

Title	The dual function of reference in verbal monologues : the "dagger speech" in Macbeth
Sub Title	
Author	小菅, 隼人(Kosuge, Hayato)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学藝文学会
Publication year	1997
Jtitle	藝文研究 (The geibun-kenkyu : journal of arts and letters). Vol.73, (1997. 12) ,p.107- 123
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	安藤伸介, 岩崎春雄両教授退任記念論文集
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00072643-00730001-0107

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

The Dual Function of Reference in Verbal Monologues : the “dagger speech” in *Macbeth*

Hayato Kosuge

Is it not monstrous that this player here,
But in a fiction, in a dream of passion,
Could force his soul so to his own conceit
That from her working all the visage wann'd,
Tears in his eyes, distraction in his aspect,
A broken voice, an' his whole function suiting
With forms to his conceit? And all for nothing,
For Hecuba! (*Hamlet*, 2. 2. 551-8)⁽¹⁾

Seeing a solo performance by a player who has just visited Elsinore, Hamlet feels ashamed that he is so helpless, and then hits on a plan to make use of a play for getting positive proof of Claudius's guilt. Hamlet is an emotional audience. What is moving for him is, on the one hand, the First Player to perform a violent action for a fictitious story, and on the other hand, the function of a play which could represent Hecuba on a stage. Meanwhile, Hamlet is an acute observer for the player's acting: the facial expressions, the tone of the voice, and the gestures. Thus, he recognizes the player, the acting, and the fictional character at the same time. Nevertheless, strictly speaking, what he really watched during the performance was *only* the man in action; the figure referred to the performer and to the character. In a theatre, a performer is hidden under the veil of a figure as well as a character, as can be seen in an extreme case such as a

hidden puppeteer at a puppet show.⁽²⁾

This referential function is a fundamental characteristic of theatre even when it is merely implied. Analyzing *untitled event* at Black Mountain College, Erika Fischer-Lichte states that it was a performance where real people performed real actions in a real space in real time ; moreover, “theatre not only fulfills a *referential* function, but also a *performative* one.”⁽³⁾ Viewing her statement, it may be argued that theatre carries both the reference to a character in fiction and to a performer in a real context. That is why *Untitled Event* became a theatrical event, to make the audience realize the dual aspect of the theatre by emphasizing only one function. From the point of view of this duality of theatre, a player in action could be called a “figure” because the connotation of the word hints at something visual as in a painting or at something artificial for a particular purpose as in geometry. Then a basic illustrative diagram for this duality could be as follows :

PERFORMER ← FIGURE → CHARACTER⁽⁴⁾

One question immediately arises ; does a figure refer to the other two equally? In “Noh, Kabuki and Western Theatre : An Attempt of Schematizing Acting Styles,” Mitsuya Mori observes very truly that the relationship between the three elements (i.e. the Actor, the play, the Character) changes in various cultural contexts though they appear on the stage simultaneously.⁽⁵⁾ Similarly, in verbal monologues, the relationship between a figure, a performer, and a character, is not constant. A figure can sometimes be identified with a performer, sometimes with a character ; therefore, in the former relationship, a fictional character is referred to emphatically, while the performer emerges in the latter. Thus, from the point of these relationships, this paper intends to consider the dual function of reference in verbal

monologues. After the brief definition of the terminology, I shall claim that there are two types of reference in the verbal monologues of Shakespeare ; one illustrated by the somniloquy of Lady Macbeth, the other with Malvolio's daydream. My choice of these examples is due to the existence of an observer on the stage. We can consider the functions of reference to a character and a performer by means of their responses to the figures. Then, as a compounded type, the "dagger speech" in *Macbeth* shall be examined, where the first type is mingled with the second. In that speech, the audiences recognize two different figures at the same time.

Before entering into a detailed discussion, we must try to clarify our central conception of monological speeches.

(1) Although "monologue" is often used interchangeably and confusingly with "soliloquy," all dramatic speeches which don't address any person in the story line are "monologue"; that is, "soliloquy" is always part of "monologue."⁽⁶⁾

(2) Although all dramatic speeches are unmistakably spoken aloud toward the auditorium, all monologues are divided from the point as to whether they are silent or aloud. On the one hand, there is a type of monologue as nobody makes any sign of having heard the speech within the story line.⁽⁷⁾ They could be called "mental" monologues because this conventional device has been very often used with the aim being the revelation of the speaker's thought. On the other hand, the "verbal" monologues which have audibility within the story line make the actions a real event within it. Therefore, they occasionally have hidden auditors, which can differentiate them from the conventional mental monologues, especially when the speaker is alone on the stage.

