Between the Stage and the Page: Printed Marginalia in Gascoigne's *Supposes*

Cristiano Ragni

This article analyzes printed marginalia in the 1573 and 1575 editions of Gascoigne's Supposes, *highlighting their liminal dimension, typical of early modern English play-books, between printed and performative textuality. The printed marginalia in the 1573 edition not only are annotations that speak from the margins of the possible performance of the text but can also be read as a sign of cross-fertilization between coexisting types of drama. The marginalia in the 1575 edition clearly aim at readers of the playbook rather than at spectators of future performances. In this sense, they are unlikely Gascoigne's originals, but the result of interventions by those involved in the volume's printing. The article explores how the printed marginalia in these two editions of Gascoigne's* Supposes *suggest intriguing relations between the play's textual and performative dimensions.*

George Gascoigne's *Supposes*, a translation/adaptation of Ludovico Ariosto's *Suppositi*, met with great success among Elizabethans. The result of Gascoigne's probable willingness to capitalize on Ariosto's increasing fame in early modern England, '[it] contribute[d] more directly than any other [work]', according to Donald Beecher, 'both to the founding of the European drama, and to the shaping of the English stage'.[1] For his *Supposes*, Gascoigne evidently worked on both the prose and the verse editions of Ariosto's comedy, following one or the other at will, and did not restrain himself from re-elaborating various passages in a personal way so that the outcome is anything but a derivative version of the Italian original.[2] In fact, as G.W. Pigman III has aptly put it, '[Gascoigne] paraphrases [Ariosto's works], adapts [them], often expanding on his originals, less frequently condensing them, and occasionally changing the sense completely'.[3] This occasional change of meaning already appears evident, for instance, when considering the title: while for Ariosto the noun 'suppositi' was meant to refer to the idea

Cristiano Ragni (cristiano.ragni@univr.it) is a researcher and lecturer in English Literature at the University of Verona.

of 'substitution', by using a noun derived from the verb 'to suppose' Gascoigne clearly wanted to complicate the epistemological backdrop of the comedy, hinting at humorous 'misapprehensions of reality, false postulations, and dramatic irony'.[4] This aim is something, as Beecher has explained, to which also the marginalia that were added to the 1573 and (especially) the 1575 editions of the play greatly contributed.[5]

In light of this last consideration on the role they have within the broader context of Gascoigne's works, my article will analyze the different printed marginalia that can be found in both editions of *Supposes*. How do they contribute to our understanding of Gascoigne's cultural operation? What can they tell us about the perception of playbooks in the early modern period, suspended as they were between the textual and the performative dimensions? Do they establish connections with a possible (past or future) performance, or are they only aimed at 'directing' the reading experience of the consumers of the printed editions? Before answering these questions, however, it is necessary to provide some general framework regarding the publication of playbooks and the practice of annotating/ printing marginalia in early modern England.

Playbooks and Marginalia: The Early Modern English Context

Today, as in the past, playbooks, unlike other types of texts, stand out for the liminal position they occupy: they are at the same time texts that can be read, and some sort of 'reproduction' of a performance which has been or could be seen.[6] This 'liminality' was already perceived in early modern England, as evidenced for instance by the title page of the 1584 edition of Robert Wilson's *The Three Ladies of London*, which advertises the play as both 'a worke right worthie to be marked' (ie a text that can be read and annotated as was common practice at the time), and the 'material reproduction' of a play that 'hath been publiquely played'.[7] If the existence of such title pages testifies to the awareness of the peculiar nature of the printed editions of plays, it has also led scholars to ask themselves what was the relationship between those printed copies and the performance to which they somehow gave form, and whether they were meant as reproductions of past stagings, as scripts for future performances, or both. In his *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (1997), Jeffrey Masten has famously considered playbooks as 'surrogates' of staged performances, 'record[s]', he writes, 'of … particular theatrical performance[s] a reader/consumer may have heard of or attended';[8] or, in any case, as attempts to convey what has been termed the 'inherent theatricality' of those texts.[9] Other scholars have

