

Experiencing the Space and Place of Early Modern Theater

Lloyd Edward Kermode

California State University, Long Beach
Long Beach, California

Space and place

I recently asked two questions of six friends (none of whom knew that I was working on the concepts of space and place, but all of whom knew that I work on Renaissance theater). The first question was, “You are walking along the Strand in London (or another major street of your choice); I stop you and ask you to name three nearby *spaces*. What are your answers?” Having received the answers, I asked a second question: “You are in the same place; now name three nearby *places*.” Two respondents are literature professors, one is a secondary school teacher, one works in the corporate world, one is an actor and writer, and one is an ex-graduate student of mine. Perhaps not a cross-section of the general public, but a relatively accurate spread of interested parties for a study such as the present one. Three respondents put themselves on the Strand as suggested; the others imagined main streets in Paris, Bristol (UK), and New Orleans. A few fairly clear patterns did emerge from the responses. When asked about “spaces,” almost all the respondents talked of locations that included some “openness” about them: paths, squares, courtyards, parks that could be crossed, intersected, and passed through. When asked about “place,” they tended to identify closed locations: rooms, buildings, historical locations that one could go “inside.” The spaces also sometimes needed clarification in order to locate exactly what the respondent was trying to convey, as in “that space around that object next to that other feature” —space, to some degree, as *nothingness* made into *something* by objects in place.

The places mentioned by the respondents were sometimes not only significant in their own right, but also as locations *from which* to appreciate *other* spaces or places: bridges from which to see the city, a shop or café where one goes to observe or be seen. Space for these respondents leaves experien-

tial options open, whereas place guides the experience. There was only a single instance of a respondent's "place" being the same as another respondent's "space" (Trafalgar Square), which I found surprising, since I expected several respondents to read my first question as asking about "place," not "space." I think this overlapping would increase with a proper survey sample, and I suspect it might align with the history of the location in its town—whether the urban "space" of the square has been made a "place" by an event (the eighteenth-century riots in Queen's Square, Bristol), by a memorial and specific name (Trafalgar Square), or by renaming over time to mark the location as a place within a city (Place de Louis XV/de la Révolution/de la Concorde).

The survey results seem to conform to the geographer Yi-Fu Tuan's distinction of "space as that which allows movement" and "place" as "pause."¹ But *in* the pause, there is the opportunity for active (self-)identification. When space is traversed by a subject, she learns about her own relative place in the world, but it is an individuated experience. Lefebvre voices a concern with the relationship of the subject's own body to that subject's understanding of immediate space.² The more "egotistical" our measure of local space is (i.e., the more it relates to our own size, reach, senses, and opinion of other bodies infringing on the space), the more difficult it becomes to talk about "space" in general, as something that can be experienced by a group or an audience together. Once arrived at a place of pause, however, there is also a rush of dynamic meaning centered on that place: that place *means* as a result of the journey taken to get there, the type of person in attendance, the expectations of what the place will deliver—and these are to a greater or lesser extent unifying factors for an audience, a body that experiences a place communally as well as individually. But clearly the categories of place and space require the complement and the contrast of the other to be understood, talked about, constructed, and utilized. Dramatic activity puts into practice this inevitable symbiotic relationship, privileging a "place" of activity, which is constantly fed by the actors' and audiences' sense of the space around and within the theater.

In 1997, an issue of the journal *Renaissance Drama* was dedicated to the special topic "The Space of the Stage." At that time, Crystal Bartolovich could write that "the literature on early modern spatial imaginaries and practices is now enormous."³ I am not sure what the appropriate adjective would be fifteen years later (I can only think of *humungous*), and it is hardly the intention of this essay to summarize that work. I do, however, want to address some major theoretical, philosophical, and practical debates about the nature of space and place in the world and in theatrical representation.

In doing so, I will introduce several ideas studied in the essays that follow and, I hope, provide some thoughts for further study. The essays in this collection were selected for their ability to engage clearly, rigorously, and deeply in the practical, theoretical, and personal phenomena prompted by the topic of place and space. They do not shy away from *then* and *now* connections, them and us, early modern and modern, but make these connections with proper care. They embed highly theorized, philosophized, and contextualized versions of space (as witnessed in the body, the soul, items of household furniture, theater structure, tiring house, forest, prison, city, and garden) in fundamental notions of the way text does its work as intellectual spur and the way performance does its work as affective experience. The overarching wonder of studying place and space is the awareness it elicits of the seemingly alien and irrecoverable status of early modern structures of life, on the one hand, and on the other, of the remarkable resonances of sympathy we feel between early modern textual declarations of human relations to space, location, and being, and our own modern epistemologies and ontologies.

There is currently a resurgent interest in developing literary-theoretical approaches to performance, and such methods should do much to deepen our understanding of action in place and space. The basics of such sensitivity have been there for decades in the work of a careful reader and stage historian like Alan Dessen; it has been developed more recently by scholars concerned with performances in meaningful places outside of, as well as in, theater buildings proper, such as in studies of royal pageantry, progress, and coronation by Janette Dillon, Julie Sanders, Andrew McRae, and Alice Hunt; and there is a continuing movement interested in theorizing spaces of early modern performance and reception (as witnessed, for example, by a new Edinburgh University Press series on theory and performance in Shakespeare due to begin publishing in 2013).⁴ I foresee an effective new performance theory incorporating an open-minded combination of a variety of elements: (a) traditional close reading that appreciates literary (and therefore page- and stage-physical) form; (b) the historicizing of cultural elements in play texts and contexts that reveals performance practice in the early modern period; (c) an ability and willingness to treat the play text at once as a prompting performance script, giving the words on the page the affective breath of life on the stage, and as a literary text, uncovering a semantic complexity that may be partially lost in the necessary decisions of singular performative interpretation; and (d) an employment of modern theory not just within the familiar fields of literature, history, philosophy, and theater, but also from other areas, such as architecture or design (as

demonstrated in Julia Lupton's piece in this collection) to encourage a new flexibility in our reception and reviewing of past spatial, object, human, and material relations.⁵

Perhaps an obvious omission in the present collection's interpretations of space and place is an essay specifically on geographies of space: maps, diagrams, geometries, and the organizing of places in two dimensions for moral, social, political, and ideological purposes. This is the most extensively covered aspect of space studies in monographs and essay collections in recent years, however, and so another contribution here would be less beneficial to the aims of this collection.⁶ Yet there is one aspect of the geographical analysis of "place" that the stage both confirms and challenges, and which we should note briefly before moving on: that human beings strive to *own* space, to make it "proper" to them in order to be in a position to dictate its meaning to themselves (to distinguish one place from another) and to others to maintain power and control. We might think, for example, of the loss by Titus of the Rome he understands or the usurping of Gloucester's household by Cornwall and Regan. To encompass and create or maintain a place as comprehensible to the self, it must be marked with personal identity. Events sacred to the self must have taken place there in the past, or, if it is a new place of occupation, it must be personalized: from moving into a "new" apartment to colonizing a "new" land, the newest occupant may erase the old; may assimilate the old into a new idea, design, and compulsion; or may overlay the past, which often rises to peep through the surface, as in a palimpsest. Either way, the individual must re-mark the place in some way to instigate or confirm meaning. The theater, of course, repeatedly overlays meaning in its practice of incremental repetition; rehearsal and performance both embed fundamentals and introduce difference, expanding the psychic meaning of the place for performers and audience.

