges provides a pulpit, which he describes as 'a firmly-built structure of commanding height' (42) from which Antony addresses the crowd. Hodges is so taken with the utility of such a structure that he imagines it a permanent fixture of the Elizabethan stage (44). In fig 46, which depicts Prospero's cell, Hodges provides a 'small central porch projecting from' the upper stage (136); in a note on the structure, he muses that the porch is 'so simple, so obvious and so useful' that he can think of no reason why it did not exist. He provides variations on the porch-and-pulpit combi-

nation in drawings for *King John*, 4.3 (fig 19), so that young Arthur may have a lower height from which to leap; for *Antony and Cleopatra*, 4.15 (fig 28), so that Cleopatra and her women may lift Antony's body more easily; and *2 Henry VI*, 1.4 (fig 41), so that Duchess Elinor may observe the magic show below. Utility is the principle also for an enlargement of the trap. As Hodges observes for *Macbeth*, the witches' cauldron in 4.1 is 'no ordinary cooking pot' (123); the trap through which it rises and sinks must also be wide enough to provide stairs for the eight kings to ascend 'upright all the way' (123).

As scholars have done since Malone, Hodges struggles with the issue of a 'typical' Elizabethan playhouse. Most of his designs are based on the sketch of the interior of the Swan playhouse done by Johannes de Witt and copied by Arendt van Buchel into his commonplace book, from which sketch Hodges extrapolates templates for stage conditions (fig 7) and the stage and tiring house wall (fig 10). But with the discovery in 1989 of the foundations of the Rose and its wedge-shaped stage, Hodges developed alternative designs as in the series of drawings for *1 Henry VI* (figs 8 and 9; see also fig 20). The differences among stages raises the issue of playhouse-specific staging, and Hodges seems of divided mind. He devotes an entire chapter to showing how adaptable plays were to spaces such as a great hall (figs 49–51), yet he designs the five-tiered dais of *Richard II* specifically for the Swan (fig 11). He restricts the venue of some plays: he would limit plays such as *1 Henry VI,* that require the firing of ordinance, 'to the open-yarded public theatres alone' (55), and he finds the necessity of an 'open grave-trap' for *Hamlet* so compelling that he declares it not to have been taken on tour but played 'exclusively' at the Globe and Blackfriars (158–9).

Hodges observes that, after Malone's publication of *The Rise and Progress of the English Stage* in 1780 and the Henslowe material in 1790, it seemed possible to scholars that 'a stable and methodical code of stage presentation' could be constructed (10). Hodges recognizes, and his own drawings demonstrate, the naivete of such an expectation. Not only does he often explain how he might revise this or that drawing, but he also shows in various of his designs how the work of theatre historians and textual scholars influences his choices. In fig 22, which depicts the entry of the whole army in 3.5 of *All's Well that Ends Well*, Hodges follows the lead of T.W. Baldwin on the size of the Shakespearean company and imagines that the extras needed for such a procession could be drawn from 'two or three separate acting groups' within the company, one perhaps largely apprentices (75). In fig 21, which depicts the second Induction scene from *The Taming of the Shrew*, Hodges provides two drawings. In the

first, Christopher Sly is positioned 'aloft' and the musicians are on the main stage. In the second, Hodges puts Sly on the main stage and the musicians aloft to accommodate the argument by the New Cambridge editor that the stage direction for Sly to be 'aloft' is an error.

By being both artist and director, Hodges captures moments that demonstrate the happy confluence of Shakespeare's theatricality and Elizabethan stage conditions: for example, the use of posts for eavesdropping in 4.3 of *Love's Labor's Lost* (fig 32), the use of a trap and recessed curtained space in 5.3 of *Romeo and Juliet* (fig 13), and the rods and pulleys that permit three suns to appear in the sky in 2.1 of *3 Henry VI* (fig 48). For this reader, however, two of the drawings stand out: fig 39, which depicts basic stage furniture for *1 Henry IV*, including a table, two benches, several stools, and a chair; and fig 23, which depicts the interior of the tiring house, including a king and queen poised to enter through the opened stage door. These drawings need no further comment to convey both the economy and energy of the Elizabethan playhouse.

ROSLYN L. KNUTSON

Michal Kobialka. *This Is My Body: Representational Practices in the Early Middle Ages.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999. Pp viii, 313.

Michal Kobialka says in his introduction that his book is not a history of drama but a analysis of how that history has been represented and why it has been so represented. The text that returns from time to time is the 'Quem quaeritis', but equally important is the scriptural verse, 'Hoc est corpus meum'. The two are entwined because Kobialka is interested in a history of the medieval representations of the relation of religious persons to the body of Christ. His point of departure for the representational practices of the subtitle is the claim that the medieval concept of representation differs from the one that we hold, one that derives from Aristotle and Plato.

Kobialka begins with a critique of the criticism on the drama in the twentieth century. He summarizes the work of Chambers and Young on the 'Quem quaeritis' and the desire for origins that it exhibits. After reproducing Hardison s argument on the defects of the evolutionary thesis, he turns to the new research of the second half of the century in order to describe the interests and procedures of the new archival researchers (REED, the Malone Society, and others) and those scholars interested in drama in performance (Wickham and others). Kobialka concludes his analysis by making the argument that the