highlighted instead that, even if dramatic texts are presented as 'record[s] of …
particular theatrical performance[s]', the use that was made of them does not
seem to differ from that reserved to other textual typologies and that playbooks
were therefore perceived as *texts to be read*, unrelated to possible performances.[10]
Considering, however, that printing did indeed make it possible, through certain
typographic conventions and techniques, to visualize the effects of staging on
the page, I think it is fairer to opt for a more 'middle ground' position and agree
with what Tamara Atkin has concluded as regards the fact that 'all early printed
playbooks were designed as much for *readerly consumption* as for *performance*'.[11]
Among the conventions that were used to signal the origin of those texts in the
dimension of the performance are also some of the marginalia that can be found
on the pages of the printed editions.

   Marginalia, as Katherine Acheson has deftly summarized, can be considered
as 'an integrated part of the early modern environment'.[12] Indeed, hardly a reader
of the time did not leave some notes in the margins of the books they handled:
an unmistakable sign of the intellectual dialogue between the individual and the
cultural heritage that a given text represented. Unsurprisingly then, at least for the
early modern context, most of the studies devoted to marginalia — among which
seminal works by Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton (1990), William Sherman
(2008), Stephen Orgel (2015), or more recently Claire M.L. Bourne and James
Scott-Warren (2022), to name but a few[13] — have long focused on *handwritten*
marginalia, 'unique and privileged evidence of humanist reading practices'[14] pro-
viding significant insights into the intellectual habits of such relevant annotators
as, for instance, Gabriel Harvey, Lady Anne Clifford, or John Milton. Interesting
though the study of this kind of marginalia is, it very often ends up producing
'microhistory',[15] which does not allow to establish large patterns and becomes
truly relevant only when it can be traced back to well-known personalities. This
limitation has led scholars to turn their attention also to the marginalia *printed*
on the pages of early modern editions, which had previously been somewhat neg-
lected. These started being considered as 'equally important', as William Slights
has put it in his pivotal study dedicated to the topic, precisely because 'they [are]
not unique manuscript witnesses'.[16] In fact, as Slights goes on to argue, printed
marginalia can be said to be even 'more broadly influential'.[17] Why so? First,
because when compared to handwritten ones, whose nature is inevitably idiosyn-
cratic, 'printed marginalia … provide strong indicators of how *at least one person*
thought a text should be read'.[18] Of course, as is known, the 'person' behind
them was not necessarily one, as different people (the author, the compositor, the
printer, and their collaborators) contributed to the publication process.[19] In any

case, printed marginalia do testify to someone's intention to establish a certain type of relation with a group of readers. Second, and intrinsically connected with the previous point, the readership that printed marginalia addressed was undeniably larger than that of manuscript annotations. In this regard, printed marginalia do indeed stand out as typographic conventions that actually provide us with more details for the identification of general trends, doing 'more than any other material feature of book production in the [early modern] period to determine, from book to book, the nature of the reading experience'.[20]

In the specific case of early modern literary texts, marginalia of all types are undeniably sparse: '[these texts] tur[n] out (on the whole)', to put it in Sherman's words, '*to be annotated far less frequently* than those used by the period's lawyers and far less wittily than those involved in the period's religious controversies'.[21] As a consequence, especially when considering early printed playbooks, unsurprisingly, as mentioned above, scholars have paid greater attention to editions presenting handwritten marginalia, mostly in an attempt to find clues about the first performances. However, as Hannah August has recently pointed out, the few that can be found in those editions seem to 'demonstrate a sense of commercial drama as a *textual genre*', rather than acknowledge the performative dimension in which those texts originated.[22] Again, different is the case of printed marginalia. If annotations that aimed to somehow 'direct' the *reading experience* of the texts were obviously printed in the margins of playbooks as well, we can also find there elements such as speech prefixes, act or scene divisions, and especially stage directions, which signal that those editions were certainly produced with an eye to the (past or future) *stagings* of the texts.[23] This coexistence of different marginalia is indeed what the two editions of Gascoigne's *Supposes* also prove, thus confirming that the printed annotations are the ones to look at in order to investigate and understand the ways in which a fruitful dialogue between the page and the stage was being developed at a time when drama was becoming more and more successful.