The ownership of a "place" (or rather, the limning of a place by marking off a delimitation of space) also has the political, coercive potential of appearing to slow or stop time within space, and, as my brief survey has shown, this gives human beings a sense of control and confidence in the "places" of enclosure and "pause."⁷ Once a place has been formed, purchased, named, built on, and decorated, it can, for ideological purposes, assert itself as a timeless place, or at least as a place that is consistently different from (and superior to) its surroundings.⁸ Caterina Albano writes, "To render space legible is, in fact, a political act of appropriation."⁹ Indeed, since place does not appear *ex nihilo* but is part of a process, a social construct manipulated by minds and bodies, the hegemonic ideology (owners) uniting the dominant

force of place-shaping will determine the ways in which places in any environment are “read,” discussed, thought about, used, and controlled.¹⁰ Ideology, in other words, works through determined, manufactured places that reconfigure earlier notions of “place” in any location and locale.¹¹ Moreover, the right to impose one’s view of a place’s identity and legitimate use on others is a matter of motion and practice in that place. Activity and repetition embed meaning, but as pointed out in the paragraph above, there is in performance the constant shift in space, the slight difference in human repetitive action; moreover, there is the opportunity for coercive, alternative representation of activity and therefore the meaning of a place. As Tim Cresswell points out, “People acting ‘out of place’ suggest different interpretations.” This leads us back to boys dressed as women, dead kings risen again, conjurers and witches, and regicides on the stage, all “out of place” in their proper location in the school of abuse. Cresswell goes on, “If enough people follow suit, a whole new conception of ‘normality’ may arise. In effect, the ‘reading’ of people acting in space is also a kind of ‘writing’ as new meanings are formed. The consumption of place becomes the production of place.”¹² If place is protean in this manner, its meaning and significance molded and remade by use, then theater is the quintessence of place.

Michel de Certeau defines *space* as inhabited and “*practiced place*,” giving us the phenomenon of “spaces constantly coming into being” from “the law of a place,” which is “something dead,” “an inert body.”¹³ It is an attractive model for thinking about how a static bricks-and-mortar (or lath-and-lime) theater building comes to life with the “practice” of playing, with the movement of bodies in space. De Certeau’s negative-place/positive-space relation seems, however, not to allow two rather fundamental human experiences, which reverse the negative/positive binary, and in doing so both reinstate “place” as the fundamental term for theatrical activity and retract the stark division between the two terms. To address “place” first: when we think of “another place,” we already understand it in terms of its activity. When my son asks to go to Legoland California, he is not imagining a “space” of land just north of San Diego, but a location given definition by being named “Legoland” and by confirming the appropriateness of the naming with the built features and activities that take place there.¹⁴ In this view, the *space* occupied by the place called Legoland is of minimal importance. Similarly, we might ask someone what “theater” they have seen lately, and in naming the place we assume the activity. We are not asking the person whether they toured empty auditoriums or took photographs of lobby fronts; rather, we are wondering about the ways in which theatrical

performance has affected them. The notion of a “place” that is somehow sterile suggests paradoxically that we can conceive of a *useful* location without thinking about *use*. Place is made by movements and exchanges in a certain space that we subsequently identify as significantly different from movements and exchanges in alternate space. Andrew Gordon’s reading of urban space against de Certeau to argue that “the city was enacted before it was visualized” can be applied to the theater and to any significant place of cultural activity.¹⁵ To think of the permanent, dedicated London public theater as a place for playing, but dormant until activated into “space,” obscures that place’s very conception as a theater and its rise out of the decades of dramatic utterance, movement, and property manipulation that took place in other spaces-turned-places: households, gardens, inn-yards, streets, halls, and schools. The place called the theater, like the place called the city, is already “enacted” and brought into being in *previous* performance and space usage. Even a ghost town is a place, despite its lack of active residents, for the idea of the town’s establishment and the subsequent organization of its built environment were always infused with its existence as a location of activity. There is no dormant “place” without a concomitant dynamism of “space” in a place’s conception, construction, and, in the case of the ghost town, even its afterlife—it has to be a ghost *of something*.

If we turn to “space,” we can see that de Certeau’s celebration of dynamic space does not quite account for our general *fear* of “space.” From minding the gap in the tube station to the dangers of space travel, we are constantly reminded of the anxiety that space is a no-thing within which we cannot survive without clinging onto places. Nature abhors a vacuum; thus corporate society fills blank walls and television time that can contain text and image (as did the corporate society of London in the accession pageant for Elizabeth I, which obsessively ensured that all void spaces in the pageants contained text); on public transportation, the space between stops is written away by a timetable that privileges those places of literal pause; a tourist bus needs desperately to fill the spatio-temporal voids between “places of interest” (we never say “spaces of interest”) with narratives of the place you have just seen/been and the place to which you are going. In the popular understanding of place as something certain and space as what is *not place*, place always has identity. To re-identify a place with new activity in de Certeau’s sense is not to liberate a place’s inertness with originary creation, but to colonize, to annihilate by replacing the last known identity of the place, or to imbricate new spatial usages over the old/previous ones. Such an accumulation of meaning in a positive place by exciting but unpredictable manifesta-

tions of space is very much of a kind with the working trope of theatrical activity. We cannot separate place and space in theory or practice as discretely as any adjectival binary (passive/active, stasis/motion) would suggest. If one *becomes* the other, it is not so much in the sense of transforming as it is in the sense of accreting, producing either interesting contradictory layers of meaning or complementary stratifications over time. Place and space are in a constantly combined relation, where one of the two elements will variously come to the surface, supported by and requiring the other. In practical, material matters of place, such as plotting building sites or drafting maps, the relationship between what we see and what we understand to be represented in space appears to be one of synecdoche: we place symbolic marks and technical terminology (shorthand) on maps and in blueprints to represent larger spaces. In psychic constructions of space and place, we might think instead of a metonymic relationship between our terms, for the *essence* of one term evokes the general idea of the other: the essence of the theatrical place is the production of multiple movements in space (bodily, aural, tactile), and the essence of personal space comes from, and entails the production of, social interactions in specific places. Many other manifestations of the space/place symbiosis might be added to these brief proposals.