I. Involuntary monologues : Lady Macbeth in sleepwalking

The first type of verbal monologue to be considered is that of the speaker who is not conscious of his/her own utterance in the “real” context of drama, for example, Lady Macbeth’s monologues in the sleepwalking scene (*Macbeth*, 5. 1). In these types of speeches, a character appears through the performer and the figure, both of whom are identical. It may be diagramed as follows :

PERFORMER = FIGURE → CHARACTER

Firstly, we should note a remarkable characteristic of this scene. It is not only a real event but also a “show” in the sense that she has an audience who carefully watches her actions. It is the gentlewoman who introduces the Scotch doctor to the place of the performance, summarizes the performer’s actions, and urges him to watch it carefully: “Lo you, here she comes! This is her very guise, and upon my life, fast asleep. Observe her, stand close” (19-20). Subsequently, the doctor very carefully looks at the scene and listens to the speech all the time while the show is going on : “I will set down what comes from her, to satisfy my remembrance the more strongly” (32-4). In fact, her monologues and gestures are so plentiful of activity that it would be suitable for a show. Her speech demands shouting and murmuring in turn as follows :

Out, damn’d spot! out, I say! One—two—why then ’tis time to do’t. Hell is murky. Fie, my lord, fie, a soldier, and afeard? What need we fear who knows it, when none can call our pow’r to accompt? Yet who would have thought the old man to have had so much blood in him? (35-40)

Together with such intensive speeches, she enters with a taper, rubs her hands, cries, smells her own hands, sighs, coaxes, reaches her hand, and

runs out.

Lady Macbeth, however, has no intention of acting. She is a real sleepwalker for the gentlewoman and the doctor, and a realistic somnambulist for the audience in the auditorium. Therefore, for actresses playing the role, it would be ideal to act as a real madwoman without any evidence of a performer showing through. The stage history shows actresses' efforts in identifying themselves with the role. Louise Heiberg commented: "When I rehearsed this scene in the solitary hours of the night... I was often seized with an inexplicable horror, as if the room was filled with demons moving closer and closer.... And yet, I could only rehearse this scene at night."⁽⁸⁾ Sarah Siddons was criticized that her acting as a madwoman had been much too real for the character to remain a dignified queen as well.⁽⁹⁾ Maurice Evans-Judith Anderson asked for advice about sleepwalking of a psychiatrist, and observed a hypnotized female patient at a hospital.⁽¹⁰⁾ Adelaide Ristori was so naturalistic in her expression that *Saturday Review* stated: "It is ugly; and tragedy should not be ugly."⁽¹¹⁾ In fact, both of the actresses and the directors seem not to have been worried that she truly looked ugly. Gordon Craig imagined an untidy old woman as Lady Macbeth in this scene, and wrote to the actress, "I may horrify you by the drawing I've made of Lady M.... because it's ugly."⁽¹²⁾

Accordingly, this scene is the same type of performance as Umberto Eco has quoted: a drunkard man with red nose and slurred speech who is permitted to stand in public under the auspices of Salvation Army as a sign for the evil effect of drink.⁽¹³⁾ He is a real drunken man, really drunk in a real space in real time. Eco, furthermore, acutely pointed out that the drunken man refers back to the class of which he is a member, "not to *the* drunk who he is, but to *a* drunk."⁽¹⁴⁾ In fact, there would be two possibilities for the response to

this performance; the audience could recognize a weakness of mind for drink in the very man to laugh at him on the one hand, while they can be reminded of many drunken men in the world so that they may be given the message of the effect of drink on the other. In either way, the audience receives him as a *sign* of a drunken man. A drunkard as a sign is a fictional entity represented through the action of the real drunk; therefore, it is a character. Hence it can be diagrammed as [the performer=the drunk → a drunk]. In this type, a performer and a figure are identical and this then refers to a fictional character with which a performer (=a figure) is associated.

Although there have been various interpretations about the cause of Lady Macbeth's sleepwalking, such as remorse of conscience, fear, and apprehension of destruction, it can be safely said that Lady Macbeth is a character of a woman tortured by inner forces which she can never confide to anyone. The responses of the gentlewoman and the doctor illustrate this image clearly :

Doctor : What a sigh is there! The heart is sorely charg'd.

