SPECTACLE IN BALE AND HEYWOOD

Peter Happé

To begin with I ought to say a word about SPECTACLE as I see it, though I expect that definitions or descriptions of this word may well be canvassed elsewhere in this collection. I note that in a book I recently reviewed the word was translated as 'entertainments' — by an English translator. I am inclined to use this gloss as a means of approaching the process of performance in general. This must include the visual appearance of what is enacted, as well as a number of dynamic aspects — especially actions, gestures and movements. There would also arise the audience's sense of the space of the stage, and whether it represented any specific place, or was, more generally, a neutral place upon which things happened.

I

The discussion of spectacle which I shall attempt here concentrates upon John Bale and John Heywood, who were roughly contemporary, and who both wrote and helped to perform plays in the 1530s. In this decade they were perhaps in the prime of their lives, being respectively 35 and 33 years of age at its beginning. By its end Bale had written or translated about two dozen plays, according to his own lists. For Heywood we can account for work on about eight, some of which may have been done before 1530. Both seem to have taken some interest in writing and producing plays after 1540, but not on so great a scale. The active work of both ends around 1560. This consideration of dates suggests that the 1530s was a significant decade for the development of the interlude, and the exploration of it as a theatrical medium. There is no doubt that both dramatists aimed at performance and it is highly likely that both achieved it to some degree. In short this appears to be a period of practical achievement in the English theatre, and Bale and Heywood played significant though not unique parts in it. Taken together these two dramatists provide an opportunity to investigate relationships between text and performance.

My purpose is not however to emphasise similarities between these two: rather it is a matter of considering the diversity of their work. In many ways they are complementary to one another. To begin with Bale may

have written plays as a Catholic, but it was his conversion to Protestantism which provided the occasion and the spur to most of his writing, this becoming polemical and aggressive. Heywood remained a lifelong Catholic, and probably suffered for doing so. His plays sustain a Catholic viewpoint to an extent which has not always been recognised: but one may suggest that his mode of working is much more defensive and cautious than Bale's.[1] It is interesting that both were paid by Cromwell for dramatic performances: Bale in 1538 and 1539, and Heywood in 1539.[2]

These differences in religious outlook and polemical method are accompanied by differences in theatrical imagination. The effects they seek to achieve on the stage are quite different, and the interrelationship between written text and performance is highly individual. It is very difficult to compare what might be termed the entertainment value of each. On the surface Heywood looks by far the more witty writer, and his reputation in his own times supports this. He wrote for audiences at the Court, and perhaps also audiences with a specifically legal training. The verbal nature of his text depends heavily upon ingenious wordplays and the witty manipulation of sound and meaning. However this does not mean that we should dismiss the spectacle in his work: I hope to show that it plays an important part in the processes of argument which are fundamental to his concept of drama.

By contrast Bale, as a professional religious teacher, adopts a much more serious tone. Even when he uses ideas and situations in a comic mode, it is often a matter of biting sarcasm, or a heavy irony with the polemical intention uppermost; and it is more often than not explicitly spelled out. There are frequent comic routines which could be entertaining, but always those who were entertained were not likely to be Catholic in outlook. Even if the plays were done today, I suspect that they would still be found offensive. This is a pity because Bale shows considerable variety and competence in the construction and execution of his plays.

II

Turning to the relationship between text and performance, I take it as axiomatic that a dramatic text needs to be realised by a performer. Though there may be instances where this has not yet happened and the text must be read only, its exploration by experienced actors and directors adds an immeasurable amount to the determination and even the construction of meaning, and to the experience of the drama. Such an exploration may even

help to account for the state of the text as it has come down to us. Though performance in itself be ephemeral in that it can never be exactly repeated, the experience of performance by actor, director, and audience builds up a culture of awareness about the nature of a play, and in doing so interpretation is developed. This is not to say that such development will be only in one direction; new concepts of a play may be determined precisely because they are in contrast to what has previously been evolved. The key lies in the attention given by many participants in and contributors to performance.

