THE CHANGING THEATRICALITY OF *CYMBELINE*

By DIANA WALLSGROVE

On stage, *Cymbeline*'s fortunes have been chequered. In the eighteenth century it was popular and successful. In the twentieth century it was largely ignored - since 1879 there have merely been fifteen Stratford productions, as against more than seventy of *Hamlet*. Throughout its stage history, playwrights, actor-managers and directors have cut and adapted the play to focus on differing aspects of its theatricality, in order to try to appeal to their own audiences, with various degrees of success. Any production of Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* can be seen, through what is excised or emphasised, to be a reflection of contemporary theatrical taste and a conditioned response to the nature of the play.

The latter half of the twentieth century has seen *Cymbeline* being re-evaluated and reappraised as a piece of work specifically for and of the theatre, having received little previous scholarly attention or acclaim. Concurrently there have been many studies of the Shakespearean stage, such as those by Andrew Gurr, and it is possible today to see approximations of Jacobean theatre design at the Globe, London, and in the Swan and Courtyard theatres in Stratford-upon-Avon. Many theatre companies choose to use configurations other than proscenium arch that reject naturalist scenery, and allow a closer actor-audience relationship by breaking down 'the fourth wall'. In these stage conditions *Cymbeline* seems to be flourishing.

In this study I shall consider *Cymbeline*'s changing relationship with the stage. In Chapter One I shall demonstrate that the play's original staging was intended by Shakespeare to appeal to audiences at both the Globe and at the Blackfriars theatres. I

shall suggest that its mixed genre and sources were deliberately adopted by Shakespeare in order to appeal to the more socially mixed arena playhouse audience and to the more sophisticated audience at Blackfriars, thus maximising its success.

In order to show how *Cymbeline* could be re-presented on the Restoration stage, in Chapter Two I shall present a detailed examination of Thomas D'Urfey's radical seventeenth century adaptation, exploring the context and the commercial expediency behind its selection. I shall demonstrate firstly that D'Urfey adapted it in order to make optimum use of changeable scenery, and secondly in order to remould the characters into Restoration stereotypes, fully exploiting the use of actresses through additional female roles. It can be seen that at this time Shakespeare's words were not regarded as sacrosanct and the play could be regarded as useful material that could be reshaped to attempt to achieve commercial success on stage.

In Chapter Three I shall look at subsequent changes. I shall show that on the eighteenth and nineteenth century stage, the play's appeal increasingly becomes the didactic presentation of Imogen as the ideal woman. Its anachronistic nature becomes problematic where pictorial realism is the preferred production style.

In conclusion I shall consider how the play has been staged more recently in order to please its audiences. I shall argue that an understanding of the nature of Shakespeare's play and the audience for whom it is being performed, allied to the techniques and technology of today, can make *Cymbeline* a successful piece of contemporary theatre.

CHAPTER ONE: RENAISSANCE

Productions of *Cymbeline* in the early years of the twenty-first century reveals a number of common features, despite their being performed in very different theatres and performance contexts. [1] These productions of *Cymbeline* are: the Globe 2001; the Lucille Lortel Theater, New York, 2002; the Swan Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon, 2003; the Open Air Theatre, Regent's Park, London, 2005; the Dell, Stratford-upon-Avon 2006; and Restmorel Castle, Cornwall, 2006. For each of these productions, the audience was seated in a roughly semi-circular shape, in relatively close proximity to the acting area. None of the performance spaces was a proscenium theatre and several had 'Shakespearean' platform stages. All but the New York and Swan theatre productions were performed out of doors although the production at Restmorel castle made use of atmospheric stage lighting rather than daylight. None used 'authentic' costumes in that none were specifically and homogeneously from one precisely identifiable date or era – for example the Globe company, rather than wearing the reproduction Jacobean costume that is often their trade-mark, wore identical white tunics and trousers. All used actors doubling parts. All used humour extensively and encouraged a direct actor/audience relationship. All deliberately emphasised the 'fairy-tale' elements of the play, some adding narrators for exposition. It could be argued that each of these productions was informed by an understanding of the theatrical conditions prevailing when the play was written and by the nature of the play itself. Exactly how some recent productions of the play can be seen as congruent with popular traditions of Jacobean theatre I shall explore later in this study.