Gentlewoman : I would not have such a heart in my bosom for the dignity of the whole body. (53-6)

The character of Lady Macbeth which is recognized by them is the one deserving of compassion, in contrast to that by Macbeth as "thy undaunted mettle" or by Malcolm as "fiend-like queen." As a result, the gentlewoman prays God for her immediate recovery, and the doctor implicitly hopes for the possibility of her peaceful death. For them, Lady Macbeth has become an anguished character by her own sin beyond the real somnambulist as seen in the doctor's prayer, "God, God, forgive us all!" (75) Thus in the involuntary monologue, a fictional character looms through both the real body of the performer and the real action of the figure.

II. Intentional monologues : Malvolio in daydream

Next, there are verbal monologues whose subject is aware of his/her own utterances. As can be seen in Malvolio's daydream (*Twelfth Night*, 2. 5. 23-80), such an intentional type, in contrast to the first type, the figure is identified with the character so that it refers back to the performer. Thus the simple diagram is :

PERFORMER ← FIGURE = CHARACTER

Originally, monologues in the comic tradition were directly addressed to the audience. Typical comic figures like the Vice in Tudor Interludes strolled among the audience, very often crying for "Room."⁽¹⁵⁾ Moreover, such comic characters sometimes picked up a member of the audience to talk with him/her. As an extreme example, Johan the husband in *Johan Johan* left his coat with one member of the audience, snatched it back and asked another audience member to keep and presumptuously clean it during the performance :

[*To one of the audience.*]

Therfore I pray you take ye the paine

To kepe my gowne till I come againe.

[*Snatches it back.*]

But yet he shall not have it, by my fay!

He is so nere the dore he might ron away.

[*To another spectator.*]

But bicause that ye be trusty and sure,

Ye shall kepe it, and it be your pleasure.

And bicause it is aray'de at the skirt,

While ye do nothing, skrape off the dirt. (250-7)⁽¹⁶⁾

Shakespearean fools and villains are their direct descendants, and it can be said their tradition is still alive in modern vaudeville or in Rum

Tum Tugger in the musical *Cats*.

There surely are some reasons for the fact that such a close relationship with the audience has been limited to Vices and comical figures; it is justly obvious that they intend to show someone their special talents or skills with a purpose of jesting.⁽¹⁷⁾ Such ostentatiousness can also be recognized in many places in Shakespearean monologues. For example, Launce in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* imitates a son kneeling before his father, breathing of his mother, and his weeping sister in turn (2. 3. 23-30). The Porter in *Macbeth* also presents his talent by mimicking a "farmer," an "equivocator," and an "English tailor" (2. 3. 4-14). Furthermore, Launcelot Gobbo in *The Merchant of Venice* personifies the conscience and the fiend in his mind with gestures and facial expressions constantly changing in tempo (2. 2. 1-32). On the other hand, it goes without saying that the "family of Iago," who are the descendants of the Vice, boast of their plots and comment on other figures throughout the story. As Bernard Spivack has correctly pointed out, a characteristic of the Vice had still survived in the Elizabethan England in that their performances were a demonstration of their wit in comedy, of their villainy in tragedy.⁽¹⁸⁾

If the fundamental characteristic of their action is an ostentatiousness, one question arises: do they give the monological performances only for the audience in the auditorium? Considering the fact that performance is always performance for someone and that Shakespearean personae always pretend to stay within the drama even when their speeches are not necessitated by the plot, we immediately have another question: who are the audiences for their monological performances? We could have only one possible answer; the self is not only the performer but also the audience. In other words, the monologue

speaker not only stages his own demonstration, but he also becomes his own observer. In *Twelfth Night*, the report Maria delivers about Malvolio off stage illustrates the manner in which he is projecting himself into the imaginative character and is watching the figure: "he has been yonder i' the sun practicing behavior to his own shadow this half hour" (2. 5. 16-8). Launce creates the scene by casting himself as well as a dog, shoes, a stick and a hat, and sees them: "I am the dog—no, the dog is himself, and I am the dog—O! the dog is me, and I am myself" (2. 3. 21-3). In the Launcelot's monologue, all roles are parts of the self; moreover, "Lancelot/Gobbo/Lancelot Gobbo" is repeated nine times in the first twenty lines sounding like an object, whereas the subjective "I" appears six times in the second twelve lines like a comment on his own play. This could be explained as "I" watching an inward debate between "the conscience," "the fiend" and "Launcelot" from the position of audience in the first part, and the watching "I" being involved with that "inward theatre" in the second part.