It is by means of this phenomenon of the performance culture of a play, in so far as it can be recovered, that we can assess the importance of the circumstances of both Bale's and Heywood's theatrical milieux. Each seems to have built up some practical experience of performance both in terms of the kind of stage he might have used, and also the kinds of dramatic effects which could be achieved. In the case of Bale we seem to be dealing with plays which were very adaptable as regards the location of the performance, as we happen to know that his plays were performed both indoors and outside. It is also highly likely that he personally took his plays on tour, and, to judge from the ascription *Baleus Prolocutor* in four of the texts, he appeared in the plays *in propria persona*, and he may also have taken other parts. Though at times Bale may have wanted to influence the authorities, or even the King himself, over a particular piece of doctrine or public policy, he also apparently intended his plays to reach a wide audience, one which would value and benefit from his polemic, and his instruction. Indications of doubling in two of the plays suggest that Bale was proceeding on a quasi-professional basis, probably with adult actors, and there is the strong likelihood that he was working with a touring company.

Heywood's theatrical environment seems to have been confined to the Court, or perhaps, in the case of *A Play of Love*, to a location which provided a legal audience. Though the casts of the plays are usually limited to four or five actors, there is no indication of doubling, and in *The Play of the Wether*, and in some of the lost plays, there is a high probability that the cast consisted wholly or largely of boys. There are few indications of special settings, and there is virtually nothing in the plays which is inconsistent with productions in a typical Tudor hall and before an élite audience. Though there is usually a muted reflection of religious values, the premium on pleasing and entertaining is high. The plays are the work of one used to the ways of the Court, and the need to avoid giving offence to those who have influence. This does not however prevent Heywood

making overt or covert reference to known figures at Court, not excepting the King.

In order to particularise and exemplify the differences between Bale and Heywood in their approach to spectacle, I propose to discuss some aspects of the ways in which these dramatists stage two characters which are examples of 'the Vice'. This is not to attempt an historical study of the Vice, but it is worth noting that the two instances to be considered here are among the earliest known manifestations of a rôle which became theatrically dominant in the next generation. In order to do this I shall deal with selected aspects of Sedition in Bale's *King Johan*, and of No-Lover-Nor-Loved in Heywood's *A Play of Love*.

III

Bale's dramatisation of doctrine was made theatrically effective because he saw the doings of the (to him) evil papist powers as embodying a capacity to practise a wicked deception. For him papists could always be identified by their stagey tricks. This arose partly because of his suspicion of ritual. The manifestation of Catholic evil is thus particularly appropriate in the Vice who, even at this early stage in his development, has an astonishing range of stage tricks which are designed to show his superior craft as an evil influence: and they have the advantage of making him successful theatrically. Because of the importance of the theological and political allegory I want to concentrate here on the stage manifestation of the allegory in his rôle.

I pass quickly over the exposition in the early part of the play, and come to the sequence where the action on stage actually demonstrates his pedigree and shows how the relationships between the evil characters are built up, and how this structure anticipates the plot against King Johan which is the main function of the second part of the play.

The allegorical nature of the relationship between Sedition, Dissimulation, Private Wealth and Usurped Power is presented over a sequence of stage events which are not naturalistic, but which are meant to give the audience a growing awareness of the corruption of the evil characters. As a preliminary, Sedition says he must change his apparel to a religious one (296—8), and he leaves the stage in order to do so. On his return he eagerly awaits the appearance of his 'felowys' (631). The business begins with Dissimulation singing the Litany offstage: Sedition immediately joins in with a parody — *Sancte* pyld *monache*, I beshrow *vobis* (640). After some grumbling about King Johan, Sedition finds out Dissimulation's

name, and introduces himself in an evil genealogy as his cousin. It appears that his father was Privy Treason, the brother of Dissimulation's father, Falshead, and that their grandfather was Infidelity, whose ancestor was the Antichrist (667—77). Dissimulation describes his many deceitful activities, and he also demonstrates his cunning by showing that his habit is made up of elements from different religious orders. His lines are no doubt accompanied by gestures which point up the various colours:

> We resemble sayntes in gray, whyte, blacke and blewe. 732

This anticipates his later attempt to become a saint by his poisoning of King Johan. The immediate remedy, Sedition suggests, is to bring in Private Wealth. The phrase 'bring in' is a theatrical pun in that it means to connect allegorically and it also means carrying out the action of leading these two evil characters on to, or about the stage. Dissimulation complains that he cannot bring in them both, but Sedition makes it clear to him and to the audience that once Private Wealth is brought in, Usurped Power will follow automatically. By this time the two new characters are on stage, singing a psalm, and the stage direction *Here go and bryng them* indicates that there is now a procession led by Dissimulation across the stage.