These twenty-first century productions received favourable reviews from theatre critics that commented on the audience's enjoyment of the play. One reviewer says "the afternoon I watched, it was surely an audience pleaser." [2] Another

comments on “audible delight” in the final scene and “whoops of joy” at the end. [3] *Cymbeline* is said to be “a rattling good yarn” and it is observed that the play is “superbly balancing laughter and tears”. [4] One critic describes it as “a hilarious and enchanting piece of theatre” with “sheer outrageous theatricality”.[5] Another describes watching the performance as “An evening well spent”. [6] These reactions seem to suggest that, at the present time, ways can be found of making Cymbeline acceptable, even enjoyable, on stage.

These views are in strong contrast to evaluations of the play by most scholars and theatre critics in the twentieth century, many of whom seem to find it necessary to make apologies for the play. They claim that it is flawed, transitional, experimental – not wholly his work, or that of a bored, tired, old and disillusioned writer. George Bernard Shaw described the final revelations as “a tedious string of unsurprising denouements” but, as Kenneth Muir states, he “had never seen the play performed without the cuts which were always made in the nineteenth century”.[7] Roger Warren, editor of 1998 Oxford edition of the play, regards the play very differently – and in a much more positive light.

> I was fortunate to encounter *Cymbeline* for the first time in performance, at Stratford-upon-Avon in 1957, with Peggy Ashcroft unforgettable as the heroine; so from the start the play has been for me, not the eccentric experiment described by so much criticism, but an absorbing theatrical experience.[8]

Barbara Mowat comments “The core of the play is the romance story: its mode is suspense, curiosity, wonder”.[9] Mowat also describes having seen “an incredibly fine and moving production” at Stratford, Ontario in 1970. Peggy Simonds similarly expresses the desirability of seeing the play on stage. It is “a more deeply moving experience in the theatre than it could possibly be in the study where so much of its inherent theatricality must be imagined”. [10]

J. M. Nosworthy is highly critical of the play. Editing the Arden edition in 1955, however, he was approaching the play whilst its stage presentation was still firmly embedded in traditions inherited from the nineteenth century. For him, the play's "structural ineptitude" can only be explained by it being "experimental" – the writer "feeling his way into a new genre". [11] To him *Cymbeline* lacks dramatic uniformity and it is only by focusing on Imogen that it can in any way redeem itself (introduction, p.lviii). Even Imogen is, he feels "impaired by excessive vitality" and her creation is "a superb accident" – quite how this should have occurred he does not explain. He closes his discussion of the play as an 'experimental romance' with the conclusion "If, on occasion, we are content to forget the play and concentrate on its heroine, no great harm is done" (introduction, pp.lx-lxi). In this estimation he seems to be reflecting the nineteenth century fixation on Imogen as the perfect woman, and even to be approving of the "Bishop's wife" aspects of her that Shaw saw and condemned in his analysis of the role.[12]

Robert Uphaus again excuses the play on the grounds that it is experimental.[13] It is, he asserts, a parody. He cannot accept that Shakespeare would deliberately adopt "the conventions we associate with romance" unless it is to undermine them. He says that, in production, Iachimo's emergence from the truck, and Jupiter's descent, would provoke laughter in the audience. This does not seem to have been the reaction in the recent productions previously cited. Significantly, he comments that "every *reader*" of the play (my italics) has been "struck, not to say astonished, by [its] conclusion". The ending is not intended to create wonder, he claims, but to demonstrate its technique – "one is aware more of the manner of the accomplishment than of its effect" (p.67).

Both writers are bringing their critical sensibilities to bear on the product of a very different theatrical context from their own. Neither Nosworthy nor Uphaus take into account the broader context within which Shakespeare wrote the play. In criticising the play, or assuming that it is a 'spoof', they are evaluating the play according to their own notions of what a play (and even what a Shakespeare play) *should* be. In order to determine why *Cymbeline* has its own distinctive qualities, it is necessary to regard it initially as a work deliberately created within a very specific (and different) theatrical context from our own. That the theatre, in the later twentieth century, has appropriated some of its features is an issue to which I shall return later in this study.