Thus, in these types of verbal monologues, the speaker has a desire to see his own impersonation of a character in the imagination which is different from what he really is. Moreover, for the purpose of enjoying it by himself, the performer uses voice, face, and gesture to mimic that character's figure. Just after entering the stage, Malvolio is pleased with himself over the possible romance with Olivia and then over the raising of his social status in becoming "Count Malvolio." He not only imagines these, but illustrates "child-like" pleasure in detail as "I frown the while, and perchance wind up my watch, or play with my—some rich jewel" (2. 5. 59-60). Furthermore, by extending his hand "thus," quenching his "familiar smile with an austere regard of control," he talks to Sir Toby in his imagination as if the real Toby were there. Maria's trick succeeded because she presented Malvolio

with an image of a “Count” on the same level as what he had imagined for himself though Maria’s is a much more comical one: a boastful way of talking, an air of importance, a peculiar outfit, and smiling. Consequently, he was defeated in having to create the figure not only in the eyes of himself but also of Olivia.

Despite the ostentatiousness of his transformation, those actions reveal the performer’s intention and personality for the outsider, so that it could be diagramed as [Malvolio ← figure=“Count” Malvolio]. During Malvolio’s solo performance, Toby and Andrew react mainly to his boastfulness, neither to what he demonstrates nor how his acting skill is ; as a result, all of their comments are words of damnation. The personality behind the figure acting an imaginative character appears as Maria illustrates :

. . . a time-pleaser, an affection’d ass, that cons state without book, and utters it by great swarths ; the best persuaded of himself, so cramm’d (as he thinks) with excellencies, that it is his grounds of faith that all that look on him love him. (2. 3. 148-152)

Fortunately or unfortunately, however, his figure appears to refer to a character of a madman in the eyes of Olivia, not to his resolution to follow her advice as “. . . to inure thyself to what thou art like to be” (2. 5. 148), nor to his true boastful personality.

III. A compounded type: “dagger speech” of Macbeth

Macbeth’s “dagger speech” in Act 2 scene 1 contains plenty of gestures. Macbeth, waiting for the bell, sees an illusionary dagger :

Is this a dagger which I see before me,
The handle toward my hand? Come let me clutch thee :
I have thee not, and I see thee still.

Art thou not, fatal vision, sensible
To feeling as to sight? . . .

.....

I see thee yet, in form as palpable
As this which now I draw.

.....

. . . I see thee still ;
And on thy blade and dudgeon gouts of blood,
Which was not so before. (33-47)

The dagger is real for him at the moment. He tries to clutch it, and then, draws his own dagger to compare it when he finds it intangible. During these gestures, he speaks to the dagger directly in the form of “thou,” “thee” and “thy.”

These actions are never from the ostentatiousness, but from the true feelings. Thus, the speech from line 33 to line 47 should be a verbal monologue based on his pathological mental state, as is found with Lady Macbeth, as Sasaki Kenichi correctly observes.⁽¹⁹⁾ Therefore, his action refers to “a character”; he is a man who has a desire to consummate his plan quickly, but at the same time has some hesitation to carry it out. For the referential function of Macbeth’s verbal monologues to a fictional character, his speech just after the murder of Duncan is another good example because it is very close to that of the sleepwalking scene in content :

Exit [Lady Macbeth]. *Knock within.*

Macbeth: Whence is that knocking?

How is’t with me, when every noise appalls me?

What hands are here? Hah! they pluck out mine eyes.

Will all great Neptune’s ocean wash this blood

Clean from my hand? No ; this my hand will rather

The multitudinous seas incarnadine,
Making the green one red.

Enter Lady Macbeth. (2. 2. 54-60)

The character referred to in this monologue, like that of Lady Macbeth in Act 5, could be explained such as remorse of conscience, fear, and apprehension of destruction. Lady Macbeth's speech in this scene is a foil to that character. That is, she responds to her husband's four questions as if they were conversing: "I hear a knocking / At the south entry" (62-3), "Your constancy / Hath left you unattended" (65-6), "My hands are of your color" (61) and "A little water clears us of this deed" (64).

Nevertheless, unlike Lady Macbeth's somniloquy, Macbeth becomes occasionally conscious of his own action by the way that he sees what he does: "Mine eyes are made the fools o' th' other senses, / Or else worth all the rest" (44-5); "There's no such thing: / It is the bloody business which informs / Thus to mine eyes" (47-9). Macbeth incidentally speaks such an objective view of his own action throughout the play. For example, he imagines his own figure described as "wither'd Murther" or Tarquin:

... wither'd Murther,
Alarum'd by his sentinel, the wolf,
Whose howl's his watch, thus with his stealthy pace,
With Tarquin's ravishing strides, towards his design
Moves like a ghost. (52-6)

It is done so often that it becomes an undercurrent of his consciousness through the whole play: "The eye wink at the hand; yet let that be / Which the eye fears, when it is done, to see" (1. 4. 52-3); "Hah! they pluck out mine eyes" (2. 2. 56). Consequently, he paraphrases his life as "a poor player, / That struts and frets his hour upon the stage" (5. 5.