Sedition asks Dissimulation who brought him (i.e Dissimulation) in, and then supplies the answer that it was the Devil. As for Sedition himself, he admits that he came in by Dissimulation and 'his affinyte' (782). This last part of the 'pagent here this howre' as Private Wealth calls it (786), must now be completed by having Sedition borne in on the backs of the other three: and the relationship is once again spelt out:

> To bare me on thi backe and bryng me in also
> That yt maye be sayde that fyrst Dyysymulacyon
> Browght in Privat Welth to every Christen nacyon,
> And that Privat Welth browght in Usurpid Powre,
> And he Sedycyon in cytye, towne and tower
> That sum man may know the feche of all owre sorte. 792—97

(Notice the evilly charged words *feche* and *sorte*.) The point is further sharpened by the stage direction which introduces Sedition's triumphant, but scatological speech:

> *Here they shall bare hym in, and Sedycyon saythe*
>
> Yea, thus it shuld be Mary, now I am alofte
> I wyll beshyte yow all yf ye sett me not downe softe. 803—4

We should here recall that Sedition is probably dressed as a bishop, and it was part of Catholic ritual that bishops were carried into their enthronement. The sheer theatricality of the scene is remarkable, and its polemical undertones are quite clear. This turns out to be the first phase of the demonstration which is now completed by a song (whose words are unfortunately lost).

A further recognition or demonstration now follows, once again expressed in stage business. Much to the surprise of Sedition and Dissimulation, Private Wealth now tells them that Usurped Power is actually the Pope. They must not be deceived by his present 'light' apparel which does not include the tiara, cross keys, and cope. Dissimulation kneels, anxious to receive papal absolution *a pena et culpa* at once, even though Sedition suggests it is for making cuckolds. Usurped Power grants this once he has established that Dissimulation does not preach the Gospel. Upon the completion of this the business turns to the delivery of a message by Dissimulation to the Pope, and the allegorical mode of the sequence we have been following is temporarily suspended while the historical sequence of the excommunication is enacted.

This account of a specific piece of spectacle can be supplemented by a brief review of the ways in which Sedition's identity is manipulated through the play. There is a broad distinction between when he appears as himself, and when he appears embodied in the historical character, Stephen Langton. According to the version of the history Bale was following,[3] Langton was elected by the monks of Canterbury to be their Archbishop, and the Pope validated this against the will of King Johan. The play thus operates by varying attention between two levels, the allegorical and the historical. There is also the notional historical allegory in which King Johan represents Henry VIII.

Initially Sedition is quite open in telling the King his name (90), and the early sequence is meant to establish his threat to the kingdom which arises through his prior allegiance to Rome. He gives details of his support to traitors and rebels (218), and shows how the royal supremacy may be challenged by the bishops working in alliance with Rome. These ends are pursued partly by exploiting the secrecy of the confessional. It is not clear what he is wearing, though his claim to be found in many different places in the ecclesiastical hierarchy may be a clue to the general impression given by his costume. As the sequence ends, however, he sets off to change into an ecclesiastical costume (297). We have seen that in the following

sequence he goes through a 'pageant' which may depend upon his identification as a bishop. As this merges into the historical events at Rome, the Pope suddenly refers to him as Stephen Langton (937). This may well be a moment of special awareness for the audience, as the link between Sedition and Langton is forged for the first time. The Pope sets up the plan to excommunicate Johan, and among the instructions for costumes in the stage direction is one that requires Sedition to change for a monk (983). It should be noted however that this stage direction is in Hand A, the scribe who copied the earlier recension.[4] Though Bale must have seen it, since he revised the manuscript extensively, there is no telling how far he approved this particular instruction, and it may reveal some confusion on the part of the scribe. However the underlying intention that Sedition be manifested as Langton is clear. In the next sequence he seems to sustain the rôle of Langton, but he uses the alias Good Perfection, to hear the confession of Nobility under secrecy. He is specifically asked by Nobility to put on a stole, and he carries out the rite, including a Latin absolution (1148—89).