Many of *Cymbeline*'s severest critics accept that a Jacobean audience would have enjoyed it. Barbara Mowat quotes Morris Arnold who, when criticising Shakespeare's overuse of soliloquies, observes in 1911 that "these were doubtless acceptable to their audience".[14] That the theatricality of Jupiter's descent would "provide entertainment" is also pointed out by Gassner writing in 1968.[15] Kristian Smidt, examining the play's 'unconformities' points out: "nor can Shakespeare as the leading playwright of a prestigious theatrical company have been indifferent to popular taste".[16] Shaw, re-evaluating the play in 1945, realises that the verse given to the apparitions in Act 5 scene 3 "is not doggerel: it is a versified masque […] introduced […] to please King Jamie". [17]

This is just the point. Shakespeare is not, I would argue, producing a peculiar, muddled play because of some lapse in talent or inspiration. He is choosing to write *Cymbeline*, deliberately, because it would be popular with the audiences for whom he was, quite specifically, writing.

In 1948 G. E. Bentley complains that previously most scholars and critics have ignored Shakespeare's "proper context" – i.e. the stage.[18] He points out that Shakespeare was writing for London's most commercial theatre, and for an organised and professional theatre company. Bentley stresses Shakespeare's unique position, as one deriving his income not only from writing and acting, but also from part-ownership of theatre buildings, stock etc. Thus Shakespeare was more fully involved with the commercial aspects of his theatre than any of his contemporaries; he was also involved with one specific company, continuously, for twenty years.

Bentley claims that the availability of the Blackfriars theatre to the King's Men from 1608 (and their knowledge of the appropriate style for that theatre from considerably earlier) led to a new type of play being written. They were "writing new [plays] for the full exploitation of this unprecedented opportunity". (p.40) The King's Men were well aware who their more sophisticated and discerning audience in the indoor playhouse would be (the gentry, the court, the professional classes, and lawyers), and adapted their repertoire accordingly.

> [They] evidently saw what was coming […] for in the next few years they understood and exploited the situation more effectively than any other troupe in London. (p.45)

Bentley compares the theatrical style used by Beaumont and Fletcher in *Philaster*, to that of *Cymbeline*, claiming that it belongs to a similar theatrical genre; it was performed by the same company and was written for the same, newly available, theatre audience. *Philaster*, he states, was very popular, and it was one of the most influential plays of the seventeenth century. This is a reflection of the rise in status of the theatre, Bentley claims, and an indication that the Globe was "left to take care of itself".

Whilst Bentley's reminder of Shakespeare's financial involvement with the King's Men's ventures is a useful one, to claim that Shakespeare wholly turned away from the Globe is to ignore a number of significant facts. It is overly simplistic to say that Shakespeare was writing "a new kind of play for the new theatre and new audience" (p.49). This overlooks the composition of *Pericles* (perhaps 1607), generally considered to pre-date *Cymbeline* (1608 – 10), but which shares many of its qualities and generic features. It could be argued that in 1607 Shakespeare hoped that the Blackfriars would become available, but Bentley uses *Pericles* as an illustration of the Globe's taste for 'old plays' or at any rate for old-fashioned plays, as it was still being played there in 1631. When judged by numbers of editions, *Pericles* is one of the most popular plays in print between 1574 and 1642.[19] That *Philaster* is similarly high-ranking suggests that there is no clear distinction for readers between what was being performed at the Globe and at the Blackfriars. Rather, once Shakespeare and the King's Men had two playhouses, able to operate throughout the year, with court appearances in addition, their repertoire would need to be readily transferable between playing spaces and, despite the greater profitability of the Blackfriars (as shown by Bentley, p.47), income and success at the Globe is hardly likely to have been totally ignored by the company.

In composing *Cymbeline* Shakespeare may have been catering for this wider audience. Nosworthy notes that *Mucedorus*, which he describes as "a silly old play", was a popular revival at the Globe in 1607.[20] It "caught the fancy of the age and maintained its popularity over a longish period" (p.xxv). Its genre is similar to that of *Cymbeline*. G. K. Hunter lists the qualities of *Pericles* – tragic emotion described rather than experienced, alternations of joy and sorrow, the individual's struggle in an unstable world – and claims that they would appeal to mixed audiences both at the

Globe and, later, at the Blackfriars.[21] Its style – which he describes as "sophisticated nostalgia" – indicates a popular revival of an earlier Elizabethan taste. This description could also apply to *Cymbeline*.