Theatrical place and placelessness

Henri Lefebvre's ideas aptly complement theatrical analysis when he distinguishes between "representations of space" as conceptualized, planned space of production and "representational space" as space that is "directly *lived* through its associated images and symbols."¹⁶ In Lefebvre's concept, "place" doesn't come into the equation as somehow opposed to or preparatory to "space." In fact, "place" can even be seen in this case to follow spatial conception; thus "place" reveals the productive activity that has gone on within represented and lived "space." If we decide to use "place" as our main term, in line with the popular sense of place as a solidly identifiable location of occupation, then we enter, it seems to me, a satisfyingly "geographical" and experiential realm of understanding, as opposed to a philosophical one. Now, some while ago Catherine Belsey showed that "common sense" views on our sense of place in relation to texts and history often have trouble standing up to critical scrutiny.¹⁷ So I do not want to rely on a general sense of "place" versus "space" as a cornerstone for any philosophy of human-centered spatial understanding. Yet we are concerned here, in drama, with a popular form of entertainment (keeping in mind that elite audiences of court and household

did not necessarily possess a more refined common sense than the plasterers, cordwainers, and gentlemen of the Globe). So if we can think in terms of “place” as always already a location of activity and dynamism that gives it identity and purpose, then we are satisfying the common-sense division between “place” and “space” while understanding our preference for places over spaces, without falsely or simplistically rejecting the role of “space” in the formation of the identity of “place.”

Doreen Massey, in *Space, Place, and Gender*, arguably gives the literary and theater scholar (both critic and historian) more immediately applicable notions of spatial phenomenology than do the French philosophies. Massey argues that “space must be conceptualized integrally with time. . . . the aim should be to think always in terms of space-time.” She also sees “space-time as a configuration of social relations.”¹⁸ These concepts very quickly paint a picture of the working assumptions of theatrical representation. Blocking, scene-setting, vocal projection, and auditorium organization all contribute to, develop, and negotiate the “ever-shifting social geometry of power and signification” that Massey sees as central to the identity of “space.” Of particular importance for the complexity of performed early modern drama is Massey’s insistence on “the existence of the lived world of a simultaneous multiplicity of spaces: cross-cutting, intersecting, aligning with one another, or existing in relations of paradox or antagonism.”¹⁹ I will apply below such notions of the “lived world” to the actions of the theater’s “performed world” in the example of the *Hamlet* “closet” scene. Massey shifts the de Certeau-like contrast between an imagined place that is static, bounded, elsewhere and one that is brought into the immediacy of space by activity to argue that a place only comes into focus as always already penetrated by the coincidences of community interaction. Place is where a “particular set of social relations . . . interact at a particular location,” and these relations inevitably come from and head toward other places; thus “the identity of place is partly constructed out of positive interrelations with elsewhere.”²⁰ The place of the stage in this imaginary is very much a hub of meaning in motion: facts, events, rules, and identities coming toward the theater from all sides; and laughter, vinegar-blood, slander, and representations of the city fanning out of it.²¹

Massey’s outline of a “simultaneous multiplicity of spaces” intersecting and coexisting in cooperation and tension is precisely the nonrestrictive view of spatial work that we see enacted on the early modern “open stage.” Whereas editors and modern readers expect placement and specific location for every scene, Dessen writes, “I know of no evidence that the

audience at the Globe or Blackfriars shared this obsession with place.” On the “chameleon stage,” locale may shift within a scene, or two locations may be present simultaneously, either psychologically, as in Coriolanus’s closing scene, which seems amorphously set in at least two cities, or materially, as in *As You Like It*, where the banquet in the forest seems to be onstage while Orlando and Adam are wandering around, starving. These examples from Dessen suggest an early audience receptive to spatial suggestion and layering in the service of dramatic message (Coriolanus’s breadth of identity and influence; the irony of desperation and relief in the forest of Arden). Dessen also points out the work of the “gestic” “this” and the “here” that instantly “place” characters without the need for mimetic or even representative scenery (“meet me in this orchard”; “it was brought to my chamber here”). “Inside” and “outside” need not be staged as “separate” stage spaces or divided by obvious scene breaks, and static “other places” are brought onto the stage to meet travelers, whereas we would expect travelers to exit and *go to* another place.²² All these staging conventions suggest that concretizing “here” and “there” and the related “now,” “before,” and “later” as necessarily separate “places” that require the clearing or separation of stage space would be anachronistically to limit “Elizabethan” performance options that left the reading of space at once “open” and precise—an undefined, mutable, shareable, splittable space is one that can instantly be given single or multiple “place” definition by a word, a gesture, an item of clothing. But just as important, perhaps, is the ever-present possibility of a lack of location. Such a phenomenon enhances King Lear’s open space of madness (that Rowe and later editors felt compelled to call a “heath”); it confirms our sense of placed placelessness that constitutes the island in *The Tempest*; it forces us to wait for the speech, to interpret the costume, to “feel” along with the characters their “place” in the world of the play (and find it out through movement as well as speech). Such empathetic experience is less immediate, more variable, and involves harder work than modern scene-setting and staging, for it takes time to get to know character, place, and the relationship between the two.

King Lear is the quintessential play of placelessness on the stage, making it for a number of commentators “unstageable” but eminently readable.²³ Jay L. Halio counters that “although *King Lear* is a difficult play, it is not difficult to stage, notwithstanding Charles Lamb’s famous demurrer—that only the imagination can encompass it.”²⁴ For Lamb, the rootedness of the stage in time and place makes the performance too shocking and disorienting for the modern playgoer, but reading allows us to absorb the extremities in our mind and process them at our own pace and in our own

psychological places without the actor's body and interpretive movement and voice inflection or dynamics forcing us to take it all on board in the immediacy of a theatrical moment. For Henry Turner, Edgar's invention of the "Dover" cliff-top is a prime moment for the manner in which a shocking "spatial" scene is at once grounded yet kept in suspension. Turner argues that the "scene" is not so much about space, which cannot be experienced without markers *in* space, but about diminution and distance, phenomena that work in the context of a view from multiple perspectival points.²⁵ As such, "It is both a 'scene' enacted *in* space and a 'scene' *of* space," one in which the blind Gloucester guides us "feelingly" to empathize with the vertigo of placelessness.²⁶ In this view, performance "opens up" and pluralizes an event. For the reader, the ability to pause, look away, reread, and consult contexts permits the absorption of extreme spatial dislocation (the opportunity for pause gives the reader a place from which to look out over the uncertain spatiality of the play). While act and scene divisions on the page, moreover, artificially "unify" a text, making its trajectory and continuity inevitable and give them a "'setting' which inserts the action into a pre-existing spatial dimension," the stage performance is a constant mutation of space, "the dynamic whereby space, as potential, 'solidifies,' as it were, into a specific location, which in turn redissolves into 'emptiness' and another potential location."²⁷