Sedition, without leaving the stage, is next accosted by Clergy and Civil Order, who immediately recognise him as the Archbishop, and Sedition accepts that his name is Stephen Langton (1192). For a long period after this he remains in this historical alias. During this time he makes Clergy and Civil Order kneel to him, showing them his bogus relics (a rare intertextual link with Heywood), proclaims a jubilee for those who attack Johan, and takes part in the excommunication and the conspiracy against Johan. In one place Bale interpolates, in his own hand, a curious offstage speech consisting mostly of noises to simulate a rebellious commotion (*Extra locum*: 1377 *sd*). He apparently wanted Sedition to be identified, but this could only be done if the noises he made were recognisably Sedition's. When King Johan is overcome by Pandulphus (an alias for Private Wealth) Sedition has a passage of uncontrollable laughter characteristic of the Vice (1694—1701).

At his next entry he is again named as Stephen Langton in the stage direction (1782). His function in this episode is to hear the King's confession and pronounce the absolution in Latin. He helps to secure the release of the personified character Treason, and continues to persecute England. Still in his ecclesiastical rôle, he hears that Dissimulation, now transformed into the historical rôle of Simon of Swineshead, intends to poison Johan and he gives absolution in advance (2049). Dissimulation can only persuade Johan to drink from the poisoned cup by drinking first from it

himself. Sedition ensures that Dissimulation has a saintly death and will become the object of idolatrous memory.

After the death of Johan the historical plot is completed, and Bale returns to the allegorical mode, celebrating Johan's Protestant achievement by the introduction of Verity and Imperial Majesty, the latter being identifiable in part with Henry VIII. Sedition reverts to his abstract rôle, and when challenged he again assumes his other alias, Good Perfection (2466). After Clergy accuses him as a thief, he claims sanctuary (2474—5). His last contribution to the political discourse is to explain that even now papal practices and abuses are still rife. But justice is meted out to him. Condemned to be hanged and quartered at Tyburn, he rejoices in his new sainthood, worthy to be remembered with St Thomas à Becket (2590). Thus he is play-acting to the last, but the nature of his deception is by now unmistakable.

As a contributor to spectacle Sedition has many attributes: his is the most vivacious rôle in the play. He has a repertoire of verbal tricks including jokes, proverbs, lists, insults, rude jokes. His verbal dexterity reveals an instability in his character, and this is matched by his lively actions, and the way in which his identity is manipulated according to dramatic function. The managing of a rôle which appears at times as a purely abstract characterisation, and at others as a historical person, has often been noted. But it must be emphasised that whatever the interpretative significance attached, the theatrical effectiveness of putting the audience into two minds should not be underestimated. Unfortunately we are not quite sure how costume contributed to this double identity, but it clearly provides theatrical opportunity, and we shall find that there are places in Heywood where the identity also comes into question. Sedition is especially active in singing and in the parody of ritual and ceremony. His theatricality is part of Bale's suspicion of play acting and trickery. Although he is thus theatrically engaging, his evil manifests itself in moral, religious and political dimensions which are commensurate with Bale's polemic.

IV

Heywood avoids personified abstractions embodying moral vices and virtues. This is significant as an indication that he is more interested in human types. Characters as such are established in terms of their social rôles, or their emotional predicament. The effect of this is to concentrate the dramatic action upon the exploration of these types, often in parallel

situations or tending towards conclusions which imply a balance of interests. In *A Play of Love*, No-Lover-Nor-Loved, who is named as the Vice in a stage direction (1297, quoted below), offers a major threat to the equilibrium, especially as he has much business and many speeches which are subversive. However his rôle is ambivalent since it is finally brought under the control of reason and love which are the main moral imperatives of the play, even though they are not presented dramatically in the form of personified abstractions. The Vice himself does not here embody a moral evil, unless it is felt that to love no one and to be loved by no one is morally reprehensible. However his actions are often without concern for others and he acts to ridicule them and cause discomfort. In this way he echoes the behaviour of many minor devils, even though his purpose is not to produce damnation. However mischievous he may be, he is as human as the other characters. Though Heywood's moral world is very different from Bale's, it is not amoral: the morality of love and reason is deeply embedded in the play, and shows itself most strikingly in the balanced structure which reveals tension and equilibrium between the four characters.