Arthur Kirsch accepts that *Cymbeline* was written for this wider audience. "It would please both audiences and be suitable to the conditions of both theatres". [22] Similarly, Jennifer Richards and James Knowles agree that Shakespeare does not, at this point in his career, simply become, as King's Man, the cultural servant of the King's and thus the Court's, taste: "The plays sought to appeal to a broad cross-section of society".[23] Even Nosworthy concedes that "the acquisition of the Blackfriars may have induced Shakespeare to pen dual-purpose plays" (Arden introduction, p.xvii). However, Shakespeare's choice of genre and style seems to Nosworthy to have coincided fortuitously with the popular taste. Shakespeare and Fletcher were "following a rehabilitated dramatic convention which accorded, co-incidentally, with Jacobean taste and the increasing amenities of the stage" (p.xxxvii). It would seem very surprising to me if he was not *knowingly* exploiting both. Smidt, as shown above, thought that Shakespeare was acutely aware of popular taste. He states:

> [Shakespeare] wrote in his later years with a greatly increased knowledge of what would work in the theatre. Things that a reader may question need not be questioned by an audience and improbabilities which disturb a studious mind will often add to the delight of a spectator. [24]

Smidt then seems, rather oddly, to suggest a reluctance on the dramatist's part to conform to this popular taste. Shakespeare, he claims, later inserted the dream sequence into Act 5 scene 3 of *Cymbeline* to "satisfy the taste of the Blackfriars audience for shows of ghosts and gods". He "felt an obligation to use the theatre's hoisting equipment." (p.132) Just because such theophanies might not suit Smidt's

notion of appropriate theatre, it does not follow that Shakespeare was reluctant to use them. On the contrary, he may have thoroughly welcomed the opportunity for such flamboyant displays of theatricality.

Peggy Simonds starts her book on *Cymbeline*'s iconography by quoting L.P Hartley's famous statement about the past being "a foreign country" where things are done differently.[25] She stresses the impossibility of experiencing a Jacobean play in a way even remotely similar to its original audience. We no longer perceive allusions that must have been so clear at the time of its composition. What becomes apparent, when looking at the many stylistic and narrative influences of the play, is that Shakespeare, by blending many strands, is indeed appealing to and communicating with 'a broad cross-section' of his public.

The play has been criticised for blending Roman history with romance but to assume that this is simply a mistake is to overlook its possible significance. Simonds explores the references to Troy in the play, explaining that James I identified himself with Brute, legendary founder of Britain, whose wife was called, importantly, Innogen. She sees clear allusions to Jacobean propaganda in the numerous Trojan references. Uphaus sees the refusal to pay the tribute as "a fairly strong appeal to national pride" and Cymbeline's resumption of this at the end as "a parodic reversion".[26] However, to my mind more convincingly, Patricia Parker argues that as it is the Queen and Cloten who demand war, this is not to be seen as laudable patriotism but as jingoistic nationalism. The final agreement with Rome parallels King James's wish to be seen as a peacemaker, harmoniously uniting the three countries under his rule.[27] In this Jacobean 'pax', not only is Britain forming an alliance with ancient (or even renaissance) Rome but with papal Rome as well. References to Rome, especially to Aeneas and Augustus, link the Augustan 'pax' with

the contemporary one. Similarly, the Welsh location and references to Milford Haven have led Geoffrey Bullough to date the play 1610, claiming that it was written (and possibly first performed) for the investiture of Prince Henry as Prince of Wales in May/June of that year. [28]

Rather than seeing *Cymbeline* as belonging to a wholly new genre, it is also possible to demonstrate that it possesses traditional features that draw upon a much older type of play, performed by travelling players, which Shakespeare may have remembered from his boyhood. Leo Salingar identifies many plot motifs in *Cymbeline* that occur in late medieval romantic tragic-comedies and saints' plays.[29] These include faithful wives, disguise, lost children and seeming death. Salingar cites a comprehensive study by Laura Hibbert of thirty-nine variations on the 'patient Griselda' type (often with a mother-in-law making accusations) in the fourteenth century (Salingar, p.39). He claims that the earliest example of the fugitive heroine in male disguise occurs in Indian drama. He describes a fourteenth century example of the wager story, *Oton* (French) and of the 'lost sons' motif, *Esmoreit* (Dutch), to illustrate the longevity of these exemplary fables. He agrees with many other critics that Shakespeare was also utilising more contemporary tales: *The Decameron* by Boccaccio (which may not have been available in English), *Frederick of Jennen* (1560), and the play *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune* (1589), all of which are included as sources in Bullough's collection. He is at pains to demonstrate that Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*, far from being experimental, is rooted in a continuous popular tradition of exemplary romance, which would be familiar to at least some of Shakespeare's audience.