This linear cross-fading of place between scenes is accompanied by the constant two-way traffic between "here" and "there" on the stage: either the temporal here and there of what, in the fiction of the play, has happened and will happen at *those other* points in time; or the spatial here and there of what is *onstage now* and what is *offstage now* (brought into the mind's eye by the text, a gesture, or a property). Taking his cue from Dessen's collection of stage directions, Bruce Smith notes in his contribution to this collection the temporal and spatial proximity, or currency, of the "as" in directions such as "as if" and "as from." The "as" indicates the *here*, the fact that on the stage imitation, but also real, new, and present action is taking place; the "if" and "from" indicate the other place, the "there" from which the imagined action is being drawn—a fictional place offstage, within. Thus the "place" of the stage, or rather the space of performance, is suspended on this line between presence and absence. It consists of movement in time that at once proves we exist and makes a difference in the present moment, and yet it reveals our constant isolation from and yearning for spaces of the past and the future and places elsewhere, ungraspable, in front of our (mind's) eyes but just out of reach. We can see this "elsewhere" in the expanse of Goneril's "eyesight,

space, and liberty” and in the tantalizing torture of Lear’s “Look there, look there” (Folio 1.1.54, 5.3.286).

The theater has a particular aptitude, then, for presenting the body in space, the body’s understanding of its own place and the places it has built around itself. The theater can also effectively present the *absent* place, the ghostly other that remains elsewhere in time and space but which the theatrical experience always has within its phenomenological grasp. Thus Queen Isabel, according to Bushy, looks “awry” on the world, gaining a perspective that the theater thrives on, and so she sees “shadows / Of what is not” (*Richard II* 2.2.23–24), the imaginings of places within (offstage, “there”) that Bushy strips of substance, but which are such stuff as dramatic space is made on. And thus Henry V insists that he “cannot see many a fair French city for one fair French maid that stands in my way,” and he is countered by the King of France, who, apparently aware that the play is coming to an end, opens the view wider in space and forward in time: “Yes, my lord, you see them perspectively, the cities turned into a maid—for they are all girdled with maiden walls that war hath never entered” (*Henry V* 5.2.293–97). What is in front of Henry is a woman, but the theatrical representation insists that she is also a glass through which we see movement in space (the paradoxical centripetal focus given to the embodiment of an expanding national space) and time (the revelation of the “future anterior,” the play’s prediction of Tudor history).

Those places or “no-places” that come on stage from realms constructed by a character’s imagination or by the communal vision of other places, such as heaven and hell, straddle Lefebvre’s notions of representations of space and representational space, both of which are deliberately outlined, coercive semiological concepts and creative spaces of conflict and possible appropriation and change. When Hamlet sees his father’s ghost, the other place of purgatory comes onstage. Such an appearance of the out-of-time and out-of-place unsurprisingly *displaces* what happens on the familiar part of the stage (the representations of real, live people in the here and now of the fiction). The ghost works differently on the two present stage bodies, dividing the immediate stage experience into two realities. Hamlet is drawn toward the new presence while Gertrude is repelled; Hamlet’s space is co-occupied by a visible, visiting, displacing presence, while Gertrude’s space is at once perceptibly free of the interfering presence but also temporarily confused and unknowable as she absorbs the effect of the un-present to which Hamlet addresses himself.

Let us look at this moment in a little more detail. Hamlet com-

mands and pleads at the same time, “Do not look upon me; / Lest with this piteous action you convert / My stern effects” (3.4.118–20). The “piteous action” may simply be the appearance, but it may also indicate weeping, holding out of hands, or some other gesture of appeal by the ghost that has the potential to “convert” Hamlet’s building rage. As Hamlet looks on, his mother says, “you do bend your eye on vacancy” (3.4.108), the idiom suggesting a painful intensity to the vision, the “bend” echoing the “awry” of *Richard II*’s Isabel. For Gertrude, Hamlet is looking on space and making something of nothing; for him, Gertrude is not experiencing the space he is occupying. The audience, in its withdrawn, triangulated position, is pulled in somewhere between the characters, conflicted in its reading of the apparition. At least two realities occur simultaneously on the stage at one time in the fiction of the play. Hamlet shares his stage space with two other bodies and insists on his reality as he tells Gertrude to look “On him, on him,” and commands her “Look you” on the object that “even now” leaves “at the portal” (3.4.116, 127). Gertrude, meanwhile, is in a room with only her son. We do not know that either of them is mistaken in their perception of the reality of the place they are in or the spaces they occupy, and thus these two spaces coexist along with the third, expanded space in which the audience resides—an audience able to witness two characters’ independent and overlapping spaces, plus their own as removed theater spectators and auditors. Gertrude’s response to having her experience of the place contradicted, “Alas, he’s mad” (3.4.96), foregrounds the very mechanism of theater and its distinction from everyday sanity. The theater of multiple personality permits and even relies on several simultaneous experiences, uses, conversions, and co-options of space(s) within single places, scenes, and moments in time.

The place of time in theatrical space

I have been unable to avoid temporal reference in my discussion so far, for there is an inevitable pressure of time on our notions of space and place—the *here* comes with a *now*, and the *there* wants a *then*. Nostalgia for the past, prophecy for a known or longed-for future, time compression and parallel realities, traditional repetition (seasons, holidays), and many other time-based impositions alter our views of space and place. But the relationship is symbiotic. In the opening essay of this collection, Bruce Smith draws on the work of George Lakoff and Mark Johnson in reminding us that “we cannot *think* time except in terms of space and motion-in-space: time does not exist apart from human knowing.” Smith points out that “the same metaphors

for time occur in all the world's languages." We might add idiom to the metaphor, for we say things like time "stands still," as if time is a figure with whom we can negotiate, as of course poetically (especially love-poetically), we have tried to do for hundreds of years, in spite of our admission of failure in the *carpe diem* trope. We do not talk about a timed moment in a play, as in "one hour and fifteen minutes into *Othello*"; rather, we talk of the play's running time spatially, as when we say "in act 2, scene 1 of *Othello*." The exception to this observation would be when we have stripped the play of its performance space and virtualized it by encoding it onto a DVD or into a website with a time slider control. The early modern *plot* is another example of the phenomenon of a spatial overlay of theatrical time. As a geometrical term, *plot* denotes shapes and takes on an artisanal meaning for three-dimensional structures, including scaffolds and stages. In this sense, *plot* can refer to an emplotted design or map, a plot of land, or a platform (etymologically *plat* and *plot* are variants of each other).²⁸ If, as Turner states, performance "required a mastery of *space*, and not simply of time, as the mimetic medium in which that action took place," then thinking of the narrative sequence as a physical "plot/plat" gave it a shape to be marked out rather than a line (or multiple lines with "subplots") to be followed.²⁹