As to spectacle and the Vice, we can say that his is the most active rôle in the play: indeed hardly anything requiring physical activity occurs on the stage without his prompting, or at least participation. His part is most marked by the close links between actions and words. He is the last of the four characters to appear and he immediately sets about ridiculing Lover-Loved who is, in a logical sense, his 'opposite'. The game is to show the latter is a 'woodcock', and one of the techniques is to say the word 'woodcock' as often as possible. In the light of some of his later behaviour it is highly likely that this name calling is accompanied by elaborate gestures of mockery and introduction, perhaps including a bow. Much later in the play the Vice gleefully returns to the name when he feels that he has succeeded in showing the extent of Lover-Loved's folly.

At the end of the initial sparring with Lover-Loved it is the Vice who takes the initiative in sending his opponent to find an appropriate judge in order to decide which of them has the most pleasant life. There follows at this point the theatrical device of his monologue of about three hundred lines, to which I shall return shortly. First we should look at the range of actions which occur in his part. When the other characters are assembled he carries out a sort of ritual welcome: the speech makes it clear that this is a sequence of moves around the others, and involving several bows or curtsies:

Ye have ben here before me before now,
And nowe I am here before you,
And nowe I am here behynde ye,
And nowe ye be here behynde me,
And nowe we be here evyn both together,
And nowe be we welcome evyn both hyther;
Syns nowe ye fynde me here with curtsy I may
Byd you welcome hyther as I may say. 705—12

Inherent in this is a sense that Heywood expected his actor to be able to bring off these actions and movements as a kind of joke, but also they have an intellectual function in setting up the oppositions between the characters. The actions are thus part of the fun of the stage whatever their underlying intellectual purpose.

His participation in setting up the judging again offers movement games. As he reviews the conflicts and similarities between the others, his speech contains a significant play, or leash, on the word *joyne*:

Lovyng not loved, loved not lovyng,
Loved and lovyng, not lovyng nor loved:
Wyll ye see these foure partes well joyned?
Lovyng not loved, and loved not lovyng:
Those partes can joyne in no maner rekenyng.
Lovyng and loved, loved nor lover:
These partes in joynyng in lykewyse dyffer.
But in that ye love ye twayne joyned be,
And beyng not loved ye joyne with me,
And beyng no lover with me joyneth she,
And beyng beloved with her joyne ye:
Had I a joyner with me joyned joyntly,
We joyners shulde joyne joynt to joynt quyckly ... 777—88

The fun is perhaps increased by the bawdy pun on *joyne*. There follows a complementary manoeuvre on *part*:

For fyrst I wolde parte these partes in fleses
And ones departed these parted peses
Parte and parte with parte I wolde so partlyke parte
That eche shulde parte with quyet harte. 789—92

This game about sorting and distinguishing is fundamental to the trial or argument which is about to be played out. On the page it may be confusing, but when acted, with the Vice pointing and moving the others

about, it would be possible to distinguish them quite clearly. I also think that a director could help by assigning different colours to the actors, and by making them physically different. Both these could relate to the prevailing mood of the characters. One notable point is that Loved-Not-Loving is a woman, as the Vice repeatedly points out.