Critics have suggested that, in addition to the romance tradition (whether in prose or in the theatre) Shakespeare was also aware of and drew upon popular Italian

tragi-comedies such as Guarini's *Il Pastor Fido* (1590), which, in turn derived their pastoral settings from Greek romances and the plays of Apuleius.[30] The blend of romance with classical principles in Sidney's *The Arcadia*, and Spenser's *The Faerie Queene* can be seen again in Shakespeare's *Cymbeline* and in the work of Beaumont and Fletcher, significantly in the contemporaneous *Philaster.* Andrew Gurr claims Sidney and Spenser as the latter's primary sources. [31] These writers were catering for sophisticated readers; what makes Shakespeare different from his contemporaries, Logan and Teskey argue, is *his* reading of *popular* literature.[32] Shakespeare can be seen thus to be blending a broad range of influences and source materials – sophisticated and populist - in order to accommodate the tastes of his heterogeneous audiences.

Nosworthy demands "Why such a mish-mash?" eventually conceding, grudgingly, that Shakespeare, in *Cymbeline*, might have known what he was doing.[33] Bullough sums up Shakespeare's technique rather more satisfactorily. He "was consciously working in a tradition of folk-lore and literary romance when he added to what he found in Holinshed and Boccaccio." He sees the play's "loose and episodic" structure as deliberate, rather than accidental, "as if to insist on the 'popular' ballad-like nature of the entertainment". It also contains "condensed and intricate presentation of thought and character" along with "sophisticated artlessness". These apparent contradictions are identified by Barbara Mowat as a mixture of 'representational' (or naturalistic) drama and 'presentational' techniques that use illusion-breaking devices to present the *stage* world in a self-consciously fictitious way (such as with asides, non-introspective soliloquies, and masque).[34]

What has to be accepted is that Shakespeare was writing, with a great deal of experience, for a theatre-going public drawn from a broad cross-section of his society. To quote Mowat:

> When an author chooses a story, a genre, a theatrical style, a narrative or dramatic mode, he is choosing a way of creating a certain kind of experience and a way of saying what he wants to say. (Prologue, p.3)

Shakespeare *deliberately* chose to use rhymed 'fourteeners' in some parts of *Cymbeline* – for example for the ghosts visitation in 5.3 – because they *are* archaic and nostalgic forms, appropriate for ghosts from the past and recognisable audibly as such to the Jacobean audience. In these last plays critics have identified a shift from elite patronage to a more plebeian commercialism that regards the theatre as a 'business' like the Royal Exchange. Spectacle operates within the wider public discourse which belonged to the emblematic and visual culture of the period. [35] Non- or semi-literate members of the audience can hear the kind of argument that it cannot read. Theatre thus acts as an exchange between oral and written cultures. The late plays, including *Cymbeline*, with their emphasis on spectacle and emotion, are thus able to communicate with a wide audience. If the more educated and sophisticated audience at the Blackfriars can only accept romance ironically as parody (as Uphaus claims) its members are nevertheless being entertained, and paying substantially for the privilege.[36]

When the theatres re-opened in 1660, the political climate, theatrical practice, and the audience had all changed. As Mowat says "that which is "natural" in one period becomes "artificial" or "crude" in another. [37] In order to have a continuing place upon the stage, *Cymbeline* would have to be re-shaped and revised in accordance with the taste of the new era.

---

[1] *Cymbeline* directed by Mark Rylance, the Globe Theatre, London, 2001

Cymbeline directed by Bartlett Sher, the Lucille Lortel Theater, New York, 2002
Cymbeline directed by Dominic Cooke, Swan Theatre, Stratford-upon-Avon 2003
Cymbeline directed by Rachel Kavanaugh, The Open Air Theatre, Regent's Park, London, 2005
Cymbeline directed by Steve Purcell, The Dell, Stratford-upon-Avon 2006
Cymbeline directed by Emma Rice, Restmorel Castle, Cornwall, 2006

[2] Kenneth Tucker, '*Cymbeline* at the Globe', *Shakespeare Newsletter* (Spring-Summer 2001), p.37 reprinted in *Shakespearean Criticism*, vol. 84 ed. by Michelle Lee (Farmington Hills: Thomson Gale, 2004) p.24

[3] Charles Isherwood, 'Review of *Cymbeline*', *Variety 386*, 5 ,28 January 2002, reprinted in *Shakespearean Criticism*, vol. 84 ed. by Michelle Lee (Farmington Hills: Thomson Gale, 2004), p.25