Printed Marginalia in Gascoigne's *Supposes*

Gascoigne staged his *Supposes* between Christmas and Lent in 1565–6 at Gray's Inn in a likely attempt to compete with the more famous kind of entertainment offered by the Inner Temple, where *Gorboduc*, for example, had been staged in 1561–2. *Supposes* did not find its way to the printing house; this was probably due to the fact that, soon after 1566, Gascoigne experienced some financial problems which resulted in his withdrawal from Gray's Inn, imprisonment for debts,

and participation with Sir Humphrey Gilbert in a military expedition to Flanders.[24] Only when he returned to England in 1572 did he try to secure patronage through the publication of his works. 'His first attempt', Pigman wrote, 'shot spectacularly awry':

> *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* (1573) is a collection of his writings under the guise of an anthology of works by diverse gentlemen, assembled by one of their friends and surreptitiously published by another. Instead of demonstrating Gascoigne's resourcefulness as a writer and mastery of courtly indirection the book was deemed lasciviously offensive and 'written to the scandalizing of some worthie personages'.[25]

Sold anonymously by Robert Smith and printed once Gascoigne had already traveled back to Flanders, where he had supposedly become familiar with dubious people involved in spying activities, this incomplete anthology 'gathered partly (by translation) in the fyne outlandish gardins of Euripides, Ovid, Petrarke, Ariosto, and others, and partly by invention, out of our owne fruitefull orchardes in Englande' was also probably censored, as the title page of the 1575 edition seemingly implies, thus proving to be very far from the success Gascoigne had hoped for.[26]

Despite all its faults and editorial vicissitudes, the edition of *Supposes* included in the 1573 *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* presents four printed marginalia that, few as they are, turn out to be quite interesting:

1. Erostra[to] et Du[lippo] ex improviso (Erostrato and Dulippo suddenly; E3v, left margin);
2. Dulip[p]o is espied by Erostrato (E3v, left margin);
3. Pasi[philo] subito et improviso venit (Pasiphilo comes suddenly and unexpectedly; F2r, right margin); and
4. Erostrato exit (Erostrato goes out; H4r, right margin).

These marginalia are evidently stage directions, and they are remarkable because they clearly remind readers that the text they are handling is not only a story to be read, but also a play to which the physical actions of actors had at some point given life on a stage.

Stage directions, as is known, are among the printed marginalia that, more than others, testify to a clear connection between the text they comment upon and the performative dimension from which it originates. Critics have only recently emphasized this aspect, however.[27] Instead, stage directions have long met with little interest among scholars: misled by their marginal position in relation to

the main text and by what has been often described as a lack of 'literariness' or 'specificity' that would allow them to be traced back unambiguously to the author(s) of the text(s), scholars have completely ignored the multiple interpretative possibilities that stage directions clearly possess.[28] Notably, however, whoever their author was and despite their undeniably textual nature,[29] stage directions can never really be divorced from the (past and/or future) performances that they evoke.[30] Since the 1573 edition of *Supposes*, as David Bevington has explained, is clearly a recording of the 1566 performance of the play,[31] the fact that the only marginalia added there are stage directions allows us to argue not only that they are probably Gascoigne's originals, but also that they may likely report what the actors had done at Gray's Inn.