The comic device which follows is conceivably an imitation of Wolsey. The sanctimonious confession and the admission that he is now a judge who was never a sergeant (810) points to an impersonation. As usual in such cases we cannot be certain how far the mimicry may have gone, but it does not need much in the way of gestures, actions, and poses by the actor for the reference to be taken by the audience, especially if it consisted of lawyers familiar with Wolsey's manner. The action may be all the more pointed by Lover-Loved's line introducing the sequence:

> Why where the devyll is this horeson nody? 800

Possibly this conceals a movement to a higher level (up a ladder? on to an upper stage?) from whence he may dispense justice. Later his actions include an enactment of the nose-to-arse joke at the expense of Lover-Not-Loved the text for which lasts for 14 lines (1018—31); and there is a reappearance of the curtsying, also to Lover-Not-Loved. But the climax of his action must be his appearance as described in the stage direction:

> *Here the vyse cometh in ronnyng sodenly aboute the place among the audyens with a hye copyn tank on his hed full of squybs fyred, cryeng* 'Water, water, fyre, fyre, fyre, water, water, fyre,' *tyll the fyre in the squybs be spent.* 1297 *sd*

Notably he has gone off thirty or so lines previously after another thrust at the Woodcock, Lover-Loved. One should not underestimate the force of the surprise at his reappearance, especially as he comes in so strangely dressed and creates such a din by his fireworks and his shouting. He terrifies Lover-Loved by his account of the fire and the threat to the beloved. This outrageous episode is meant by him to prove that love brings only pain.

The episode is made all the more effective by his recounting of the circumstances of the lady's predicament. Here the narrative is relatively short, but we must now return to the soliloquy which I want to present as a remarkable *coup de théâtre*, attempting to dispel the doubts about it by emphasising that it is a magnificent vehicle for performance by a skilled actor. Most actors like being alone on the stage since the opportunity arises for close manipulation of audience response, and we should not be

put off by the length of the speech. It contains many sections in the narrative which require gesture, movement, and also the imitation of direct speech divided between two or more speakers.

There seems little doubt that Heywood saw this speech as a performance opportunity as he has the Vice say that while Lover-Loved is away :

> My parte hereof shulde pas evyn in mummyng 408

and he tells the audience, in a way which is characteristic of Heywood's manipulation of them:

> I shall for your confort declare suche a story
> As shall perfetly plant in your memory
> That I have knowledge in lovers laws. 415—7

In passing we may note that his telling in the tale does not actually show him to be so skilled in the ways of love, nor so impervious to it as the performance should ostensibly demonstrate: in other words there is an ironic dimension to the performance in spite of him, and the performer must allow for this.

The performance opportunities in this speech include the play upon the proverb 'mockum mockabitur', which is used and repeated, and also chances for impersonation and for carrying out a dialogue in two voices — his and hers. There is a notable range of feelings in such phrases in the narrative as:

> my mynyon semed/ Very mery ...
>
> anone she mysdemed ...
>
> No worde or loke but such as shewed as sadly ...
>
> I fet a sygh such one
> As made the forme shake which we both sat on ...
>
> Alas, dere harte!

Some of these emotional passages are conducted in such a way by the Vice that his attempted ironic detachment from his words is made quite clear. The dramatisation of the narrative continues with the strife between the two angels, Hope and Dred, and a passage which offers another chance for contrasted voices, and perhaps also for position games as well, with the Vice's fictional self in the middle. The leashes seem sometimes like a patter song, as does the one which ironically imitates the lovers' talk in reconciliation after a quarrel:

Anone there was 'I love you' and 'I love you' —
Lovely we lovers love eche other —
'I love you' and 'I for love love you'.
My lovely lovyng loved brother,
Love me, love the, love we, love he, love she ... 581—5

and so on for several more lines. As he gets to the end of his tale, with his own position rather compromised in that the young woman got the better of him, he seeks by rhetorical means to shift the blame towards a proof that he really is skilled in the ways of love, even if we, by now, know otherwise. It seems to me that the communication of this scepticism in the audience will be much enhanced in performance.

V

Though the intellectual and philosophical purposes of the two dramatists differ, there seems little doubt that the effectiveness of these two Vices depends upon the opportunities for performance in the two rôles. They are undoubtedly the most vivacious characters in both plays. There is much emphasis upon rôle playing, enacting, mimicry, pretence. The audience, witnessing these performances may well be entertained by them, but it is clear that in both cases a degree of detachment, and a critical attitude is anticipated and likely to be engendered.