We can think further about the necessary confluence of time and space as it relates to making scenes in the theater, a process that attempts to place fictional image and object from some other time over the material bodies, objects, and theater structures of the present moment. The significance of the "present" layer of setting is wildly different when we move from the theater building into site-specific performance, but even within a theater, where the structural materials should be familiar and neutral to frequent playgoers, some inevitable friction exists between the double place/time scheme presented during a performance of a "displaced" fiction in a "this place" of reality. Smith notes that "*Scene* is the perfect word to capture the simultaneous physicality of performance space and the fictionality of performance space," and we might add that the scene also attempts to fix temporality. The process of playing involves memorizing lines and rehearsing scenes so as to give the impression of spontaneity and originality. Playing is also a process of memorializing in which known figures of the past are embedded in a new world of present performance. These processes of presenting newness worked in the context of what has come to be known as the early modern "open stage," the usefully blank field of the stage before perspective and panel scenery. The benefit of such a neutral ground for the memorial reconstruction of persons and events was advanced as an educa-

tional concept in the 1820s, when Antoni Jaźwiński introduced his memory grid. This device plotted a large board arranged in ten squares by ten squares to represent time periods (year, decade, or century, depending on the desired scale). On the board were placed shapes, colors, and symbols to represent the date, location, and nature of historical events. While many chronologies “map” time, Jaźwiński and collaborator Józef Bem “rejected the notion of a visual territory of history in favor of a visible but featureless mnemonic field.”³⁰ Part of the reason that Thomas Nashe could praise the theater of his time for giving “immortalitie” to the resurrected “fresh bleeding” Talbot and “glorious” Henry V (which he remembers from a non-Shakespearean version) is the potential of the “open stage” to be molded around any introduced person, place, or period.³¹ The Chorus in the Folio version of *Henry V* presents the “visual territory of history,” while the performance itself happens on a “visible but featureless mnemonic field.” Or rather, a fictionally featureless field, for any attempt to represent the past objectively in performance (or indeed any deliberate bias) has the potential to be altered by the space of revival and the ways in which that space affords occupation by human beings and objects.

The constant presence of extra-diegetic material that is not related inherently or permanently to the fiction being told in a performance—whether theater stage posts and railings, country house façades for progress performances, or city streets for civic pageantry—contextualizes and alters not just the audiences’ experiences of the play for specific performances, but the meaning of the play’s action itself, in the present moment, and also potentially in the future, as earlier performances in specific spaces “ghost” later productions (thus the context for Essex’s pre-coup performance of *Richard II* fuses onto that play its political aptitude, which can hardly be shaken off in subsequent production). These earlier extra-diegetic influences may also come from the theatrical world outside (thus the execution on a scaffold of Dr. Lopez ironically breathes new life into *The Jew of Malta* for its revival in 1594). Previous roles of an actor, previous spaces of performance for the same play, previously used properties, and previously played scenarios all feed our understanding of a present performance by importing from another time and multiple stage-places all those active spaces that do not inherently obtain within the script. These meanings accumulate and shift with the palimpsest of repeat performances, reviews, and technological change. We are always reviving and killing off past spaces of performance, playing at being the Lear gods, controlling the other for our sport. But in fact we are embraced, involved, and perplexed by the oppressive, stultifying, conserva-

tive places of the past and the fascinating, liberating, enlightening spaces of the present.

Sound is in several respects a temporal phenomenon. Frequency is the number of waves moving in a space at a fixed speed (depending on air conditions). Sound interference between two discrete places makes occupants aware of another experience in time going on elsewhere. Sounds from outside the theater building pass through and over the walls to become part of the soundscape within.³² Julie Sanders has recently reminded us of the proximity of a number of the public London theaters to the river and of the interplay of visual elements such as characters entering the stage, wet, and audible elements such as the cries of the watermen that kept the audience in mind of the theater's place within the city life from which it was also separated.³³ We might add the interfering sounds of the bears and dogs roaring and baying across Bankside and even the short period of simultaneous activity in the Rose and the Globe (the latter built in 1599 remarkably and perhaps belligerently close to the earlier and smaller building). There must have been significant overlap of sound between the two buildings' players, crowds, music, and effects such as explosions (as there are at multistage music festivals and multicourt sports tournaments).

For a moment, let us add to these noises disturbing the theatergoer another set of sonic relations. Imagine the interference of airplane noise into headphones or an old washing machine rumbling from the kitchen and disturbing a quiet movie scene going on in the living room. In each case, sound in its *proper* place confirms and satisfies the space occupied: the actors' words and "noise" of musicians tell us we are at a play; the airplane jet's roar tells us we're still in the air; and the noise of the washing machine tells us it is working. But when those same sounds move into alien space by passing through walls, doors, windows, and otherwise occupied ear drums, they confuse not just space but time as well, as happens during the time period we have dedicated to the activity of movie-watching that is counterpointed unpleasantly by external shouts or mechanical noise.

The human ear begins to hear two sounds as distinct (as opposed to layered or "thickened") when they arrive at the ear about thirty-five milliseconds apart. The smallest practical distance will yield this difference.³⁴ The confusion of sound arriving sooner (from stage, screen, or headphone speaker) and later (from watermen or washing machines) gives every space an ambience of temporal displacement. We are at every moment experiencing something happening close to the present instant but at the same time experiencing a sound from a distance that emanates from and indicates an

event in another time. Even within our immediate space inside the theater, we are temporally *displaced*. We comprehend space around us by reflections of light and sound off surfaces more than by direct sound. Such reflections tell us about a space's closure, height, and material and our location within the space, toward the back, off to the left, and so on. These reflection effects are enhanced by deliberately closing off a space. In the laboratory of the theater, for example, space is closed off by creating, intentionally or unintentionally, resonant soundboards at specific frequencies that absorb and diffuse sound, and by setting specific surface textures, colors, and shapes in front of the audience's eye. In such a space, we thereby intensify, hyperbolize, and re-view the materials of life. We understand the spaces we occupy by analyzing what we see and hear. In doing so, we experience a layered self-placement in various relations to the events and bodies indicated around us by sight and sound in a plurality of time. It is not absurd or even metaphorical to say that as we stand still in space to look and listen, we time-travel.