Three of these marginalia are written in Latin and one is written in English. The combination of the two languages is not particularly surprising. Even though by 1573 it had become more common to print stage directions in English, other early modern playbooks present a similar 'linguistic mixture'.[32] Looking at them more closely, however, it is possible to note another slight, but significant difference: if the only one in English, indicating as it does that one character is being spied on by another, is somewhat more 'narrative', the ones in Latin, pointing out the sudden arrival on-stage of characters or the fact that one of them, Erostrato, leaves the scene, can instead be said to sound more 'technical'. In this sense, the latter seem to echo the same 'technical' stage directions found in the editions of the widespread academic plays that were written, acted out, and printed in Latin at the time, and with which Gascoigne and his fellow colleagues at Gray's Inn were certainly familiar. I do not think it is too far-fetched to claim that these Latin marginalia may indicate that the people involved in the staging and printing of a vernacular drama such as *Supposes* — a genre which was still relatively new in the 1570s — likely looked at the conventions used for the publication of the more authoritative academic drama when it came to deciding how to produce their own edition. After all, other scholars have underscored how Gascoigne's work, blurring the boundaries between academic exercise and entertainment, does indeed testify to the fortune of the university plays which had been thriving in England since the 1560s, as well as to the role played by the Inns of Court in the mediation between academic drama proper and the world of commercial theatre.[33] On the other hand, the only marginalia written in English could be said to express Gascoigne's 'voice' instead, addressing colleagues who had to (or might) stage (again) his play in that vernacular which was spoken at the Inns of Court and would become the language of the highly successful commercial drama of the London stages. Overall, then, the four marginalia that can be found in the

1573 edition of Gascoigne's *Supposes* not only represent annotations that from the margins of the printed page 'speak' of the performance of the text, but they can also be read as a sign of cross-fertilization between different but coexisting types of drama at the time.

One may ask at this point why Gascoigne might have wanted to foreground the dynamics of performance within the printed text, and to thread the needle between performed drama and academic drama. The answer to this question is twofold. On the one hand, one could argue that the four stage directions in the 1573 edition of *Supposes* seemingly demonstrate Gascoigne's willingness to follow in the footsteps of earlier examples of printed drama which had established a sort of 'tradition' in this sense: just think, among other examples, of John Heywood's interludes in the 1530s or, closer in time, the editions of the anonymous *Nice Wanton* in the 1560s.[34] As Greg Walker has pointed out, these examples testify to a widespread and 'conscious attempt to sell plays as [possible] *scripts for performance*',[35] which inevitably led to stressing, by means of the typographical conventions available, the intimate relation between the printed text and its original staging. On the other hand, we should also keep in mind that performances were still exclusive events at the time, taking place, as Tamara Atkin notes, 'in the hallowed halls of England's great houses and institutions'.[36] Therefore, we cannot dismiss the idea that, in reminding his readership of the fact that his *Supposes* had been staged, Gascoigne may have wanted to capitalize on the desire of those who did not usually have the chance to witness performances to be made privy to an exclusive event such as the original staging of the play they were reading. In this regard, I agree with Michael Hetherington, who has claimed that, besides Gascoigne's well-known interest in attracting the attention of those in power, the paratexts of his works also glimpse the possibility of 'mass readership': 'in comparison with [his] contemporaries …, Gascoigne had a more particular, more situated, and more material sense of what it is to read and be satisfied'.[37] Instead, as regards the hinted connection between performed drama and academic drama, we can with relative safety assume that this was in fact part of Gascoigne's larger self-authorizing strategy aimed at his readers 'in positions of influence';[38] a subtle — if smart — way of reminding them of his association with such a prestigious institution as Gray's Inn, where academic plays were regularly produced, as well as his own literary ability to move easily across different genres.

Because of the 'misfortune' that befell his *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, in 1575 Gascoigne decided to print a second edition, changing the title to *The Posies of George Gascoigne Esquire*. This one would prove to be more successful but, despite the claims to have produced a more 'honourable' text to satisfy the censors who

had apparently opposed the first edition, and despite the attempt to present himself 'as a now repentant prodigal who has renounced his wandering, errant, and inconstant ways',[39] *Posies* too ended up being censored for the undeniable sexuality of some of its content: 'a close study of the revisions [that Gascoigne made]', Cyndia Clegg has argued, 'reveals a rhetorical strategy that sought to deflect reception away from political and personal slander … [but] the *Posies*' prefatory materials actually draw the reader's attention to its sexualized discourse'.[40]