I think this is most strongly enhanced by the different, but effective play upon the identity of the two Vices. We have noted that the sequences in which they introduce themselves are extensive and complex, and they contain much physical activity and movement. In the case of Sedition there is the highly suggestive link between abstraction and historical personage. With No-Lover-Nor-Loved, the comic performance, rich in movement, gesture, and mimicry, separates the audience from the character, and is likely to produce a deep scepticism about what he asserts.

There is here a kind of fluctuation over the exploration of identity, and the variations we have noted are specific though differing developments of the nature of dramatic characters in the morality play as a genre. For Bale the polemical intent prompts the use of symbolic aspects of dramatisation, including properties such as ecclesiastical vestments, the bell, book and candle. In *Three Laws* his use of such items is even more extensive. The technique involves a defiance of probability and realism, and substitutes a dramatic performance which invites interpretation on more than one level. It is clear that costume change in both plays has a significant effect here.

The Vice beneath the costume becomes highly interesting when such a change is made.

Finally the theatrical devices in these plays are part of a process designed to influence contemporary events. For Bale this is a single-minded mission, even an obsession, and it seems that every detail of the spectacle may well be endowed with polemical intent. For Heywood the process is much more cautious, oblique and restrained. *A Play of Love* hints delicately at the true nature of love near the end when the conflicting experiences of love are brought into balance, and the play refers covertly to the law and its abuse *en passant*. But Heywood's personal commitment seems to be more directed towards entertainment for its own sake — a turning towards the sheer pleasure of intellectual and theatrical ingenuity for their own sake. As a Court entertainer he had much to gain by this commitment. Any polemic would have to be carefully calculated. Because of this the interrelationship between ideology and entertainment in his work, it is much more intriguing and more difficult to characterise than it is with Bale.

University of Southampton

NOTES

1. For example *The Play of the Wether* may be read as a plea for religious and political toleration at a time of deepening anxiety over the King's divorce and its eschatological implications.
2. For Bale see *The Complete Plays of John Bale* edited Peter Happé, 2 vols (Boydell and Brewer, Cambridge, 1985—6) 4; for Heywood see *The Plays of John Heywood* edited Richard Axton and Peter Happé (Boydell and Brewer, Cambridge, 1991) 7. Subsequent quotations are from these editions.
3. The primary historical source is thought to be the English version of the *Brut*.
4. The manuscript is HM3 at the Huntington Library, and was printed in facsimile: *Kynge Johan nach der Handschrift in der Chatsworth Collection* edited Wily Bang in *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas* 25 (Uystpruyst, Louvain, 1909).

RÉSUMÉ EN FRANÇAIS

Techniques spectaculaires dans les pièces de Bale et de Heywood

Mon propos est de décrire et d'analyser certains éléments du spectaculaire dans les œuvres de ces deux auteurs, qui ont connu le succès au cours de la période 1530—40. Au-delà des ressemblances dans les techniques de représentation, je tenterai de rendre compte des potentialités spectaculaires de l'interlude à cette époque. Malgré des différences dans leurs orientations politique et religieuse et dans les techniques utilisées par l'un et par l'autre, on pourra examiner la scénographie de ces deux auteurs et l'utilisation qu'ils font des deux vices. Nos auteurs créent une série de situations destinées à séduire le public et à le distraire, jouant adroitement du texte et des autres signes théâtraux. Quoique de telles scènes soient superficiellement comiques, elles ont en réalité un objectif sérieux.

En ce qui concerne Sèdition, je considèrerai la mise en scène de son entrée, et la manipulation originale de son identité par rapport à sa fonction allégorique. Dans le cas de No-Lover-Nor-Loved, j'examinerai son jeu physique, sans oublier par ailleurs que le jeu sur le langage est important dans la stratégie dramatique de J. Heywood. Le long monologue de ce Vice illustre l'étendue de son répertoire comique et met en œuvre de nombreuses techniques spectaculaires, y compris le dialogue mimétique. Même si la pièce de Heywood n'est pas une allégorie morale au même titre que celle de Bale, elle s'inspire d'une vision morale de l'humanité et utilise les techniques du théâtre moral contemporain.

Ma conclusion sera que le spectacle fourni par ces Vices permet d'explorer leur identité théâtrale et différents niveaux d'interprétation grâce à un jeu vigoureux et divertissant.