The present collection

Bruce Smith's essay opens the collection that follows with his ten "measures" of Global space experienced by audiences of Shakespeare's plays in their original performance circumstances. These are multidimensional spatial aspects of performance that aggregate to yield the "phenomenal" space of theatrical experience. Smith's observations intersect with his earlier work, lay ground that the other essays trace differently or expand, and prompt further study. One intriguing example that points toward a new mode of inquiry is his brief discussion of controlled/delimited sound volume and dissipation in performance, as when Hermia wakes in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* to find Lysander gone, and her cries create what Smith calls "an interpersonal soundscape just big enough for two people." Acoustic spaces, what I tend to think of as acoustic spheres of influence or experiential circles of engagement, exist as discrete entities. Characters, for example, can carry around their whispered "to themselves" voice wherever they stand or sit or lie on the stage—or off, we imagine. Such discrete acoustic forms also combine with other "spheres" to create overlapping, interfering soundscapes. The spaces/scapes create concentric, increasingly large, circles of engagement, as when a character like Hermia speaks "for two" within the imagined space on stage, within the hubbub of audience murmur in the theater, within the noise of London. Spatial soundscapes also create competing circles of similar size, such as Hermia's utterance competing with an involuntary response between

two audience members; or the Pardoner and the Friar speaking their competitive preachments simultaneously in John Heywood's interlude, splitting and layering the acoustic space of performance; or Hamlet and Gertrude's alternate realities.

Emma Atwood uses her own three measures of space (performance space, representational space, and imaginative space) to break up some of the "communal" experience arguably favored by my concentration on "place" in this introductory essay. She illuminates the layered, plural responses by individual audience members to any performance. Of particular interest to Atwood is the demand in *Edward II* for "the audience to reimagine a space that they have not yet confronted," namely, Killingworth. Such a prompt for a memory or knowledge that is left up to the creative power of each spectator fractures response and multiplies the imagined spaces projected onto the play. As spatial imaginary that is forced onto the audience yet also kept in suspension until the future, it puts auditors in an empathetic position with Edward's own wishful yearning for another unknown: his "little nook or corner" within which to frolic with Gaveston. When Edward finally resignedly declares that "all places are alike" (5.2.145), we are placed back on that theatrical line between the "here" and "there," knowing that each place is experienced differently by various bodies in time and motion but knowing also that all of these places are displaced in space and deferred in time, pushed offstage and away from the audience, and simultaneously pulled into the theatrical "within," the fictional, privileged place beyond what is shown on stage.

Making things that are "out of place" visible, and bringing to the fore frightening sights that *Edward II* would at first only suggest, is a central concern of Ashley Busse's essay on the "abject," the ironic foregrounding (through overt structures of concealment) of what should remain hidden and invisible.³⁵ The Renaissance stage *made* places to show the portentous and the unthinkable—the revealing space, the booth—so that when the time came, it would be a "proper" experience for someone on or off the stage. The revelations of death in *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Revenger's Tragedy*, or *Duchess of Malfi* are each presented in spaces owned by their artistic presenters, revealing bodies and death as stage property, elements that are at once of the stage world and the "real" world, crossing the boundary between the fiction and the actual, between the life and death of the characters, between the performance onstage and the truth that lies "within" (i.e., offstage and between the lines), between the knowable if deceptive "here" that presents itself to us and the unknowable "there" of another place and a future time.

As such, these moments and these materials—and importantly the very curtain or arras that hides these “scenes” until revealed—present a screen, a veil that simultaneously keeps the object hidden but keeps its presence in visible proximity.

The will to foreground and make visible (or at least knowable) the full human identity, for better or for worse, is the engine that drives the characters of *The Merchant of Venice* in Donovan Sherman’s essay. Concerned with the very nature of human internal space and its relation to the natural and supernatural environment, Sherman illustrates the theater’s ability simultaneously to evoke and reject a belief in the impossible, thus keeping in suspension the “here” of visual and material evidence and the “there” of philosophical hypothesis and theological spirituality. To do so, he outlines the fraught debate over the place and activity of the soul, in which the microcosmic (body, self, “here”) and macrocosmic (world, heaven, other, “there”) are joined. Our experience of our very movement and interaction in space as human beings depends on our faith in a soul that is either emotive, unified, separate, or transmigratable. This insoluble problem of the relation of bodily matter and spirit constantly resonates on the edge of certain of the period’s preoccupations: physiological, humoral somaticism; the Elizabethan struggle to cleanse the body of the church with the theological and experiential emptying out of substance in church furnishings and reinterpretation of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist; and the decline and end of the biblical plays of blood and affect. The force of an idea of the soul as something that moves (between bodies, between earth and heaven) lies in the necessity of mobility to comprehend the concept of matter that occupies no space, of a formless form. A comprehension of spiritual presence needs the spirit somehow to nudge the place within which it is situated so that we can witness human/holy movement.

The critique of the sacred within the human is balanced by Helga Duncan’s study of *As You Like It*’s external sacred places in which human bodies move and change. When the play brings on stage both the “here” and “now” of the court and forest, the transitional space between the two places becomes the region of contention. Duncan carefully enters this space, noting the constant association of spatial occupation with theological faith and notions of belonging. Certain intimations and stage effects (church bells, picnic feast spreads, sheepcotes in the forest fringe) mark locations as good or bad, hospitable or dangerous. But these very places are made and remade through performance and repetition, permitting the inversion of expectation. Thus the physical place of the forest embodies the proper psychic place

of a court through hospitality and, in the end, a sacred place of conversion. The “fringe” of the forest is read by Duncan through the multiple workings-out in the play of edges of identity and crossings of expected behavior. By the time the play ends, we are back on that theatrical line between “here” and “there,” not just in terms of the location of contextual “scenic” places, but in terms of the place of human identity itself, with the epilogue boy dressed “as if” a woman appealing to men and women in the audience, who in the fiction of the play acted “as if” a man acting “as if” a woman.