In this edition of *Supposes*, twenty-five printed marginalia were added to the forementioned four. The new ones are all in English, and are not stage directions, but can be considered 'explanatory comments', in the sense that they signal the presence of the various 'supposes', and sometimes reveal their presumed qualities (eg 'a *pleasant* suppose'; or 'a *true* suppose'), thus 'calling attention', in Beecher's words, 'to the moments of supposing on the part of several characters throughout the play'.[41] We may interpret these marginalia as evidence of the apparent intention to engage readers and make them better understand the play and its various, possible meanings. This goal is not surprising. After all, Gascoigne's much commented on 'Prologue' to this second edition, playing as it does with the different interpretative layers of the verb 'to suppose', clearly aims to turn the experience of reading the comedy into a sort of game aimed at stimulating the interpretative skills of its readers. Building on the widespread fashion to devise codes and riddles, typical of the learned gentlemen of the Inns,[42] this 'game' emphasizes a sort of mental dimension of the text, which stimulates the readers' effort to find clues to understand the story. In this regard, the marginalia added to the 1575 edition do indeed reveal, as Jill P. Ingram has put it, Gascoigne's familiarity with such a 'social' practice as 'the "intelligencing" technique of decoding or deciphering [aimed at engaging readers in] recognizing each deceit'.[43] Personally, I am not entirely convinced that this is really the case, as the addition of these marginalia not only does not really help readers make sense of the intricacies of the plot, but also seems to spoil the very game that was supposedly meant to be played with them. As a matter of fact, as Richard McCoy has noted, 'what Gascoigne tells us we must understand is both vast and unsettling, since a suppose is either a mistake or the imagination of one thing for another and we have no way of distinguishing between them … He aims to bring our "braynes in a busie conjecture" which … we may find endless'.[44]

In any case, what can be argued is that, differently from the four marginalia of the 1573 edition, which referred to the staging of the text, the additional twenty-five which coexist with them in the later edition are more clearly aimed at the *readers* of the playbook. At the same time, the fact that the 'original' four

marginalia are nonetheless included in this edition seemingly reveals the intention of continuing to remind the readers of the origins in performance of the text they were reading. By reproducing both types of marginalia, in other words, this second edition confirms the 'double' nature of playbooks, continuously stretched between the origin in performance of the text they reproduce and the reading experience of their consumers. In the past, I have suggested that the twenty-five marginalia of the 1575 edition may not have been Gascoigne's originals, but the result of the intervention of the people to whom he handed the physical realization of the book.[45] However, precisely because of the learned (albeit unsettling) intellectual game that is established between their author and the readers, it is highly likely that Gascoigne himself — a member of the sophisticated circles of Gray's Inn and a likely acquaintance of suspicious intelligencers in Flanders — is the mind behind these sophisticated marginalia which require to be 'intelligenced'.

Overall, then, the printed marginalia in the 1573 and 1575 editions of *Supposes* contribute to shedding light on the cultural operation that Gascoigne undertook when he decided to turn his translation/adaptation into a publication. Despite the obvious differences between them, these marginalia ultimately testify to one of the earliest attempts at meditation between the page and the stage 'precisely because they foreground the dynamic between text and performance'[46] and never let readers forget about it. In fact, they confirm the 'middle ground' position regarding early printed playbooks as products both for 'readerly consumption' and for 'performance'.

Notes

1   Donald Beecher, 'Introduction', in Ludovico Ariosto, *Supposes. Translated by George Gascoigne*, ed. Donald Beecher and John Butler (Ottawa, 1999), 11, 20.

2   For a thorough analysis of Gascoigne's interventions see the still valid R. Warwick Bond, 'Introduction', in his *Early Plays from Italian* (Oxford, 1911), XV–XLV; and the recent work of Silvia Silvestri, *Intrecci anglo-italiani sulle scene elisabettiane. Ariosto, Gascoigne, Shakespeare* (Bari, 2024), 67–122.

3   G.W. Pigman III, ed., *George Gascoigne: A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* (Oxford, 2000), 472 n. 5.1.