24-5). Although Macbeth, unlike Malvolio, does not intend to mimic a different character, he recognizes himself to behave like a performer.

Both Malvolio and Macbeth see themselves as certain characters. Macbeth, however, thinks the character to be a player who is forced to play a part. Then, the “poor player” has done an involuntary performance, like Lady Macbeth, where a performer is identified with a figure referring again to a character. Therefore, it would be diagramed as follows :

Macbeth ← himself = “a player” (=FIGURE → CHARACTER)

This diagram could be schematized as the compound of the first and the second type on verbal monologues :

PERFORMER ← FIGURE = [PERFORMER = FIGURE → CHARACTER]

The performer which is referred to at the extreme left is, in a sense, Shakespeare himself, while that in the middle is a man with a “heat oppressed-brain”; for, although Macbeth is a part of *Macbeth*, he has one consciousness which rules over the play itself, that is, “every man must play a part.”⁽²⁰⁾ The view of Macbeth as a “great poet,” which Kenneth Muir has clearly rejected, would be validated only in this sense.⁽²¹⁾

Furthermore, when we have a close look at the diagram, we recognize that Macbeth has two figures on the stage as well as two performer’s aspects. That duality of figure is caused by the duality of time and space. As M. C. Bradbrook states, from the standpoint of the relationship between the medieval pageant and *Macbeth*, some Shakespearean scenes are suddenly transformed as in pageant, where the audience experiences another world.⁽²²⁾ Moreover, one may say, as Maynard Mack in fact does, that two worlds co-exist in this play and “Macbeth enacts his crimes in the historical world, experiences them in the symbolic world.”⁽²³⁾ Then, every time the “symbolic” world appears

around himself, Macbeth fights to deny the existence and draws himself from the place: “There is no such thing”; “Hence, horrible shadow! / Unreal mock’ry, hence!” (3. 4. 105-6); “Infected be the air whereon they [witches] ride, / And damn’d all those that trust them!” (4. 1. 138-9). In this sense, two worlds overlap, as with the performer’s aspect. This duality could also be, for example, found in the three witches; the objective real beings, skinny old women with beards, are on the same stage with subjective real beings as three weird sisters who are “representative of potentialities within him [Macbeth] and within the scheme of things of which he is a part.”⁽²⁴⁾

IV. Conclusion

It would have been a controversial topic for the people in the Shakespearean age to ask which is the core of theatrical experience, a fictional character or an actual performer. For some Elizabethans, theatre was the place where the “ghosts” of their ancient heroes walked again. Thomas Nashe, probably referring to the Talbot scenes in *Henry VI part I*, commented:

How would it have joyed brave Talbot (the terror of the French) to think that after he had lien two hundred years in his tomb, he should triumph again on the stage, and have his bones new embalmed with the tears of ten thousand spectators at least (at several times), who in the tragedian that represents his person imagine *they behold him fresh bleeding*.⁽²⁵⁾ (emphasis added)

On the other hand, some playgoers concentrated more on popular actors such as Tarlton, Alleyn and Burbage. In his close study on the Elizabethan playgoers’ tastes, Andrew Gurr quoted the example of an innkeeper who confused “Burbidge” (i.e. Burbage) for Richard the

Third :

But chiefly by that one perspicuous thing,
Where he mistooke a player for a King.
For when he would have sayd, King Richard dyed,
And call'd—A horse! a horse!—he, Burbidge cry'de.⁽²⁶⁾

Obviously, in Elizabethan England, as may be the same case with the modern audience, there were at least two kinds of people in the auditorium, divided according to the priority of real actors or fictional characters; moreover, those tastes had been shifting from one to the other for around eighty years from 1560s to 1640s as Gurr pointed out.⁽²⁷⁾