Julia Lupton examines the ways in which hospitable spaces are opened up by the interaction of human beings with objects that present themselves for use in designed and improvised ways. Drawing on environmental theory of “affordances,” she analyzes how places are made into “tasksapes” that contain organisms engaging with other organisms making use of various objects to delineate the relations between them, rather like—Lupton points out—in a theater. As a prompt from the stage will register a different space for each audience member in Atwood’s argument, so the presentation of an object will reveal a difference in the utility and potential of a place for different organisms. Is a stool used for sitting at a table, for standing on to reach for something, for propping open a door? Each use will redefine the space that has been made out of the named place—in the case of Lupton’s essay, Capulet’s house. Lupton notes that certain objects afford an understanding of extra space, separated from but related to the space of immediate occupation. Thus the presence of marzipan in the first act of *Romeo and Juliet* “points inward, to the backstage areas of house and stage that support the fanfare of entertainment.” Interestingly, if we step back from the fiction of the play, we can see that something similar is true of all stage properties, which reveal the presence of a “live” backstage, invisibly arranging what is performed “in the open.” Overlapping spaces, then, occur as a player leaves the stage and goes both “within” the offstage fictional world and into the extrafictional world of the backstage theater. Moreover, spaces of activity in time are palimpsested, as, for example, the imagined kitchen of marzipan preparation in *Romeo and Juliet*, which overlays the tiring house that brought out the property, which overlays the author’s study that produced the script for the company. Once again, the theater’s work is being done between the present “here” and the “there” of both the past (cause) and future (effect). As Russell West points out, there is an irony or double-sidedness of the theater as a built “world apart,” which makes the audience “ciphers [to] this great account,” filtering spatial information between outside and inside, real and theatrical activity. The audience is situated on the “line

between” that passes through time and space in the theatrical experience. Even as it declares its inability to *be* the real world (as in the Chorus’s apology in *Henry V*), the theater marks its situation as “constantly porous to the outside.”³⁶

This porosity is nothing new. Previous critics have noted that “the city frequently inserts itself into the drama as a player more than as merely the setting of dramatic narratives”; that “cities are not blank books, but palimpsests” and thus “city comedy begins not with aery nothing, but with local habitations that already have names, with London places that are already laden with meaning”; that writing about London places is a “demonstration and a celebration of the playwright’s power to shape communal urban consciousness”; that “the work of the playwrights constructing London theatrically contributes to the process by which its inhabitants that are members of their audience occupy the city imaginatively and impose a conceptual order upon it”; and in part, that ideas of place “were discursive constructions produced *by* the drama that represented them, imaginative creations that referenced actual places in the city, but in doing so imbued them with meaning and gave them cultural significance.”³⁷ The theater’s representation of the incursions of the city into theater literally *rewrites* those places, then. Thomas Platter’s famous remark about English people learning at the playhouse what is going on abroad and its reminder of the insular nation’s habit of dismissing strangers needs complementing in the light of newer research into provincial drama, household performance, private entertainment, and noncanonical plays. The English also saw at the playhouse what was going on right before their eyes and right around them in their houses, towns, and country—the place of stage was as a “perspective glass” through which local space was clarified and made available for new examination, comprehension, and utilization.³⁸

In her study of Middleton’s writing and the construction of the New River reservoir in London that concludes this collection, Su Mei Kok expands this observation on theatrical activity as necessary to “shape communal perceptions” about urban space. The New River project brought with it a new concept of owning space and acquiring the right to use and profit from space that required textualizing. By indicating a symbiosis between Middleton’s workmanship and the working of the mechanical project, and between the writer’s dedication to patronage and to the welfare of citizens, Kok demonstrates how official pageantry irons out the seam between the spaces of a “traditional” community of London and the foreign suburbs and environs bringing in this new water source. In doing so, it also recognizes

the temporal seam between the familiar and embedded conduits and spouts of the old city and the newness of the New River that literally cuts its way across these spaces and undermines (“pipes” its way under) London.

While the essays in this collection largely look out onto the world from the place of the theater, then, the world itself *as* theater—and as a map of ownership, interaction, and constant spatial reconfiguration—must always be taken into account. The site-specific performance study by Su Mei Kok usefully views the theatricality of and in the built environment rather than “reading” the city and country from within the theater, as done recently, for example, by Jean Howard and Darryll Grantley.³⁹ Site-specific performances mark the social place of the audience members more determinedly than in the public theater. In the latter, paying audiences take their place and show their class or their decision to place themselves among a specific contingent for that day’s performance, and their reactions to the performance will be tinted by the hue of that group. In the former case, in say a household performance, the social places of neighbor, servant, guest, and host and those persons’ relationships to the spaces of the house and garden are vitally embedded in certain relational constructions and therefore are available for more radical comment and disturbance. In *The Cultural Geography of Early Modern Drama*, Julie Sanders works from the premise that “drama was one of the key means by which early modern English society strove to make sense of space,” and thus site-specific drama was a “writing” of place as well as *about* place. Sanders goes on, citing Mike Pearson, to note that such performances are “conditioned by the sites in which they take place, but are also active in the recontextualization and reconfiguration of the understanding and practices of those places.”⁴⁰ This collection is a contribution to the need to reconsider how we think about and how we theorize the coming-into-being of, the sustaining of, and the interactions between space and place in the early modern theater.



Notes

I would like to express my gratitude to all the participants of the “Early Modern Dramatic and Literary Spaces” conference, November 6–7, 2009, California State University, Long Beach, where the conversations on space and place that would eventually lead to putting together this collection began. In particular my thanks are due to Bruce Smith and Julia Lupton, who presented papers at that conference and supported me throughout the project. The collection is far better for the involvement of

Janette Dillon as second reader and co-editor. I could not imagine a more pleasant working experience. I am also very grateful for the calmness and clarity with which Michael Cornett kept track of this long organizational process.

- 1 Yi-Fu Tuan, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977), 6; cited in Tim Cresswell, *Place: A Short Introduction* (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2004), 8.
- 2 Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1991), 184.
- 3 Crystal Bartolovich, "Putting *Tamburlaine* on a (Cognitive) Map," *Renaissance Drama* n.s. 28 (1997): 29–72, at 63 n. 5.
- 4 Among Dessen's work, see especially *Elizabethan Stage Conventions and Modern Interpreters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984). See further Janette Dillon, *The Language of Space in Court Performance, 1400–1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Julie Sanders, *The Cultural Geography of Early Modern Drama, 1620–1650* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Andrew McRae, *Literature and Domestic Travel in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); and Alice Hunt, *The Drama of Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- 5 For historicizations along the lines I suggest here, see, for example, Martin White, *Renaissance Drama in Action: An Introduction to Aspects of Theatre Practice and Performance* (London: Routledge, 1998); Keir Elam, *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama* (London: Routledge, 2002).
- 6 Major recent contributions to "geographies" of reading and the reading of maps in literature and the history of spatial understanding include John Gillies, *Shakespeare and the Geographies of Difference* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Garrett A. Sullivan, Jr., *The Drama of Landscape: Land, Property, and Social Relations on the Early Modern Stage* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1998); John Gillies and Virginia Mason Vaughan, eds., *Playing the Globe: Genre and Geography in English Renaissance Drama* (Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1998); Bernhard Klein, *Maps and the Writing of Space in Early Modern England and Ireland* (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001); Andrew Gordon and Bernhard Klein, eds., *Literature, Mapping, and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); D. K. Smith, *The Cartographic Imagination in Early Modern England: Re-Writing the World in Marlowe, Spenser, Raleigh, and Marvell* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008).
- 7 See James D. Mardock, *Our Scene Is London: Ben Jonson's City and the Space of the Author* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 14, citing Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 36.
- 8 An example of such a "place" would be the Rome of *Titus Andronicus*. It is a place defined by its superiority to the Goths, its separation from the wicked forest "fitted by kind for rape and villainy" (2.1.117), and by its decorative "rich ornament" (1.1.52) of Lavinia. But kind/nature refuses to be tied to such ownership and concomitant stasis and artificial contrast between parts of space, or between categorized "places" within a larger space. Thus Titus is "barbarous" (1.1.131, 375), Rome is a "wilderness of tigers" (3.1.53), and Lavinia's "treasury" (2.1.32) is easily picked.