4   Beecher, 'Introduction', 67.

5   Ibid.

6   See Tamara Atkin, *Reading Drama in Tudor England* (London and New York, 2018) and Hannah August, *Playbooks and their Readers in Early Modern England* (London and New York, 2022), 6–7.

7   Robert Wilson, *A Right Excellent and Famous Comedy Called the Three Ladies of London* (London, 1584; USTC: 512286). Even though similar frontispieces had been printed even earlier, this one is particularly revealing. Together with George Peele's *The Arraignment of Paris*, and John Lyly's *Sappho and Phao* and *Campaspe*, also printed in 1584, Wilson's *Three Ladies* is indeed known to have been staged by professional companies in front of large audiences in commercial theatres, and not in the 'private' contexts of the universities or the mansions of some aristocrat.

8   Jeffrey Masten, *Textual Intercourse: Collaboration, Authorship, and Sexualities in Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge, 1997), 115.

9   In this regard, see for instance Zachary Lesser and Peter Stallybrass, 'The First Literary *Hamlet* and the Commonplacing of Professional Plays', *Shakespeare Quarterly* 59 (2008), 371–420, https://doi.org/10.1353/shq.0.0040, and Claire M.L. Bourne, *Typographies of Performance in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2020), https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198848790.001.0001.

10   August, *Playbooks and their Readers*, 9.

11   Atkin, *Reading Drama*, 8 (my emphasis).

12   Katherine Acheson, ed., *Early Modern English Marginalia* (London and New York, 2019), 4.

13   See, among others, Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton, '"Studied for Action": How Gabriel Harvey Read His Livy', *Past and Present* 129 (1990), 30–78, https://doi.org/10.1093/past/129.1.30; Stephen Orgel, *The Reader in the Book: A Study of Spaces and Traces* (Oxford, 2008); William H. Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia, 2008); and Claire M.L. Bourne and Jason Scott-Warren, '"thy unvalued Booke": John Milton's Copy of the Shakespeare First Folio', *Milton Quarterly* 56 (2022), 1–85, https://doi.org/10.1111/milt.12418.

14   Acheson, *Early Modern English Marginalia*, 3.

15   Allan F. Westphall, '"Laboring in my Books": A Religious Reader in Nineteenth Century New Hampshire', *The Library: The Transactions of the Bibliographical Society* 13.2 (2012), 185–204, 187.

16   William W.E. Slights, *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books* (Ann Arbor, 2001), 10, https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.17226.

17   Ibid.

18   Ibid (my emphasis).

19 See among others Sonia Massai, *Shakespeare and the Rise of the Editor* (Cambridge, 2007), and Bourne, *Typographies of Performance*, 9–31.

20 Slights, *Managing Readers*, 3.

21 Sherman, *Used Books*, xiii (my emphasis).

22 August, *Playbooks and their Readers*, 20.

23 Peter Happé, 'Printers of Interlude', in *A Companion to Tudor Literature*, ed. Kent Cartwright (Oxford, 2010), 192–210, and Atkin, *Reading Drama*, 195–206.

24 See G.W. Pigman III, 'Gascoigne, George (1534/5?–1577), author and soldier', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2004), https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/10421; Jill Phillips Ingram, 'Gascoigne's *Supposes*: Englishing Italian "Error" and Adversarial Reading Practices', in *Italian Culture in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries: Rewriting, Remaking, Refashioning*, ed. Michele Marrapodi (Farnham, 2007), 83–96, 94; and Silvestri, *Intrecci anglo-italiani*, 67–80.

25 Pigman, 'Gascoigne'.

26 See Cyndia Clegg, *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (Cambridge, 1997), 103–22, https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511585241.

27 See Atkin, *Reading Drama*; Sarah Dustagheer and Gillian Woods, eds, *Stage Directions and Shakespearean Theatre* (London, 2019); Bourne, *Typographies of Performance*; and August, *Playbooks and their Readers*.