[4] Charles Spencer, 'Review of *Cymbeline*', *Daily Telegraph*, 8 August 2003

[5] 'Review of *Cymbeline*', *Stratford Herald*, 14 August 2003

[6] 'Review of *Cymbeline*', *Sunday Times Culture*, 19 June 2005, p.22

[7] George Bernard Shaw quoted by Kenneth Muir, *Last Periods of Shakespeare, Racine and Ibsen* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1961), p.41

[8] Preface to, William Shakespeare, *Cymbeline* ed. by Roger Warren (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p.v

[9] Barbara A. Mowat, *The Dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Romances* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1976), p.142

[10] Peggy Munoz Simonds, *Myth, Emblem and Music in Shakespeare's 'Cymbeline': An Iconographic Reconstruction* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1992), p.31

[11] William Shakespeare, *Cymbeline* ed. by J.M. Nosworthy (London: Methuen, 1955), introduction, p.xxx

[12] Edwin Wilson, ed., *An Anthology of Bernard Shaw's Writings on the Plays and Production of Shakespeare* (New York: E.P.Dutton, 1961), p.39

[13] Robert Uphaus, *Beyond Tragedy: Structure & Experience in Shakespeare's Romances* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1981), pp.49 -68

[14] Morris Arnold, *Soliloquies of Shakespeare: A study in technic* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1911), quoted by Barbara Mowat, *The Dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Romances*, p.53

[15] Gassner, 'Forms of Modern Drama' in Dramatic Soundings ed. by Glenn Loney (New York: Crown, 1968) quoted by Barbara Mowat, *The Dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Romances*, p.59

[16] Kristian Smidt, *Unconformities in Shakespeare's Later Comedies* (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1993), p.15

[17] Edwin Wilson, *Shaw on Shakespeare*, p.58

[18] Bentley, G.E. 'Shakespeare and the Blackfriars Theatre', *Shakespeare Survey*, 1 (1948), pp.38-49

[19] Andrew Gurr, *The Shakespearean Stage 1574 – 1642* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), p.227

[20] William Shakespeare, *Cymbeline* ed. by J.M. Nosworthy, introduction p.xxxi

[21] Hunter, G.K., *English Drama 1586 – 1642: The Age of Shakespeare* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), p.503

[22] Kirsch, Arthur C, '*Cymbeline* and Coterie Dramaturgy', *English Literary History*, 34. 3 (September 1967), pp.285-97

[23] Richards, Jennifer and James Knowles, eds., *Shakespeare's Late Plays: New Readings* (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1999), p.14

[24] Kristian Smidt, *Unconformities in Shakespeare's Later Comedies*, p.20

[25] Peggy Munoz Simonds, *Myth, Emblem and Music in Shakespeare's 'Cymbeline'*, p.13

[26] Robert Uphaus, *Beyond Tragedy: Structure & Experience in Shakespeare's Romances* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1981), p.56

[27] Patricia Parker, 'Romance and Empire' in *Unfolded Tales: Essays on Renaissance Romance* ed. by George M. Logan and Gordon Teskey (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1989), pp.203-6

[28] Geoffrey Bullough, ed., *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul; New York: Columbia University Press, 1975), p.6

[29] Leo Salingar, *Shakespeare and the Traditions of Comedy* (Cambridge: CUP, 1974), p.37

[30] Munoz Simonds, *Myth, Emblem and Music in Shakespeare's 'Cymbeline'*, p.35

[31] Francis Beaumont, and John Fletcher, *Philaster*, ed. by Andrew Gurr, (London: Methuen, 1969), introduction p.xxxiv

[32] George M. Logan and Gordon Teskey, Introduction to *Unfolded Tales: Essays on Renaissance*, pp.1-9

[33] William Shakespeare, *Cymbeline* ed. by J.M. Nosworthy (London: Methuen, 1955), introduction p.lxxviii

[34] Barbara A. Mowat, *The Dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Romances*, p.36
[35] Kate McLuskie 'The Poets' Royal Exchange' in *The Yearbook of English Studies* 21 (1991), pp.53-62 quoted in *Shakespeare's Late Plays: New Readings* ed. by Jennifer Richards and James Knowles (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1999), pp.14,15
[36] Robert Uphaus, *Beyond Tragedy: Structure & Experience in Shakespeare's Romances* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1981), p. 52
[37] Barbara A. Mowat, *The Dramaturgy of Shakespeare's Romances*, p.36