- 9 Caterina Albano, "Visible Bodies: Cartography and Anatomy," in Gordon and Klein, *Literature, Mapping, and the Politics of Space*, 89–106, at 90 and 102.
- 10 Tim Cresswell, *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 151, 161.
- 11 See John A. Agnew, *Place and Politics: The Geographical Mediation of State and Society* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1988), 5: "Locale refers to the structured 'microsociological' content of place, the settings for everyday, routine social interaction provided in a place. Location refers to the representation in local social interaction of ideas and practices derived from the relationship between places."
- 12 Cresswell, *In Place/Out of Place*, 165.
- 13 De Certeau, *Practice of Everyday Life*, 117, 118; Sanders, *Cultural Geography*, 99.
- 14 As Janette Dillon notes, "space is not really a fixed material feature, but is constructed by the way it is occupied" (*Language of Space*, 6).
- 15 Andrew Gordon, "Performing London: The Map and the City in Ceremony," in Gordon and Klein, *Literature, Mapping, and the Politics of Space*, 69–88, at 70.
- 16 Lefebvre, *Production of Space*, 38–39.
- 17 Catherine Belsey, *Critical Practice*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2002).
- 18 Doreen Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 2, 3.
- 19 *Ibid.*, 3.
- 20 *Ibid.*, 168, 169.
- 21 Almost every spatial metaphor we apply either to early modern or to our own understanding of spatial relations necessarily involves borders, edges, resistances, and the concomitant transgression of these features. Massey's gendering of the topic of space and place emphasizes the physical and psychic reality of social and performative borders for women throughout history. She writes, "The need for the security of boundaries, the requirement for such a defensive and counter-positional definition of identity, is culturally masculine," and the determination of space by men anxiously asserts boundedness and polices the boundaries so instated; thus the interfering woman feels "out of place" and has to invade it (*Space, Place, and Gender*, 7, 148). Dillon emphasizes the inextricability of material and psychic space, the continual making of space that goes on in theatrical and everyday life's performances, and the equivocality of borders between spaces. In *Theatre, Court, and City, 1595–1610: Drama and Social Space in London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), she deemphasizes the specificity of physical location and discusses the dynamic constructions of place and space by dividing her chapters into discussions of spatial activity or experience rather than *places* in the popular sense of the term as geographical location. In this, Dillon reads to some extent in opposition to Steven Mullaney's geo-conceptual mapping of "liminal" theater in *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988). See especially Dillon's chapters "City, Court, and Theatre" and "Placing the Boundaries" in *Language of Space*.
- 22 See Dessen, *Elizabethan Stage Conventions*, 84–104, at 84–86.
- 23 Henry S. Turner, *The English Renaissance Stage: Geometry, Poetics, and the Practical Spatial Arts, 1580–1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 160–63.

- 24 Jay L. Halio, ed., *The Tragedy of King Lear*, updated ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 32.
- 25 Turner, *English Renaissance Stage*, 166–69.
- 26 See *King Lear* Folio 4.5.141, in *The Norton Shakespeare*, 2nd ed., ed. Stephen Greenblatt et al. (New York: Norton, 2008); and see Turner, *English Renaissance Stage*, 169. All further citations of Shakespeare’s plays are from the *Norton Shakespeare*.
- 27 Turner, *English Renaissance Stage*, 180.
- 28 See *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. (1989), s.v. *plot*, n. 1a and 3b, the meanings of which correspond to *plat*, n. 1 and 2, and see the etymologies for each word. Also, *platform*, n. and adj., can have the variant forms *plotform*, *plotforme*, and *plottforme*, demonstrating the etymological connection between *plot* and *plat* with a connection to performance space.
- 29 Turner, *English Renaissance Stage*, 24.
- 30 Daniel Rosenberg and Anthony Grafton, *Cartographies of Time: A History of the Timeline* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2012), 205.
- 31 E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), 3:239.
- 32 The definitive study of early modern soundscapes and theater noise is Bruce Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).
- 33 Sanders, *Cultural Geography*, 21.
- 34 5–35ms results in “chorusing” or “phasing” of two sounds. Frequency of sound is also a major factor in hearing spatio-temporal difference. At low frequency we hear sounds as very different with only about 20–30Hz of alteration, and at upper-mid frequencies, such as around 1–2KHz and 4KHz, where detail of the human voice and popular instruments such as guitar, piano, and snare drum are enhanced, we are very sensitive to slight frequency alterations.
- 35 This “foregrounding” is an inherent part of theater in that the building structure “frames” the performance, both deliberately and by chance. As Russell West states, “Examples of framing devices are clear spatial and temporal brackets such as the stage boundaries or a prologue, which demarcate what is to be included and what is to be excluded from the fiction, both in terms of space and of time. Paradoxically, even as they operate to set the work apart, frames must be ignored by the spectator, thus being excluded from the semantic field of the work of art.” Russell West, *Spatial Representations and the Jacobean Stage from Webster to Shakespeare* (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2002), 33.
- 36 West, *Spatial Representations*, 42.
- 37 Darryll Grantley, *London in Early Modern English Drama: Representing the Built Environment* (Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 5; Mardock, *Our Scene Is London*, 13, 45, 45; Grantley, *London*, 11–12; Jean Howard, *Theater of a City: The Places of London Comedy, 1598–1642* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 211.
- 38 Platter’s account is reproduced in Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, 3:364–66.
- 39 Grantley, *London*; Howard, *Theater of a City*.
- 40 Sanders, *Cultural Geography*, 9, 122.