These two examples of theatrical experiences could also apply to the audience on the stage. For the gentlewoman and the Scotch doctor, the verbal monologue reveals a general character which Lady Macbeth belongs to; whereas, for Toby, Fabian, and Andrew, it refers back to the particular personality of Malvolio. In the former type, the performer is explicit in the form that is identified with the figure, mainly because the speaker doesn't assume the audience in the nature of *monological* speech; to the contrary, in the latter, the character is identified with the figure, partly because he has a desire to clear his own position for himself by the *verbal* expression. Hence, Macbeth in the "dagger speech," which is a compounded type, brings out the double figure stemming from his double consciousness, and then his action often moves our viewpoint from one to the other. In conclusion, as the audience always faces only a figure on the stage in the real context, the referential function is to reveal what still remains behind the real. In both general and particular terms, the complexity of the functions of reference may be the core of theater as Peter Brook implies: "I believe that, theatre, like life, is made up of the unbroken conflict between

impressions and judgments—illusion and disillusion cohabit painfully and are inseparable.”⁽²⁸⁾

NOTES

- (1) All references to Shakespeare are to the Riverside Shakespeare Edition, ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Boston : Houghton Mifflin, 1974).
- (2) We cannot say that a puppeteer is always hidden at a puppet show. In the Japanese puppet theatre *Bunraku*, some puppeteers do not hide themselves. For insight into the relationship between a performer, a figure and a character in the puppet theatre, refer to Willmar Sauter's lecture, "Analyzing the Theatrical Event: A Puppet and a Puppeteer and the Making of Fiction, seen from a Phenomenological Perspective," Seijo University at the International Colloquium of Theatre Studies '97 in Tokyo, 27 March 1997.
- (3) Erika Fischer-Lichte, "Performance Art and Ritual: Bodies in Performance," *Theatre Research International* 22. 1 (1997): 22-37; for the referential and performative functions, also see, Jean Alter, *A Sociosemiotic Theory of Theatre*, (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1990) 32.
- (4) For the concept of "figure," see, in particular, Manfred Pfister, *The Theory and Analysis of Drama*, trans. John Halliday (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988) 161.
- (5) Mitsuya Mori, "Noh, Kabuki and Western Theatre: An Attempt of Schematizing Acting Styles," *Theatre Research International* 22. 1 (1997): 14-21. For the diagram, I am deeply indebted to Mori's model.
- (6) See, in particular, Lloyd A. Skiffington, *The History of English Soliloquy* (Lanham: Univ. Press of America, 1985) ix-x.
- (7) See, for the classification, M. L. Arnold, *The Soliloquies of Shakespeare* (1911; New York: AMS Press, 1965) 19-23.
- (8) This episode is quoted in Marvin Rosenberg, *Masks of Macbeth* (Newark: Univ. of Delaware Press, 1978) 562.
- (9) Rosenberg, 566.
- (10) Rosenberg, 567.
- (11) Rosenberg, 568.
- (12) Rosenberg, 568.

- (13) Umberto Eco, "Semiotics of Theatrical Performance," *TDR* 21 (1977): 107-17.
- (14) Eco, 110.
- (15) See, in particular, T. W. Craik, *The Tudor Interlude* (Leicester : Leicester Univ. Press, 1967) 19-20.
- (16) *Medieval Drama*, ed. David Bevington (Boston : Houghton Mifflin, 1975).
- (17) See, Arnold, 102-5 ; Craik, 38-9.
- (18) Bernard Spivack, *Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil* (New York : Columbia Univ. Press, 1958) 205.
- (19) Sasaki Kenichi, *Serifu no Kozo* (*The Structure of the Speech*) (Tokyo : Chikuma Shobo, 1982) 37-9.
- (20) See, for the use of metaphors of the play in *Macbeth*, Anne Richter, *Shakespeare and the Idea of the Play* (London : Chatto and Windus, 1962) 130-2.
- (21) Kenneth Muir, Introduction to Arden *Macbeth* (1951; London : Methuen, 1972) liii.
- (22) M. C. Bradbrook, *Shakespeare the Craftsman* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1969) 4-6.
- (23) Maynard Mack, *Everybody's Shakespeare* (Lincoln : Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1993) 190.
- (24) Mack, 186
- (25) Thomas Nashe, *Pierce Penilesse*, ed. R. B. Mckerrow, rev. ed. F. P. Wilson, *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, I (1904 ; Oxford : Oxford Univ. Press), 211 ; see also John Webster, *New Characters (drawne to the Wife)* in Sir Thomas Overbury's *A Wife* (1615 ; 2nd ed.).
- (26) Andrew Gurr, *Playgoing in Shakespeare's London*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge : Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996) 242.
- (27) See, for a full account, Gurr, chap. 5.
- (28) Peter Brook, introduction, *Marat/Sade*, by Peter Weiss (1965 ; London : Marion Boyars, 1982) 5.