28 See among others Eric Rasmussen, 'Afterword', in *Stage Directions in* Hamlet*: New Essays and New Directions*, ed. Hardin L. Assand (London, 2003), 226–7: '[In modern editions] Stage directions, quite literally, don't count … convention dictates that stage directions be linked to the previous line of dialogue and that each line of the stage direction receive a decimal point, for example, 37.1. Numerically, at least, a stage direction is worth exactly one tenth as much as a line of dialogue'.

29 See Linda McJannet, *The Voice of Elizabethan Stage Directions: The Evolution of a Theatrical Code* (Newark, DE, 1999) and Emma Smith, 'Reading Shakespeare's Stage Directions', in Dustagheer and Woods, *Stage Directions*, 93–114.

30 See Laurie Maguire, 'The Boundaries of Stage Directions', in Dustagheer and Woods, *Stage Directions*, 45–68: 'Stage directions [may] turn a literary text into a performance. Stage directions are aimed at actors and directors, but actors often ignore them. Stage directions are written, but they are different from other written texts. Stage directions, the "kinesic code" that regulates "the conduct of actors on stage" are … read by book-readers. Stage directions function as a gloss on the main text. In stage directions we hear the author speak whereas in dialogue the author's voice vanishes' (46).

31 David Bevington, 'Cultural Exchange: Gascoigne and Ariosto at Gray's Inn in 1566', in *The Italian World of English Renaissance Drama: Cultural Exchange and*

Intertextuality, ed. Michele Marrapodi and H.J. Hoenselaars (Newark, NJ, 1998), 25–40.

32   This is what the research that I have been carrying out as a member of the Project *In the Margins of Theatre* (IMT) has demonstrated, based on cross-searching databases such as English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC), Universal Short Title Catalogue (USTC), and Database of Early English Playbooks (DEEP), and on pivotal studies such as Alfred Harbage, *Annals of English Records, 975–1700*, rev. Samuel Schoenbaum and Sylvia Stoler Wagonheim (London and New York, 1989) and *British Drama, 1533–1642: A Catalogue*, ed. Martin Wiggins and Catherine Richardson, 7 vols (2011–19).

33   G.K. Hunter, *English Drama 1586–1642: The Age of Shakespeare* (Oxford, 1997), 117: 'The milieu of London inevitably brought [the Inns'] student audience closer to court drama and the professional theatre than the universities were allowed to be. What is even more important … is that the plays at the Inns were mainly in English, and on some occasions written by professional dramatists. These factors allowed cross-fertilization to a degree not possible at Oxford and Cambridge'.

34   In this regard, see Cristiano Ragni, '"… he poynteth to the women": Esempi di *marginalia* a stampa in due interludi di epoca Tudor', in *Marginalia ai testi drammatici nella prima età moderna. Prospettive tra Antichistica, Anglistica e Ispanistica*, ed. Francesca Coppola, Francesco Lupi, and Cristiano Ragni (Pisa, forthcoming).

35   Greg Walker, *The Politics of Performance in Early Renaissance Drama* (Cambridge 1998), 16, https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511583155.

36   Atkin, *Reading Drama*, 7.

37   Michael Hetherington, 'Gascoigne, Miscellaneity, and Aesthetic Satisfaction', in *Selected Essays on George Gascoigne*, ed. Gillian Austen (London and New York, 2023), 139–56, 153.

38   Gillian Austen, *George Gascoigne* (Cambridge, 2008), 5.

39   Richard C. McCoy, 'Gascoigne's Poses and *Supposes*', in *Selected Essays on George Gascoigne*, ed. Gillian Austen (London and New York, 2023), 69–78, 69.

40   Clegg, *Press Censorship*, 103.

41   Beecher, 'Introduction', 67.

42   Austen, *George Gascoigne*, 26.

43   Ingram, 'Gascoigne's *Supposes*', 84.

44   McCoy, 'Gascoigne's Poses and *Supposes*', 71.

45   See Silvestri, *Intrecci anglo-italiani*, 97–122.

46   Dustagheer and Woods, *Stage Directions*, 6.